U.S. Congress. Congressional Record.

Appendix

The Port of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Port of Baltimore is a vital and important asset to the people of Maryland, and the activities of this great port facility have once again been interestingly portrayed by the able maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, Miss Helen Delich, in her recent article entitled "A Day in the Port of Baltimore." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DAY IN THE PORT OF BALTIMORE

A day in the port of Baltimore has no beginning, no end.

Like world commerce, it flows continuously, sometimes in high tempo, sometimes in low. At night the port's activity slows, in the small hours, but the noises of work go on in the glare of floodlights. One familiar with the port's routine may tell the time by movements of men and boats. One familiar movement opens the following chronicle of a busy day in one of the world's greatest ports:

Mornings, about 5 o'clock, cold and dark in January, two big tugs, the *C. Stewart Lee* and the *Holland*, each 100 feet long, suddenly come alive. Their deck lights blazing, they back out from upper-harbor berths as the captains sound two warning blasts on the whistles.

The boats are headed for their tour of duty in a harbor that has been busy all night. Big freighters have been nudged into or away from piers as loading or unloading has gone on in the glare of floodlights. Ships have been arriving all night from Cape Henry or the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and the weatherbeaten little pilot boat, *Hi-Jack*, has been busy picking up pilots as they climbed down Jacob's ladders of the incoming ships.

In midharbor the lights gleam on the great dredge *Maryland*. She has been dredging in the channel all night. In the distance brilliant flares of orange-colored light are signs that molten buckets of steel are being poured at the mills on Sparrows Point. Bright flames burn gases at the big oil refinery and there is a whiff of sulfur in the cold air as several other plants make sulfuric acid.

Specific mission of the two tugs in this early morning scene is the usual chore. The speedy *C. Stewart Lee* is to take in tow the supertanker *Esso Santos*, fresh out of Amuay Bay, Venezuela, with a cargo of oil. The spanking-new *Holland* is to pick up the loaded iron-ore carrier *Marore*, out of Seven Islands, Quebec.

On this day, like most others, 20 ocean-going ships will arrive or depart, at all hours around the clock. And another 40 vessels will either be tied up at the piers, or in shipyards undergoing repairs.

At the piers the port will handle 30,000 tons of ore, 50,000 tons of coal for domestic and foreign use, and 1,200,000 bushels of grain. All this in addition to other shiploads of cargo. All told, it is enough to give employment directly to 90,000 persons in the Baltimore area, and indirectly to 400,000 throughout the State.

Soon after the city hall clock strikes 5, tugboat activity increases and the general tempo of the harbor steps up. Among the first offices to open is that of Mike Cataneo who, for years, has made a good business of sending men to piers to catch the tieup lines thrown over from ships. The radio-telephone in his office begins to bark as ships call for linemen. Here are samples:

"*Havmoy* leaves pier 6, Locust Point, at 6 o'clock for Key Highway."

"*Lualaba* docks pier 1, Pennsy, at 5:45."

At about 5:30 the port's two major ship-repair yards step up their activity. At one, the Bethlehem-Key Highway upper yard, the big drydock is lowered. Water rushes up over the pontoons and keel blocks and around the massive hull of the supertanker, *Atlantic Engineer*, which has been in the dock for 6 days having some of her bottom plates replaced. At the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., the Honduran freighter, *Augusta*, is set afloat in the same manner after an overnight drying out and routine voyage repairs.

The 2 companies have 10 drydocking facilities, said to be among the finest in the world. They are almost continuously busy. At the Key Highway yard, the Norwegian *Havmoy* is pushed into a dock to undergo minor repairs. At another dock the American passenger-freighter, *African Endeavor*, is raised to check her bottom for damage. She had recently run aground. And the Bull Line freighter, *Edith*, is drydocked for major repairs. She had smashed her bow in a collision in Delaware River.

As these operations go on, the *Lualaba* is inching into Pennsylvania pier 1, where trucks are to drive right down to the end of the pier to pick up general cargo, such as bales of hemp rope, cases of Chianti wine, degelatinized bone meal, aluminum scrap, and toys.

When the loading of heavy machinery aboard the *Lualaba* begins some hours later, rail cars will be run alongside of her for direct loading. Like all general-cargo piers in the port, this one has railroad tracks on the pier aprons right beside ships. Cargo can thus be loaded or unloaded directly from one to the other.

At 6 o'clock on this morning the Maritime Exchange opens. Its first act is to record the arrival of 10 ships during the night. Next it finds out what ships will arrive or leave during the day.

At about the same time the United States Public Health Service doctor, accompanied by the rat inspector, boards his launch at Hawkins Point. They head for the quarantine anchorage, where the Swedish ore carrier, *Raunala*, is flying her yellow flag. It means: "We are from a foreign port and need quarantine clearance before docking."

A for-hire launch bounces out to the stand-by anchorage with crew members of the various ships who have been ashore all night. As soon as all are aboard, the freighter *Patapsco River* heads for the Curtis Bay coal pier to load 10,000 tons for Britain. On the other side of the pier the *Harold T. Andrews* is loading 10,000 tons for Japan.

The port's four coal-loading berths have exported as much as 10 million tons in a single year—in addition to handling many millions more for domestic use.

By 7 o'clock longshoreman's union halls along Clinton, Hull, and Thames streets are jammed with men awaiting assignment for the day's work, though they don't have to report to their assignments until 8 o'clock. Within a few minutes the loudspeakers begin to blare the names of foremen, the number of men they will need and where they are to work.

Al Davis with 20 men at five, Port Covington, for Atlantic and Gulf. Philip with 20 at 3, Locust Point, for Loran. "Beefstew" and J. Scott with 10 each at Cottmans. As they are called men begin to stir, shape into gangs, and leave for their assignments.

And in the harbor the ship chandlers are busy. They begin solicitation on the *Johannes Maersk* as soon as her gangway is lowered at pier 10, Canton Railroad. They sell supplies to the vessel which runs regularly to the Far East with tobacco from Calvert and St. Marys Counties. The ship also carries Ohio tinplate to Manila and Baltimore broom-making machines to Hong Kong.

From now on tempo of the port goes into high gear. Molasses from Ciudad Trujillo is pumped from the Norwegian *Rogn* through hoses and pipes to the giant tanks at Port Covington. At pier 9, Locust Point, dried cherries, wine, and vermouth from Marseille are unloaded from the *Exiria* of the American Export Lines. Straining winches of the Cuban *Bahia de Nipe* unload sacks of raw sugar to be processed at the American Sugar Refinery.

Cork from Spain is being discharged from *Polyphemus* for the Crown Cork & Seal Co. The *Mormacpine*, direct from Santos, Brazil, with a cargo of coffee arrives in the quarantine anchorage. Her captain hopes to get clearance so she can be ready to start discharging at 1 p. m. at the coffee pier, 1 Pennsylvania.

About midmorning the Maryland pilots' dispatcher, Joseph Ignatowski, telephones from the pilot's office on the Recreation Pier to Norfolk to ask how many ships are likely to come up from Hampton Roads this day. He makes about 20 calls a day also to New York, Philadelphia, Chesapeake City and the Maryland pilot boat at Cape Henry to check on incoming vessels and to report in turn on ships leaving Baltimore, giving their destinations. It is important that no ships be kept waiting for a pilot at either entrance to the port, the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal or the Capes.

Though noon is lunch time for longshoremen, work does not stop. During the half-hour when lunch boxes are opened, tugs switch empty lighters and put loaded ones in their places, and railroad crews do the same with cars on piers.

At 2 in the afternoon tugboat crews change. Those who started work early in the morning take their boats back to their respective piers to turn them over to the night men. The crews alternate weekly on the night and day shifts.

Three in the afternoon is an important hour of decision in the port of Balti-

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

more. It is then that stevedoring companies determine whether to work overtime that night, how much longer it may take to load or unload a ship, and they make an estimate of how many longshoremen will be needed the next day.

And from 3 o'clock on, sailings out of the port mount rapidly. Masters of ships headed for New York, Philadelphia, or Norfolk want their vessels to be on hand promptly the next morning so loading or unloading can start without delay. Paying longshoremen while they wait for a ship to arrive is expensive. An owner says he makes money only while his ship is under way—and never while she is in port.

Union halls are open, too, at 3 and after to take work orders for the next day and to send gangs for night work on ships whose captains are anxious to finish loading or unloading late and sail at midnight or in the wee hours of the morning.

As darkness falls on the port, about 5 p. m. in midwinter, night mates and night engineers report to relieve officers on American-flag ships during their stay in port. Gangway guards, pier watchmen, port patrolmen, and police-boat crews have already been switched for the night.

And nightworking gangs of longshoremen amble up ships' gangways with their hooks, crowbars, and cables over their shoulders. In the darkness the looming bulk of the *African Endeavor* is floated out of drydock. She went in earlier in the day to have her bottom checked for damage after running aground. Her place was taken in the dock by the freighter *Kristina Thorden*, in need of routine repairs.

At 5:30 the molasses-carrying *Athelbeach* arrives. It is half an hour before closing time for quarantine authorities. But officials, including immigration and customs inspectors, are standing by to give her quick clearance so she can discharge her liquid cargo during the night at the United States Industrial Alcohol Pier.

Before 6 the *Four-Ace Excalibur* finishes discharging her cargo at Locust Point. She can now take advantage of the night and sail up to New York through the Chesapeake and Delaware Canals, and be there in time to start loading at 1 p. m. the following day. Her cargo was left on the pier overnight for loading into boxcars or trucks. It is an odd assortment of goods—garlic, marble ware, silk tissues, gloves, metal and silverware, Aleppo wool, carpets, copperware, strawhats, Gorgonzola cheese, laurel leaves, olive oil, sheep casings for sausages, mavrodaphne wine, and eggplants. Much of it is bound for the Midwest.

Until 7 o'clock the port is as busy as it usually is in the early morning. Tugs, line catchers, and the little pilot boats rush busily to and from ships and piers as arriving ships tie up and others sail.

As the tempo slows a little later, two radar-equipped tugs are a part of the port's all-night activity. They tow barges of limestone between Port Covington and the Bethlehem Steel plant.

After dark the beltline railroad around the harbor comes to life, as the Pennsylvania, Baltimore and Ohio, Western Maryland, and Canton railroads exchange cars. The city does not permit their operation in the daytime on tracks along busy Key Highway and Pratt Street. Exchange of cars is necessary because some freight brought in over the B. & O. might be scheduled for a ship loading on the Canton road's side of the harbor, and vice versa.

The night operator of WMH, city-owned marine radio station, is relieved at midnight. His relief carries the vigil on for another 8 hours. The station "ears" are tuned in on ships' radios.

Though the port is busy al night, activity slows in the early yours. The shrill sounds of winches, whistles are muted, and in the cold dark one may catch snatches of song and music as ships' crews enjoy themselves.

All night Coast Guard picket boats cruise every part of the harbor, their crews keeping a watchful eye on the security of the port and looking for slicks of bilge oil. It is against the law for ships to pump bilge into the harbor.

The port has still another night patrol. Special officers and customs inspectors in plain clothes prowl the piers and nearby streets, looking for smugglers of narcotics or other goods.

Long-distance calls from every part of the country come all night to the dispatcher in the pilot office from relatives of seamen.

Thus it goes around the clock. A great port attuned to world commerce never sleeps.

Forced Repatriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the New York Times on January 26, 1956, urging approval of House Resolution 137, introduced by me on February 8, 1955.

Interest in this resolution is mounting, and it is my hope that the Committee on Rules will see fit to report it to the House at an early date.

The letter follows:

FORCED REPATRIATION—CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION URGED INTO PROGRAM OF OUR AUTHORITIES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The undersigned deem it appropriate to call the American people's attention at the start of the second session of the 84th Congress to House Resolution 137, which was introduced by Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH, of New York, on February 8.

House Resolution 137 calls for the creation of a select committee, authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and "liberated" civilians as carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47 in Germany as well as in other countries. The select committee shall also be authorized to fix the responsibility for the forced repatriation program.

REASONS OUTLINED

Congressman BOSCH has, in the preamble of House Resolution 137, enumerated the reasons which primarily induced him to introduce it on the floor of the House. These reasons may be summarized as follows:

That the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Soviet-controlled countries brought death and misery to untold thousands who were shot, hanged, or died in the Siberian slave labor camps.

That the forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war as well as of liberated civilians cannot be justified by the Yalta agreement of February 11, 1945.

That forced repatriation was also in violation of our own Department of State's rulings in implementation of the Yalta agreement, as released by the Department of State on March 8, 1946.

That the forced repatriation of those prisoners of war who were Soviet citizens and who had enlisted in the enemy's army was in complete contradiction to the opinions of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, as repeatedly expressed during the last 40 years.

That this forced repatriation represents an indelible blot on the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles.

That forced repatriation, and therefore annihilation of millions of anti-Communist Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Hungarians, Balts, and of anti-Communists of other origin, is still poisoning our spiritual relations to the vigorously anti-Communist peoples behind the Iron Curtain. This constitutes—according to Congressman BOSCH—a serious impediment of our present foreign policy.

FOR QUICK ACTION

The undersigned are agreed upon the validity of all of Congressman BOSCH's motives for the introduction of House Resolution 137. Therefore, they consider House Resolution 137—especially from an ethical point of view—as one of the most significant resolutions ever introduced in the American Congress. They believe that a congressional investigation of forced repatriation is no more than a token payment on a debt of honor, owed by the American people to all freedom-loving peoples behind the Iron Curtain. They desire to express publicly their deep interest in the issue and their hope that Congress will now act upon House Resolution 137 as soon as possible.

Unless our Nation takes a firm, unequivocal stand against forcible repatriation to Communist countries, our honor will be seriously damaged in the eyes of the free world.

William F. Buckley, Jr., James Burnham, Julius Epstein, Arthur Bliss Lane, Isaac Don Levine, Sol M. Levitas, Eugene Lyons, Patrick F. Scanlan, William S. Schlamm.

NEW YORK, *January 23, 1956.*

Federal Aid to and Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is being opportuned to take one more step along the road to socialism by enacting a bill which will place the Federal Government as the overall controlling hand in the direction of the public schools of the United States.

There is presently pending before the powerful Rules Committee of the House of Representatives a motion for a rule to bring to the floor of the House of Representatives for debate the bill, H. R. 7535, introduced in Congress by Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat of Pennsylvania's 21st District. Among other features the Kelley bill would provide annual grants for the building of schoolhouses in the States in the total amount of $1,600,000,000 spread over a 4-year period. Thus the amount for fiscal 1957 would be $400 million.

On the basis of the amount in revenues contributed by the several States in fiscal 1954, and on the basis of the number of children in each State of school age, that is, from 5 to 17 years of age, every State would contribute to the program, but the returns would vary greatly.

J11 R5 2d set

For example, six industrial States in the North would contribute 57.654 percent of the Federal funds which would be distributed and would get back only 35.747 percent. Graphically, what each State would contribute to the program and get back is shown by the table following:

Contributions to and returns from the $400,000,000

State	Puts in percent	Puts in dollars	Takes out dollars
California	7.620	$30,480,000	$27,545,819
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
New York	18.749	74,996,000	32,794,708
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Total	57.654	230,616,000	142,988,829

By subtracting the take from the put, the 6 States shown above will contribute $87,627,171 each year for 4 years or a total of $350,508,684 to help other States build classrooms for the children attending the public elementary and secondary schools.

By contrast to the contributions of the 6 northern industrial States the State of Mississippi with a per capita personal income of but $873 in 1954 would contribute $800,000 toward the program and get back $6,506,886 which is better than an 8 to 1 return. Notwithstanding this favorable return the people of Mississippi generally reject the idea of Federal aid and Federal control over their public schools.

Indeed, in recent years a committee of the Mississippi Legislature investigated and rejected the whole idea of Federal aid to education. Yet this proposed bill literally would force the State to take it whether they wanted it or not.

To show the utter ridiculousness of this scheme to distribute Federal tax money all over the 48 States and our outlying possessions I am appending hereto 2 tables.

Table I shows the percent of income payments to individuals spent in the school year 1953–54 by States:

TABLE I.—*Percent of income spent for current educational expenses by States*

[Public elementary and secondary schools]

[Percent of income payments to individuals for the calendar year 1953 used for current expenses of public elementary and secondary schools]

State	Percent of income spent on current expenses	Rank
Alabama	2.92	18
Arizona	3.14	13
Arkansas	2.49	29–30
California	2.87	19
Colorado	2.76	21
Connecticut	1.90	47
Delaware	1.96	45–46
Florida	2.57	26
Georgia	2.61	25
Idaho	3.18	12
Illinois	2.04	43
Indiana	2.26	33
Iowa	3.34	7
Kansas	2.77	20
Kentucky	2.14	40
Louisiana	3.12	14
Maine	2.25	34
Maryland	2.24	35–36
Massachusetts	1.88	48
Michigan	2.19	37–38
Minnesota	3.24	10–11
Mississippi	3.00	16
Missouri	2.07	42
Montana	3.45	6
Nebraska	2.66	24
Nevada	2.16	39
New Hampshire	2.41	31
New Jersey	2.30	32
New Mexico	3.90	2
New York	2.12	41
North Carolina	3.08	15
North Dakota	3.61	4
Ohio	1.98	44
Oklahoma	3.24	10–11
Oregon	3.25	9
Pennsylvania	2.19	37–38
Rhode Island	1.96	45–46
South Carolina	3.32	8
South Dakota	3.49	5
Tennessee	2.49	29–30
Texas	2.56	27
Utah	3.75	3
Vermont	2.75	22
Virginia	2.51	28
Washington	2.74	23
West Virginia	2.97	17
Wisconsin	2.24	35–36
Wyoming	3.99	1
United States	2.43	

Table 2 shows the relative amount put into the $400 million annual fund and the amounts each State would take back if the bill is enacted into law.

This compilation refers specifically to H. R. 7535, the Kelley bill, which provides grants up to $400 million for each of the next 4 fiscal years for schoolhouse construction in the States, making a total possible expenditure of $1,600,000,000 in the 4-year period under title I of the Kelley bill. The table following has been compiled from the official Bureau of Internal Revenue report on collections from the States for the fiscal year 1954. This compilation shows the percent of revenue collected in each State in fiscal 1954, the relative amount of dollars each State will have to contribute to a $400 million fund in fiscal 1956 for grants to the States, and the amount which will be returned to each State as grants-in-aid for schoolhouse construction. This compilation is accurate within one-half of 1 percent.

State	Percent contributed	Dollars they will put in	Dollars they will take out
Alabama	0.542	$2,172,000	$8,968,658
Arizona	.232	928,000	2,537,686
Arkansas	.226	904,000	5,313,957
California	7.620	30,480,000	27,545,819
Colorado	.897	3,588,000	3,611,322
Connecticut	1.841	7,364,000	4,782,562
Delaware	1.288	5,152,000	835,050
Florida	.967	3,868,000	7,623,902
Georgia	1.002	4,008,000	10,237,501
Idaho	.153	612,000	1,691,790
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Indiana	2.287	9,148,000	10,226,657
Iowa	.755	3,020,000	6,420,128
Kansas	.719	2,876,000	4,750,027
Kentucky	1.900	7,600,000	8,317,970
Louisiana	.774	3,096,000	8,090,229
Maine	.244	976,000	2,244,876
Maryland [1]	2.726	10,904,000	16,202,148
Massachusetts	2.719	$10,876,000	$10,573,691
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
Minnesota	1.516	6,064,000	7,699,816
Mississippi	.200	800,000	6,506,886
Missouri	2.532	10,128,000	9,174,710
Montana	.167	668,000	1,594,187
Nebraska	.585	2,340,000	3,220,909
Nevada	.121	484,000	466,327
New Hampshire	.178	712,000	1,279,688
New Jersey	2.944	11,776,000	11,343,672
New Mexico	.152	608,000	2,320,790
New York	18.794	74,996,000	32,794,708
North Carolina	2.206	8,824,000	12,178,549
North Dakota	.091	364,000	1,724,325
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Oklahoma	.894	3,576,000	5,715,215
Oregon	.611	2,444,000	3,863,287
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Rhode Island	.424	1,696,000	1,778,549
South Carolina	.361	1,444,000	7,005,748
South Dakota	.102	408,000	1,724,325
Tennessee	.729	2,916,000	9,174,710
Texas	3.120	12,480,000	21,982,431
Utah	.424	1,696,000	2,168,962
Vermont	.108	432,000	965,188
Virginia	1.539	6,156,000	9,207,244
Washington [1]	1.184	4,736,000	6,355,059
West Virginia	.419	1,676,000	5,747,750
Wisconsin	1.857	7,428,000	8,740,918
Wyoming	.081	324,000	780,826
Hawaii	.194	776,000	1,409,825
Possessions			422,000
Total	99.656	398,664,000	400,000,000

[1] Compilation for Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, while that for Washington State includes Alaska. The possessions are American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, and Virgin Islands.

The Pacific War Veterans Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place before the American people a policy statement of the national commander of the Pacific War Veterans of America. The veterans who have defended us have a right to be heard.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN V. ABERNETHY, OF NEWTON, N. C., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE PACIFIC WAR VETERANS OF AMERICA, JANUARY 26, 1956

"You cannot conquer the enemy abroad without first disposing of his ministers at home" warned wise old Demosthenes. That is true in our country today. The Constitution and most everything for which the veteran fought are in mortal danger, and it is time for every pro-American veteran to get tough. Indeed the hour is late.

Totalitarianism, communism, alien-born socialism, wild-eyed one-worldism, and vicious liberalism, are gnawing at our vitals. They seek to, and do, breed confusion in their planned strategy to divide and conquer. I announce, therefore, that this organization has gone to war with every "ism" except Americanism.

What are the objectives of the "isimites"? The handwriting is on the wall. Their first target is—as they often boast—to wipe out the last vestige of States rights through the instrumentality of the United States Supreme Court, and many, or most, of the "isimites" would supplant our Anglo-Saxon founded government with a one-world totalitarian dictatorship. I submit, therefore, that every pro-American veteran has his work cut out for him. He must make endless war upon:

Red professors and pink teachers; tainted textbooks in every public institution of learning; fellow-traveling ministers; usurped powers of the Supreme Court and Supreme Court-made law; circumvention of the Constitution by Federal regulatory boards and commissions; enforced racial integration; nullification of the immigration laws; alien inspired control of the mails; the subtle undermining of the Constitution by the United Nations which is a fraud and a failure; entangling and unlawful executive agreements, and reckless foreign aid programs.

Not one dime should be appropriated for foreign aid—if indeed, such appropriations are lawful—while a single worthy veteran, or a veteran's dependents, are in need. It is a matter of common knowledge that literally thousands of sick veterans are being denied Veterans' Administration medical care while VA hospitals are being closed in the name of economy—all this when it is proposed to legislate a 10-year foreign aid program.

I call upon Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions, to submit the Commission report and clear the air. If there are good reasons for further delay, let the general release a progress report. The $64 question in every veteran's mind is: Will this Commission be used as a device to defeat veteran legislation or to stall it?

The Pacific War Veterans of America is mindful that in grateful recognition of their sacrifices, the Congress from our very beginning as a nation has legislated service pensions for the aged veterans of all wars through the Spanish-American War, and we are happy to join forces with our comrades of World War I in sponsoring just legislation in their behalf.

The Honorable Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement that concerns an eminent American gentleman of Swiss descent, the Honorable Albert Gallatin:

The celebration on January 29 of America's second Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, provides an occasion for remembering this great Swiss-American who was born in Geneva in 1761 and came to this country 19 years later.

Like so many other foreign-born Americans, Gallatin contributed greatly to the development of his adopted land. As the founder of the House Ways and Means Committee, he proved himself one of the ablest Congressmen of his time.

Remembering him gives rise to the thought of the splendid relations that have prevailed between the land of his birth and his adopted country for almost 200 years.

This cordial relationship has proved beneficial in many ways but it is of special interest to note, here, that my State of Illinois profited in 1954 to the extent of nearly $10 million in sales to Switzerland, to rank as one of the leaders among the 48 States.

In this regard, I would ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a clipping from the Chicago Tribune of January 9, showing the advantages of a liberal trade policy in dealing with America's best cash customer in Europe.

Our Trade With Friendly Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Press Intelligence, Inc., regarding our trade with friendly Switzerland:

SWISS SPEND $190 MILLION IN UNITED STATES EACH YEAR—THEY'RE OUR BEST CASH CUSTOMER IN EUROPE

WASHINGTON, January 8.—Switzerland is America's best cash customer in Europe. The Swiss buy more than they sell to this country.

Since the end of World War II the Swiss have purchased a half billion dollars more from the United States than this country has purchased from Switzerland.

Watches account for more than half of Swiss commodity exports to the United States. This fact has promoted the American watch industry to sound warnings that if the American precision industry should be wiped out by this competition, the United States might face a serious crisis in the event of war.

AMOUNT BY STATES

In 1935, during the depression period, American products sold to Switzerland totaled $7.4 million. In the years since exports have climbed sharply. In 1947 they hit a peak of $190 million. In 1954 the total was $150 million.

Since the Swiss have habitually bought more from the United States than they have sent here, the United States has amassed a trade surplus of nearly a half billion dollars since the end of the war.

Switzerland has made purchases in every 1 of the 48 States. The purchases fron States in the Chicagoland area are as follows:

Illinois	$9,612,000
Indiana	5,234,000
Iowa	1,969,000
Michigan	13,440,000
Wisconsin	2,899,000

LIST AMERICAN SALES

The major American export products to Switzerland are as follows:

Automobiles	$9,120,165
Chemicals	7,207,768
Copper ore	6,564,380
Cotton	7,155,399
Electricals	3,811,709
Fruits, vegetables	6,246,045
Furs	4,349,651
Metal goods	2,144,469
Nuts	4,401,433
Steel products	10,495,020
Synthetic fibers	9,699,466
Tobacco	9,763,842

Switzerland has received no economic aid from the United States.

Our System of Electing a President Should Be Reformed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News, the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and other Scripps-Howard newspapers recently published a most interesting series of three articles dealing with the electoral college and our antique system of electing a President. The series was ably written by Mr. Charles Lucey, a staff writer of these newspapers and a noted journalist and student of American politics.

The primary objection that I have to the electoral college system is that millions of voters throughout the country are disfranchised at each presidential election. On several occasions in our history men were elected to the office of President without receiving the majority of the popular vote but they succeeded in getting a sufficient number of electoral votes in the electoral college. Under such a system, how can we truly say that the President is elected by the people?

I favor the direct way of choosing all elected officials of our country, from the President on down. I firmly believe that the electoral college should be abolished and a new and more democratic system should be substituted. In the near future, I hope to introduce a bill advocating a plan along these lines.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the series of three articles by Charles Lucey, which are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 23, 1956]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM THWARTS WILL OF AMERICAN VOTERS

(By Charles Lucey)

Congress will begin debate soon on proposals for a basic change in the most important step in the American political process—the election of a President.

The object of reform is the electoral college system which each four years gobbles up millions of votes cast nationwide for the Presidency and translates them into electoral votes.

Political sages have brooded 150 years about this. The electoral college is only a rubber stamp; in fact it elects no one and it is too decrepit to be collegiate. Its usefulness ended even before there were torchlight parades and hard-cider campaigns.

Change is needed because the present electoral college machinery does not reflect the people's will accurately.

It thwarts that will.

It actually disfranchises millions and, in effect, counts their votes not for the man they voted for but for the man they opposed.

Proposals before Congress now would amend the Constitution so the antiquated system of electing a President can be revised to make democracy work better.

GOAL

Simply, the goal is to end the unit-rule, or winner-take-all, system of apportioning each State's electoral vote and to divide the electoral vote among candidates more nearly according to their popular vote.

If the American people knew the basic unfairness of the outmoded electoral system—if they knew that, in effect, millions lose the vote they cast for the presidency—they almost certainly would do something about it.

Political students long have seen and acknowledged the existing flaws. But because the system is so complex—hard to understand and explain—the popular sentiment necessary to reform has been difficult to generate.

Only 50 to 60 percent of the total popular vote for President ordinarily has real effect.

In 1952 Dwight Eisenhower received 34 million votes and Adlai Stevenson 27,300,000. Mr. Eisenhower had 55 percent; Mr. Stevenson 44.4 percent. Yet Mr. Stevenson got only 89 electoral votes to Mr. Eisenhower's 442.

Only 3,200,000 Stevenson votes were effective—less than 12 percent—in winning electoral votes for him.

In 1948 Harry Truman's nearly 3 million votes in New York counted for Thomas E. Dewey, who got the State's total 45 electoral votes. But in Illinois nearly 2 million Dewey votes went into the electoral vote for Mr. Truman.

FOUR PROPOSALS

Today four different proposals are before Congress to change this electoral system. The Senate leadership is ready to bring the issue to the floor if proponents can work out a compromise with a fair chance of acceptance. To amend the Constitution takes a two-third vote in both Senate and House, then a ratification by 36 of the 48 State legislatures.

None of the proposals would affect this year's presidential election.

To understand the need for reform, it is important to trace the development of the electoral college.

When the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution they scarcely thought in terms of today's brand of democracy. There was limited faith in the ordinary citizen's ability to vote wisely. Constitutional Convention delegates were chary of giving one and all a shot at the ballot box.

"It was as natural," said Virginia's George Mason, "to refer the choice of a proper character for Chief Magistrate to the people as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man."

Popular election proposals got nowhere. The Convention voted first to give Congress power to choose the President—and then changed its mind. But there was insistence on interposing some kind of election mechanism between the masses and the President. The final choice was to let States choose as electors well-informed men who in turn would choose a President.

The States could do this as they wished. Legislatures could name electors or they could be chosen by districts or on State-wide tickets standing in block for one party or one candidate—the method used today.

It didn't take long for State political leaders to see they'd have more influence nationally if they could wield a whole State block of electoral votes than if the votes were split among candidates. Out of this grew today's winner-take-all system by which the candidate who gets the most votes in the State—by no matter how thin a margin—takes the State's total electoral vote.

There is a wide field for mischief in this museum piece. Electors actually could ignore the vote in their States and go their own way—and in a close election with the pressures great they might do just that. In 1948 a Tennessee elector ran on both Democratic and States rights slates, then cast his vote for States-Righter STROM THURMOND instead of Harry Truman despite the fact the State went for Mr. Truman.

It wasn't important—but conceivably it could happen when it would be important.

The idea of a presidential elector exercising independent judgment perished long ago. They're automatons now, hardly doing more than cluttering up the ballot in many States. But there's another hazard in this, too.

JUST SUPPOSE?

What would happen, political students ask, if a man elected President in November died before taking office in January? Independently minded men might choose a President wisely, but what of today's obscure electoral college?

Remote, maybe, yet possible—and capable of chaos. Horace Greeley, who happened to be defeated by U. S. Grant in 1872, died soon after the election. Suppose General Grant had died—or that Mr. Greeley had been the victor? It could have meant vast confusion—and while this has not often happened, the risk recurs with each presidential election.

No one knows how many million Americans stay home and don't bother to vote each 4 years because of the winner-take-all system. Mr. Eisenhower's unusual personal appeal drummed up a fair vote in the South in 1952, but ordinarily Republicans there haven't turned out because they knew their States would go Democratic and their own vote would be lost.

If a State's electoral vote were split this would not be true. There would be greater incentive for Democrats to vote, also, if real competition came into Southern elections.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 24, 1956]

CONGRESS HAS PLANS TO CHANGE OUTDATED ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Charles Lucey)

For 150 years political authorities have believed the United States should find a better way to elect its President and today a new ferment stirs in Congress to do something about it.

It takes a constitutional amendment to overhaul the antiquated and outmoded electoral college and at least four different methods of doing this are advanced in proposals to be before the Senate soon.

The goal of all is to end the unit-rule or winner-take-all system of counting each State's electoral vote and, instead, to divide this vote among all candidates more nearly according to their popular vote.

The two plans most likely to attract support are the so-called Daniel-Kefauver and Mundt-Coudert proposals. The Daniel-Kefauver plan has been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is expected to reach the floor in the next few weeks. Sponsors of the Mundt-Coudert and other proposals may offer their measures as substitutes when Senate debate begins.

Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, are advocating a simple nationwide popular polling for direct election of the President.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, who as 1948 States' Rights presidential candidate picked up a package of electoral votes himself, is urging a reform which would retain the electoral college but divide each State's electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote.

Here is a sizeup of the two plans now chiefly supported:

THE DANIEL-KEFAUVER PLAN

Backed by Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and a score of other Senators, this plan would abolish the electoral college as such. It would retain, solely as a counting device, the present apportionment of electoral votes among the States. But electors as individuals or as a group would cease to exist.

A State's total electoral vote would be divided among candidates in direct ratio to their popular vote. If a candidate in New York or Ohio or California receives 42 percent of the popular vote, he would get 42 percent of that State's electoral vote, right down to decimal point figuring.

Say a State has 12 electoral votes and casts 2,400,000 popular votes. The Democratic presidential candidate receives 1,600,000, the Republican 600,000 and a third party candidate 200,000. Today the Democratic front runner gets all 12 electoral votes. Under the Daniel plan he'd get only the share the voters gave him—8. The Republican would get 3, and third party man 1 vote.

The Constitution now provides a candidate must receive 266 of the total 531 electoral votes. It has happened often that a candidate received a majority of the electoral vote while leading all other candidates, but without a majority of the popular vote. Three times a candidate won an electoral majority under the present system while actually running second in popular votes.

Senator DANIEL stipulates the winning candidates must have at least 40 percent of the electoral vote. If none has, the Presidency would be decided in both Senate and House, instead of the House alone as happens now if an election majority is lacking. Instead of each State casting a single vote, as today, each Congressman would cast a vote—a more democratic system recognizing population differences among States.

Daniel plan opponents criticize chiefly one point—they say dividing the vote might lead to "proportional representation." In fact, this is not what is known as "PR" or proportional representation as used in local elections in the United States—it might be called more properly a proportional counting plan.

But critics say that minor party votes are wasted now unless cast for the candidate of a major party. And that under the Daniel plan they would be cumulative from State to State across the country in a way to encourage development of minority parties. They see a threat to the two-party system.

Others say a danger would come, not in electing a President by the proportionate count, but in the pressure that would build up later to have Congressmen elected statewide rather than by districts, with each party getting a proportionate share. It is held this statewide cumulative process would let splinter groups elect Congressmen they cannot manage now in separate districts. Hence, it is contended, there is an encouragement to multiple parties and the danger of what has happened in France and other European countries.

THE MUNDT-COUDERT PLAN

This plan would retain the electoral college but would divide each State's electoral votes according to results in congressional districts.

That is, presidential electors would be chosen the same as Senators and Representatives—two electors in each State chosen as are Senators, the rest elected by districts. The Mundt-Coudert plan holds to the requirement of a majority of all electoral votes for election.

This is the system favored by Jefferson and other Founding Fathers and many who came after them. In 1824, Missouri's famed Senator Thomas Hart Benton argued against the winner-take-all system of counting electoral votes:

"The intention of the Constitution is violated because it was the intention of that instrument to give each mass of persons, en-

titled to one elector, the power of giving that electoral vote to any person they preferred. In New York 36 electors are chosen. Nineteen is a majority and the candidate receiving this majority is entitled to count 19 votes—but he counts in reality 36 because the minority of 17 are added to the majority."

VOTES WASTED

Bring the figures up to date and the case is the same today. In 1948 Harry Truman's nearly 3 million votes in New York won him nothing whatever; the State's 45 electoral votes went to Thomas E. Dewey.

The Mundt-Coudert plan also would bring the Senate into a determination of who is President if no candidate gets an electoral majority.

The chief flaw charged against the Mundt-Coudert scheme is that unfairness results because of the unequal sizes of congressional districts. Houston often is cited as having roughly one-sixth the State's population but it has only one of the 24 Texas Congressmen. The 11th Indiana (Indianapolis) District has more than 550,000 population but the Ninth Indiana District has only 260,000. The Dayton district in Ohio has twice as many persons as the smallest Ohio district.

The Mundt-Coudert answer is to urge a stronger law forcing States to make their congressional districts more nearly the same size—in the past legislatures often have dragged their feet on reapportionment.

No plan is without some objections from the constitutional experts. But there is wide agreement for the need of change to wipe out the inequities and dangers of today's electoral college system.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 25, 1956]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE OVERHAUL MEANS SHOT IN ARM FOR UNITED STATES

(By Charles Lucey)

America will see a brandnew kind of presidential election and democracy will get a healthy shot in the arm if the ancient electoral college system is overhauled.

Americans don't vote directly for a President now, of course.

They choose electors in each State and the electors cast the State's ballot for the front-runner in the popular vote of that State.

Sometimes the margin is paper thin. Yet the winner takes all—and millions voting for the other candidates in effect see their votes wasted so far as the national count is concerned.

Each State has as many presidential electors as it has United States Senators and Representatives—New York 45, Pennsylvania and California 32, Ohio 25, Tennessee 11, and so on.

TWO PLANS

The constitutional amendment proposed by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and Representative FREDERIC COUDERT, Republican, of New York, would have each State's electoral votes on the same basis as Senators and House Members are elected. That proposed by Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, would ignore congressional district lines and divide each State's electoral vote in direct mathematical proportion to what each candidate received statewide.

First result of all this is that millions of voters in effect now disfranchised would see their votes actually count for the man they prefer.

New vigor would be given the two-party system and almost certainly more voters would have a part in choosing a President. In many States today—this is true especially in the South—voters do not bother to vote because one party nearly always wins and determines the State's voice under the unit rule.

But if the Republicans knew they had a chance on a congressional district or proportional-count basis to pick up odd votes in the South even though they could not carry a whole State, there would be incentive to extend and broaden the two-party system.

The same would be true of the Democrats in some normally Republican Northern States.

TRUE INDICATION

A presidential campaign would become more truly national in scope instead of the present concentrated efforts in the big States and cities.

A presidential candidate knows today if he can carry New York or Pennsylvania or Ohio by even the barest margin he gets the entire electoral package. So he devotes most of his time to such States. Under a congressional district or proportional division of electoral votes, in which he would get a fair share of votes cast, there would be inducement for spreading a campaign more evenly over the whole country.

A major evil of today's presidential elections—kow-towing by both major parties to splinter or minority groups—would be ended. Today's winner-take-all system lets the pressure blocs in close States claim they have the number of votes needed to tilt such States. For fun? Not at all—for hard-boiled pledge and promise of what is to be delivered after the election by the winner. It's a what-do-we-get-out-of-it kind of democratic process.

Take away the system which gives the State's entire block of electoral votes to the top runner and the pressure group which has 100,000 votes in New York or Chicago cannot claim its 100,000 is more potent than the same number in Nebraska or Indiana.

NO MORE ARGUMENT

For many years an argument put forth for a presidential candidate was that "he can carry Ohio" or "he can carry New York." The large States have dominated the choice of men to go on the national tickets. Those who would do away with the winner-take-all system say it would give able men from lesser States a reasonable shot at the highest office in the land.

Altogether, proponents of all plans say reforming the electoral college system would bring more people into the active working of American democracy at the highest level. The country could stand it. In 1952 some 61 million voted for Messrs. Eisenhower and Stevenson—the highest total ever—yet an estimated 37 million eligible voters stayed home.

The case for electoral reform is old—but few roads are harder to travel than those leading to constitutional amendment. Altogether, since within a very short time after adoption of the Constitution, nearly 200 proposals for a change in the electoral system have been made in Congress.

Most recent was in 1950, sponsored by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Republican, Massachusetts, and Representative ED GOSSETT, Democrat, Texas. This plan, forerunner of today's Daniel-Kefauver proposal, passed the Senate but was lost in the House. Some of the old lines of opposition would hold in a new test this year, but there have been important conversions, too.

BREAK NEEDED

Amending the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress and subsequent ratification by 36 of the 48 States. Once the dam breaks, the process sometimes is completed rapidly. It needed only a year to get three-fourths of the States to approve electing United States Senators by popular vote. It needed a year to get the Prohibition amendment into the Constitution and 10 months to get it out. It took 4 years to ratify the No-Third-term amendment.

Today, Hill sponsors of the differing plans are speaking a compromise. If there is no compromise all plans may fail; if there is, one may get through. The Senate leadership is ready to give the green light for floor debate.

None of the measures would affect the 1956 election. But reform could be ready for 1960 if what a Senate committee wrote 20 years ago were to be heeded:

"The only object of an election is to accomplish the will of the people.

"If we permit a system to prevail that thwarts that will, we will trifle with one of the most serious purposes of Government. Under our present method, then and now, that will of the people will be clearly thwarted."

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

The following table shows what has happened in the last four presidential elections under the present electoral college system and how major party candidates would be affected under proposed electoral reform plans. Electoral totals under reform plans exclude those electoral votes that would have gone to minor party candidates.

	Popular vote	Electoral vote (present system)	Daniel-Kefauver plan	Mundt-Coudert plan
1952				
Eisenhower	33,666,062	442	290.4	375
Stevenson	27,314,987	89	236	156
1948				
Dewey	21,969,500	189	221	203
Truman	24,104,836	303	258	289
Thurmond	1,169,000	39	52	39
1944				
Dewey	22,066,078	99	223.8	214
Roosevelt	25,602,505	432	294.7	315
1940				
Willkie	22,304,755	82	214.6	182
Roosevelt	27,243,466	449	313.3	344

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 38th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Ukraine and I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in the House in their recent salutation to the gallant people of the Ukraine.

The Iron Curtain is drawn across the afflicted Ukrainian nation. Its people are shut off from the rest of the free world, but let us work and pray for the day when tyranny, oppression and persecution will be banished from the Ukraine and the other enslaved nations still in Red bondage.

The glorious history of the Ukraine is one of struggle and sacrifice to maintain its precious freedom from the old Ukrainian Kievan state of the ninth century to the Ukrainian National republic of 1917. It was in 1920 that the Ukraine became one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, but despite the destruction of its national church, famine, mass

murder, purges and banishment of its citizens, the ruthless extermination of its natural resources, the Ukraine has remained a symbol of the hope and burning fervor of a people destined to be free and independent.

The Ukrainian people have fought and died to preserve their freedom. The fight goes on today to regain their independence and free way of life. While oppression again stalks this nation of more than 40 million people, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, the lamp of freedom still burns in the hearts of its people. It will not be extinguished and will blaze again, proudly and fiercely, when the great goal of liberation has been won.

In this great struggle of the Ukrainian people, our own Nation must continue to encourage and assist the gallant and brave Ukraine to regain its independence. Let us help to speed the day when the Ukraine will again enjoy the fruits and blessings of freedom.

Earl Wilson, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana, EARL WILSON, has been a Member of Congress for 16 years, since 1940, and he is second in seniority in his State only to Mr. HALLECK. Mr. WILSON recently announced his candidacy for his ninth consecutive term and the reaction of the editor of the Madison (Ind.) Courier is significant. The Courier's editorial is as follows:

WILSON ANNOUNCES

Our district's veteran Congressman, EARL WILSON, has formally announced that he will seek reelection this year to his ninth consecutive term. This should be good news to the people of Jefferson County, for Mr. WILSON certainly has shown himself to be a most effective friend of this whole area.

Madison now is one of the fastest growing and progressive cities of the Midwest and our Congressman's efforts have helped us in that growth. His drive for Markland Dam and general acceleration of the Ohio River development have been effective. Almost singlehandedly last year he maneuvered an appropriation of $2.5 million which is getting Markland work off to a flying start. He is determined, he says, to stay behind that project and drive for its completion on schedule.

We know also that Mr. WILSON now is working for a new post-office building for Madison. He already has the attention of topmost postal authorities and he predicts favorable action before long.

Jefferson County last year was honored when its illustrious hero, Maj. Samuel Woodfill, was buried with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery. The major's grave is just a few yards from that of his beloved commander, Gen. John J. Pershing.

Had it not been for Congressman WILSON'S efforts Major Woodfill's body might still lie in the little Hebron graveyard near Madison.

All these things, and many more, prove that we have in Mr. WILSON a fighting Congressman who never hesitates to go to bat for the people he represents. His long tenure in office—he has been our Congressman since 1940—has given him a know-how and a seniority in Congress which combine to cut through redtape and get things done.

Water Hyacinth Obstructions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious aquatic plant growth from navigable waters, particularly in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. My colleague from Louisiana, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON, a member of the House Committee on Public Works, has introduced a similar measure.

This bill is a culmination of efforts extending over a long period of time to come to grips with this important problem.

On August 4, 1954, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Collier's magazine and an exchange of correspondence with the Corps of Engineers concerning the deadly menace of the water hyacinth to the Gulf States from Texas to Florida, as well as other areas. I urged upon this body the imperative necessity to take immediate steps to eradicate and remove the source of infestation of this menace once and for all and pointed out the steps that had been taken in that direction up to that time.

In the Collier's magazine article the following stark facts are brought out:

The water hyacinth has caused heavy losses to commercial fishermen, put trappers out of business, greatly handicapped the oil and logging industries, suffocated game fish beyond estimate, and driven wildfowl from their winter nesting grounds. * * *

Moving with the wind and the current like floral juggernauts, the mats have spread through all the Gulf States from Texas to Florida and have reached as far north as Virginia and as far west as California. They cover hundreds of thousands of acres of lakes, ponds, streams, ditches, bayous, canals, marshes, and swamps. * * *

In Louisiana alone, the depredations of the water hyacinth have been estimated by the State Department of Wildlife and Fisheries at $55 million to $65 million per year. This is a high price even for a lavender symphony. In terms of human misery, moreover, the price has been ever higher.

A resolution was adopted by the Congress directing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on water hyacinth obstruction submitted in House Document No. 91, 55th Congress, 3d session. The resolution provided as follows:

Be it further resolved, That this action be taken with the view to determining the estimated cost of permanently eliminating the hyacinth plants and other marine vegetable growths from these streams, and that the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture and the United States Public Health Service be solicited, since the aforementioned obstruction of such streams affects the fishing industry, agriculture, and health conditions.

I am very pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, in cooperation with the agencies referred to in the resolution, has submitted to the Secretary of the Army for transmission to Congress the report referred to in the resolution. After reviewing the problem thoroughly, the report of the Chief of Engineers, concurred in by the other related agencies, recommends a separate and comprehensive project to provide for control and eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic growth from the navigable waters and tributaries in the States above mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to F. W. zur Burg, of Southwestern Louisiana Institute and to Tulane University, New Orleans, for their work in preliminary research on the subject in cooperation with Government engineers and scientists.

Following my remarks on the floor on August 4, 1954, I received very encouraging expressions of support of the movement from Representatives and Senators from all the States involved, and I hope that by united effort we can have successful hearings and approval of the measure I have introduced during this session of Congress.

The report of the Chief of Engineers follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Water hyacinth obstructions.
To: The Secretary of the Army.

1. I submit herewith for transmission to Congress the interim report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in response to resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted February 6, 1945, requesting the Board to review the reports on water hyacinth obstructions submited in House Document No. 91, 55th Congress, 3d session, with a view to determining (a) whether any expansion of the scope of operations, or any change in the method now employed, for exterminating and removing the hyacinth plants and other marine vegetable growths from the waters of Louisiana, and such other States as are affected, is advisable at this time; (b) the nature and extent of the various public benefits that would accrue from such extermination and removal; and (c) the amount of local cooperation that may be warranted by reason of the local benefits; and further, that this action be taken with the view of determining the estimated cost of permanently eliminating the hyacinth plants and other marine vegetable growths from these streams, and that the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture and United States Public Health Service be solicited, since the aforementioned obstruction of such streams affects the fishing indusry, agriculture, and health conditions. In is also in review of the interim reports on Lake Okeechobee and

its tributary streams, Florida, with a view to removing the water hyacinth, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945. The nature of the problems involved does not permit presentation of a final solution for successful eradication of marine plant growths without further extensive research and field operations. For this reason, an interim report is submitted to present a recommended 5-year program of increased scope of operations in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Based on experience gained through this program a final report under the authorization will be submitted at a later date.

2. The existing Federal project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1899, as amended, provides for distruction or removal by the Corps of Engineers of the water hyacinth in the navigable waters of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, so far as they constitute an obstruction to commerce, using any mechanical, chemical, or other means whatsoever (except that in Florida the use of chemicals injurious to cattle is prohibited). Annual operations thereunder are carried out to the extent required to meet the essential needs of commercial navigation. Generally those operations have been limited to hyacinth control in the main navigable waterways. While no local cooperation is required under the existing project, local interests in the aggregate carry out considerable removal operations of local benefit independently of the Federal work for navigation. No authority now exists for Federal eradication measures in the interest of flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, and public health.

3. The water hyacinth infestation has spread markedly in recent years into tributary waters and headwater areas, and the alligator weed is now prevalent in a number of localities. The belt of damaging infestation extends across the Southern States from North Carolina to Texas, and from the salt water line on the south to the area of intense winter freezing to the north. Generally after rains and floods large masses of hyacinth plants are carried downstream into the principal waterways. Along the Atlantic coast the infestation is spreading northward from Florida. Clogging of waterways has become so extensive, oftentimes blanketing a long stretch of a watercourse from bank to bank, that, in addition to obstructing commerce and navigation, the problem has assumed a greater scope. Among the additional adverse effects are those to agriculture by blocked drainage and increased flooding of low cultivated lands; to fish and wildlife by destruction of their food supply and depletion of the dissolved oxygen in the water; and to public health by increased malaria hazard and pollution from plant decomposition affecting public water supplies.

4. A comprehensive field survey, including extended research and experimentation, has been accomplished by the Corps of Engineers in full cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency. The three interagency field committees organized to make the basic study of the coastal region extending from North Carolina to Texas, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, have recommended an expanded Federal program for control and eradication of aquatic plant growths from the waters of those States, in the interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related public purposes, with the provision that the Chief of Engineers may require such local cooperation as he may deem appropriate. Annual cost for a 5-ycar all-purpose program, including continued research for development of most effective and economical control measures, was estimated at $1,520,000 in 1949. That sum included the annual allowance which was estimated as being required under the existing Federal project for reasonably adequate control measures on navigable waters in the interest of commerce and navigation only.

5. After due consideration of this report, I concur generally in the views and recommendations of the Board. It is obvious that the local benefits to accrue from such an expanded program would be substantial, and in my opinion these local benefits warrant participation by local interests either by cash contribution or services in kind. Although I recognize the difficulties involved in prescribing a blanket degree of local cooperation for all areas in which the proposed expanded program is to be prosecuted, I also recognize the need of the Congress for a basis on which it can consider and determine an equitable allocation of costs. Present policies provide for Federal participation ranging from 100 percent for certain flood control and navigation improvements to essentially 0 percent for certain fish and wildlife and public health improvements. A weighted average of local contributions toward the various purposes involved in this program approximates 25 percent. I believe that local responsibility for 25 percent of the program would not be an unreasonable requirement, and that it would not place an undue burden upon local interests.

6. With respect to the use of chemical herbicides, the application of spray solutions including 2,4–D from boats or aircraft is indicated to be effective in attacking infestations in lakes and other large water areas, without harmful effect to fish and wildlife, other animals, or human beings. Such applications must be carefully controlled in order to prevent damage to certain crops on adjacent lowlands. Even when due care is exercised in applying the spray solutions, however, there is a possibility that crops may be damaged. In my judgment, local interests should hold the United States free from claims for any damage that may occur, if any should arise from such operations, and I consider it advisable to secure appropriate assurances as a condition precedent to Federal operations in any expanded Federal program.

7. Subsequent to preparation of the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the expanded program set forth therein has been reexamined in the light of existing conditions. It has been found that the scope of the measures proposed is adequate, but the total annual cost of the existing and expanded programs on a 5-year basis is presently estimated at $1,655,000.

8. Current expenditures for removal of the water hyacinth from navigable waters under authority of the River and Harbor Act of 1899, as amended, have averaged about $305,000 during the past 5 years. In view of longstanding Federal responsibility for maintenance of channels for commercial navigation, I am of the opinion that such maintenance work should be continued without contribution of local funds. A substantially lesser amount should suffice for this purpose after the 5-year program is completed.

9. Accordingly, I recommend that in addition to the existing Federal project for Water Hyacinth Control for Navigation, a separate comprehensive project be authorized to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish, and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated total cost of $1,350,000 annually for 5 years, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, all generally in accordance with the methods set forth in the report of the Board and with such modifications as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, subject to the conditions that the States hold and save the United States free from claims for any damages that may occur from such operations and participate to the extent of 25 percent of the cost of the additional program. This project will be designated as the expanded project for aqutic plant control.

10. In order to facilitate administration of the proposed program, close coordination between State and Federal agencies will be required. It is contemplated that the portion of the program to be accomplished each year will be determined by agreement between the State and Federal agenices concerned in the light of the availability of local funds which, in turn, will govern the amount of Federal funds appropriated each year for expenditure by the Corps of Engineers on behalf of the Federal agencies.

S. D. STURGIS, Jr.
Major General, USA,
Chief of Engineers.

How Mr. Summerfield Shortchanged Our Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of our conscientious postal workers have come to me with a complaint against the Post Office Department which I believe to be soundly justified. In all fairness to our postal workers corrective action should be taken.

I would like to take a few minutes of the House's time to describe the circumstances under which employees of our Post Office Department were given reduced pay for December 1 and 2 of last year.

Under Public Law 68, the new postal pay bill which Congress passed last session, the Postmaster General was given discretionary authority to put the act into effect at any time within 180 days after the date of enactment. Postmaster General Summerfield chose December 3, a Saturday, as the date to convert to the higher wage scales. This date, the Department explained, was chosen primarily for administrative considerations in order to simplify their bookkeeping for compensatory time in the future and to allow for a pay lag of 7 days.

But what did the selection of this particular date do to the postal employees? They received their regular salaries through Wednesday, November 30, and the new law did not go into effect until Saturday, December 3. So what happened to December 1 and 2? Employees were paid for these 2 days on a daily basis

set under the old law which specified, in section 7, that a 360-day base should be used in figuring daily rates. Annual salaries were therefore divided by 360. An employee earning $3,600, for example, got $10 for each day. This assumed that Saturdays and Sundays not worked were also figured at this $10 rate to arrive at an annual total wage of $3,600. But what of the new law? Under Public Law 68, Saturdays and Sundays not worked are not counted because a new biweekly pay method of computing on the basis of a 5-day workweek was instituted. Therefore, when the Postmaster General chose Saturday for the conversion date, he deprived the postal workers of getting the pay they would have earned under the old law for these 2 days, Saturday, December 3, and Sunday, December 4. Nevertheless, he went on to figure the pay for December 1 and 2, Thursday and Friday, on the basis of a 360-day year which assumes Saturdays and Sundays are included.

This is commonly known as dirty pool where I come from. By all fair standards, if they used the 360-day pay basis as set forth in the old law, they should have counted the days worked as defined under the same law. In other words, through what appears to be a deliberate attempt to shortchange the employees, our postal workers received reduced pay for these 2 days.

How could this injustice have been avoided? Very simply. The most obvious solution would have been to put the new schedule into effect at the end of the old pay period on December 1 with no lapse of time. Another alternative would have been to convert to the new schedules on Monday, December 5. Under this plan, Saturday and Sunday would have been figured under the old law. Or any number of other days, I am advised by experts on the House Post Office Committee, would have allowed the Department to get its bookkeeping in proper order, and at the same time would have given the postal employees the pay they earned and deserved.

Of course, we may say that this is all academic. The yearly pay of our postal employees is the same regardless, and by next December 3 they will have received the same amount as they would have 1 year after a December 1 or December 5 conversion. This is true. But the fact still remains that their take-home pay for December 1 and 2—those abandoned days between statutes—in effect, was less. And I feel that some action should now be taken to rectify this.

Complaints were made to the Department last December questioning the legality of the Postmaster General's choice of dates. The Comptroller General has ruled that the selection of Saturday, December 3, was legal. But, as has been pointed out by postal regulation experts, the selection of any number of other days more advantageous to the postal employees would also have been legal. Unfortunately, once such a decision is made and declared legal, it cannot be changed administratively if it will cost the Government more.

Complaints are still coming into my office from postal workers—and I have taken them up with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I am advised that nothing short of legislative action can correct this situation, which is legal by the letter of the law, but which subverts its spirit, and places a burden on the individual postal employee. I can understand the Department's interest in arrving at reduced costs to the taxpayer through future savings which they say will result from the streamlined bookkeeping methods instituted under the new law. This I heartily endorse. But it should not be done at the expense of our loyal postal employees. If morale is injured by callous administration of a law intended to help our hardworking postal people, no amount of administrative shortcuts will give us the efficient postal service we want and must have. I am hopeful that, with the proper concern registered by the Congress, some action can be taken to pay our loyal postal employees their just due.

Address by Homer S. Brown Before the 1955 State Convention at Harrisburg of the Pennsylvania State Education Association, December 28, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

EDUCATION, THE ARCHITECT OF TOMORROW

"Ignorance is the curse of God; knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to Heaven." (Shakespeare.)

"All men by nature desire to know." (Aristotle.)

Man's desire for knowledge has brought him to the high noon in his conquest of nature. His insatiable desire to know has made possible the splitting of the atom. On November 30, this year, the Associated Press announced that the atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, had cruised 25,000 miles without taking aboard fuel, and predicted it could cruise for many more thousands of miles, and perhaps months, before any major replenishment of its nuclear fuel would be necessary.

Heat, now generated from a pound of uranium has been demonstrated to be more efficient than 1,500 tons of coal. The polar route, from Los Angeles to Copenhagen, a distance of 5,800 miles, is now on regular air passage schedule in 24 hours. However, if that is too slow, you can board a British passenger jet in London and arrive in Sidney, Australia, a distance of 11,000 miles, in 34 hours.

The life span of a child born in the United States has been increased to an average of 68 years, as against 30 years in less economic developed areas of the world; and to make for a more abundant life for those who live in less fertile areas, man is now attempting to conquer the desert and polar regions of the earth. In the desert, representing one-fourth of the world land surface, he is harnessing power from the sun and wind; he is attempting to produce rain by coaxing the clouds over an area where the rain is needed to drop this most-needed element to make fertile the arid regions, instead of permitting the clouds to drift elsewhere to shed their rains.

Life magazine of December 12, 1955, in an editorial entitled "1980's Shape of Things To Come" gives this picture:

"A flick of the nuclear switch and presto, the North Pole melts, the vast continent of the Antarctica thaws into productive use; Greenland grows bananas; Vermont grows oranges; and everybody's heating bill vanishes."

Calculation has given way to automation, for an electronic computer, commonly called the human brains, can determine the density of electrons in a nitrogen molecule and the energy of the molecule in 2 hours—a job that would take a man equipped with pencil and paper 800 years.

Dr. Albert G. Conrad, professor of the engineering school at Yale, was recently quoted as saying: "He (man) has increased the speed of communication by a ratio of 30 million. He can send a message around the world seven times in a second. Unfortunately it sometimes requires years to get this same information from the outside to the inside of a human skull."

"Incredible and breath-taking" are feeble and mild terms with which to describe man's limitless accomplishments in the world of science and technology. Why then do we need to be disturbed about tomorrow? Cannot the human race rest its case for plenty and survival on this record alone? Is not man's knowledge abundant proof that education, through science, has already constructed our world of tomorrow?

To answer this question in the negative one could be accused of the highest degree of hypocrisy, for none of us would surrender, if we could, this age in which we live so comfortably for the ages of Shakespeare and Aristotle. Nevertheless it was said many years ago that "man cannot live by bread alone," and wise men of today are saying that man cannot live by material objects alone, created by science, however breathtaking these may be.

It is vital and necessary, therefore, in this advanced age of automation to continue to think of every child as an individual—not a machine—and to strive not only to build better schools but to make possible a greater appreciation on the part of youth of the world in which he lives, and to bring into focus the need for individual responsibility when it comes to belief in and attachment to ideals that machines and gadgets cannot supply. Let us look realistically at man's greatest challenge, as one illustration to show that things of matter cannot build a safe tomorrow. We have deposited in our Pandora box the blueprint for building nuclear weapons so powerful and so destructive that we are searching for places upon which to test these weapons, as the radio fallout is so fatal that the earth, water, and vegetation for miles and miles beyond the testing grounds become contaminated with deadly radiation. We are running a race to see that the lid of this box is not opened in warfare, for if war occurs it will not only destroy life, but as one atomic scientist says, it will also destroy the history of man. Mythology tells us that at the bottom of Pandora's box was hope, and that when she inadvertently opened the lid she released the plagues that descended upon man; that she hastened to replace the lid and hope did not get a chance to escape, and thereby man, since he still had hope, was able to escape being condemned to a state of wretchedness and depravity. We dare not open our Pandora box, unless it is for the purpose of converting our instruments of war to instruments of peace, for otherwise we will not have a chance to retain hope, or anything else.

Broadly speaking it could be stated that the purpose of education is to provide methods by which the child may develop to the fullest extent of his capabilities and to equip the child to become a patriotic, productive citizen. I am sugesting that education, as the architect for a better tomorrow, should place more emphasis upon (1) a greater study of the principle known as the rights of man, and (2) the need to live in a world where all men are neighbors.

In the first category, we are alarmed at the ignorance concerning the most priceless heritage of free people. Linowitz, in an article in the September 1955 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, writes that "at a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a paper was read presenting the results of a survey of popular understanding of the Bill of Rights in this country. One-third of the American people, the paper showed, do not know what the Bill of Rights is or the function it is intended to perform. And another one-third, the survey found, apparently oppose the principles for which the Bill of Rights stands." This is an appalling and frightful conclusion and it is no wonder that in such a climate men who are demanding "man's right to the free flow of knowledge," "the right of silence," "the right to move freely," "the right of free inquiry," "the right of dissent," "the right to read," "the right to work without being discriminated against because of race, creed, color, or national origin," and "the right to public education without discrimination on account of color" are ofttimes severely criticized and condemned as heretics and subversives. Education must find a way to lay a stronger foundation in the minds of youth concerning these ideas that keep men free. It has a responsibility to see that youth understands not only how we became free but likewise how we can remain free from enemies both within and without.

In this domain of knowledge one encounters what is called the controversial, which stems, in part, from two factors; first, the restrictions on freedom which become necessary to some degree in every society or government, a subject incapable of mathematical proof, but vital to every orderly society; "for where every person has absolute freedom, none in the end has any." The difficulty is to define the area of the maximum degree of freedom and the equal protection of the law, without prejudice and discrimination. This is a question which sometimes challenges the status quo, and cuts across customs and traditions. In the second place, no study worthwhile on this matter can successfully be taught without bringing into focus laws and systems of governments where individual freedom is suppressed. Although the teacher here, like the searcher in the field of fundamental science, is searching for truth, he offends school directors, calls down the wrath of the demagog; silence is the better part of wisdom; or he conforms, knowing full well that by such action reason is dethroned and the light of truth is blacked out. In a somewhat different but related field bearing up the nature and the equality of man, who are afraid of the truth even though chemistry, biology, and anthropology show us the light.

"There is not a truth existing which I fear or would wish unknown to the world," said Thomas Jefferson. This should be our guiding star and our resolve to follow the light of truth wherever it might lead. Malebranche, as quoted in Holmes' "collected legal papers" says this is man's greatest heritage, for, says Malebranche, "If God held in one hand truth and in the other the pursuit of truth, I would say 'Lord, the truth is for Thee alone, give me the pursuit'."

The second point of emphasis in a most neglected area of our education is the failure to teach more of the relationship of peoples to each other, and how vital it is to respect the rights of other people. That all men are brothers lies at the bottom of our basic religious heritage. However, today only a person blind to reality can fail to recognize that the world is divided into two camps—the free world and the slave world. Both worlds possess the know-how to build machines and hydrogen bombs. In the latter live almost 1 billion people, and it is bidding for the minds of many other millions who today are undecided as to which way of life is better for them. Frank C. Laubach, in a letter to the editor of the Ladies' Home Journal, in January 1953 paints this graphic picture: "The illiterate two-thirds of the human race * * * reach up a hand asking 'who will help us?' Anybody who offers to take that hand can have them, even if he lies. They are the easiest people on earth to win as friends—easy for us—equally easy for the Communists. The Communists promise to lift them, because they want to enslave them. We largely ignore them."

I would take issue in part with this indictment of the learned world traveler and point to the fact that dollars-and-cents wise, our Nation since the end of World War II up to June last, has spent in foreign aid $51,366,000,000, of which $36,673,000,000 went for nonmilitary grants and credits. Although in the beginning the largest part of this aid has been directed to Europe, since 1953 the emphasis has been shifted toward the less economic developed countries of the Middle East, south Asia, Africa, and the Far East. In addition, nongovernmental agencies have been steadily working in these areas by teams of scientists to increase food productivity; to relieve against contagious diseases, and to teach fundamental education. Notwithstanding this, there are those who fear we are losing the race for "the minds of men." One writer not long ago stated this case simply by saying "we have neither won friends, nor influenced people." Some may say that this is a problem that can only be solved on the international level and that our youth should not be given such momentous matters; that they are immature and will become confused—they will be led astray into doctrines detrimental to our political philosophy; and that they have no time to indulge in what some people term this area as "pure star-gazing." We forget the youth of today will be leaders of tomorrow, and the wise counsel of the Scriptures "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it" (Proverbs 22, 6). Have we forgotten the training of youth under Hitler?

In the quarterly report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York for October 1955, is an article entitled "The Values Students Live By," prepared by four Cornell University sociologists. With grants from the Carnegie Corp. and after a 6-year survey where 7,000 students in 12 widely scattered colleges were questioned as to their attitudes toward education, politics, religion, choice of occupation, courtship, marriage, and ethics, the article concludes by saying "the larger picture that emerges from the 12 campus surveys reveals that the students as a group reflect with remarkable consistency the dominant values of their society and their elders." I would say, parenthetically, that the survey did not mention sportsmanship, for had it included this activity, I fear the end result would have been to the contrary, as has been recently demonstrated by student revolt against the Governor of Georgia, in the University of Pittsburgh-Georgia Tech-Sugar Bowl incident. Governor Griffin of Georgia, in saying Georgia Tech could not play against Pittsburgh because of the presence of a Negro on the latter team, was expressing what he thought to be the dominant value of his society of white supremacy. It took the students to rebel against this decadent and moribund idea, and it is well for Georgia, for the United States, and for the free world, that they were victorious.

Youth can be taught that people are different—but differences do not connote racial inferiority. Where there is outward manifestations of inferiority it is due to lack of training and lack of opportunity to acquire knowledge, for all men are equal in dignity, and all men desire and are entitled to the better things of life.

By directing your attention to the matters briefly touched upon above, I am not unmindful of the following factors that also call for immediate solution—the serious shortage of qualified teachers and the inadequate salaries they are paid; the high birth rate which calls for more classroom space. It is estimated that it will cost $30 million for nearly 1 million classrooms in the next decade. In this regard, the United States Census Bureau reports that one segment of our population, children between the ages of 5 to 13 years old, have increased 26.5 percent during the past 5 years; the alarming figure of young people who drop out of high school and college. Only a few days ago the United States Commissioner of Education reported a drop of 4,254 in the number of degrees awarded in 1954–55 as against 1953–54; the $9 billion spent annually on public education, and the cost is still rising; the solution to the plight of the financially distressed school districts and the most alarming, perhaps, of all from the point of view of same, that the schools of Russia are training and graduating more scientists and engineers than are being trained in the United States, as the figures for 1954 show Russia, 58,000; the United States under 20,000. These are factors largely stemming from material and economic weaknesses in our educational structure.

I am confident that our Nation, which represents 6 percent of the world's surface, and 7 percent of the world's population, but which produces over 50 percent of the world's goods, and spends $30 billion annually for a defense program, will quickly find answers to these problems and adjustments made to correct these inequities.

The recent White House Conference on Education, and the small White House conferences held previously in the 53 States and Territories have alerted the people of the Nation to these needs, and once the people are alerted, they will act intelligently to meet the crisis. Today there is a veritable ground-swelling of interest at the grassroots level in our country in the interest of public education. The increase in the number of tax dollars allocated for public-school purposes will make possible larger buildings and equipment; will provide more adequate compensation for the teacher; enlarge our program for the handicapped and the retarded; provide scholarships for students who drop out of school for financial insufficiency; make possible advanced study for the gifted child; replace the courses that have been dropped in physics, mathematics and chemistry, so that more students will graduate from our high schools prepared to continue in the field of science; but tax dollars in themselves cannot produce a healthier climate where ideas of the rights of man may mature. These dollars cannot create a switch, nuclear or otherwise, that can be flicked on as scientists foresee we may be able to do in 1980, to melt the ice of Antarctica, in order to make man truly educated. This is the process that begins in the cradle, and ends, insofar as we know, in the grave; it is the process that requires dedication of the individual to his immediate society or nation to which he owes a priority in the matter of loyalty and devotion; it also requires knowledge about and the responsibility of living in a world community. Especially is this true of Americans, since we

have assumed leadership in the free world. Ignorance of the world around us could be one of the direct causes of forfeiture of this leadership.

These dollars can be a means only to an end—the end finally being the choice we make as to whether we live as free men, or as slaves; and this attachment calls for an understanding and knowledge on the part of the teacher and the pupil alike to things beyond material reach. Herein lie the great challenges to education as the architect of tomorrow—the end result being to build a tomorrow of peace where men may live together unafraid, and with mutual respect for each other. The reach for those ideals that never die, among which are justice, equality, and freedom, may be called the "end attainment" of man. He may never gain the ultimate, and the distance he climbs will be measured by his reach. Robert Browning gives us the chart for today and tomorrow: "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

Farmer at Mercy of Weather's Whims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Farmer at Mercy of Weather's Whims" which appeared in the January 25, 1956, issue of the Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FARMER AT MERCY OF WEATHER'S WHIMS

We have never cared for that particular description of a farmer which called him a gambling man, although the comparison turns up now and then. It is based on the idea, of course, that those who play cards or put money on a horse's nose at a race track are taking small chances indeed in comparison with farm people who are obliged to stake their work, their year's income and indeed their entire capital upon turns of the weather.

Latest example of the fickle nature of the elements which the farmer is obliged to deal with is seen in the plight of the truck farmers of south Florida. Their business is to raise vegetables when most other regions can't do so, but in this enterprise they take chances, too, for now and then they are frozen out or flooded out.

This winter a lot of the south Florida growers lost. A week of severe cold caused losses which in one county alone—Dade—are estimated at $20 million. And in Palm Beach County—so we note in the Florida papers—only 2,000 acres of vegetables escaped damage out of a total of $100,000.

Florida is not alone in its crop ruin. The citrus growers of the lower Rio Grande valley were hard hit in 1949 and in 1951 in many cases so hard that entire orchards were killed off. Many of the citrus people in this rich region did not replant in citrus, so discouraged were they. Indeed, they went in for winter vegetables, though the famous pink grapefruit of the area is still on the market, praise be.

Anyway, so fickle is fortune and so unpredictable is weather that the misfortune which Florida has just suffered is a gain for the Texas farmers. The Rio Grande crops are unhurt this winter, and are worth more to their owners than would be the case if they had to meet the Florida competition.

One man's loss is another man's gain, in cases of this kind, pointing up again the uncertainty which a farmer must face when he consigns his capital to the ground, hoping to be blessed with favorable weather, rain at just the right time, but knowing all the while that now and then he is going to be dealt a sharp blow by outrageous fortune, in the guise of flood or drought or freezing or blistering weather.

Journalism and Marriage Mix Well, Willises Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an article entitled "Journalism and Marriage Mix Well, Willises Agree," which appeared in the January 30, 1956, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

Mr. and Mrs. James W. Willis, of Irvington, Ky., have devoted the greater part of their lives to dispensing news in line with the true facts. The integrity and high principle which they have established in connection with their newspaper work has been instilled in their children, and fortunately will be carried on by them. The son, James M. Willis, is the owner of the Meade County Messenger. He is ably assisted by his wife in the publication of this paper. The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James W. Willis is married to George M. Wilson. She and her husband own and publish the Breckinridge News, as well as the Herald of Irvington, Ky.

Not only have the members of their family benefited by the high standards set forth by Mr. and Mrs. James W. Willis, but the entire community has reaped the rewards of their efforts. Their main interest has been in the betterment of their community for they have given their active support to all flood control projects, soil conservation and an improved agricultural program. And certainly the local schools and churches have felt the impact of their influence and aid. To citizens such as Mr. and Mrs. Willis deserved tribute should be paid.

The article is as follows:

JOURNALISM AND MARRIAGE MIX WELL, WILLISES AGREE

(By Gail Ransdell)

BEDFORD, KY., January 29.—Journalism and marriage go well together, agree Mr. and Mrs. James W. Willis, of Irvington.

Actively engaged in printing and publishing for the past 50 years, they were recognized at the midwinter meeting of the Kentucky Press Association in Louisville last week for having celebrated their golden wedding anniversary January 17.

"I suppose I'm about the first Linotype operator to set a story about her own golden-wedding celebration," laughed Mrs. Willis. "We held open house on Sunday (the 17th was a workday), and I set the story the next day."

Mrs. Hattie Willis, 69, has been operating a Linotype for 35 years. But she began setting type long before that, when her husband became editor of the Record Press at Hardinsburg in 1914. Before that they had a job-printing shop.

After a short time at the Record Press they bought The Irving Herald, which they published 38 years. They sold it to their daughter and son-in-law, the George Wilsons, for whom the veteran Linotypist now works daily.

In addition to the Irvington Herald, the Wilsons also publish the Breckinridge Herald. The work on both is done at the Irvington shop, but the Breckinridge Herald is strictly a Hardinsburg paper.

STARTED AS PRINTER'S DEVIL IN 1884

"I have been in the newspaper game longer than that—ever since I was 12," interrupted the 83-year-old James W. Willis. "I started as a 'printer's devil' at Leitchfield, back in 1884. My job was to distribute type.

"I'm still distributing type today. You know, I work for my son, James Willis, owner-editor of the Meade County Messenger."

The elder Willis commutes 10 miles daily, fair weather or foul, from Irvington to Brandenburg to help with the Messenger. In addition to his job on the paper, he is active in the Masonic Lodge and has been a steward of the Irvington Methodist Church for 40 years.

"He can do just about anything around the shop," declares the younger Willis, a past president of the Kentucky Press Association. "He manages the place when I'm away."

Neither of the elder Willises has ever had a vacation from the print shop. But they manage to come to the K. P. A. meeting every year. Willis has missed only three times since 1914. Once was during the 1937 flood when the trains stopped running and the other two times were due to illness.

Three generations of the Willis family attended the midwinter meeting. In addition to the George Wilsons and the James Willises—elder and junior—the family was complete with the presence of 13-year-old Jane Willis. This was the 20th semiannual K. P. A. meet Jane has attended.

The Co-Op Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to include this very splendid editorial which appears in the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal relating to the bill which I have offered to fairly tax cooperatives.

The editorial follows:

THE CO-OP TAX BILL

Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS a few days ago introduced a bill carefully designed to correct inequities in the Federal tax system as it regards cooperatives. The measure would carry out the recommendations made to Congress last year by Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey.

The gist of the situation Representative DAVIS' bill would correct lies in the fact that many so-called cooperatives do business in competition with private firms, but do not pay much or any Federal income tax on their earnings. It is estimated that the aggregate of Federal taxes escaped by the cooperatives is $400 million a year.

In commenting on the purpose of his bill, Representative DAVIS said: "In simple language, my bill would require cooperatives to

pay Federal income tax to the full extent on earnings that are not taxed to their patron members; would impose a 20-percent withholding tax which would be paid by the co-op corporation and would be credited to patron members; and would repeal the special co-op income-tax privilege of deducting dividends paid on stock." It adds up to a move long past due.

There is nothing whatever in Mr. DAVIS' bill to inflict any hardship or penalty on either the bona fide cooperatives or the vast concerns that have sprung up under the name to compete with fully taxed organizations while enjoying unfair advantages. It should be emphasized that the Davis bill is aimed at injustices now worked on ordinary businesses that must compete against rivals that get tax benefits by use of the co-op title.

The real cooperative consists of a group of individuals who band together to gain the legitimate advantages that go along with ability to sell and buy in large lots. Concessions were made to such co-ops a long time ago—as far back as 1916 in some cases—when they were small and genuine. What Mr. DAVIS has in hand are the doings of multi-million-dollar outfits that sell practically everything and were not even imagined when much of the existing tax structure was formed.

The goal is to put everybody engaged in competitive business on the same tax footing, and nothing could be fairer or more desirable than that.

Action Needed on Flood Control Projects in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the January 19, 1956, issue of the Del Norte Triplicate, published at Crescent City, Calif., carried an editorial of special significance on the flood-control problem in California.

Entitled "Let's Demand Action Now," it points out that California's rivers must be tamed to protect our people from floods, and to utilize the water resources demanded by California's present needs and future growth.

The editorial wisely recognizes that the State has a huge stake in this problem, and commends the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors for its action in engaging hydraulic engineers to make a study of the county's needs—both for flood-control measures and for economic utilization of wasted water.

I have advocated and supported projects to control the raging waters of our rivers. I proposed a dam on the Feather River, supported passage of the Trinity River project, obtained approval and funds for the Coyote Valley Reservoir—and am working on flood-control surveys and projects for the Eel, Smith and Mad Rivers.

It is not the premise of the Federal Government to alone construct these projects, its obligation is to assist the local government in their construction. The December floods most certainly dispelled any doubt that an expanded program for flood control must be launched and carried out expeditiously.

I desire to include with my remarks the editorial referred to above, as follows:

LET'S DEMAND ACTION NOW

A cynic once said, "It takes the worst to bring out the best in people."

Although this may be somewhat of an exaggeration, the recent disastrous floods in California have shown that people do open their hearts in times of calamity.

The steady stream of food, clothing, blankets and money flowing to water-logged Klamath indicates a great deal of selflessness when the occasion demands.

If the same degree of unanimous action could have been obtained in the past, it is conceivable that the destruction in Del Norte, Humboldt, and the other 48 out of 58 counties could have been prevented.

It is generally agreed that the Oroville Dam on the Feather River would have prevented the inundation of Yuba City and surrounding territory—if it had been built.

It is generally agreed that Coyote Valley Dam would have minimized, if not prevented, the deplorable losses sustained in Mendocino and Sonoma—if it had been built.

The Smith, Klamath, Trinity, and Eel Rivers, along with others in northern California, must be tamed if we are to protect our citizens and to approach complete utilization of our water resources—demanded for California's present needs and future growth.

To be sure there is great controversy about who will get what proportion of impounded waters. There is equally great controversy about the mechanics of getting north coastal waters to the areas where they will be used.

These factors pale into insignificance, however, with the realization of the immense damage, suffering and loss of life which could have been prevented were the proper dams in existence instead of being simply drams or a focal point for battles over region advantages and governmental philosophy.

Since there is nearly unanimous agreement that these dams must be built sometime, let us build them now.

These projects cannot be completed overnight. While construction is going on, men of good will with a real desire to advance the welfare of all California can solve the vexing problems of rights to the surplus waters which will be stored behind the dams. Competent engineers are already at work trying to determine the easiest, most efficient methods and routes for transporting waters to areas of deficiency.

Perhaps politics is the most shameful aspect of the delay which has characterized taming of California's rampaging rivers. Although many complicated factors are involved, the issues—when stripped to its essentials—is whether California will proceed with construction plans or whether we will wait around for the Federal Government to sometime come in and make them and do the jobs.

Last week the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors made a very wise move when it engaged competent hydraulic engineers to make an intensive study of the county's needs both for flood control measures and for economic utilization of our wasted water. From these studies may well come a new era for our citizens; the birth of a new industrial economy; the protection of the economy we have enjoyed.

While the memory of disaster is still fresh, let us all unite to see that it does not happen again. Californians, whether from "areas of origin" or "areas of deficiency," whether Republicans or Democrats, whether flood victims, their benefactors, or simply observers of the terrible catastrophe, should demand action now.

AMVETS' 1956 Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 17 I had the privilege of introducing to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Rudolph G. Pesata, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II, at which time he presented to the committee the AMVETS 1956 legislative program.

Mr. Pesata lives in the 10th Illinois Congressional District, which adjoins the district which I represent. He is a veteran who became active in AMVETS immediately after his discharge from the service in 1946, and held many major posts in the organization prior to his election to national commander. Besides his work in this veterans' organization he has been active in the National Federation of Post Office Clerks and the National Association of Postal Supervisors. In those capacities his path has crossed mine on many occasions, and I have always been impressed with his keen judgment, objective thinking, and fair approach to the problem at hand.

The AMVETS' 1956 legislative program as presented to the Veterans' Affairs Committee by Mr. Pesata is as follows:

AMVETS 1956 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Statement of Rudolph G. Pesta, national commander of AMVETS before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, on January 17, 1956)

Chairman TEAGUE, Mrs. ROGERS, and members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it is a distinct privilege to accept on behalf of my organization this opportunity to present the highlights of AMVETS 1956 legislative program. I can assure you that this appearance represents a milestone in my year as national commander.

This date, of course, marks the approximate halfway mark of another congressional term. To me, however, it is a beginning—the beginning of a productive legislative year—a year that we of AMVETS hope will have special significance, marked by success in resisting the efforts of those who would place expediency and economy above equity and merit in determining the best course for our Nation's veterans.

This goal cannot be attained by AMVETS alone. It requires the active interest and support of every member of this committee. In the year ahead, you will undoubtedly be called upon to consider many of the recommendations stemming from the recently completed Hoover Commisison study. Some have merit, while others strike at the very heart of the veterans benefit structure. You have already demonstrated an awareness of the implications of the Hoover recommendations on veterans affairs with the release, on March 26, 1955, of an analysis of their report on Federal medical services. We are confident that in your forthcoming deliberations you will reject those recommendations that adversely affect the best interests of veterans.

BRADLEY COMMISSION

The recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions will surely be unveiled prior to the adjournment of this session of Congress. Almost a year ago, my predecessor, in a similar appearance be-

fore this very committee indicated that AMVETS would not prejudge the recommendations stemming from the study being conducted by the Bradley Commission. We reiterate that statement today.

Anticipating, however, that recommendations to alter the existing non-service-connected pension structure will be forthcoming, delegates to the 11th National Convention of AMVETS adopted a resolution that opposes any move on the part of the Bradley Commission or any other group to eliminate the non-service-connected veterans pension system. In our judgment, present pension laws are sound. Any move to eliminate or reduce them will be opposed vigorously by AMVETS.

DISABILITY AND DEATH COMPENSATION

Believing that the rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death are not commensurate with today's cost of living, we shall seek legislation to provide such an increase in the immediate future. We recognize that H. R. 7089, the survivor benefits bill, which passed the House of Representatives during the last session of Congress would revise drastically the scale of compensation payments to widows, children, and parents. The proposed revisions are not, in the judgment of AMVETS, the most equitable approach to this problem. We realize, however, that legislation before this committee to increase the rates of compensation to survivors will be dependent upon Senate action on H. R. 7089.

Under current statute, a psychosis that becomes manifest to a degree of 10 percent within 2 years of separation from military service is presumed to be service connected for treatment and hospitalization purposes only. AMVETS contend that the presumption of service connection, being valid for this purpose, would be equally valid for the payment of compensation. Accordingly, we urge you to consider amendatory legislation during this session of Congress.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

In the field of veterans' pensions for non-service-connected disabilities, we have but one legislative recommendation. As you well know, unmarried veterans, who may be obligated to support dependent parents, cannot qualify for non-service-connected pension based on total disability if their annual income exceeds $1,400. It is the considered opinion of AMVETS that unmarried veterans who prove to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration that they are supporting dependent parents should receive the same consideration with respect to income limitations as married veterans. We, therefore, recommend that the income limitation for single veterans with dependent parents be increased to $2,700 per year in determining entitlement to non-service-connected pensions under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a). We respectfully urge that this committee consider this matter during the current session of Congress.

DEATH PENSIONS

A long-standing inequity in the criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for death pension demands attention by this committee. As you know, widows of World War II and Korean conflict veterans to be eligible must establish that the veteran upon whose death the application for pension is based was separated from service for medical reasons or that he had an ascertainable degree of service-connected disability at the time of death. The widows of World War I veterans applying for this benefit are spared this requirement and may qualify merely on the establishment of 90 days' service and a discharge other than dishonorable. We can see no logical reason for the disparity and recommend its correction.

Equally deserving of attention during this session is legislation to provide for the deduction of burial expenses from the proceeds of commercial life insurance in determining a widow's annual income for entitlement to non-service-connected death pension. In many instances, a widow is denied pension for a year because the proceeds from a small insurance policy, most of it consumed by burial expense, cause her to exceed the statutory income limitation of $1,400 or $2,700 as the case may be.

EDUCATION

AMVETS continue to recognize the need for a scholarship assistance program for the children of certain deceased veterans. We have reviewed with approving interest H. R. 588, the bill to provide Federal scholarships for the minor children of our war dead, and introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee. We believe your action continues the enlightened policy, first exemplified by Public Law 346, which not only recognizes the heroic sacrifices of our servicemen and women, but also acknowledges a responsibility for their future in terms of self-help.

Even more important is the future of those youngsters whose fathers' sacrifices have prejudiced their own opportunities. AMVETS, as you know, have long believed both in the particular need for educational grants under such circumstances and the responsibility of the Nation to provide them. In fact, our current resolution on this subject, first adopted in 1954 and reiterated in 1955, goes even beyond the scope of your proposed legislation and includes the children of all service-connected dead and totally disabled.

Because we feel that scholarships must be provided, whether through private or public action, AMVETS have already taken steps in this direction in the absence of large-scale activity by the Federal Government. Our National Service Foundation has established the AMVET memorial scholarship program which annually awards seven $2,000 college scholarships to the children of deceased or totally disabled former servicemen.

On the basis of our experience with the scholarships and with the problems of the children of servicemen, I should like to recommend that the children of all service-connected dead and permanently and totally disabled veterans be eligible for scholarships. The inclusion of these additional groups will, of course, increase the cost of the scholarship program. No one, however, can or should be pennywise when considering the educational future of these children. Most of them would not face the need for help if their fathers had not been killed or disabled in the defense of our country. We respectfully urge you to assign the highest priority to the consideration of this worthy legislation.

The excellent results of the veterans education program are known to all of us. This investment by a grateful Nation acting through Congress is paying and will continue to pay for many years tremendous dividends in economical, social, and technological advances. Accordingly, AMVETS will continue to actively support all programs to effect improved educational opportunities, and particularly, we will support an educational program for all ex-servicemen that will continue as long as the youth of the Nation are being drafted for military service.

HOUSING

It has been estimated that some 11 million World War II veterans have not used their entitlement to the loan-guaranty provision of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The authority to grant this benefit will expire in July 1957. Like the education program, the effect of this program on the economy of the Nation has been tremendous. Its advantages to the Nation far outweigh any objections that can be cited. With the termination date approaching, it is reasonable to assume that many thousands of veterans will utilize their entitlement in the immediate future. As the demand for housing increases, some inflationary reaction, in the nature of higher prices in both old and new housing, could conceivably follow. Aside from the possibility of inflation, the natural rush of veterans trying to meet the July 1957 deadline could result in a boom-and-bust proposition of greatly accelerated construction activity for a year and a half followed by a sharp decline. Such a situation could have dire effects on the economy of our Nation.

At the time the July 1957 limitation was imposed, no one, of course, could foresee the outbreak of Korean hostilities in June 1950. In the 3 years that followed, substantial credit controls were imposed and construction materials became scarce. These factors undoubtedly interrupted the home buying plans of many veterans.

Because of these compelling reasons, we support a 3-year extension of the loan-guaranty program for World War II veterans.

In discussing the World War II housing program, we cannot overlook the splendid work of this committee in exposing the unscrupulous persons engaged in the illegal sale of GI housing entitlements in certain areas of the country. Such a practice is not only illegal but casts a shadow upon the integrity of veterans everywhere while besmirching an otherwise fine record of achievement. We urge that you continue your vigilance in this direction.

HOSPITAL-REPAIR PROGRAM

We are not unmindful of the fact that the investigations conducted by this committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress into the state of repair and maintenance of Veterans' Administration hospitals played a major role in the appropriation of additional funds for sorely needed repairs and modernizations in older facilities. In recognition of this outstanding contribution in the interests of veterans, our national executive committee in its spring meeting of 1955, commended the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and urged that the needed overhauling and repairs brought to light by your investigation be completed at the earliest practicable date.

Obviously, this extensive project will require additional moneys. Accordingly, delegates to the most recent AMVETS national convention unanimously endorsed a resolution calling upon Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to increase the tempo of this long-range project. We expect to make these views known to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress. We are confident that this committee will continue its active interest and productive efforts in support of the so-called Veterans' Administration nonbed betterment program.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted here today, Mr. Chairman, to highlight our legislative program for the coming year. In the interest of time we have, of course, touched only upon certain matters of current interest to veterans and those concerned with the welfare of veterans and their dependents. With your permission, sir, we desire to submit a digest of the resolutions adopted in September 1955 by the 11th annual national convention of AMVETS. These resolutions contain the complete AMVETS legislative program, and, in our judgment, merit the same attention as the portion already cited.

A close analysis of this program will reveal that AMVETS are interested in the perfection of a sound legitimate structure of veterans' benefits—an enduring structure that will adequately and properly discharge the Nation's obligation to its veterans and at the same time earn and merit the respect of the American people.

Basically, the structure should include (1) adequate compensation and medical treatment for service-connected disabilities and adequate but equal care for survivors, (2) pensions for veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected conditions, with need, unemployability, and disability as the fundamental tests to be met, (3) entitlement to hospitalization for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities when a bed is available and financial need is apparent, (4) vocational rehabilitation to overcome occupational handicaps created by service-connected disability, (5) education and training to replace lost opportunity, and (6) special assistance, including certain priorities and preferences, in obtaining suitable, gainful employment.

This in essence is our program. We look to you who are responsible for plotting the proper course for millions of veterans for assistance. We are confident that your objective thinking and careful study followed by the nonpartisan, vigorous action you have demonstrated so frequently in the past will result in a sound equitable structure of veterans' benefits. We pledge to this committee and its extremely capable staff our continued cooperation and assistance in attaining this goal.

An Expression of Appreciation by Flood Victims to a Unit of the United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include a letter from Patrick J. Murphy and John Menary commending the officers and men of the 777th A. C. and W. Squadron for their outstanding assistance to the community of Klamath, Calif., which was practically destroyed during the recent flood.

The First Congressional District, which I represent, is composed of 7 counties. Every county has suffered severe flood damage and all are included in the Presidentially declared disaster area of California.

I made two trips to the district to inspect flood damage and to assist in coordinating application of disaster assistance. I saw the devastation firsthand, talked to many victims, and heard numerous accounts of acts of heroism performed by individuals, police, firemen, civil defense workers, and various units of the Armed Forces.

I would not endeavor to single out nor list these acts of heroism performed under hazardous conditions to save lives and property. I believe the acts exhibit once again that regardless of race, color, creed or position—the American people can be counted on to rally to the aid to each other in times of distress.

The following letter reveals one such incident among many, and constitutes an expression of appreciation:

HON. HUBERT SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the recent flood disaster here in Klamath, many individuals, companies, and organizations proved themselves worthy of the heartfelt thanks and admiration of this community. The purpose of this letter is to tell of the outstanding job done by one of these—the 777th A. C. & W. Squadron, commanded by Maj. Edward G. Cassidy, which, as you know, is an Air Force unit stationed here.

The men of this organization helped individuals move belongings before the waters rose; they fed and housed homeless people during the emergency and immediately thereafter; provided food and bedding for many people in the Requa area; worked with civil defense on guard duty to prevent looting and to provide road block details; helped shovel out schools, churches, many individual homes and businesses; sent out messages by radio to notify friends and relatives of people's safety; and supplied medical care and medicines. They shouldered many of these same responsibilities in the Klamath Glen area.

After people started returning to their homes, the squadron announced that it would pick up, clean, and do their best to repair all electrical appliances damaged by the flood which were turned in to them. To date, they have repaired hundreds of items, such as stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, irons, etc.

Not only is all the actual assistance deeply appreciated, but we were especially impressed by the cooperative attitude in which it was offered and the spirit in which it was executed by the men of the squadron.

We feel that the long hours, the heavy labor, and the generous spirit of these men given to a community where they, as individuals, are only temporary members, deserve more than just a local word of thanks. We would appreciate your discussing our gratitude for the outstanding job done by this Air Force squadron at the Washington level in hopes that they may be commended by one of their own leaders.

PATRICK J. MURPHY,
JOHN MENARY.

Protect Our Armed Services Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, a wave of protest is spreading over the country against the status-of-forces treaty. The enormity of the deprivation of the rights of American servicemen and women permitted under this treaty is speedily coming to light.

The Bow amendment which was passed by the House by a substantial margin evidenced the real opinion of the country. It provided that hereafter no American military serviceman could be stationed in any foreign country to which the United States has surrendered criminal jurisdiction of the American military personnel. Unfortunately, it was not accepted by the other body.

I am unable to discern any single, real, substantial justification for the present status of forces treaty arrangement. It is said by the proponents that the treaty provides reciprocal rights, that we are able to try foreign military personnel in American courts just as we confer the right on foreign courts to try American boys. However, it is not pointed out that foreign personnel are tried under American law which guarantees complete due process to the accused—a full statement of the specifications of the crime alleged, right to bail, presentation to the grand jury in all serious cases, fair trial by an unbiased judge and jury, confrontation of witnesses, presumption of innocence, entitlement to counsel, and all other constitutional safeguards to which any accused is entitled in our courts under the Constitution and the law.

It must be recognized that in many countries where our boys are stationed the law does not provide these safeguards, indeed some of them do not comply with the fundamental requirements of due process as known to our constitutional law. There is no justification whatever for this country continuing such an arrangement that is so unfair and unjust to those who are making greatest sacrifices to serve the Nation and who are entitled to the full protection of our Government.

This arrangement has been defended on the grounds that our friends abroad will continue to cooperate as they have in the past in turning over those charged with offenses against their laws to our own military courts for trial. However, the arrangement has not worked out that way. Foreign nations are not surrendering any of our accused troops for trial by our military and they are not meeting the expectation held in high quarters that they would act in this manner.

It strikes me that this is another instance of ill-advised appeasement of foreign nations and so-called reciprocity in which our Nation, as usual, does most of the reciprocating.

If State Department employees are immune from this treaty, there is all the more reason that members of the Armed Forces should also be immune, and I hope that the administration and the Congress will soon act to correct what is becoming truly a scandalous infringement of the basic rights of our beloved servicemen and women serving in foreign countries.

Face of a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, W. R. Oliver and Alton Broussard, editors of the magazine, Rural Power, have over the years done a

banner job in reporting progress and giving information to people of southwest Louisiana as to developments in rural power through REA. The Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation is the world's largest rural electrification association. Many of the outstanding citizens of southwest Louisiana are responsible for the phenomenal success of this project and the managership of Mr. U. J. Gajan has been extremely successful.

Most inspirational is the coverplate of the February 1956 issue of Rural Power featuring Face of a Farmer and an editorial in that issue similarly entitled. Knowing the man who bears this countenance and the inspiration he has been to the development of our areas in Louisiana, I invite the reading of this editorial, which follows, by all of my colleagues:

FACE OF A FARMER

The face on the cover of this magazine is familiar to many. Some may know the gentleman's name; many others will recognize this visage simply as the face of the American farmer. They will see in it the reflection of all the wonderful qualities that make America great. They will see strength, character, personality, respect, the dignity of labor, the rewards of the good earth.

That the face is that of M. W. "Mike" Scanlan, president of the Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corp., is secondary. More important is that "Mr. Mike's" countenance is typical of all farmers. You might say his is the face of democracy at work; democracy with a pitchfork in its hand.

Here is the face of a man who has pride. Not pride in the sense of self-admiration or an exaggerated idea of his own worth, but pride in accomplishment and ownership.

Here is the face of a man who enjoys independence, who operates his own farm, produces much of what he eats, earns his money, voices his opinions, loves his family, serves his God, and enjoys sharing his blessings with his fellow man.

Here is the face of thousands and thousands of member-owners of REA who saw their city neighbors install electric refrigerators, electric washing machines and driers, electric ranges, fans and air conditioners, while their own wives were filling kerosene lamps, cleaning sooty chimneys, breaking ice films on water buckets, scuffing their fingers on washing boards.

This is the face of the farmer who was doing hundreds of farm chores as his great-grandfather did them, while his city friends accomplished the same tasks and many more with a 1 horsepower electric motor at a cost of about 5 cents.

This is the face of the farmer who decided to do something about his situation. He bettered it a thousand times over by obtaining REA power. He not only got electric power to increase his own worth to the soil and the Nation, but to provide his wife and family with the almost limitless number of electric labor-saving devices.

And furthermore, this farmer obtained electric power for himself and his neighbors despite the fact he faced tremendous obstacles. Private industry, when asked, said electricity couldn't be brought to the farm; it wasn't practical, and the farmers wouldn't use it if they had it.

History has proved the farmer was right and the public utility companies were wrong. Yet our farmer is still fighting—fighting to retain his electric co-op, which the utility companies would now like to gobble up.

This is the face of the farmer who owns and operates his electric cooperative and with deep humility enjoys pride of ownership.

This is the face that fulfilled your Rural Electric Association's creed:

"To advance the position of agriculture—to enrich the life of the community—to free men and women from the heavy drudgery of the home and farm—this Rural Electric Association was erected by southwest Louisiana farmers to supply the rural areas with the limitless service of electricity."

It Really Makes a Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a timely editorial which appeared recently in the Steamboat Springs (Colo.) Pilot.

It has recently become an absolute necessity for Cabinet members to catch up on their magazine reading. Members of Congress have also been observed reading magazines.

For Republican Members who have recently taken up this pastime, I would like to recommend Time, which enjoys thinking of itself as a weekly magazine which interprets the news in an understandable way for those who are not well enough endowed intellectually to interpret events for themselves.

I recommend Time for all good Republicans not necessarily because all good Republicans are lacking in intellect, but because in Time the Republicans will always find satisfying reading.

Time's deft writers are artists of the highest caliber. They must of necessity be artists in order to color the news as they do. This weekly magazine, which is supposed to make some attempt to be objective in its reporting of the facts, presents one of the most slanted news reports in the Nation.

Time, however, is not the only publication today which presents a colored view of the news. In many instances, the press today is not living up to its responsibilities. One of the major concerns of a free press should certainly be to strive for objective reporting in its news columns. I submit that many reporters are not doing that. There are those who are doing an outstanding job, but I am inclinded to believe they may be in the minority.

Certainly one publication which is head and shoulders above all others in its ability to slant and color the news is Time magazine, as the following editorial from the Steamboat Springs Pilot indicates.

The editorial follows:

IT REALLY MAKES A DIFFERENCE

We long have marveled at the adroit fashion in which news magazines color the news to suit their taste and influence public opinion by the way they interpret events of the day.

It has remained for Milton S. Gwirtzman, former Harvard Crimson editor, now at Yale Law School, to point out a few glaring ways in which the public is misled. The article from the Harvard Crimson is reprinted in the January edition of Neiman Reports. As no one saves old news magazines it is difficult for the average reader to discern the direction in which he is being led.

Gwirtzman has had the time to check back on Time, which boasts you can depend on its accuracy. He compares Time's reporting on the same men and the same events during the Democratic administration in 1946–52 and the Republican administration of 1952–55.

Parts of the article follow:

Take the income tax, an event of annoying recurrence. The average American, of whom Time writes with great apparent familiarity, was bent over by his tax burden during the Democratic years. Thus: "This week once again, the American taxpayer * * * was working over his income-tax return. He did not do the job happily. * * * The blow, in full and crushing measure, now lands each March 15 on the chin of a fellow named John Q." (March 10, 1952.)

But in 1955: "Sixty million Americans have by this week signed their 1954 income-tax forms. * * * They did this, wonderful to tell, without riots or protest * * * It has become more and more unfashionable to criticize the income-tax level." (April 18, 1955.)

Or look at the periodic reports on the economic health of the Nation:

April 2, 1951 (Democratic administration): "Never in United States history had the cost of living been so high. Between January 15 and February 15 the consumer's price index jumped 1.3 percent to 183.8."

July 4, 1955 (Republican administration. Consumer price index, 192.3.) "After a considerable shift in domestic economic policy, the United States is more prosperous than ever before."

The sudden glow which accompanied the Republican administration even transformed personalities. George E. Allen, when a Government official in the Truman administration, was worked over as follows:

"For 18 years, roly-poly George E. Allen bobbed around Washington like a pneumatic rubber hose." (October 16, 1950.) "Last week the President (Truman) eased his croniest crony, George E. Allen. into the Board of Directors of (the) Reconstruction Finance Corporation." (January 28, 1946.) "George is all the more remarkable because ,to the naked eye he is a clown." (August 12, 1946.)

But behold: "Last week the President (Eisenhower) chatted quiety with golfing companion George E. Allen, Washington lawyer and friend of Presidents." (December 14, 1954.)

Time's technique is perhaps best revealed in its weekly column on the Presidency. Its reports on Presidential behavior are able to rise above objectively and perceive distinctions where none are apparent. Thus, "President Truman flapped open his leather notebook, and began in his usual flat tone to read his message to Congress on the State of the Union. When he finished 45 minutes later, he had made little news." (January 21, 1952.) However, "President Eisenhower's 1955 State of the Union speech had sweep and calm balance;" and although "it elaborated the obvious, perhaps that was precisely what the Nation needed." (January, 17, 1955.)

What bothered Time about the Fair Deal was its omnibus character. "In this best of all Democratic worlds he (Truman) had something for everybody. For the businessman, he had his new program of Government loan insurance and other aids to small business. For the farmer and consumer, he had the Brannan plan." (May 22, 1950.) "For everyone else, there was a whole grab-bag of social and economic promises." (January 18, 1948.) One might expect that Time would be similarly annoyed when President Eisenhower proposed such familiar Fair Deal items as "lower tariffs, technical assistance,

public works, highways, public housing, strengthened health services, alleviation (of) the shortage of schoolrooms, increase in the minimum wage, higher pay scale for postal employees, amendment of the McCarran Act to eliminate injustices and discrimination." (January 17, 1955.)

But once again, Time was able to spot the difference: "Through the departmentalized details of his (Eisenhower's) proposals runs a clear, consistent thread, joining each fact and each measure wtih all the others. The thread is the general good. He has not thrown together a hodgepodge of group interests. Every proposal seems to be tested by the standard of the whole Nation's interest." (January 18, 1954.)

It is perhaps arguable whether a weekly has any more right than a daily to editorialize in its news columns. Instead, with what must be a great expenditure on interviews and questionnaires, it tells its readers what the people think:

"In the eyes of most United States citizens, Harry Truman's administration had bogged down in ludicrous futility." (June 3, 1946.)

"The public had an impression of a petulant, irascible President who stubbornly protected shoddy friends, a man who has grown too touchy to make judicious decisions, who failed to give the Nation any clear leadership in these challenging times." (April 23, 1951.)

"They saw Ike, and liked what they saw. They liked him for his strong, vigorous manner of speech and for an overriding, innate kindliness and modesty. But most of all, they liked him in a way they could scarcely explain. They liked Ike because, when they saw him and heard him talk, he made them proud of themselves and all the half-forgotten best that was in them and in the Nation." (June 16, 1952.)

It is comforting to know that the educators, corporation presidents, Congressmen, and others who depend on Time, can draw their opinions from such a clear, pure fountain of fact. Makes the rest of us feel more at ease.

Congratulations to the Navy Department for Its Effective Cooperation With Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a program of the Navy Department which has operated so successfully in the city of Huntington, W. Va., that it is being applied to similar situations all over the Nation. I refer to the Navy Department pilot program of assistance for substantial labor surplus areas, first tried in Huntington. The success of this program illustrates clearly the great good which can be accomplished through the sincere cooperation between responsible Government leaders and officials of small business.

Much of the credit for the success of this program can be directly attributed to the outstanding efforts of Navy Department officers who have devoted themselves tirelessly to this project. I want to particularly congratulate Vice Adm. M. L. Royar, Chief of the Office of Naval Materiel. His direct interest in helping small business and labor in a surplus labor area has enabled that area to return to a more prosperous condition in the course of 1 year. Admiral Royar retired only yesterday and to me this program stands as a fitting climax to a successful career.

The personal direction and assistance of Rear Adm. R. L. Swart, Vice Chief, the Office of Naval Personnel, has in equal measure contributed to the success of this program and through it to the economic well-being of a number of industries and thousands of individuals. Therefore, I want to note also a particular vote of appreciation to Admiral Swart.

To those in the Navy Department who cooperated with these men, I think we also owe our congratulations. Dr. Kenneth P. Borgen, in particular, has devoted long hours to creative and practical efforts of immeasurable value in successfully completing this program.

Of course, the businessmen who have participated in this activity in the Navy Department have themselves made an outstanding contribution to their community and the Nation. Through their efforts in cooperation with the Navy Department, not only have their own businesses thrived but their work for the Navy Department has made a real contribution to our national defense. Following is the letter from Admiral Swart explaining the Navy program:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF NAVAL MATERIAL,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1956.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURNSIDE: With this letter I am forwarding to you a copy of ONM Instruction 4803.3 of December 13, 1955, on the Navy program of assistance for substantial labor surplus areas with the hope that it may be helpful to you and the Congress.

Our program of industrial workshops, community production clinics, and technological exhibits, in addition to procurement awards, places maximum reliance on private initiative and vigorous, informed competition. We feel that initial results of the program in Huntington, W. Va., indicate that it is beneficial to both the community and the Department of the Navy.

As you know, in Huntington, a defense-production pool has been formed to produce a critical defense item on an integrated basis in that dispersed geographic area as a mobilization planning project for a military agency. In addition, the community has benefited from the work of their local industries committee formed in conjunction with the program. We are informed that several plants have expanded their facilities and payrolls as a result of increased commercial and Government business. The Navy, alone, shipped out approximately $14 million worth of material produced in the Huntington area in fulfillment of contracts during the first 7 months of 1955. Employment during the period increased from 78,775 to 82,900.

You may also be interested in knowing that our work with the Huntington community proved most helpful in assisting firms in the flood-disaster counties of the Northeastern and Western States this fall and winter. We adapted the labor-surplus area program to the flood-disaster areas and have conducted 28 industrial clinics in these areas for manufacturers. At these clinics, our program of production and procurement assistance is explained. ONM Instruction 4800.32 of October 17, 1955, and ONM Instruction 4800.33 of November 14, 1955, are enclosed for your information in this connection.

Further, you may be interested in our program of technological exhibits for labor-surplus areas. Such an exhibit was held in Detroit, Mich., during October 1954. Personal interviews were held 6 months later with a representative sample of the some 5,000 persons who attended this exhibit of new methods, processes, and patents. Twenty-three percent of those interviewed were in the process of developing ideas gained at the exhibit of significance to defense production or had already put them into effect. Among some of the applications of exhibit ideas were the use of printed circuits in electronic equipment, the use of aluminum ferrous metal in jet engine components, and the use of the shell molding process to cut costs and achieve closer tolerances in castings. It may be that such an exhibit would be helpful to your district.

I feel sure that you are pleased to learn of the great benefits which have been derived from the program which you initiated in Huntington in December 1954. It has been a pleasure to work with your office and the aggressive, cooperative Small Industries Committee of Huntington headed by Mr. Charles Peoples.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. SWART,
Rear Admiral, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Materiel.

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES OF HUNTINGTON, W. VA.—SUMMARY REPORT OF FINDINGS OF SMALL INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE OF HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Problem: How can small-business men of Huntington, W. Va., cooperate to make the maximum use of their production resources to obtain more commercial and Government business?

Background: On December 11 and 12, 1954, our Congressional Representative, in cooperation with the Huntington Manufacturers Club and the Chamber of Commerce, arranged meetings of local manufacturers, labor organizations, and Government officials concerned with procurement. The Government officials attending representing the Department of Navy, the Army, the Air Force and the Small Business Administration expressed a positive interest in helping the small industries of the Huntington area obtain opportunities for bidding on defense contracts.

Fourteen manufacturers prepared brochures to help promote their products and many individual contacts were arranged with Government procurement officials who further indicated interest in helping Huntington develop a broader defense production program.

On June 21, 1955 an industrial workshop was arranged in Washington at the Navy Department by Huntington manufacturers. It was the first workshop held by a defense agency for small business firms. As a part of this effort, the manufacturers had personal conferences with representatives of the various naval bureaus. Meetings were also arranged with Air Force procurement officials and Small Business Administration people concerned with organizing production pools. Following the Washington meeting, Huntington businessmen formed a committee to work on the problem of pooling their respective production capabilities in order to broaden their area of competition. Several advisors were obtained from Government and industry to help outline a program of action during the week of July 18, 1955.

It is interesting to note that a total of approximately $3,729,782 in defense contracts has been awarded small firms in the Hunt-

ington area since January 1, 1955. This indicates that there are actual opportunities for Government procurement by small business firms in Huntington.

Summary of findings: Having duly considered the problem in continuing sessions over the period of July 18–21, 1955, a committee of Huntington's small industries makes the following overall recommendation, as the Huntington approach to the problem.

1. The prime and subcontractor method of doing business should be made more effective in Huntington.

2. A production pool should be formed to increase the ability of small industries in Huntington to obtain Government contracts for critical defense items.

The committee recommends that these proposals, as detailed in parts I and II of this report, be studied by appropriate Huntington industries with a target date for approval, modification, or disapproval of August 4, 1955. In the interim period, the committee will be available for discussion of details of the proposals.

A major objective to be served by these proposals is to increase average manufacturers' sales of Huntington firms to both commercial industry and the Government by 25 percent in the calendar year 1956 as compared with 1955. This amounts to a target increase of $30 million and an estimated increase in employment of 3,000 people, which would be further augmented by employment increases in professional and service occupations in other business establishments of the community. In addition, broader defense interests will be served in fully utilizing the capacity of small industries for defense production, broadening the industrial mobilization base, providing for the production of critical defense items in dispersed geographic areas, and insuring full utilization of the manpower resources of labor surplus areas and the availability of occupational skills required for mobilization production.

The committee recognizes that intensive effort and hard work is required to carry out its proposals. However, it is believed that the necessary leadership and cooperative spirit and know-how to accomplish the tasks set forth are present in Huntington. It is also believed that the action program outlined will accomplish the objectives set forth.

Committee members: Paul G. Davis, C. W. Davis & Sons, Inc.; L. Milton Polan, Polan Industries; Charles Peoples, the Peoples Co.

Committee advisers: Darwin Ensign, Ensign Electric & Manufacturing Co., Huntington, W. Va.; Herman Brown, former general manager, International Nickel Co., Huntington, W. Va.; Conley Dillon, Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.; Kenneth Borgen, Executive Office of the Secretary of the Navy, Office of Naval Material, Washington, D. C.; Comdr. William C. Logan, Inspector of Naval Material, Huntington, W. Va.; Dixon Smith, Small Business Administration, Richmond, Va.; Delbert Williams, Small Business Administration, Charleston, W. Va.

Utilization of Industrial Resources of Huntington, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of findings of Small Industries Committee of Huntington, W. Va.:

PART I

Problem: How can small businessmen of Huntington, W. Va., cooperate to make the maximum use of their production resources to obtain more commercial and Government business?

Facts bearing on the problem: The potentials of small business in the Huntington area are not presently fully utilized by the firms in the area. For example, a Huntington contractor obtained a prime contract for a metal products unit which it had previously manufactured and could largely be produced in Huntington. The purchasing phase of the contract was turned over to the purchasing department for action in accordance with the established buying procedures of that company.

It was determined that:

(a) Presently known sources were being solicited without consideration to local companies except as they previously fitted into the procurement plans of the prime company.

(b) That local sources were not advised of the possibility of work and the availability of tooling.

(c) That many local sources were not calling on the purchasing department of the prime contractor.

Steps were taken to notify other local companies which responded at various levels. Some immediately took steps to obtain orders by submitting quotations. Others, not recognizing the extent of the work, did not take advantage of the notification. All local companies submitting bids were given an opportunity to meet lower prices coming from outside sources.

This and similar examples indicate that the prime and subcontractor method of doing business can be made more effective in Huntington. It has the advantage of utilizing current industrial practice. The following action program is recommended.

Recommendations

1. Increase the knowledge of the productive capacities of all businessmen in Huntington among each other and prospective buyers.

(a) This should widen the area of procurement for both commercial and Government business.

(b) It should make maximum use of production facilities in Huntington prior to subcontracting out of the area.

This may be done by:

(a) Interchange of industrial brochures.

(b) Open house for each manufacturer.

(c) Central file of production resources of Huntington in chamber of commerce for use in obtaining new business.

2. Increase contacts with Government and commercial enterprises.

(a) The Inspector of Naval Material, Huntington, will ensure that all subcontract possibilities are brought to the attention of appropriate manufacturers in Huntington as well as the chamber of commerce in appropriate instances. This includes prime contracts and instances where manufacturers are looking for a second source.

The Huntington group should ensure that the Inspector is fully aware of each manufacturer's capabilities as well as group capabilities.

(b) Invite selected manufacturers to survey Huntington's resources.

(c) Write to selected manufacturers and make known resources of the community.

(d) Augment personal visits to potential buyers. Establish an itinerary for each Huntington manufacturer to visit selected firms and explain his productive abilities as well as other facilities in Huntington.

(e) Ensure placement on bidder's lists of appropriate Government agencies and follow through aggressively on potential business.

(f) Fully utilize Federal, State, and local government services for solving the problem including the Small Business Administration and Area Development Division of the Department of Commerce.

3. Huntington manufacturers should make known to each other business opportunities which come to their attention.

4. Augment Huntington's production capacity as requirements develop.

(a) Subcontract outside of the Huntington area.

(b) Provide facilities locally such as foundry and forging capacity and screw machines and turrent lathe capacity.

5. The local industries committee of the chamber of commerce together with the Huntington Manufacturers' Club should take the necessary steps to carry out the program. A steering committing should be formed from these two groups to carry out the program.

Areas for further investigation

1. What should be the nature of the contents of the master brochure?

2. What supplements of subcontractor potential should each manufacturer include in his brochure to indicate that he as a prime contractor has subcontractors available in Huntington?

3. What sorts of information should be contained in the central file of the Huntington Chamber of Commerce and how should it be used.

4. What staff assistance should be provided to small-business men in the program by the Huntington Chamber of Commerce?

PART II

Problem: How can small-business men of Huntington, W. Va., cooperate to make the maximum use of their production resources to obtain more commercial and Government business?

Facts bearing on the problem: There are many items of Government procurement which are beyond the manufacturing capabilities of an individual small-business man but which could be made by several manufacturers on a pooled basis. The Government has made it possible for such firms to combine in an organization to produce defense items without violating antitrust laws. These so-called production pools cannot operate to produce commercial items.

Recommendations

1. Manufacturers in Huntington should form a pool of their production facilities in order to secure contracts to manufacture guided missiles on an integrated basis or any other item suitable to Huntington facilities. Two committees should be established, namely, a procurement committee and an organization committee with the following responsibilities. These committees should be organized by a steering committee of the chamber of commerce and Huntington Manufacturers Club. They should operate simultaneously and report to the steering committee by October 1, 1955.

a. A procurement planning committee should be designated to determine the possibility of developing negotiations with the military departments for contracts to produce guided missiles or other suitable items.

1. This committee should ascertain the specific opportunities for guided missile production on an integrated basis in terms of the Huntington area production resources.

(a) Types of missiles.

(b) Production requirements for each missile—short and long-range, by rate and dollar volume.

(c) Production resources required to meet requirements.

2. The committee should also explore subcontracting possibilities of guided missiles with current or prospective prime contractors

3. This committee should have available a master brochure of Huntington's production capacity to be developed by the local industries committee of the chamber of commerce. This should be acceptable to the Small Business Administration.

4. This committee should have appropriate security clearances for working with the military departments.

5. The first formal approach of the committee to the military departments should be with the appropriate staff sections of the Department of Defense and the Office of Defense Mobilization. Preceding such an approach, the committee should develop a sound procurement proposal.

b. An organizational committee should be designated to develop recommendations for an organization to conduct the pool's business assuming success of the procurement committee.

(1) The committee should consider legal and financial aspects such as tax problems aspects and relationships of pool members with each other and with the Government.

(2) Determine and recommend the type of pool which will be most effective for its purpose. The committee should look into corporate and unincorporated organizations as well as cooperatives. It should contact existing production pools and ascertain their strengths and weaknesses. Information available indicates that a strong, centralized type of organization has the best chance of success.

(3) The selection of top management for the pool is of maximum importance. The general manager of the pool should be highly qualified from a production and managerial viewpoint and be thoroughly familiar with Huntington facilities. He should command the respect of the community and possess demonstrated leadership abilities.

(4) The committee should establish the qualifications for participants in the pool and ascertain whether there is sufficient interest to warrant an organizational meeting in conjunction with the Small Business Administration.

(5) Draft a proposed charter for the operation of the pool and work out a plan of operation, including production scheduling.

(6) Draft a proposal to finance overhead costs of the pool including allocation of costs among pool members and method of defraying costs. It is considered that organizational expenses will be a minimum of $1,000. Other costs are estimated to be a minimum of $50,000 for the first year of operation.

(7) Determine engineering assistance and staff required for the overhead organization.

2. To carry out the preceding proposals, it is recommended that a steering committee be designated from the Huntington Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturer's Club.

The steering committee should develop and carry out an educational program to inform private industry and the Government of the Huntington effort including full utilization of all information media including the radio, television, and the press.

a. This committee should direct the operation of the program and schedule it.

b. It should insure critical evaluation of results of the program and develop improvements as necessary.

PART III

Subsequent developments as of December 1, 1955

The Huntington community has aggressively carried out the preceding action program. Major actions follow:

1. Formed a local industries committee comprised of an executive committee, organization committee, and procurement committee.

2. Organized a defense production pool which is under review by the Small Business Administration for approval and transmittal to the Department of Justice for their approval. Several major corporations have indicated a great interest in participating in the pool's plan to produce a critical defense item such as a guided missile on an integrated basis in this dispersed geographic area as a mobilization planning project. The pool has had a survey performed by a hired consultant and others by major corporation representatives which indicate the plan is feasible. Members of the excutive committee have also visited other contractors' plants in this connection to insure that they have the manufacturing capability. They have also made arrangements to augment their own engineering staffs if it becomes necessary.

3. Completed a master brochure of production resources of manufacturing plants and the production potential of the community.

4. Visited each other's plants to become thoroughly familiar with the production potential for subcontracting purposes.

5. Have increased their sales efforts with significant results. Several plants have expanded their facilities and payrolls as a result of increased commercial and Government business. The Navy, alone, shipped out approximately $14 million worth of material produced in the Huntington area in fulfillment of contracts during the first 7 months of 1955. Unemployment has been reduced from 5,250 in September 1954, to 4,100 in September 1955. Employment during the same period increased from 78,775 to 82,900.

The executive committee is continuing to push forth aggressively on their program. Its membership is as follows: Charles W. Peoples, president, the Peoples Co., chairman; Paul Davis, vice president, C. W. Davis & Sons, Inc., member; Dr. M. L. Polan, vice president, Polan Industries, Inc., member; Dr. Conley Dillon, Marshall College, consultant.

Huntington industries who are participating in the defense production pool are as follows: Armstrong Products Corp., P. O. box 940, Huntington, W. Va., sheet metal fabrication; C. W. Davis & Sons, Inc., 837 Adams Avenue, Huntington, W. Va., metal fabrication including piping and tubing; Ensign Electric and Manufacturing Co., 914 Adams Avenue, Huntington, W. Va., electrical equipment and controls; Enterprise Wheel & Car Corp., P. O. drawer 1799, Huntington, W. V., manufacturing and fabricating heavy steel items including industrial equipment; Huntington Plating and Polishing Co., P. O. box 9066, Huntington, W. Va., electroplating and metal finishing; LeJohn Manufacturing Co., 111 22d Street, Huntington, W. Va., electrical products and appliances; Fred McCorkle Machine Shop, Inc., 125 3d Avenue, Huntington, W. Va., general machine shop work; Metalcraft Inc., of Huntington, P. O. box 9116, Huntington, W. Va., wire and wrought iron specialties; The Peoples Co., 712 Buffington Street, Huntington, W. Va., textile fabrication including heavy canvas; Polan Industries, Inc., P. O. box 1720, Huntington, W. Va., precision equipment, optical, electronic, mechanical, and fire control and machine tool rehabilitation; A. F. Thompson Manufacturing Co., P. O. box 610, Huntington, W. V., manufacture heating and cooling equipment; C. I. Thornburg Co., Inc., P. O. box 2163, Huntington, W. Va., fabricator and manufacturer of pipe nipples, valve floor stands, and cast iron flanged pipe; W. Va. Steel and Manufacturing Co., P. O. box 118, Huntington, W. Va., production and fabrication of steel products including steel bars and shapes.

It is noted that in addition to the above firms, there is considerable production potential in Huntington or the nearby area.[1] This includes a plentiful supply of electric power, economical rail, highway, and water transportation to consuming and producing centers, large natural resources of salt, timber, limestone, sand, clay, shale, oil, natural gas, and water.

Among the major industrial firms located in or near Huntington are the Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Sylvania Electrical Products, Inc., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Owens-Illinois Glass Co., International Nickel Co., Inc., Houdaille-Hershey Corp., ACF Industries, Inc., and American Container Corp. In addition, Kaiser Aluminum Co. is building a large aluminum producing and sheet fabricating plant at Ravenswood, W. Va., which is near Huntington.

Seven firms in Huntington produce chemicals, 9 firms produce electrical products, 11 firms are manufacturers of glass, 31 firms engage in metal product manufacturing including steel production, fabrication, forming, machining, and casting in addition to brass foundries and tool and die works, 7 firms are engaged in stone, clay, and concrete products, 8 firms make textile products, and 26 firms manufacture wood products.

[1] Industrial Survey of Huntington, W. Va., August 1955, 205 pp., Huntington Chamber of Commerce, 522 9th Street, Huntington, W. Va.

Trade Versus Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, a great many people believe that the so-called truce in Indochina and Korea evidences a further deterioration of free world unity and emphasizes the alarming growing strength of world communism. To be sure the truce was short lived. Recent events in the Far East abundantly illustrate the continuing aggressive spirit and designs of Red China.

Candor compels me to suggest that it should now be manifest to every thinking observer that communism is continuing to make great headway in Asia just as it has done in certain parts of Europe. In fact, there is no nation in the world today fortunate enough to be free from the ravages of the evil conspiracy which seeks the destruction of human liberty.

The Marxist timetable established long ago is unfolding with almost unbelievable rapidity in the Asian theater. The Reds have capitalized upon the tremendous resentment and rebellious spirit aroused by the evils of European colonialism and imperialism in the East. The conquest of China and Korea and the Indochina truce have tended to diminish American prestige in Asian countries. Communist infiltration, strong pro-Communist sentiment among the leadership of certain of these countries are other factors extremely favorable to the spread and growth of sovietism in the Far East.

The attitude of some of our allies who insist upon carrying on extensive trade and commercial intercourse which strengthens the war potential of the Communist world is making it increasingly difficult for our own Nation to secure real cooperation in effecting measures to check further Red aggression and expansion. It must be clear to us now that so long as some nations sharing our attachment to free institutions think more of securing temporary

economic benefits flowing from Soviet trade than they think of strongly sustaining the cause of the free world and joining in efforts to liberate unfortunate smaller subject nations from tyranny and slavery, conditions will be favorable for additional Soviet aggression and expansion.

Many Americans are disturbed by the ironic paradox of some of our allied nations who are apparently willing to resign themselves to a precarious and dangerous status in this atomic age with those who are militantly striving for complete world conquest. Practically everyone is interested in peace and there is no question whatever that the American people to a man and to a woman, are eager to cooperate with all nations which sincerely seek peace through collective security measures.

As a Nation we undoubtedly squarely stand for genuine wholehearted international cooperation to achieve lasting peace and to check those dangerous movements which threaten to disturb world peace.

Actually at the present time there is only one challenging movement and that is organized world communism and because of its nature, its aims, its secretive methods, its deceitful practices, its willingness to resort to trickery, deception and aggression, it is impossible for free nations to conduct sincere or satisfactory peace negotiations.

Another extremely discouraging development is the apparent apathetic attitude of other free nations which seem to be indifferent to the great perils of the world Communist conspiracy, or who are willing to foster cordial, economic relationships with Communist enemies even while they openly engage in aggression and subversion. All these things are extremely distressing to the American people and tend to diminish their confidence in the effectiveness of collective security measures.

Notwithstanding the obstacles and disappointments, let us take a strong, firm stand against the Communist peril and let us work unceasingly for the peace.

Middle East Caldron—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Middle East Caldron" by James H. Sheldon which was published in the winter issue 1955–56 of a magazine entitled "Prevent World War III." This article will appear in two parts. It is an article which should be of great interest to all those who fear revival of any Fascist movement in the world. It is an article which makes startling disclosures. I have no reason to doubt its accuracy, and it is well worth reading:

MIDDLE EAST CALDRON

(By James H. Sheldon)

The Middle East is a place where troubles start. It has been such a place ever since dim ages before the Trojan War—because the area lies at the strategic crossroads between Europe, Asia, and Africa.

For the same reason that Caesar and Napoleon campaigned around the Nile, so did the Kaiser and his henchmen talk about the drive to the east and concentrate their energies on such projects as the Berlin-to-Baghdad railroad.

Germany's oldline geopoliticians, and likewise the Nazis of Adolf Hitler's Third Reich, gave top priority to building up their influence in the Middle East—and Germany industrialists and diplomats of today follow the same line, albeit with different labels attached.

The United States has long been at pains to develop a policy which would achieve the near-impossible objective of reconciling opposing forces there—and when the Russians needed a new political line this year, they found the opportunity ready-made in their offer of arms to Egypt and other Arab States.

One important reason for continued tension in the Middle East can be found in the entrenched position which the Nazi regime so vigorously built for itself there—a position which has been given continued support by postwar German developments.

Back in 1945–46 an entire group of some 17 Nazi army and S. S.—Himmler's dreaded elite guard—men were smuggled out of Germany, in spite of the allied occupation, into Egypt. False passports and like subterfuges were involved. Included were two topmen from "Milamt Six"—the secret intelligence section of the S. S., which had been organized by Walter Schellenberg under the direction of the notorious Ernst Kaltenbrunner.

Others were former high-ranking experts from the Abwehr (German Army Counter-Intelligence) department formerly under Lt. Gen. Erwin Lahousen. (This was the Abwehr section concurred with "foreign countries, penetration, and sabotage"). Still others came from the S. D. (a Gestapo intelligence group operating within the S. S. Corps) and at least two of these early migrants to Egypt had served with the notorious Einsatzkommandos ("Special Service Detachments")—the S. S. extermination units operating in Eastern Europe.

This group of Nazi experts soon became accepted as an all-powerful cadre in Egypt, and proceeded to organize the intelligence and policy-forming units of the Egyptian Army. Every man in this setup was at the time on the "wanted" list of the Allied commanders, and subject to automatic arrest, had he been caught within the territory of occupied Germany.

Later, they were joined by a considerable body of military experts and seasoned "top sergeants" who had survived the collapse of the Hitler regime. Among these were Lt. Gen. Wilhelm Fahrmbacher, a corps commander in the Nazi army who had been held for a time by the French as a war criminal, but was released and soon became General Naguib's leading military adviser. Fahrmbacher took along as his deputy Maj. Gen. Oscar Munzel, well known in officer circles of the third Reich, and they were later joined by Gerhard Mertins, who assumed the duty of educating the Egyptians in the techniques of parachute jumping and air attack.

Not long afterward, these military specialists were followed by Dr. Albert Degener—well known to New Yorkers as the prewar director of the German-American Board of Trade, one of the most prolific sources of pro-Nazi agitation in America before his presence was officially labeled undesirable by the State Department. Herr Degener's function in Egypt was the same as that which he had once performed in New York: to organize a German-Egyptian Chamber of Commerce.

The extent of his support at home can be gleaned from the frequency with which the German weekly news magazines feature articles on German-Egyptian trade developments.

The extent of this German penetration into Egyptian affairs has since grown alarmingly, as John Gunther puts it in his highly respected book, Inside Africa, "Bonn is acutely interested in Cairo and vice versa. About 600 German technicians are employed by the Egyptian Government working on several levels—military, engineering, railroads and the like. 'Nasser could never have made his coup without his German advisers,' I heard it said. Probably this is an overstatement but German technical skill has been helpful to the junta in several conspicuous areas."

As Gunther also points out, a German naval specialist is reported at work on Egyptian naval affairs and a German tank officer is engaged in mechanizing the armed forces. Three hundred German firms were represented at a recent trade fair in Cairo and a flourishing German-language newspaper has developed in that city. Meanwhile, German universities have set up special arrangements to facilitate the exchange of students from the Middle East.

On October 26, 1955, the West German news magazine, Der Spiegel, carried a story about the role which a former economic assistant of Hitler played in the arms deal between Egypt and the Communist bloc.

This former Nazi, Dr. Wilhelm Voss, once held a leading position in Hitler's war economy as president of the Skoda Works, a huge armament combine taken over by the Germans after they grabbed Czechoslovakia in 1939.

Evidently, this former Nazi was coached for his role in Egypt by the Bonn Government. Der Spiegel reports:

"Dr. Wilhelm Voss, once a prominent leader in the war economy of the Third Reich, started his career in Egypt with the urgent recommendation of the German Federal Government in February 1951. He was appointed in Cairo by General Naguib as head of the central planning board and as such was the chief advisor to the War Ministry in Egypt. Under his command were employed more than 50 German military and armament experts."

The importance of Dr. Voss' role in Egypt is underscored by the fact that the relation of this former Nazi to the Bonn Foreign Office and other Bonn agencies was so intimate and effective that in 1954 the German Ambassador in Cairo, Dr. Gunther Pawelke, also a former Nazi, resigned from his post in protest.

According to Der Spiegel, Dr. Voss kept intimate contacts not only with Adenauer's chief diplomatic aides, Dr. Blankenhorn and Professor Hallstein, but also with the highest officers in the Blank office, the Bonn War Ministry. These relations were evidently a constant irritation to Ambassador Pawelke, because they meant that certain high circles in the Bonn Government were closer to the Egyptian advisor, Dr. Voss, than to the official Bonn advisor in Cairo.

The report in Der Spiegel also reveals the background of the recent arms deal between Egypt and Czechoslovakia. According to this account, the former Nazi and ex-president of the Skoda Works, Dr. Vorr, "initiated the big armament deal with the Czechoslovak agents Prantel, Nobinec, and Kostrum, who operated under the facade of being refugees but who in reality are Communist agent."

The foregoing report sheds considerable light on the organizers and secret wirepullers of the present unrest in the Near and Middle East.

Again, as once under Hitler, the German industrialists and militarists proceed with

their conspiracies according to a well known pattern. They sow unrest where it is to Germany's advantage to fish in troubled waters. Der Spiegel is not very far from the truth when it comments that "Adenauer's leading diplomats have laid themselves open to the charge that they must share to a considerable extent in the tactical victory gained by Bolsheviks in the Near and Middle East."

German pentration in the Near East is by no means confined to Egypt. The former Wehrmacht Maj. Gunther Elmar von Hardenberg has long made his headquarters at Beirut in Syria where he heads an open organization known as the Association for Christian War Refugees and a secret group called the German Aid Committee for the Near East. When John Roy Carlson visited Beirut in 1950, von Hardenberg said to him: "Whenever a new German comes to Beirut I screen him personally, then register him with the Beirut police as a friend of the Arab cause." "There are already many Germans working with the Syrians as trainers and technicians," von Hardenberg added.

In Damascus, an Arabic group which Hitler youth leader Baldur von Schirach had helped form, was still operating, and was the source of "Boycott U. S. A." posters appearing in Arab shops.

In the same region, Dashnag leaders (the Dashnags were an Armenian Fascist movement allied with the Axis) also continue to exert great influence, moving under the old misleading cry that they are fighting communism, while in reality they are bending their primary efforts against the western cause in the Middle East.

The infiltration of Syria has been repeatedly described by foreign correspondents. The Syrian Government early called in a German military mission, after it was defeated by the Israeli armies. Newsweek reported that "the first to appear in Damascus was a former Gestapo colonel named Rapp. He revamped Syrian Military Intelligence and is credited with a leading role in Syria's first military coup, when a group of army officers under Col. Husni Zayim took over the government." Later, a once high-ranking intelligence officer in Hitler's army, General Stutterheim, was installed in a top Syrian army post, assisted by another influential ex-German, Colonel Kriedel.

An important article ("Berlin-Baghdad" Again) appearing in the January 1953 issue of Prevent World War III, gives many further details on this phase of German Middle East pentration.

At the other end of the Mediterranean, a similar situation continues. The leading Hamburg independent daily, Die Welt, on October 26, 1955, printed a dispatch concerning preparations for the inauguration of a monument at Tobruk, in Libya, commemorating the dead of Hitler's Africa Corps. Said this report: "The West German Government will be represented by the German chargé d'affaires in Tripoli. • • • The association of the members of the former German Africa Corps have announced group trips for this occasion and have chartered a steamship and special planes."

From another source comes a report that when former members of the Africa Corps met in Heidelberg, with the widow of former Field Marshal Rommel as guest of honor, she was greeted by the old Nazi marching song, "Panzer Rollen in Afrika." (Tanks Rolling in Africa.)

Reciprocating such interests, Arab tobacco companies have been taking full-page advertisements in German news magazines, featuring the portrait of a desert chieftan with rifle in hand, a replica of a cigarette package and the caption: "A Testimony of Friendship."

Most of the German press has been discreetly silent concerning these affairs—but in Italy the journalistic organs of the MSI (a powerful neo-fascist movement advocating return to the corporate-state ideal of Mussolini) have had no such inhibitions and some of their comments—even after making allowance for the source—are of striking significance.

On September 6, 1955, Il Secolo D'Italia (a strong supporter of MSI) carried an elaborate illustrated account of the reception in its office of 8 editors of the Egyptian newspaper chain Dar El Goumhourya (publishers of 7 newspapers in Arabic, French, and English). The article, adorned with a 4-column photograph of the visiting editors, declares that "Our Egyptian colleagues found in the editorial rooms of Il Secolo the climate of opinion closest to their views." And adjoining headline declaimed: "Israel Has Violated the Truce with Egypt."

The director of Il Secolo has just published a book lauding Mussolini.

On July 17, 1955, Asso Di Bastoni (the recognized voice of the MSI movement) published a long article lauding the Middle East exploits of the Krupp dynasty, with especial praise for Alfred Krupp, the man who served a war criminal's sentence after trial at Nuremberg.

"Alfred Krupp is today the sparkplug of the fantastic German renaissance. He is in close tough with the surviving leaders of the Reich and has placed his agents in all parts of the globe," the article begins. There follows an outline of Krupp's friendship with "heads of government" in the Middle East and elsewhere, and the comment that "the influence of Krupp is particularly important in Pakistan in view of the existence of a group of intelligent Pakistani who were formerly members of the Wehrmacht."

"The gigantic power of revived German industry," adds Asso Di Bastoni, "extends over the whole world. Krupp has defeated all the other corporations and is constructing on the Bosphorus a 1,600 meter bridge. He has concluded advantageous contracts," the article continues, "with Syria and with the National Government of Egypt.

"The Germans achieved a decisive victory in Saudi Arabia," says the same article, "when German electric firms obtained contracts for the construction of modern powerplants, and in Egypt when the German-Egyptian Chamber of Commerce secured a concession under which German engineers will supervise the tremendous Nile dam project.

"Following up the fine work of Krupp and other perseverant German industrialists," says Asso, "the influence and prestige of Germany is enormous throughout the Arab world, where Otto Skorzeny and other ex-officials of the S. S. supervise the instruction and education of armies and Dr. Hjalmar Schacht is financial adivser." In Iran, General Zahedi (arrested by the English as a collaborationist in 1941) is praised as a factor of great power, and it is pointed out that the mother of beautiful Soraya (wife of the Shah) was German. Then continue details of German political and economic penetration in Iran, the Sudan, Lebanon, etc.

"Everywhere the men of Krupp are present and active," says Asso Di Bastoni, and adds that thanks to this, Egypt today benefits from a German advance of 8,750 million lira. These colossal figures of indebtedness are to be settled by supplies of raw materials, adds this article.

In short, behind the scenes in the Middle East are to be found everywhere the pervasive tentacle of old-line German influence, bolstered up (whether for political or economic reasons does not matter) by the modernized industrialism typified by Krupp, and strengthened by the continual comings and goings of powerful figures such as the financial wizard Dr. Hjalmar Schacht.

Underlying all this are numerous indigenous forces for violence, typified by the hot-heads of the green-shirted Young Moslem League and the fanatic Fadayan Islam (Crusaders of Islam), one of whose agents last week nearly succeeded in an attempt to assassinate Premier Hassein Ala of Iran. Another agent of the same terrorist body was more sunccessful 4 years ago, when he destroyed the life of Premier Ali Razmara, one of Iran's ablest postwar leaders.

Middle East Caldron, Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of an article entitled "Middle East Caldron" by James E. Sheldon which was published in the winter issue, 1955–56, of a magazine entitled "Prevent World War III."

When the United Nations voted the partition of Palestine to establish the new State of Israel, it was hoped that an element of Western democratic stability might be injected into this swirling conflict of forces. Failure of the great powers to pursue a firm course in support of the newly established state, however, left the way open for a kind of simmering war to continue, under conditions which could boil up into a worldwide conflict without warning.

The exodus to the Middle East of so many important military and economic figures from the Third Reich, added to Arab intransigence and extremism, has contributed much to prevent the effective exercise of influence by the Western allies in efforts to bring about peaceful settlements.

As a result, we find Premier Nasser of Egypt declaring that "Israel is an artificial state which must disappear" (May 18, 1954, as quoted in the Greek newspaper Kathenieni); and not long ago, the New York Times quoted King Saud of Saudi-Arabia as declaring: "Israel is like a cancer to the human body and the only way of remedy is to uproot it."

So violently anti-Jewish have been some of the speeches made in the United States by the Syrian Ambassador, Farid Zeineddine, that responsible organizations have been led to ask for his recall. Scarcely less inflammatory have been speeches by Mohammed Jamali, chairman of the Iraqi delegation to the U. N. The friendly State of Israel thus finds itself being denounced on American platforms as a "bastard State," and loyal United States citizens of Jewish persuasion find themselves being falsely accused of dual loyalty, in terms reminiscent of prewar Nazi propaganda.

"Whoever thinks of making peace with the enemy (Israel) signs the death warrant of all the Arab nations," Jamali once said. And a Syrian President, General Shisekly, was quoted in Cairo papers to effect that "The Middle East is not large enough for both Jews and Arabs." (What the Arabs intend to do with their vast empty spaces, and their millions of oil dollars, he didn't add.) Mohammed Naguib himself said not so long ago: "The only solution is Israel's disappearance."

An important background factor in building up this Arab intransigence has been the influence of the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini.

The Grand Mufti was one of Hitler's major henchmen—and was a principal influence in

determining the policy of Jewish extermination which Hitler pursued, and especially in making that policy the unbelievably inhuman thing it was in the Balkans and Middle East. The Grand Mufti attempted to organize a Moslem revolt against the British in Iraq at the very outset of the war, and when defeated, was brought to continental Europe by Hitler, where at various places he organized a school for the training of Moslem infiltrators indoctrinated to spread Nazi ideologies; helped to set up the blood-thirsty Moslem Legions in Yugoslavia; and finally, just as the war was coming to an end, directed the "Gross-Mufti Bureau" not far from Hitler's headquarters, from which he was engaged (along with Goebbels, Goering, Vidkun Quisling and the Nazi puppet of Iraq) in organizing a "World conference on the Jewish problem." The plans for this conference collapsed only because the Allied Armies got to Berlin before Al-Husseini and his cohorts could get their delegates there.

The S. S. Hauptsturmfuerer Dieter von Wisliczeny later declared in a war crimes affidavit based on his intimate knowledge of internal Nazi affairs that the Grand Mufti played "an important role" in constantly "inciting" the Nazi powers to more violent measures in their policy of Jewish extermination, particularly in southeastern Europe.

A study of material emanating from behind Arab boundaries today indicates that much of the basic propaganda line of the anti-Jewish agitation now being pursued by Arab League states has come down unchanged from the days of the Grand Mufti's evil liaison with Hitler.

For example, Antoine Albina, a leading tourist agent (of Syrian extraction) with headquarters in Arab Jerusalem, is currently engaged in bombarding his countrymen—as well as visitors to that part of the world—with multilingual propaganda bearing the imprint of the World Truth League. The name, significantly enough is a rough translation of the Fichte-Bund once master-minded by Dr. Goebbels.

We need not quote examples of Albina's output at length. It is sufficient to say that Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith, the most notorious of our domestic hate mongers, finds Albina's publications sufficiently inflammatory to be worthy of reprinting in his anti-Jewish monthly, The Cross and the Flag—and like-minded hate mongers in England, and even in far-away South Africa, also find Albina's material useful in fanning the flames of bias and bigotry, in those areas.

This exchange of hate propaganda also works in the other direction. We pause to cite but one instance. When an American west coast agitator named Frank Britton (who a few years ago tried to stir up a boycott against Jewish-owned businesses in Los Angeles) got out a 102-page book misleadingly entitled "Behind Communism" a prominent Arabic press agency, with offices in Cairo, Baghdad and Beirut, promptly reissued it in an Arabic version and started circulating it all over the Middle East. Britton's opus, needless to say, had little or nothing to do with the real facts about communism, but was merely a book-length diatribe against Jews and Judaism, elaborating upon the old canard that "Judaism and communism are irretrievably bound together."

A dozen pages could be devoted to further examples of the same type of agitation, designed to incite even the most lethargic to violence and guaranteed to help forestall all efforts at peaceful settlements. As a Minister in one Arabic cabinet put it the other day: "No member of my government would even dare to talk about peace with Israel."

Of course, the problem of the refugees is being exploited to the utmost by the Arab governments, so that the refugees have become as much a political tool as a relief problem. Relocation funds made available through U. N. agencies have been in large part rejected by the Arab States, who obviously would prefer to keep the refugees confined to their camps, and use them for purposes of political exploitation.

So obvious is this purpose that Egypt and other Arab countries have actually been collecting customs duties on shipments of relief materials intended for the help of the "refugee victims." A casual inspection of the lurid propaganda leaflets issued by the Arabs in this connection confirms the same conclusion.

So arrogant has this attitude become that the highly responsible Reuters agency reported on December 1, 1955, that the seven Arab League countries have actually issued a circular addressed to Dutch firms trading in the Middle East, demanding detailed information on their business with Israel and their employment of Jews in their home cities. This astounding circular originated with the Economical Siege on Israel Office in Damascus. "The Arab countries," said the circular, "are in a state of war with Israel and for this reason are making an economic siege of that country."

Meanwhile, the East-West controversy added fuel to the fire.

Soviet policy, which has on repeated occasions included the persecution of Jews and Zionists (a fact which makes propaganda like the Britton book mentioned above appear particularly ridiculous to the thoughtful reader), now seems to have entered a pro-Arab phase. According to the current Communist line, as reflected in the New York Daily Worker (Nov. 16, 1955), Israel is now regarded as "a province in Wall Street's middle eastern economic empire." Where this sort of thing may lead to, when coupled with an alarming increase of indigenous anti-Americanism in cities like Cairo, is anybody's guess.

Granting that the Americans, British, and French would like to see the Arabs accede to a permanent and peaceful settlement recognizing the just claims of Israel, the Soviets have been playing whichever side of the fence suited their position at a particular time. Currently they seem to have set out to help arm the 45 million Moslems. Should this policy be long continued, the results could be frightening indeed. Add a supply of Russian rifles and jet planes to inflammatory propaganda of the sort outlined above, mix in the aggressive intentions of the Arabs, and you have the makings of a conflagration that could very readily lead to world war III.

The Living Heritage of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Dorothy Fosdick which appeared on January 1, 1956, in the New York Times magazine.

The article follows:

THE LIVING HERITAGE OF WOODROW WILSON

(By Dorothy Fosdick)

When Woodrow Wilson died in 1924, his career as world statesman appeared to have ended in tragedy. He had failed to rally America sufficiently to the support of his program. The Senate had refused the peace treaty—and with it the League of Nations. America withdrew into the sullen isolation of the 1920's, and Wilson ended his days a physically broken and crippled man, aware that a Second World War was coming. Yet in 20 years America caught up with his convictions and resumed his interrupted work. So powerful has Wilson's influence proved that America now celebrates the centennial year of his birth in a spirit of rededication.

Some men live in history through their actual achievements—like George Washington. Others are known to the ages for their ideas and for the work they began. Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson belong to the latter group. The Nation which rejected Wilson in his lifetime honors him today as the supreme spokesman for the most urgent task of the 20th century—the adjustment of national power and interest to world organization and to the requirements of peace.

Wilsons great legacy is the United Nations and the concert of opinion and power to prevent aggression, which it represents. With startling clarity he had seen that the community of nations must organize itself to check aggression and to promote peaceable adjustment—or perish. Long before others, he understood that new weapons of mass killing could lead, in his words, to the "absolute destruction of mankind," and that there was not alternative to peace. He further perceived that the chance of peace depended on the United States bearing part of the burden of responsibility, along with others. "The peace of the world," he said, "cannot be established without America."

The League of Nations was Wilson's conception of how to meet this problem. He knew that the machinery would have to be changed and adjusted by experience, but he believed the League was the next necessary step in man's developing conception of order and responsibility in world affairs.

The League came into being in January 1920, without America, and today one stands aghast at the missed opportunities prior to Hitler and World War II, when power was available to be concerted against aggression, and when there was a world organization that needed only to be used.

But the idea of the League lives on in the United Nations. Even before World War II had ended Franklin D. Roosevelt followed Wilson's lead in initiating a second world organization, largely modeled on the first.

Wilson, then, was in a way a prophet. His vision is all the more extraordinary because he displayed very human traits—traits which in some measure accounted for his tragedy. He was, in fact, at one time an isolationist, but in the sense that he had always concerned himself primarily with national matters, and when he was first elected to the Presidency—after a long period of Republican reign—he became absorbed with plans for domestic reforms.

Conceiving of the President as the custodian of the national interest, Wilson submitted national legislation to provide that in the new industrial society every group would share in the expansion and enrichment of American life.

Lasting reforms of the new freedom enacted during his early months in office include the Federal Reserve System, the income tax, the Federal Trade Commission, the Clayton antitrust law, and the Underwood tariff-revision law.

When the war broke out in Europe within 18 months of his inauguration, Wilson's first reaction was a natural one: he dreaded what the conflagration would do to his constructive efforts at home, and he tried, as best he could, to keep America aloof. But Wilson had the basic integrity to face up to hard and annoying facts. He soon realized that if Germany won the war she would not use her land supremacy, as Britain had used her supremacy on the sea, to safeguard peace and freedom.

His conviction deepened that unrestrained national interests abroad, like unregulated

economic processes at home, do not necessarily promote the general interest. Wilson discovered that America was desperately concerned both in the outcome of the war and in the quality of the peace, and that American power might be decisive for both.

In a brief period, thinking hard and rapidly, Wilson emerged as a full-fledged citizen of the 20th century. By 1919 he was saying: "The isolation of the United States is at an end, not because we chose to go into the politics of the world but because by the sheer genius of this people and the growth of our power we have become a determining factor in the history of mankind."

With Wilson's conversion coming late, his homework for the Versailles Conference on the peace treaty and for ratification by the Senate was insufficient. But there was a deeper trouble; his opportunity for a speedy education in the White House had been unique and others were 'way behind him.

Some critics argue that if Wilson had only accepted the proposed reservations to the League Covenant, all would have been well. These reservations ranged from mild changes of language suggested by such moderates as Kellogg and McCumber to more serious objections raised by Henry Cabot Lodge and his followers.

But Wilson felt that he knew from experience what Lodge and his supporters were up to: they were still isolationists; their skillfully devised reservations would in effect have sneaked America in by the back door, released from the full obligation to use its power to prevent aggression.

The heart of the matter was article X of the League Covenant, with its undertaking "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the League." Wilson did accept interpretive reservations to other elements in the covenant, such as those declaring that the League would have no jurisdiction on domestic issues, and providing a special status for the Monroe Doctrine. But on article X he stood firm, unwilling to write American power out of the peace when he knew that only American power would make peace possible.

When Wilson spoke of the "organized opinion of mankind" which must sustain the peace, he had American opinion particularly in mind. He saw that unless this country went into the League with enough conviction to accept and carry out her full obligations, the League machinery would be stalled. But Wilson was not strong enough to drag others with him, and during an intensive speech-making tour in September 1919, appealing directly to the people, he collapsed. The treaty and covenant were first rejected by the Senate in November, and then finally again in March 1920.

Perhaps the result would have been different had Wilson been able to finish his tour, or if, say, radio had been available. Yet before he died, he said this: "I am not sorry that I broke down. As it is coming now, the American people are thinking their way through and reaching their own decision, and that is the better way for it to come."

And so it happened. Wilson could not recover, but his country could, and at the advent of the United Nations the great debate of 1919 did not even need to be repeated.

The legacy of the United Nations would have been enough to assure that Wilson's fame will live. But the mechanism of a general international organization is by no means his only bequest.

When America gives advance notice to any potential aggressor that she has concerted her power with other nations on behalf of peace, and then, as in Berlin and Korea, proves that she means what she says, she stands in Wilson's tradition. Wilson was not naive; he did not advocate the outlawing of power, but rather its organization at the service of justice to guarantee peace. When the League of Nations first met in Geneva Wilson had said: "Force is in the background."

While Wilson distrusted alliances and special blocs as the foundation of a security system, he realized that under some circumstances they might be helpful. In 1915 he proposed a treaty among the American republics mutually to guarantee each other's territorial integrity and political independence, and his plan was fulfilled with the establishment of the Organization of American States at Bogotá in 1948.

Also, it was Wilson who negotiated the Tripartite Pact alining France, Great Britain, and the United States to keep the peace against Germany, only to have the Senate, in 1920, repudiate that agreement, with disastrous consequences for the sense of security of France.

While Wilson saw the necessity of force in the background, he realized that peace could only be safeguarded if other strategies occupied the foreground.

America's emphasis on the peaceful settlement of disputes is part of our inheritance from Wilson. He knew that dissatisfied nations would seek redress, that conflicts would arise, and that, if the threat and use of force were to be minimized and contained, then opportunities for peaceful redress and settlement must be provided and perfected. In 1919 Wilson said: "Settlements may be temporary, but the action of the nations in the interest of peace and justice must be permanent. We can set up permanent processes. We may not be able to set up permanent decisions."

His influence on the conduct of international affairs is still felt. Wilson was against secret agreements, and such agreements have been radically reduced by United Nations arrangements for the registration and publication of treaties. But as Wilson gained experience in practical diplomacy he made known that a phrase he had used—"Diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view"—was not meant to preclude "confidential negotiations involving delicate matters," and during the later stages of the Versailles Conference he himself insisted on rigorous secrecy. He had come to see that final results might be better if preparatory discussions were private and informal.

America's initiative in negotiating the Human Rights Declaration and in encouraging nations to live up to it reflects Wilson's conviction that the peace will never be secure until the great masses of people feel justly treated. Wilson was a fervent Democrat, eager that America should hold high the light to guide the feet of all peoples struggling for their rights, and he almost anticipated the Human Rights Declaration in these words:

"I do not know that there will ever be a declaration of independence and of grievances for mankind, but I believe that if any such document is ever drawn it will be drawn in the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence."

American encouragement of independence for colonial peoples, as those peoples become able to undertake its responsibilities, is in the tradition of Wilson. He had favored independence for the Philippine Islands, when the Filipino peoples desired it and were prepared to assume the duties of self-government. In Wilson's wartime effort to break up the Austro-Hungarian empire and so to weaken Germany, thinking of the Czech and Hungarian Nations, he had said that "all nations had a right to self-determination."

Subsequently, Wilson regretted that particular wording, and it did prove open to abuse—for example, by Hitler when he prostituted it to his purpose of subverting the Sudetenland. In some areas today independence for a small group is no boon to the native peoples or to the whole free world, if the new state—small, detached and unprotected—proves vulnerable to communism. But still, Wilson's career is an asset in our struggle for the friendship and help of the uncommitted peoples of Asia and Africa—for he is their hero.

This centennial year of Wilson's birth is an occasion for remembering and, in remembering, it is appropriate to recall Wilson's central ideas, to ponder the essence of things for which he strove, and to consider the cost that mankind paid for the rejection of his program. So reflecting, it may be possible for us to recapture the full significance of the cause he championed, in which we are now so fatefully engaged.

A Workable Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of January 10, 1956:

A WORKABLE FARM PLAN

A dynamic farm program has been proposed to Congress by the President. Its broad attack shows the great amount of study that has gone into it plus the urgency of its immediate consideration.

However, the program has no surprises, no panaceas. It will not satisfy those who want farm prices raised tomorrow by Government edict.

Key to the major goal of the program—adjustment of production to demand—is the soil bank plan. It had been expected from developments of recent months. The principal interest in the special message is in details of operation rather than innovations.

Evidence of the basic philosophy of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, is seen time and again throughout the message. Both are determined if at all possible not to put more controls over farmers. Therefore, participation in the soil bank plan as proposed would be voluntary. Of course, the offered Government payments should be sufficient inducement to get compliance.

Next, the President showed his determination to avoid a return to any kind of Government assistance that might create new surpluses which would add, as they have in the past, to the overall problem. His language is specific. The 1954 farm law, he explains, has not been successful because it has been "smothered by surpluses amassed by the old program."

It is extremely encouraging that the President hopes Congress will get the soil-bank plan into law and into operation this year. Even some backers of the plan had doubted it could be made immediately effective. Certainly the current low farm prices call for action with a sense of urgency.

The President has called upon Congress, too, to take action on the question of limiting Government price support to family-size farms. It is one that has bothered farm authorities for years. With Presidential endorsement something constructive may come from the proposal in this session.

All in all, Mr. Eisenhower has given Congress a real base on which to build a new

farm program. Perhaps the most important aspect of the whole presentation is that its different facets appear workable as opposed to many past proposals which were totally lacking in practicality.

Address by Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Before the Young Republican Leadership School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, before the Young Republican Leadership Training School which was held here in Washington during the week of January 23 through January 27:

The Republican Party was born midway in the 19th century out of the great need in our young Nation for a national party dedicated to the protection of basic human rights and the American way of free Government and free enterprise.

Over 100 years ago on February 28, 1854, a group of Whigs, Free-Soilers and Democrats met in the Congregational Church in Ripon, Wis. This group agreed that individually each would sever his present party affiliations if Congress violated the principles of basic human rights by approving the Kansas-Nebraska bill. This measure would have permitted the extension of slavery into new territories.

After the Kansas-Nebraska bill received Senate approval on March 3, 1854, a second meeting was called for March 20, 1854. This time 53 of the town's 100 eligible voters met in the Ripon schoolhouse and a committee was appointed to start the new Republican Party.

In the words of Maj. Alvan E. Bovay, a prominent Whig who called the meeting: "We went into the little meeting held in a schoolhouse, Whigs, Free-Soilers, and Democrats; we came out of it Republicans and we were the first Republicans in the Union."

On May 9, 1854, a meeting was called in Washington by Representative Israel Washburn, Jr., of Maine, and the 30 Members of Congress who attended this meeting decided that there was a need for such a new political party and that the name Republican would be highly appropriate.

The principles of the new Republican Party won immediate support throughout the country and on July 6, 1854, only 4 months after the first meeting in Ripon, Wis., the first Republican convention was held under the oaks at Jackson, Mich., to formalize the party organization. This meeting attracted several hundred persons including a large number from other cities.

This first convention outlined the basic philosophy of the new Republican Party and adopted a resolution which read:

"*Resolved*, That * * * in view of the necessity of battling for the first principles of Republican government and against the schemes of an artistocracy, the most revolting and oppressive with which the earth was ever cursed or man debased, we will cooperate and be known as Republicans until the contest be terminated."

Since that time the Republican Party has continued its fight to protect the basic human rights and the principles of free enterprise and the essential dignity of man.

During the late winter and summer of 1854 Whigs, northern Democrats, and most of the supporters of the Free-Soil Party endorsed the principles of the Republican Party and Republican State tickets were elected in Michigan and Wisconsin in that year.

In 1855 the Nation's first Republican governor was elected in Ohio and 11 Republican Senators were sent to Washington.

The first formal national convention of the Republican Party was held at Philadelphia in 1856 and Gen. John C. Frémont was nominated for the Presidency on a platform opposing the extension of slavery, advocating improvement of rivers, harbors, and the building with Federal aid of a transcontinental railroad. The new party did not believe that the Federal Government should interfere with the peculiar institution of slavery already established in the South but felt that its spread to any additional territories should be prevented.

In spite of the newness of the Republican Party and its ineffective organization in many eastern States, Presidential Candidate Frémont received 114 electoral votes against 174 for James Buchanan, Democrat.

The new Republican Party had gained sufficient strength by 1858 to elect a plurality in the House of Representatives and to carry several State governments.

In 1860, only 6 short years after the birth of the Republican Party, it elected to the Presidency of the first Republican President, and one of the greatest men in history, Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois.

Lincoln ran on a platform similar to that of 1856, advocating also a homestead law and a protective tariff. In this election Lincoln polled 180 electoral votes.

Lincoln's great faith in the individual and in the American way of free government and free enterprise laid the foundation for the Republican Party's constant devotion to those principles. Lincoln's deep concern for the humble individual is legendary and the Republican Party has ever since held this as a basic philosophy.

From Lincoln, the party also learned the importance of free enterprise, to protect the fruits of labor and to combat a fixed-class system. Every citizen, however lowly his start in life, should be guaranteed the right of a proper reward for his efforts, his thrift, and his ingenuity.

These were the philosophies on which the Republican Party gained its sound beginning during a great trial in the Nation's history. These are the same basic philosophies of the Republican Party today.

Although the Lincoln administration was overshadowed by the Civil War, which had broken out before Lincoln took the oath of office, there were other accomplishments important to the individual man brought about during the administration of this first Republican President.

In 1862, on Lincoln's suggestion, Congress established the Department of Agriculture, passed the first Homestead Act, established the national banking system and passed the first Morrill Act, donating land for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges.

In 1864 Lincoln was renominated by the Republicans in convention in Baltimore. At that time, however, there were other political factions who wished also to share the Republican Party principles and a Union ticket was formed with a Union Democrat from Tennessee, Andrew Johnson, named as Lincoln's runningmate. The Lincoln-Johnson ticket easily defeated the Democrats in this election. Winning by 212 to 21 electoral votes.

On April 14, 1865, Abraham Lincoln was assassinated and new burdens fell on the shoulders of Andrew Johnson, whose former status as a Democrat proved a severe handicap in his sincere efforts to carry out the Lincoln program. Attempting to follow Lincoln's proposals in the reconstruction of the South, Johnson ran into a bitter feud with Congress who wanted to use harsh methods of punishment contrary to the Republican principles Lincoln had laid down. The feud grew so bitter that President Johnson in Febraury of 1868 was impeached and almost removed from office.

In 1868 Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, of Illinois, was the Republican nominee and was elected by an electoral vote of 214 to 80. During Grant's first administration a number of constructive moves were taken to guarantee the basic human rights of all Americans as the founders of the Republican Party had envisioned them.

Against the opposition of the Democrats, laws were passed for the enforcement of the rights guaranteed to Negroes in the 14th and 15th amendments. In 1871 the first civil-service law was passed.

In the election of 1872 Grant was enthusiastically endorsed by the public and returned to office with a popular majority three times as great as in 1868. He received 272 to 63 for the opposition.

In reviewing the Republican Party's record during its first 14 years in office, Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, in 1874 called attention to the following accomplishments:

"In 14 years it enacted a protective tariff which made the United States the greatest manufacturing Nation on earth; it enlisted, organized and sent back to civil life a vast army; it created a great navy, constructed on principles not invented when it came into power; it put down a gigantic rebellion; it made freemen and citizens of 4 million slaves; it contrived the national banking system; it created a currency which circulates throughout the world on an equality with gold; it made the credit of the country the best in the world; it restored specie payment; it devised and inaugurated the beneficent homestead system; it built the Pacific railroads; it compelled France to depart from Mexico; it exacted apology and reparation from Great Britain; it overthrew the doctrine of perpetual allegiance and required the great powers of Europe hereafter to let our adopted citizens alone; it made honorable provisions for invalid soldiers and sailors. * * *"

In 1876 Grant was still enormously popular but the Republican Party refused to break with their long-standing tradition against perpetuation in office. When a Democrat Representative, William Springer, of Illinois, introduced in the House of Representatives his historical resolution condemning a third term for any President, 80 percent of the Republicans cast their votes for the resolution. Although the Democrat Party later reversed its stand on the principle in endorsing Franklin Roosevelt for a third term, the descendents of Representative Springer apparently found it easier to change party than to change principle for the present Representative WILLIAM SPRINGER, of Illinois, serves in the 84th Congres as a Republican.

Thus from humble beginnings the Republican Party grew and enjoyed a long and memorable history and a popular majority during the most expansive period of its development from 1861 to 1933.

For three-fourths of that period Republicans occupied the White House. They shaped governmental policy, encouraging development of the country's vast natural resources. They built up its defense; they created its national banking system; they established the world's soundest currency; they stabilized the Nation's credit and they formulated an economic policy which has made the United States the first among the nations.

From its minority position in the Federal Government after 1933 the Republican Party

remained true to its basic principles, cooperating in the development of constructive legislation and opposing the trend toward a regimented economy and a collectivist state.

In fact, in spite of their minority position Republicans made many outstanding contributions to national policy during these years. Included among these are:

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Defeat of the attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

Exposing political corruption and racketeering and passage of the Hatch Act.

Sponsorship of a pay-as-you-go tax plan.

Leadership in the movement for United States participation in United Nations.

Protection of States rights.

Exposing inefficiency and waste in Government.

Fighting radical elements and trends in Federal Government.

Elimination of wartime controls in the postwar economy.

In 1946 the Nation elected the Republican 80th Congress, faced with the difficult task of reversing the New Deal trends of Government controls and regimentation and wasteful and unwise spending. These trends were undermining the American system of free government and burdening the American people with unprecedented tax loads.

In spite of the stubborn and deliberate opposition of a Democrat President the Republican 80th Congress fulfilled its pledges and made a record of solid legislative achievement including:

Reduction of Government expenditures.

Reduction of taxes.

A revision of the National Labor Relations Act to protect the individual workingman.

Curtailment of Government controls.

Exposure of subversive elements.

Strengthening of national defense.

Expansion of veterans' benefits.

Easing of Government housing controls.

Stopped inflationary deficit spending.

Adopted a long-range agriculture program.

Expanded social security.

Established the Hoover Commission to bring about efficiency and savings in Government.

As a minority group in the 81st Congress the Republican Party fought hard to preserve the constructive program it had initiated in the Republican 80th Congress.

Republicans in the 81st Congress concentrated their efforts on continuing the economy trend introduced in the 80th Congress and on defeating on every occasion the efforts of the Truman administration to foist socialism on this country.

In 1950 a statement of Republican principles and objectives was adopted supplementing the 1948 platform. This statement stressed the importance of Republican liberty as opposed to Democrat socialism. The return of the people to the principles of the Republican Party was displayed dramatically in the congressional elections that year and Republicans made gains of 5 Senators, 6 governors and 27 Members of the House.

The Democrat-controlled 82d Congress was noteworthy for its legislative inactivity. It was during that time, however, that President Truman fired General MacArthur; that RFC investigations disclosed influence peddling by persons close to the White House; and that Republicans continued their battle against nondefense spending.

In 1952 President Eisenhower and the Republican Party were swept into office by a landslide vote of 442 electoral votes.

Taking over the responsibilities of his administration on January 20, 1953, President Eisenhower spelled out Republican objectives in his state of the Union message on February 2. He said:

"The grand labor of this leadership will involve—application of America's influence in world affairs with such fortitude and such foresight that it will deter aggression and eventually secure peace·

"Establishment of a national administration of such integrity and such efficiency that its honor at home will insure respect abroad;

"Encouragement of those incentives that inspire creative initiative in our economy, so that its productivity may fortify freedom everywhere; and

"Dedication to the well-being of all our citizens and to the attainment of equality of opportunity for all, so that our Nation will ever act with the strength of unity in every task to which it is called."

To you who are leaders in the Young Republican organization I need not recount the great strides President Eisenhower and the Republican Party have made in the past 3 years in fulfilling these objectives. We have brought to the Nation' peace; nowhere in the world are American soldiers dying in war. We have brought to the Nation prosperity; never have so many people been employed; never have their wages been so high. We have stopped wasteful Government spending; we have stopped inflation; we have stopped the infiltration of subversives in our high Government offices.

Today Americans are free, prosperous and at peace and they look toward the future with a new confidence because the principles of the Republican Party have been followed in our Federal Government.

In closing, let me say that to many Americans throughout the Nation, the initials GOP, symbol of the Republican Party, have come to mean also guardians of peace, guardians of prosperity and guardians of progress. With the help of such Republican leadership as I see in this room today we can continue these fine traditions of the Republican Party.

Land Exchange Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the following article entitled "Land Exchange Bill," which appeared in the Washington Post on February 1, 1956:

LAND-EXCHANGE BILL

In a letter which was printed in your paper of January 20, Mr. Fred M. Packard referred to a bill of mine which had to do with the exchange of lands. This bill, H. R. 4646 of the 83d Congress, has also been mentioned in your news columns and in an editorial. In every instance, including Mr. Packard's letter, the bill is grossly misrepresented.

The legislation simply sought a solution of the problems faced by wage earners and small property owners located around a forest-products plant which was about to have its life ended or curtailed as the result of having its forest acreage acquired by the Government.

In such situations the principals in the transaction are satisfied. The Government gets the land. The private owner of the industry gets paid for it and can invest his money elsewhere. The innocent victims in such a situation are those who work and have their homes there and the other elements of the little community which depend upon the industry.

My bill proposed simply that the Government, if it had other equivalent forest lands in the area which the industry could take in replacement for the lands needed by the Government, a simple exchange of lands should be made. Thus several worthwhile things could be accomplished: the Government would not need to pay cash out of the Treasury for the lands needed.

Local government would not lose tax revenue since the exhanged lands would go on the property-tax rolls. The life of a going industry would be preserved, jobs would be saved, and local property values maintained. The privately owned wood-processing business would not benefit to the extent of a single penny.

What about "cutting into the national parks"? My bill carried the following language: "Provided, that such exchange shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, or wildlife refuges."

HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Member of Congress from Oregon.

The Bold New Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 1956 issue of Farm Journal:

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM

What do you think of the new proposals for farm legislation? There are some fresh approaches in the message the President laid before Congress last week, and they deserve plenty of discussion.

No one can predict what Congress will finally pass. That may depend on what Members hear from farmers.

Looking at the situation coldly, it is plain that if new laws are to do any good they must take into account that:

1. Nothing can be solved as long as vast surpluses in Government hands hang over the market.

2. Nothing will work if new surpluses are encouraged to accumulate.

3. Positive steps are needed to make farming profitable for years to come.

Moreover, it is pretty certain that not too many years ahead markets will demand much more food than the United States has ever produced. We may have 200 million people to feed by 20 years from now.

It seems to us that President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have looked the facts in the face. They have recognized that in agriculture there is not just one big problem but several sizable ones. The message shows full understanding that corn can't be treated alone without considering other feed grains; that feed grains can't be treated without thinking of livestock, dairy, and poultry; that cotton and rice and the Great Plains have their own particular problems; and that farms of different sizes need different consideration.

The ideas for using the surplus to reduce the surplus are ingenious and look to be workable.

The proposals at every point take into account the vital necessity that soil resources be conserved and improved.

They do give assurance that the grinding incubus of surpluses can be disposed of and used, and that new surpluses will not be created.

Objection will be raised that the plans will be costly. Actually, they will cost very little more than the present procedures that have not worked. As the President pointed out, the problem has grown out of the war (and out of postwar mistakes). And as he said: "Just as other readjustments from war were shouldered in considerable part by the Nation as a whole, so should this."

As a matter of fact, it might be cheaper in the long run if Congress were to increase the President's figures and get the main parts of the job done faster. Make the incentives attractive enough and farmers will soon bring things back into balance.

Most fertile of all the several proposals, looking to the longtime prosperity of farmers, may well be the sharp increase in research, especially for new uses, better markets and new crops. This is indispensable. "A major frontier of agriculture lies in our laboratories and experimental fields," the President said.

If the entire program is adopted and generously financed, the family farms of America should soon resume their share in the country's prosperity. It may not be perfect; with the mess behind us none could be. But it is constructive, bold, and practical. And no one is offering a better one.

Red China's Inhumanity To Man—Red China Must Not Be Admitted to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1956, in the city of Kenosha, Wis., the Most Reverend Cuthbert M. O'Gara, O. P., D. D., addressed the Midwest Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin.

Bishop O'Gara spent the most valuable period of his lifetime as a missionary priest in China. He suffered untold indignities from the Chinese Communists who had jailed him on spurious charges.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the verbatim address of Bishop O'Gara because he tells the story better than I can.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are opposed, under any circumstances, to the admission of Red China to the United Nations not even by abstaining from a vote if such a vote should come in the Security Council.

The address by Bishop O'Gara follows:

Gentlemen, we stand today at the crossroads. Christian civilization is closer to dissolution than at any time in its history.

A generation ago, an unholy and materialistic prophet foresaw this very day. Lenin, the high priest and mastermind of communism calmly stated that "the road to Paris lies through China." To paraphrase his statement: the way to the domination of the Christian world was through China, since Paris then was accepted as the symbol of Christian culture.

Thirty years ago, when I first went to the Orient as a young missionary priest, I, like the rest of the world which we now call the Free West, could afford to laugh at such a statement. At this moment, I no longer laugh. I know it can happen. I know it is happening. And, may God forbid that a further prophecy of Lenin should ever come to pass: "We shall not have to fight for America. It will drop into our hands like a ripe melon."

Gentlemen and veterans, we speak a common language. You fought, you suffered, you were willing to shed your blood, and if necessary, give up your lives to protect and preserve your Christian heritage and your country. Many of your compatriots lie buried in foreign soil, mute, but effective witnesses to the fact that you fought valiantly and suffered nobly for God and for country. Now, there is solid reason to fear that you fought and suffered in vain.

I repeat, today we stand at the crossroads.

Our Christian faith is challenged—our country is on the defensive—not to say the run.

The world's spotlight is on the United States of America and China. On this stage will be resolved, either the eventual destruction of Communist domination or the complete enslavement and ultimate liquidation of the Christian world—the free world. There is no other alternative.

If I point the greater part of my remarks this evening to the prevailing situation in Communist China, it is because I have been a personal witness to Peking's method of conquest, her determination to destroy all opposition, and her ultimate goal of enslaving America. This, of course, but follows the pattern which runs through Communist strategy the world over. The Red primer is the textbook and that whether it is read and studied in Moscow or in Peking. If the three celebrated princes of the Catholic Church, Cardinal Wyszinski, of Poland, Cardinal Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, Cardinal Mindzenty, of Hungary, if the great number of missionary bishops and priests, if the host of other Christian missionaries, yes, if any of our brave servicemen who in the line of duty fell captive to the Red enemy and have been delivered from the jaws of death and the mouth of hell—which aptly describes Communist imprisonment—if any of these were to stand here tonight, each would speak to you as I do.

Communism is on the march in the Orient and in the west and no appeasement can stay its inexorable advance.

In view of the present world situation and in the face of Communist successes on all sides, I am amazed and shocked, at the prevailing sentiment in America, that "it cannot happen here."

I lived 4 years under the People's Government of China—2 of those years in solitary confinement in a Communist prison. I was in daily contact with Communists, living with them cheek by jowl, witnessing their day to day activities, listening to their boasted objectives, especially their declared plan for the "liberation" of America.

All this, added to my observations on the home front, since my return from Communist imprisonment, compels me to declare emphatically that in my considered opinion, it can happen here.

While I was in prison, I was often told that I was not in prison at all, that I was in a sort of school, that I was being "reeducated." In a sense I found this to be very true, because I came to discover there things that otherwise I would never have known nor would I have credited. Daily I witnessed a discipline that to me was amazing. Had I seen something of that sort in Japan or Germany I would not have been surprised. But to the Chinese character, such extreme regimentation is not natural—I never dreamed it possible. I saw there a fervor, misplaced and fanatical if you will, yet a fervor in an unholy cause that would put any modern Christian to shame, or would caution any follower of democratic freedom to beware. Believe it or not, I saw in prison a whole-hearted single-minded zeal for the Red cause and a spirit of self-sacrifice to insure its success, that to me was astonishing and not a little frightening.

In the summer of 1952 I observed something, which if I had merely been told about it, I would not have believed. It was what, in Catholic circles, is called a retreat—that is a period when one cuts himself off from all wordly contact and in a series of meditation takes inventory of his spiritual assets and makes certain determined resolutions to assure the improvement of his Christian life. So what I witnessed was a 10 day retreat for the rank and file of the prison personnel. Lectures, meditations, and writing out of resolutions. The individual concentration by each one during the periods of meditation on basic Communist teachings was worthy of the intensive personal soul-searching of any Trappist monk. I walked up and down the narrow confines of my prison cell many a day and thought how much all this was like to the ultrafervent lives of the earliest Christians.

And this prison in which I was confined was but a classroom in the great school of communism that encompassed all China. Out of this nationwide school came ardent Communists—their assured destiny was to have a share in the world conquest for communism. Is it any wonder then that while I was in prison the Red hordes occupied the far western kingdom of Tibet on the one side, and overran the Korean peninsula on the other as active participants in that campaign against the combined forces of the United Nations? Indochina was a common topic of discussion among my prison guards and I saw groups of soldiers training that were no doubt destined for that southern war theater.

Since my release from prison I have seen the free West quail before the ruthless determination of Red China. Look at the record.

The debacle of Panmunjom, the sorry aftermath to a war which the so-called free world was not permitted to win; then the first Geneva Conference which accomplished the sellout of northern Indochina; the evacuation of the Tachen Islands, of which very little has been written about or discussed; the humiliating journey of the Secretary General of the United Nations to Peking, where Dag Hammarskjold knelt before Chou En-lai to beg for the release of 11 American flyers; the illfated Geneva Conference this past summer; little Geneva, an interminable conference, where an emissary of the Red dragon seems pointedly to be able to steer matters away from the question of the release of the remaining United States civilians imprisoned in China and to smother all mention of the 395 United States servicemen languishing in jail; the repeated efforts to seat Red China in the United Nations. Red China indeed is on the march.

Here in this country we hear and read much of vaunted religious freedom in China. As a Catholic bishop, a Christian churchman, I know this to be a hoax and a travesty on the truth. True, the principle of religious freedom is written into the constitution of the People's Government of China. But that is a mere blind, written down merely for foreign consumption. Where are the 4,000 bishops, priests and nuns, and several thousand other Christian misisonaries, who lived and worked in China in comparative freedom before this precious principle of freedom of religion was written into the constitution? A handful are left. And practically all in prison. The remainder have been exiled and expelled as enemies of the state and of the people. Hundreds of stanch Catholic Chinese bishops and priests and Christian ministers are mostly in jail, if they have not been sent to the firing squad. The churches profaned, violated, and turned into "palaces of culture." A

rather sinister commentary on freedom of religion.

Furthermore, a diabolical pressure has been brought to bear on the faithful to make them abandon their Christian faith. They have been compelled to take indoctrination classes, to endure calumny and to suffer scorn. Even attempting to hear Mass or receive the sacraments or to attend any religious service, brands them as reactionary and unpatriotic. Perhaps I emphasize the Catholic side in these matters, but then I am a Catholic bishop and know firsthand of what I speak. Yet the same can be paralleled in regard to the Protestant missions in China. As an instance, in the city where I lived, in the western part of Hunan Province, the seat of the diocese which I governed, the large Protestant mission there was confiscated and all the missionaries, men and women, were expelled. A fine Christian gentleman, Mr. Karl Beck, of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, who had spent 40 years in China, was cast out into the street when his church and home were confiscated by the Communists, and turned into propaganda centers of Red teaching. We invited him to live with us, and he was still living in the Catholic mission with the Fathers when I was arrested and imprisoned. After 15 months, he eventually was expelled too as an enemy of the people. Those of you who have seen the monumental Christmas issue of Life magazine of a few weeks ago recall the accounts of the two Protestant missionaries featured there; the Baptist, Dr. Levi Lovegren, of Seattle, who spent 4 years in 4 different Communist prisons—and the Presbyterian missionary, Sarah Perkins, who states, "For 28 months I was in solitary confinement but what matters is what God did for me in that cell." Let Red propaganda try and refute these witnesses.

You remember about a year and a half ago, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain visited Red China. He and his party were feted in Peking and along the coast. And after 3 weeks he came out of Red China to Hongkong and gave a report to the world. No religious persecution in China as far as he could observe. Anything that smacked of such was more in the nature of an antiforeign reaction.

Even a person far less astute than a former Prime Minister would have known before he ever set foot in Peking that the Red regime there had, up to that time, murdered 166 bishops and priests. Of this number, 127 were native bishops and priests. Hardly an antiforeign reaction. Had he dared penetrate the interior of China, had he gone into Hunan Province where I lived with the Chinese for 30 years, had he gone into the prison where I spent 2 years of solitary confinement, he would have found in that very prison a young Chinese priest, American trained and a graduate of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, lying in a dungeon then in his fifth year of imprisonment and solely because he was a Catholic priest.

Apart from this, at the time of the former Prime Minister's visit, in the city of Peking itself, or in the immediate environs, there were at least 31 priests in prison. These could have enlightened Mr. Attlee. Yet the astute British statesman seems to have heard nothing of this. And at that very time, the rector of the Catholic University, Father Harold Rigney, a commissioned chaplain in the United States Army during World War II, was completing his third year in prison. He has since been released. But Mr. Attlee seems to have heard nothing of this eminent American educator. And the Catholic University of Peking is not an insignificant out-of-the-way school but a nationally known institution and one of the showplaces of Peking which is a must for visiting dignitaries.

Mr. Attlee, with remarkable powers of observation, reported that he had inspected a market completely free of flies. Yet he failed to observe, or failed to report his observation, while on the flight from Peking to Hongkong, of the number of British vessels known to be at that time in Red China ports, discharging the sinews of war with which to carry on aggression against the combined United Nations forces in Korea.

Imagine how the intelligences of the common people of all free nations are being continually insulted by this type of Communist propaganda. One of the preposterous charges for which I was imprisoned and later expelled was that I objected strongly and forbade any Catholic under my jurisdiction from signing a petition, circulated by the People's Government of China, demanding the expulsion of the papal representative, Archbishop Riberi, on the false charge that he was a spy of the American and other foreign governments. This under the guise of freedom of religion.

Yet, despite every effort to crush Christianity, there are innumerable instances of heroic resistance. The suffering that results is harrowing. In that internal resistance to a godless regime lies the hope of the future. a hope kept buoyant in the belief that one day the people of free nations will restore to the enslaved Chinese people their stolen freedom.

Dr. Liou, archbishop of Chungking.

These are the types who want to belong to our world, to the free world, and who want to live as we do in freedom and security. But we have sold them into slavery—them and their children.

The numbers of this kind in China are multiplied by the millions when we count all those in the satellite countries of Europe whose chains must haunt our dreams by night. They belong to our world; they were part of our world; and we have let them go, and now how are we to reclaim them? There is no greater tragedy on the pages of history than the sellout of our friends in Europe and in Asia.

In 1932 a tragic blunder was made. The United States recognized the U. S. S. R. The reasons given at that time, were supposedly reasons calculated to benefit America. As an added incentive and bait, a veritable flood of gold was promised—a flood that was to pour into America, creating hitherto undreamed of riches and economic security beyond relief.

This flood of gold never materialized. On the contrary, it seems that ever since that tragic year, our precious American gold has been constantly siphoned off for the benefit of almost every nation under the sun and the nations we have favored most are now the most communistic and the most ungrateful.

But a flood did come upon us. A flood of locusts, a flood of termites, a flood of spies, of saboteurs and of fellow-travelers, each a carrier of vicious, deadly Communist propaganda. Like the plagues of Egypt, these locusts and termites overran the land, burrowed into the understructure of our country and penetrated every crack and cranny of the noble edifice that had been designed, constructed and dedicated by our Founding Fathers; they infiltrated—these termites—into the uppermost levels of the Armed Forces and the country's Government, and—as documents and statements attest—they even wormed their way into power at the very summit of our national administration.

Now are we to stand by as helpless observers and as mute witnesses to a calamity thrice compounded? Are the powers and the forces—and make no mistake, they are powerful and carry immense weight—are they to succeed in compelling us to betray our honored ally on Formosa and to recognize the perfidious regime that masquerades as the People's Government of China?

As was done in 1932, specious and beguiling reasons are now being advanced to persuade an unwary public, that it is to the national advantage to enter into a peaceful coexistence with the Red monster of Moscow and the Red dragon of Peking.

Peaceful coexistence. What a mockery to the free peoples of the world. What a betrayal of those who have fallen martyred slaves to communism.

Your compatriots, who gave their lives for God and country, would rise from their graves and denounce those deluded leaders who would propose peaceful coexistence as a solution to world tension. The martyred living, who, with leaden hearts and pain-wracked frames, lie in dungeons foul and dank, would, like a mighty army of vengeance, expose their broken bodies, and open the wounds of their souls, and in one tremendous outburst cry, "These are the festering sores of 'peaceful co-existence.'" And those 10,000 times 10,000, who as serried ranks of cowed slaves, doomed forever to trod under the lashes of the Red oppressor, they with eyes that speak their eternal dismay, would ask us, "would you also become like unto us?"

Do the high-placed proponents of peaceful coexistence mean that we should forget, even to applaud, the deaths of millions of our martyrs in Russia and Asia? Do our Kremlin-minded diplomats want us to welcome with open arms the purveyors of atheism into our homes? Into our schools? Into our churches? Are we to admit into our unmatched and fertile farmlands, the Bolshevik butchers who cold-bloodedly engineered the manmade famines of the Ukraine? Has our national memory become so atrophied and grown so craven?

Do the advocates of peaceful coexistence demand that we spinelessly stand by and watch the barter of imprisoned Americans, pawns in the crafty back-door game now being played to seat Red China among the United Nations? Is it part of the plant to cover up the plight and the number of those who lie rotting in some Chinese Communist prison, in North Korea or Manchuria or perhaps Siberia, even as I languished in a Chinese prison for 2 years? What can we think when a New York newspaper under date of January 19 of this year, quotes Government circles as insisting that a mere 18 United States citizens are in Chinese prisons or denied exit permits when on that very same day I was in possession of the irrefutable fact that there are 395 American prisoners composed of military, air, and naval personnel and civilian Army employees being held by the Red Chinese. It is common knowledge that at Panmunjon it was the Chinese Reds and not the Northern Koreans, who dominated the peace negotiations and dictated the terms. We know that one billion orientals look upon Panmunjon as a colossal defeat for the free world and that the faith of these billion people in the leadership of the West was shattered by the cynical abandonment of any show of spiritual principle to the cold expediency of the moment. Those of us who have lived many years in the Orient know only too well the magnitude of the tragic defeat of Panmunjon.

When peaceful coexistence means shaking hands with the Devil, and accepting in silence and without protest his nefarious philosophy, I choose to stand with Stephen Decatur, who preferred death to the betrayal of his country and its sacred institutions. We may not purchase security, or even freedom, at so high or so lethal a price.

I lived 4 years under the oppression of the Communist regime, under the so-called People's Government of China. Two of those 4 years were spent in solitary confinement in a Communist prison. From a prison cell I was ignominiously expelled from the country, accused as a spy for the American Gov-

ernment, an arch-imperialist, and as an enemy of the people of China.

During those years I was well schooled in Communist doctrine and in Communist objectives. My jailers, constantly emphasized to me that between atheistic communism—of which they boasted—and the Christian world, a knockdown struggle was natural and inevitable. Time and again these zealots repeated that their main objective and primary goal, was the liberation of the United States. Moreover, in their arrogance, they assured me that they had many friends and sympathizers in America and that from these sources they could always draw upon for whatever information they wanted.

And indeed, gentlemen, I have every reason to believe them. In the spring of 1944, a high official in Washington, who had just been in Chungking—so he told me—took the opportunity while in that wartime capital, to impress on the Chinese Government officials there, that their future lay with Soviet Russia and not with the United States. Not so long afterward that same official was promoted to a position of still greater influence and later mounted still higher in international affairs and today lives in peace and comfort.

But our unsophisticated servicemen, with varied backgrounds, were drafted into their country's forces, sent to Korea, and were captured there. They were thrown into filthy Chinese war prisons to be tortured and made victims of an inhuman, relentless brain-washing technique. A few of them did succumb to the frightful pressure and went over to the Reds. Three of them repented, sought repatriation, and were brought home. On arrival in their native land they were permitted to meet with their families for exactly 1 hour—and then were taken into custody, charged with criminal connivance with the enemy. Mark my words, within 24 hours, the other turncoats in China were given a detailed account of what happened that day on the west coast.

Oh, my friends, what of those who as free American citizens betrayed their country by giving away our most precious security secrets—a treachery imperiling our national life—a treachery surely of greater consequence than the defection of a handful of GI's.

When I was a youth at college, I once saw Robert Mantell, the celebrated Shakespearian actor, in Richard the Third. I took away from that memorable performance one indelible impression, which remained vividly with me until only a few months ago. I felt that the second scene of the first act was much overdrawn, that, for once, Shakespeare was asking his audience to credit the impossible.

You will recall the scene. The Lady Anne comes on stage with her entourage, bearing the murdered body of her husband's father. She encounters Gloucester, the villian and the murderer. She opens the full fials of her flaming wrath upon him. Scathingly, she reproaches him. Gloucester only smiles; then with honeyed words and fair promises he disarms her. Then, shamelessly, proceeds to woe her and before the scene closes, he has gained the Lady's consent to marry him. No sooner has the widow turned her back than the solemn promise he has made to give honorable burial to the corpse lying on the ground before him is ruthlessly broken and in a treacherous cynical mood Gloucester soliloquizes thus:

"Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
Was ever woman in this humour won?
I'll have her but I will not have her long.
What! I, that kill'd her husband and his father,
To take her in her heart's extremest hate;
With curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes,
The bleeding witness of her hatred by;
Having God, her conscience, and these bars against me.
And I no friends to back my suit withal,
But the plain devil, and dissembling looks,
And yet to win her, all the world to nothing!
Hath she forgot already that brave prince,
Edward, her lord, whom I, some three months since,
Stabb'd in my angry mood at Tewkesbury?
A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman,
Fram'd in a prodigality of nature,
Young, valiant, wise, and, no doubt, loyal,
The spacious world cannot again afford:
And will she yet abase her eyes on me,
That cropp'd the golden prime of this sweet prince,
And made her widow to a woeful bed?
On me, whose all not equals Edward's moiety?
On me, that halt, and am mis-shapen thus?
I do mistake my person all this while:
Upon my life, she finds, although I cannot,
Myself to be a marvellous proper man.
I'll be at charges for a looking glass:
And entertain a score or two of tailors
To study fashions to adorn my body;
Since I am crept in favour with myself,
I will maintain it at some little cost.
But, first, I'll turn yon fellow in his grave,
And then return lamenting to my love.
Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass,
That I may see my shadow as I pass."

Now, let us check the background of Bulganin, since he is thrust forward as the official head of the Soviet Government today—not the background of the man himself but that which he represents.

At least—and I have the figures—38 million of enslaved human beings in the prison camps of Russia and in the satellite nations. Just as examples:

Czechoslavakia, 300,000 in prison camps.
Lithuania, 500,000 in prison camps.
East Germany, 300,000 in prison camps.

And there are the hapless 20 million who were liquidated in the cold-blooded decimation of the Ukraine during the great man-made famines.

How can he—Bulganin—explain away the 1,000 violations that his Soviet Government has been guilty of in the treaties entered into with other powers, and, as documented in the Eastland committee report—even the Austrian treaty, only a few months old, yet casually broken with apologies to no one.

About Bulganin are the satellite countries—dismembered and enslaved—their fetters clanking on the floor of Europe.

That's the back-drop against which Bulganin, the voluble exponent of "democracy for the masses" appears. Now on the evening of July 23, 1955, when our eminent statesmen have left the Geneva stage, flattered, mollified, and tragically betrayed, like the Lady Anne, can't you hear from out the chorus of sardonic laughter that reverberates in the Soviet villa, the mocking tones of the Supreme Voice of the Soviet Republic?

Were ever statesmen in this manner woo'd?
Were ever statesmen in this manner won?
I'll charm them but I'll not charm them long.
What. I, the spokesman of the USSR,
Who had no friends to back my suit
But the plain devil and dissembling looks;
Forsooth, I have much mistook my proper worth.
Fatuously, they see me to be what I cannot
Myself to be a marvellous superman.
I'll get me a squad of tailors
And go along with these smart clad competitors
For the world's applause;
I'll play their game of make-believe cricket all the while;
But first I'll rid me, for the nonce, of these tell-tale corpses
And personally compromising war-victims,
I'll pressure too, Peking to do the same,
Then I'll return asmirking and lamenting
To my new made friends.

Since that evening the same Bulganin has publicly insulted the three other statesmen who sat about the summit table with him.

Peace or peaceful coexistence, to the Communist strategist, is only the vestibule to the next world war. Dimitry Manuilsky spelled out the Communist concept of peace to the party trainees in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in 1931—just 25 years ago:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course (1931), we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bouregeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Gentlemen, how are we to meet and to stop the onward rush of communism.

First, you must be on the alert, continuously vigilant against the insidious and false propaganda that is being spread through the slanted press, the slanted radio, and the slanted television. If you are to stave off this disaster you must inform yourselves and be prepared to protest falsehoods and to defend the truth.

Second, you have the inborn right and conscientious duty to demand of all candidates to public office, whether county, city, State, or Federal, to declare openly and in unmistakable terms where they stand in the matter of Red infiltration, and what views these candidates for office hold in regard to the admission of Red China into the United Nations. And don't let any of them dodge the burning issues of the day by invoking the fifth amendment.

Third, remember always, we of the free world, follow a Christian tradition, built on the teaching that right is superior to might and that principle must prompt our decisions and shape our course and not a rudderless, spineless, unscrupulous expediency.

Christ, the Son of God, did not hang upon a cross and wear a crown of thorns as a gesture of appeasement to the venal politicians of His day, but rather to teach the world for all ages to come that there are things in life of infinitely more value even than life itself.

Tax on Gasoline for Farm Use

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because of my strong feelings in favor of H. R. 8780 which exempts farm machinery fuels from Federal excise tax, and because I was detained at Bethesda Medical Center until noon Tuesday and could not get back in time to register my vote, I wish to take this means of going on record in favor of the bill. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea." In a

nonrecord voice vote the previous day, I voted "yea." I have long been a proponent of this type of legislation, having championed similar measures in the State legislature of Iowa. I am confident that it will soon become law and the farm people can start enjoying this saving. I ask leave to have this statement entered in the permanent RECORD immediately following the vote on H. R. 8780.

Spanish Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following keenly analytical article by the Honorable John Lodge, Ambassador to Spain, before the Spanish-American Board of Trade, New York, on January 5, 1956:

PROSPECTS FOR EXPANDING SPANISH-AMERICAN TRADE

(By John Lodge, Ambassador to Spain)

This evening I would like to discuss certain aspects of the Spanish economic situation, in particular, the prospects for expansion of trade between our two countries. In the past few years visible trade between Spain and the United States has, as you are aware, been rather limited, usually averaging in the neighborhood of $50 million worth of imports from Spain and $70–80 million worth of exports to Spain, with the difference being offset to a large extent by the spending of American tourists. Spain would like to import much more American goods but has for a number of years been faced with an extreme shortage of foreign exchange, and the levels of imports from the United States have been limited by the availability of dollars. The basic reason for this situation is that Spain is a poor country whose economic development has been retarded by the scars of her 3-year civil war, by the effects of the Second World War, and by the shortage of foreign exchange which made it impossible for her to import necessary machinery and materials which would permit her to make the economic advances she desires.

The situation, however, has improved markedly in the course of the past 5 years. This is partly due to two good crop years in 1950 and 1951, but of particular importance recently has been United States economic assistance, both in the form of Export-Import Bank loans and direct economic assistance furnished as a result of the military and economic agreements which were signed in September of 1953. Spain has also been an important market for our surplus agricultural commodities. Sales of these commodities to Spain have been part of our economic program in that country and have contributed importantly to the Spanish effort to overcome crises caused by crop failures. Our economic program is giving the Spanish economy a lift and is helping to put it in a position, for the first time in 25 years, where it is not living on a strictly hand-to-mouth basis and can make some plans as to the best use of its not inconsiderable resources.

In assessing the progress which has been made in Spain and the role of our help, we must fully realize the importance of the efforts which Spain has made in the past and is now making to help herself. The Spaniards are a hard-working people, and they have made advances in the past 10 years which I consider truly impressive. Even more important, perhaps, is the fact that the Spaniards have developed concrete programs to improve key deficient sectors of their economy and are moving as fast as they possibly can to achieve these objectives. Through their own efforts and with our assistance, Spain has developed her industry and agriculture to the point where, in a very few years, she should have overcome the worst effects of her dependence on a dry climate which, in years of drought, not only retards economic development but sets it back to a significant degree.

I think I should mention here one aspect of our cooperative efforts in the industrial area which has an interesting potential. For the past century Spain's industrial progress has lagged behind that of other European countries. An important cause of this is the inadequacy of power and power generating resources, such as coal, water, and petroleum. The keenness now being manifested in official Spanish circles in the possible utilization of atomic energy for generation of electric power is sharpened by their desire to try to make up through atomic energy some of the ground lost. On our part, we have been doing all we can to help the Spaniards move ahead in this field. Our two governments signed an agreement last summer under which the United States will assist Spain in designing and fueling an experimental nuclear reactor. One element of this assistance provides training for Spanish technicians in the United States in operating a reactor; some of them are here now. The most recent development in our cooperative effort in this field took place just prior to my departure from Madrid when I had the privilege of presenting an extensive atomic-energy technical library to the Spanish Nuclear Energy Board an behalf of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Our cooperation on atomic-energy matters with the Spaniards is much appreciated by them, and I look forward to future progress in this area in Spain.

These advances in the Spanish economy are important to American business because I believe that the outlook for expanding trade between Spain and the United States is good, particularly if certain obstacles can be removed. In reaching this conclusion, I have had in mind several important positive factors.

SIGNIFICANCE FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

First, the Spaniards have been cooperating closely with us for the past 2 years in working out the military and economic programs agreed upon in the 1953 accords. Contacts between Americans and Spaniards are increasing rapidly, and they welcome us in their country. In addition to the more than a quarter of a million American tourists who visited Spain in the past year, other Americans are there working on the base construction program, and more American businessmen than ever are now in Spain.

Second, with only limited United States assistance, Spain's economy should continue to expand and strengthen in the next few years, and this in itself provides a climate for a greater exchange of goods.

Third, under our technical exchange program, American experts are working with Spanish technicians to stimulate increased production in a number of key sectors of the Spanish economy, such as industry, agriculture, transportation, and mining. The essence of this program is to make available to Spain new developments in production and marketing—not only technical processes but concepts of organization and management relations. Such concepts when put into practice can promote the better use of present facilities as well as the maximum output from new investments. One of the principal means which we are using to make these new methods available to more people is the arrangement of visits to the United States of technicians from other countries, and visits to cooperating countries by American experts. There is strong interest in technical exchange in Spain, and the program is, I think, being successfully carried out. Spanish business leaders and executives in a number of industries have visited the United States to observe our production and managerial methods, and many more will be coming in the course of the next few years. These officials have shown a receptivity to American ideas and will welcome American goods.

PROBLEMS WHICH MUST BE SOLVED

While my optimism remains untempered, there are some real problems which must be solved if the full possibilities of expanding Spanish-American trade are to be realized. Spain needs more capital goods and a greater flexibility in her foreign exchange reserve situation. These cannot be provided entirely from United States economic aid because of our own budgetary and fiscal problems. A mutually beneficial way by means of which some of Spain's requirements could be met is through American private investment. Good business opportunities exist in Spain, and several American companies have during the past year established themselves there, usually in partnership with Spanish interests. At the same time, there are other American businessmen who are hesitant to invest in Spain because of certain obstacles which they have encountered, including difficulties in the transfer of earnings.

This problem is further complicated by a backlog of accumulated blocked peseta earnings. We must remember that the Spanish Government has had a severe shortage of foreign exchange and that it felt that priority had to be given to absolutely essential imports before allowing the blocked peseta accounts to be converted to dollars. There is, however, reason to expect that this situation will improve. One of the provisions of the 1953 Spanish-American economic aid pact included Spain's agreement to work out with us the liquidation of previous earnings which were blocked and the establishment of a regular system for the transfer of future earnings. Certainly there is ample evidence of the steady improvement in the Spanish economic situation during the past year, including its holdings of foreign exchange, and this helps put Spain in a financial situation where she is able to meet the blocked peseta problem without seriously endangering her economic stability.

Another barrier which makes American potential investors reluctant to invest in Spain is the limitations which are now placed by Spanish legislation on the degree of foreign ownership of new manufacturing enterprises. While I can report no specific progress on this question, Spanish officials are certainly aware that American investments would be increased if these restrictions were loosened, and I am hopeful that this can be accomplished in the not too distant future. Expanding American investments in Spain would strengthen the tie between the economies of our two countries and would therefore stimulate the expansion of Spanish-American trade. The importance and desirability of increasing trade between Spain and the United States is recognized at the highest levels of the Spanish Government. Last spring, General Franco sent a special message in this sense to American businessmen in the course of an interview which was published in U. S. News & World Report. The Chief of State said:

"We want to increase the purchasing power of the Spaniards so as to multiply and intensify all trade. In this sense we believe that at this moment financiers and promoters of enterprise from the United States

have a very vast field for collaboration with us."

THE HUMAN FACTOR

In conclusion, I would like to mention a human factor. Americans who are now in Spain are coming in close contact with the Spanish people at all levels, from high Government officials to the most modest worker. There is a real enthusiasm in Spain for things American, and this is the fundamental basis for my feeling that we can look forward to a period of closer understanding and expanding trade between the United States and Spain. Another important factor is the general attitude of Spanish Government officials and their businesslike approach to commercial and economic problems. I was particularly impressed by a speech made by Minister of Commerce Arburúa last month, in which he noted the improvement of the economy and stated that it was necessary that the "ways of commerce be brought back into their traditional channels, to those classic formulas which base commercial prosperity on the rise in volume of sales at reasonable margins in place of restrictive sales at excessively high profits."

As for the contribution which can be made by you gentlemen, members of the Spanish-American Board of Trade, I want to say again how important I think is the work of this organization. You are already playing an important role in improving overall relations between Spain and the United States, as well as stimulting greater trade between the two countries, and I am sure you will find greater tangible rewards in the future.

In this connection, it is my opinion that too many of our citizens feel that foreign policy is something removed from them and limited to officials in Washington and our diplomatic representatives abroad. In this day of rapid transport and communications, and with an unstable international situation to consider, this is a grave oversight. More than ever before in history, foreign relations have become joined with domestic relations and are, therefore, the concern of each and every one.

The continuance of good Spanish-American relations is a task to which Americans and Spaniards alike should set themselves. An indication of the state of our relations with Spain may be seen in the fact that the Spanish people have contributed recently 1,335,000 pesetas to American flood relief. I am proud and deeply touched by this entirely spontaneous display of friendship and sympathy for our people.

As you know, I have spent the past month here in consultation with officials of the Department of State and other Government agencies, and I return to my post in Madrid within a few days. I look forward with enthusiasm to resuming my duties as Ambassador because I feel that it is not only a unique opportunity for public service but that the alliance we are building with Spain is on firm ground. Prospects for the future are most encouraging for both Spaniards and Americans.

Spain today is playing a more active role in international affairs. The Spanish Government is a dependable ally. It is heartening to see our relationships developing so closely. In my day-to-day association with Spaniards themselves, I have been impressed by the forward looking enthusiasm with which they welcome military and economic cooperation with us.

Although not a wealthy country, Spain today is a vigorous nation on the march which is making a determined effort to raise the living standards of her people. Any assistance that we can give to bolster her economic potential—and I know of no better one than the ecouragement of trade—is a contribution not only to Spain but to our own national safety and that of the anti-Communist nations whose leadership we have assumed.

We can be thankful, gentlemen, that in the present divided and troubled world we have on our side a friend and ally which shares our resistance to Soviet communism and which supports the cause of international peace.

Natural Gas Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on January 26, the New York Journal-American carried an editorial which set forth vigorously and forcefully the reasons why Congress should pass the Fulbright-Harris natural-gas bill. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL GAS DISPUTE

Fundamental facts of interest to the consumer are being obscured in the Senate controversy over Federal control of the natural-gas industry.

The natural-gas business falls in three divisions—producers who obtain the fuel at the wells and who operate mainly in six States; interstate pipelines which transport natural gas to consumer markets, the bulk of which are situated in 33 large importing States, and distributors or, in plain language, local gas companies. Pipe lines and local gas companies operate as monopolies.

To protect the public, local gas companies are regulated under State laws as public utilities. The Federal Government has no jurisdiction in this field.

Further to protect the public, Congress in 1938 passed the Natural Gas Act, giving the Federal Power Commission authority over the pipelines engaged in interstate commerce. The act specifically exempted producers at the well from Federal regulation.

In June 1954 the Supreme Court ruled, by a split decision, that producers were also subject to Federal control if any part of their production was sold across State lines.

In sum, the Court held that a law passed by Congress contained something that Congress had not put in the law.

This, as in the preceding matter of oil-bearing tidelands, was a case of the Federal judiciary invading the legislative powers of Congress.

Congress nullified the earlier decision by passing a law that returned the tidelands seized by the Federal Government to the States which had owned them for 100 years without dispute.

BASIC ISSUE

Following that precedent, the Harris-Fulbright bill was introduced in Congress to rescind the natural gas decision and was passed by the lower House last year. The bill is now pending in the Senate.

The basic issue, therefore, is that legislative powers under the Federal Constitution belong solely to Congress and may not be usurped by either the executive or judicial branch.

Obviously, if the Federal Government has power to regulate the production of natural gas, then, as Senator BRIDGES has said:

"We must also extend Government control to the production of coal, lead, zinc, copper, and all other mining."

Opponents of the Fulbright bill assert that the production of natural gas is a monopoly from which the public must be protected by Federal intervention.

No reliable facts are offered to support this contention.

It is true that 197 companies produce 90 percent of the natural gas supply. But of these 197 companies competing with each other none controls 5 percent of the total production. Moreover, in this highly competitive industry there ar actually 8,000 producers operating 71,000 gas wells in 28 States.

That is hardly a monopoly.

Opponents of the Fulbright bill also allege that the consuming public is the victim of price extortion by the natural gas companies.

There are some 25 million residential natural-gas consumers, mostly in the large cities, and the millions of families who read the Hearst newspapers are among them. Naturally, we are on their side; always have been and always will be.

PRICE INDEXES

But here are some facts:

Prices vary geographically, but taking New England for an example:

The producer averages only 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet for natural gas piped into New England. The pipelines get only 50 cents. But the average home price in New England is $2.40 per 1,000 cubic feet, the local distributor getting $1.80. The distributor's price is thus 2,400 percent of the producer's price.

In Washington, D. C. a residential consumer pays $1.31 for natural gas for which the producer receives 12½ cents.

According to a congressional estimate, a local utility company collects 18 cents for delivering 2 cents worth of natural gas.

Plainly, the high costs to consumers are attributable much more to local service and distribution than to exploitation by producers; and local utilities are subject to State or municipal regulation.

Opponents of the Fulbright bill contend that Federal regulation, as unconstitutionally decreed by the Supreme Court, will increase the market supply of natural gas and reduce consumer prices.

Market statistics indicate exactly the opposite effects.

Expanding potential markets demand expanding supplies.

But the interestate supply is diminishing. Because the Federal regulation at the wellheads, many independent producers are selling their product only within their own States, where Federal control is absent. Likewise, wildcatting, or bringing in new wells, is declining.

The long-range result of Federal control must be a future market shortage and high consumer prices.

Farm Aid, Not Bonanzas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 13, 1956:

FARM AID, NOT BONANZAS

Persons who remember the potato scandals of a few years ago will hardly be surprised by the figures Secretary of Agriculture Benson presented to Congress in support of

the administration proposal to place a dollar limit on the amounts to be paid in price support to farmers.

When potato prices were being heavily supported in spite of excessive production, it was disclosed that farmers—and some get-rich-quick operators, were receiving Government payments of thousands of dollars for potatoes nobody could use. The public clamor resulted in congressional action to cut down potato supports.

But the payments of huge amounts in Government supports was not limited to potato growers. Benson submitted figures showing that it occurs in the case of virtually all crops. One percent of the cotton growers, for example, got 18 percent of all support payments. Of the money paid in supporting wheat prices, 12 percent went to 1 percent of the growers, while 24 percent of barley payments went to 1 percent of the farmers.

The figures provide strong backing for the idea of a dollar limit. If the aim is to keep up the income of the individual farmers, it doesn't make sense to hand out huge sums—running into hundreds of thousands of dollars in some cases—to underwrite competition against family farms by corporate farms. Farm supports should be to aid the bulk of farmers. They shouldn't provide bonanzas for a few.

A Time for Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Time for Praise," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of the Arkansas A. & M. College, College Heights, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIME FOR PRAISE

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Arkansas A. & M. College, of College Heights, Ark.)

PART I. THE SOUTH

God is serving the needs of the people of the world so wonderfully yet millions are either unaware or not interested. Perhaps it is desirable once each year to pause and give thanks for this service. Only eternity can tell the full story of the Christian statesmen. It is so difficult to praise all who should be praised, but below are a few worthy institutions and religious statesmen from the South:

1. Highland Park Baptist Church, Tennessee Temple Schools, and Dr. Lee Roberson.

Dr. Lee Roberson was called as pastor of the Highland Park Baptist Church at Chattanooga, Tenn. on November 18, 1942. He resigned on December 4, 1955, to become effective on January 15, 1956.

This congregation was organized on October 26, 1890. It has been called the Orchard Knob Baptist Church and Beech Street Baptist Church. The charter members were W. F. Huffaker, H. D. Huffaker, Mrs. H. D. Huffaker, Mrs. W. H. Saylor, Mr. W. H. Saylor, Mr. J. N. Keelin, Mrs. J. N. Keelin, Miss Nancy Roberts, and Mr. L. N. Perdell. The original deacons were J. N. Keelin, H. D. Huffaker, and W. H. Saylor.

When Dr. Roberson came as pastor in 1942 there were about 1,300 members. Now there are 13,609. Last year 1,163 were saved and baptized into the church. There were over 1,000 others who were saved but not baptized into this church. The church budget total is $301,059.82. There are nine full-time church employees.

The following ministers have been pastor: J. M. Chauncey (1890–92), B. M. Jackson (1891, acting), B. F. Barttes (1892–93), W. A. Simons (1893–94), Spencer Tunnel (1894), T. J. McClondiss (1895), S. H. Johnson (1895–97), J. H. Martin (1897–99), W. H. Fitzgerald (1900–01), D. B. Vance (1901–04), B. N. Brooks (1904–06), R. D. Cecil (1906–08), W. S. Keese (1908–21), J. B. Phillips (1921–30), Dr. C. F. Clark (1930–38), Carl A. DeVane (1938–42), and Dr. Lee Roberson since 1942.

Dr. Roberson was born on a small farm within 4 miles of English, Ind., 46 years ago. His early years were spent in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. His father was a motorman on a streetcar, and the family had financial difficulties. He was graduated from Fern Creek High School when he was 18.

His family was not Christian and this caused additional difficulties. Through the teaching of Mrs. Daisy Hawes and the preaching of J. N. Binford, he came under conviction and surrendered to Christ at home. When he went down the aisle the next Sunday, his mother and father followed him. He started as a church singer when he was only 16.

He attended Bethel College (now a dead Baptist college), the University of Louisville, and the seminary. He studied voice under John Sample and Miss Loudon, and at the Cincinnati Conservatory under John Hoffman. He sang at the Nashville Conservatory for DeLuca, and was offered a chance to prepare for Broadway, but he declined. Mount Vernon University at Arlington, Va., awarded him an honorary doctorate (D. D.) on September 4, 1943.

Dr. Roberson has held a number of pastorates, but he became noted at the First Baptist Church of Fairfield, Ala., where he became pastor on October 31, 1937. Dr. E. J. Daniels, another noted Baptist minister succeeded him. From 1936 to 1940, Dr. Roberson conducted 52 revival meetings too.

Dr. Roberson married Caroline Allen. The following children came to their home: Lee Anne, Johnny, Joy (deceased), Patricia (adopted), and June. Lee Anne has made public the fact that she has been called as a missionary. Johnny has made public profession of faith in Christ.

The Robersons live modestly. Dr. Roberson has refused raises even though some Baptist ministers in Tennessee are receiving about three times his salary and he is pastor of the largest white Baptist church in the world and the greatest soul-winning church in the Southern Baptist Convention. He once said: "As long as there are buildings to build and missionaries to be sent out, I want no more. I can get along on what I am getting." He always gives first, as when the youth building was being built, he gave the first $1,000. He has established Tennessee Temple Schools, which was very wise.

Dr. Roberson's preaching is dynamic. He preaches an average of twelve messages every week, including the daily radio ministry. His preaching is simple, but he emphasizes the Bible. He never takes a vacation. Ever since he first went to Chattanooga, he has had more invitations to preach in outside meetings than he can fill.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. Lee Roberson, the Highland Park Baptist Church, and Tennessee Temple Schools.

2. Bellevue Baptist Church and Dr. Robert Greene Lee.

This Memphis, Tenn., congregation was organized on July 12, 1903. It was a child of the Central Baptist Church. There were 32 charter members. Mrs. Marion S. Lemman and Mrs. P. D. Martin still belong to this great body. Mrs. M. G. Bailey, Mrs. E. L. Bass, Miss Mary Wells, Miss Julia Mae Swift, and Mrs. Robena Woods Mustin are the other charter members who are still alive. Dr. E. Y. Mullins, president, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, preached the dedicatory sermon.

The pastors have been: Dr. H. P. Hurt (1903–14), Dr. R. M. Inlow (1915–21), Dr. W. M. Bostick (1921–27), Dr. T. B. Brown (1927, acting), and Dr. Robert G. Lee since 1927.

There were 8,992 members on October 31, 1955. Last year, 334 additions came from baptism, and there was a total of additions of 1,022. The church budget for the year ending October 1, 1955, was $548,404.81. There are 19 full-time employees.

Dr. Lee, whose biographic sketch appears in Who's Who in America, is extremely well-known and highly respected. Since the death of Dr. George W. Truett, he should be termed "Mr. Southern Baptist." He was president of the Southern Baptist Convention for three terms. His writings and recordings are known around the world.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. Robert G. Lee and Bellevue Baptist Church.

3. First Baptist Church of Dallas, Dr. George W. Truett, and Dr. W. A. Criswell.

This congregation at Dallas, Tex., has become one of the most noted because of the late Dr. George W. Truett. He was born on May 6, 1867, and died on July 7, 1944. Dr. W. A. Criswell, Jr., has carried on the fine tradition.

This body was organized on July 30, 1868. The place of meeting was the Masonic hall. Four Baptist ministers composed the presbytery. They were: W. W. Harris, J. F. Pinson, W. B. Long, and W. J. Brown. A series of revival services had been conducted in the schoolroom by Reverend Harris, during which a number of Baptists then living in Dallas expressed their desire for a church. The first members were: Col. W. L. Williams, Mrs. W. L. Williams, E. G. Mays, John Hanna, Mrs. M. L. Bowen, Mrs. C. E. Mays, Mrs. A. C. Mays, Mrs. N. E. Collins, Mrs. Martha Seegar, Mrs. S. C. Akard, and Mrs. M. E. Kerfoot. Colonel Williams was elected clerk and Reverend Harris was called as the first pastor on August 22, 1868.

Prior to this time, Rev. J. M. Myers and Rev. C. W. Pearce aided in organizing a Baptist church in Dallas on October 19, 1857. Rev. Jacob Ruth was called as pastor on March 13, 1858, but this group voted to dissolve on February 12, 1860. Later the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Tex., was constituted on February 13, 1860. Rev. Joshua W. Terrill and Rev. Jacob Ruth were the presbytery. There were the following members: Fleetwood Rice, Samuel Dean, Maj. J. Dean, Josiah H. Payne, W. W. Barton, R. C. Milburn, Elizabeth L. Rice, Taphath Barton, Martha J. Payne, Mary H. Dean, F. C. Dean, S. E. Dean, Rebecca Swing, and Jane Carter. This group changed its name on August 15, 1863, to the Pleasant View Baptist Church, and that is the present name. Rev. W. E. Callahan was the first pastor.

The pastors of the present First Baptist Church have been: W. W. Harris (1868–70), C. A. Stanton (1871–72), W. Abram Weaver (1873–75), G. W. Rogers (1876–77), J. H. Curry (1878–82), R. T. Hanks (1883–89), A. M. Simms (1890–91), C. L. Seasholes (1892–96), George W. Truett (1897–1944), and W. A. Criswell, Jr., since 1944.

The first building was opened on June 22, 1873, the second one in 1890, the enlarged second one in 1908, the Truett Building in September 1925, the activities building on August 2, 1953, and the parking and recreation building in September 1953.

There are 11,115 members, and there were 311 converts last year. The church budget for 1956 totals $685,000. There are 45 white and 17 colored staff members.

Dr. Criswell was born in Eldorado, Okla., December 19, 1909. He attended grammar

school and 2 years of high school in Texline, Tex., and the last 2 years in Amarillo, Tex., where he was graduated in 1927.

His earliest recollection of being called to the ministry was when he was about 6 years old. He made his public profession in Christ when he was 10, and 2 years later made a public commital of his life to the gospel ministry. He began preaching when he was 17.

He was educated at Baylor University (B. A., 1931, and D. D., 1945) and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Th. M., 1934, and Th. D., 1937). He was pastor of the First Baptist Church of Chickasha, Okla. (1937–41), First Baptist Church of Muskogee, Okla. (1941–44), and he has been in the present position at Dallas, Texas, since 1944.

Dr. Criswell married Bessie Marie Harris, one of the young schoolteachers in his congregation. Their only child, Mabel Ann, was born in 1939. He is active in Southern Baptist life. His books include The Gospel According to Moses, Passport to the World (with Dr. Duke K. McCall), and These Issues We Must Face. His program is planned so that one-half of all church income goes to missionary, educational, and benevolent causes, which is ideal.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. George W. Truett, Dr. W. A. Criswell, and the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Tex.

4. First Baptist Church, Fort Smith, and Dr. J. Harold Smith.

This Arkansas congregation was organized on December 1, 1857. The charter members were: William H. Byers, Mrs. C. A. Byers, Mrs. M. A. Singleton, Siley M. Ellis, Mrs. M. H. Wheeler, and Mrs. M. E. McKinney. The original deacon was Siley M. Ellis.

The pastors have been: D. Buckley (1857–58), E. L. Compere (1860–70), F. L. Kregel (1871–78), G. W. Reaves (1878–79), E. L. Compere (1880–81), A. S. Worrell (1881–82), William E. Paxton (1883), G. W. Reaves (1883–85), J. B. Wise (1885–86), A. J. Kincaid (1886–92), W. P. Throgmorton (1892–95), O. L. Hailey (1895–99), N. P. Pittman (1900–02), Finley F. Gibson (1902–16), B. V. Ferguson (1916–50), and Dr. J. Harold Smith since December 1950.

The present resident membership is 3,232. There were 414 baptized last year. The 1955 budget was $225,000. There are 12 full-time employees.

Dr. Smith was born in Woodruff, S. C., on June 14, 1910. He married Myrtice Rhodes on October 12, 1933. They have two children: Martha, a senior at Ouachita Baptist College, and Donnie, age 10.

Reverend Smith received his education at Furman University (B. S., 1931) and Southern Bible Institute (honorary doctorate, 1941). He was converted on September 4, 1932, and ordained to the gospel ministry by the Poinsette Baptist Church, Greenville, S. C., in March 1933. He preached his first sermon on September 17, 1932.

In the first 2 months of his ministry, over 2,000 people were converted and reclaimed. He started a radio ministry in December 1935, that is still in operation. He now has 50 broadcasts each week. For 9 years, he has been preaching over XERF, Del Rio, Tex., for 1 hour daily.

After being a successful minister of the Woodland Park Baptist Church in Chattanooga, Tenn. (1949–50), he came to his present position at Fort Smith, Ark. He now has an average Sunday school attendance of 1,567, and 712 are in training union.

Dr. Smith is a dynamic personality, a fearless preacher of the gospel. He is fairly new in Arkansas, yet he ran second for president of the Arkansas Baptist Convention in 1955. He has been to Europe and the Holy Land twice (1950 and 1954).

Thank you Lord, for Dr. J. Harold Smith and the First Baptist Church of Fort Smith, Ark.

5. Immanuel Baptist Church and Dr. W. O. Vaught, Jr.

This Little Rock, Ark., congregation was organized on Sunday, April 17, 1892, as the Third Baptist Church. There had been a mission Sunday school at 10th and High Streets in March 1891; there had been discussion in November 1891, about the feasibility of organizing a church; and there was a West End Mission organized on March 6, 1892.

Those coming into the new church were: Rev. and Mrs. J. B. English, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Hall, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Rankin, Mr. and Mrs. M. D. Shields, Mrs. Mollie Rankin Huffman, Mrs. John G. B. Simms, Miss Fairy Carter, Mr. G. W. Pitts, Mrs. Lelia Peay Morrison, Miss Sally Peay, and Miss Lizzie Peay (now Mrs. Taylor Reynolds). The last two mentioned are granddaughters of Reverend English, who was the first pastor. The church was received into the Caroline Association in October 1892, with 36 members.

The pastors have been: J. B. English (1892), Dr. W. A. Welcher (1892–93), Dr. Frank White (1893–98), Dr. A. B. Miller (1899–1901), W. S. Roney (1902–04), Dr. J. U. H. Wharton (1904–05), O. J. Wade (1905–13), Dr. E. P. Alldredge (1913–19), Dr. Otto Whitington (1919–36), Dr. Will C. McClung (1937), Dr. R. C. Campbell (1938), Dr. C. C. Warren (1938–45), and Dr. W. O. Vaught, Jr. since 1945. Dr. Welcher was pastor when the present name of the church was selected.

Dr. Vaught was born in Versailles, Ky., during January 1911. At the age of 8 he was baptized into the Brookville Baptist Church, Brookville, Miss. He was graduated from the Caledonia High School in 1928 in first place. Immediately after being graduated from Mississippi College at Clinton, he entered Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, where he too was graduated. He has been honored with an honorary doctorate.

He has been secretary, Missouri Baptist Student Union (1935–41); pastor, Bethany Baptist Church, Kansas City, Mo., (1941–42); pastor, University Baptist Church, Abilene, Tex. (1942–45); and in his present position since 1945. His service as president, Arkansas Baptist Convention (1953–55) was outstanding. He is married to Mary Frances Bostick. They have one son, Carl Gray Vaught.

Immanuel Baptist Church has 4,310 members; 3,358 in Sunday school; 1,235 in training union; 436 in W. M. U.; and church property valued at $1,221,400. The members gave $240,000 to all purposes during the year. There were 3,271 additions by letter and 1,848 by baptism.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. W. O. Vaught, Jr. and Immanuel Baptist Church.

Thank you, Lord, for other Southern religious leaders, among whom are Dr. E. J. Daniels, Dr. J. Powell Tucker, Dr. C. Roy Angell, Dr. Roy Mason, Rev. and Mrs. C. J. Jacobson, Dr. Sam Morris, Dr. J. D. Grey, Dr. Louie D. Newton, Dr. Bob Jones, Dr. T. F. Adams, and Dr. Bob Jones, Jr.

The Importance of Belonging to a Political Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech by the Senator from Ohio, the Honorable GEORGE H. BENDER, which he gave before the Young Republican Leadership Training School held in Washington during the week of January 23 through January 27.

The speech follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF BELONGING TO A POLITICAL PARTY

(By Senator GEORGE H. BENDER)

The history of America is the history of our political parties. You cannot think of our country's development in any other terms. From the days of the American Revolution right down to the present time, our country has believed in the power of political action. Politics has been our lifeblood from the 1760's right on down.

Colonial legislatures were the fountainhead of every major program in our fight for independence. In 1768, Samuel Adams drew up the famous Massachusetts circular letter. It denounced the decrees of the British Government, and it was approved by the courageous House of Representatives of Massachusetts. The Revolutionary Party was the first political party in our country's history, even though it was illegal. The Sons of Liberty had no opportunity to grow into a political party, but they had all the makings.

By the time of our first President, two strong and opposing political elements were on the scene. The Federalists under Hamilton and their opponents, the strangely named Democratic-Republicans under Jefferson represented basic and conflicting viewpoints. This difference of opinion on important issues has been the trademark of political developments ever since.

Unlike the experience of many European countries, ours has been an emphasis upon broad agreements. In France and in Italy, relatively obscure intellectual differences express themselves through rigid, inflexible contending political parties. As a result, party lines harden and voters find it necessary to shift from one party to another, from one election to the next.

The parties themselves are so dogmatic in their views that they cannot accommodate people who differ only slightly among themselves.

In our country, the political parties are, basically, coalitions. We have room within the Republican Party for people of diverse specific beliefs as long as they share our fundamental point of view. The Democratic Party finds itself in much greater difficulties on this score. To have the same political party speaking for desegregation in the North and segregation in the South is a gymnastic feat which even Messrs. Stevenson and SPARKMAN found impossible 4 years ago. But they are still in there trying to do it.

Our own party occasionally finds it impossible to absorb all the people who are originally attracted to it. In one notable case, we found that a political marriage "for better or MORSE" was not made in Heaven, but we don't contract too many of these. By and large, our Republican Party succeeds by assimilation, not elimination. We are broad enough in our outlook to welcome people of every background, as long as they believe in our system of free enterprise and individual initiative.

This is all obvious and true, but it leads me to the $100,000 questions. Why should anyone join a political party? Why should anyone commit himself to the support of one party? I think the answer is self-evident.

The late Peter Marshall gave it to us in his own clear, simple language. He prayed, "Oh, God—let us stand for something, lest we fall for anything."

All of us can join in this prayer. Anyone looking at the world scene today must realize that the major problems which beset us are due directly to the failure of good men

everywhere to stand together for something. Political organizations are, in the last analysis, groups of men and women who stand for something.

Let me give you a few propositions. Most young people still remember their geometry, and so I shall put these propositions to you as modern-day Euclid.

My fundamental axioms are these: If any emergency arises to threaten our Western citization, it must be met by the united action of free nations. Our free nations must act effectively and promptly. This action requires political decisions. Decisions cannot be rendered by indecisive people who do not know where they stand, where they are going, or where they have been.

Let me emphasize this last idea because it represents one of the peculiar misconceptions of our time—the trend toward political independence.

Frankly, I believe that political independence means nothing but political indecision. The so-called "independents" like to think of themselves as voting for the man and not for the party. But the man and his party are inseparable in our country's political machinery. No one in the Congress of the United States votes as an "independent" upon public issues. No one in the Senate votes independently upon the organization of the Senate—or upon the confirmation of appointees nominated by the President. A man may vote with his party or against his party on particular issues, but he never votes independently of his party, even if he thinks he is voting that way. If he finds himself voting in opposition to the majority of his party most of the time, he ought to get out and join the other party.

Why should young people join the Republican Party? The Democrats claim to be "liberals" in quotation marks. "Liberal" is a fine, high-sounding word. But when we stop to think a moment, we remember that every radical, every demagog, every Communist in history has stolen the word "liberal," to pervert it to his own use.

The Republican Party for 100 years has represented the idea of constitutional government. We stand for the principle enunciated eloquently by the great Senator from Ohio, whom it was my privilege to call friend, the late Robert A. Taft. Bob Taft said that "liberty under law" was the watchword of the Republican Party. He believed in progress under the Constitution; in the protection of human rights—and property rights which are fundamental elements of human rights.

As Republicans, we believe in the distinction between ourselves and the Democratic Party. There are some areas in which both parties are in agreement, but there are larger issues upon which we differ fundamentally. We differ in our approach to world peace. The Democrats think in terms of personal conferences behind closed doors, where Yaltas and Potsdams and Teherans can blossom in secrecy. We believe in world diplomacy, in publicly declared, publicly subscribed agreements among the nations of the earth. In our approach to the spending of Federal funds, the importance of a balanced budget, we are in sharp disagreement with our opponents. They do not consider the reduction of taxes as anything larger than a popular campaign issue. They regard the Federal payroll as a jet-driven flying carpet, designed to soar upward into the stratosphere. We have never accepted these attitudes toward government, even when we were compelled by temporary need to increase payrolls and spend large sums.

There are some people who pretend that they can pick and choose the principles of both parties at their convenience. Some candidates for office have adopted this pretense. I am happy to say that these folks are not found often in the Republican camp. They are usually confused Democrats who would like to be Republicans but lack the courage to make the leap of faith. Our voters seldom share this confusion. They have an uncanny knack for discovering political hypocrisy wherever it arises.

Americans like their politics straight. That is why we have political platforms. The first party platforms ever adopted in our country were written out exactly 125 years ago by a young national Republican convention here in Washington. Some folks say that party platforms are meaningless. This is not true. They are important and significant.

In the State which I represent in the Senate, our law requires each candidate to sign a declaration under oath pledging his support to the national and State platform of his party. Anyone who signs that declaration not intending to carry it out should be disqualified to speak for his party. Anyone who does sign it must work to carry out the platform.

I am convinced that the future of our country is tied up with the continuing growth of stronger political organizations. For many years, there has been a current of discontent with politics and politicians. This current is showing signs of ebbing. More and more, young people are interesting themselves in politics and in the prospects of political careers. They are discovering that the great game of politics is more than a pastime. It is an absorbing and vitally important life interest.

Today, we must recognize realistically that the political decisions being made by our country will determine our future. We have resisted the Communist effort to drag the world over the "brink of war." I am sure that America approves our resistance. I am equally sure that America did not approve the Democratic Party in its sad record of rushing over the brink into three wars within a single lifetime.

These are the issues which make political parties. You young Republicans have chosen to cast your lot with the party which emphasizes individual freedom, personal initiative, and the dynamic expansion of America. I hope that you will persuade your friends to join you in belonging to a political party—and make that party our party.

Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the most recent of the many letters I have written to the Secretary of State, expressing my concern over the Middle East situation. This letter, dated January 23, speaks for itself; however, I would like to make clear that the alarm I feel for the future of the State of Israel is not prompted because I am a Jew. I would feel the same concern for any country whose territorial integrity and security were threatened. It behooves every American to go to the defense of democracy and freedom whenever that democracy or freedom is threatened by annihilation.

Israel demonstrated her loyalty to democracy and proved herself an ally of the United States by refusing every Communist gesture of friendship and assistance, even at the danger of its very existence. Egypt has accepted Communist arms and all the implications that go with them.

The small State of Israel came into existence at the will of the United Nations. It stands to reason she should be given every opportunity to survive and develop in a normal way. Our country, being the first to recognize Israel as an independent country, must consistently feel the responsibility to help protect its existence, as well as its borders. We cannot sit idly by and watch this young country be wiped off the face of the map. As the leading democratic nation in the world today, it is our duty to aid and assist her in this struggle for life.

One of the basic factors which keeps the Middle East in a state of crisis is the absolute refusal of the Arab States to reconcile themselves to the existence of Israel as a State. During the adjournment of Congress, I had the good fortune to visit Israel and learn and see firsthand, the amazing progress she has made during the scant 8 years of her existence. If the Arab people could only be made to realize the economic and social benefits available to them through mutual trade with Israel, I am sure there would be little hesitancy in accepting the United Nations decree that Israel is here to stay.

However, since the Arab States are adamant in their refusal to recognize Israel as an independent country, our Government must act swiftly, justly, and effectively to prevent further aggression and another local war which could well develop into a third world war. The prevention of a third world war is vital to our own national security in this atomic age.

Therefore, we must, No. 1—without delay—make a clear-cut demonstration, through a security guaranty, that our Government will not tolerate Israel's destruction, and, No. 2, we must take measures which will correct the imbalance of power created by the Communist shipments of arms to Israel's neighbors, namely, by promptly supplying Israel arms to be used for the defense of her homeland.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1956.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I again stress that I believe it is imperative that our Government grant Israel's request for arms to enable her to defend herself against the threat of Arab aggression. I am convinced that any delay increases gravely the danger to Israel and to democracy. I hope, in addition, that our administration will negotiate a security pact with Israel to guarantee the existing frontiers and that the administration will abandon the idea that any such pact should be postponed until after an agreement is reached with the Arab countries. I see no prospects of such an agreement and I am afraid that the peace propaganda that is now being circulated in Washington is intended primarily for the purpose of deceiving the administration and thus delaying vital action for Israel's defense in the form of military equipment and a security guaranty.

I hope that our Government will reject any proposals that Sir Anthony Eden may have to offer which are aimed at Israel's territorial integrity and security. I am afraid that the British Foreign Office is now trying to bring the United States into line for a pro-Arab and anti-Israel policy.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Sale of Government-Owned Synthetic Rubber Producing Facility at Institute, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD a statement which I made earlier today during hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on Senate Resolution 197 which would disapprove the sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber-producing facility to Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc.:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT C. BYRD, M. C., SIXTH DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FEBRUARY 1, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I am ROBERT C. BYRD, Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of West Virginia. I appear before your distinguished committee today for the purpose of opposing Senate Resolution 197, which would disapprove the sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plant at Institute, W. Va. The Institute facility is located in my district, and I am the author of H. R. 7301 which became Public Law 336, 1st session, 84th Congress, and which amended the Disposal Act to direct the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission to invite proposals and open negotiations for sale of the Institute plant. Pursuant to the enactment of Public Law 336, and in accordance with its terms, the Commission proceeded to invite bids on the Institute plant, entered into negotiation for a contract of sale with Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc., and submitted its report to the Attorney General. The Commission also submitted a report to the Congress on January 12. According to the law, unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress prior to the expiration of 30 days continuous session following the day the report was submitted, the contract shall become fully effective, and transfer of possession of the facility shall be made. We are presently in that 30-day period, and the resolution before us resolves that the Senate does not favor sale.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the consideration of your distinguished committee the following reasons why Senate Resolution 197 should not be passed:

1. The Government will receive a full fair value for a facility which has not operated since September 1953 and which annually costs the Government approximately $240,000 to keep in standby. Out of 6 proposals for purchase of the Institute plant, the $11 million offered by Goodrich-Gulf was the only bid which represented full fair value. The next highest proposal was $5.8 million and, although the Commission was indued with discretion to contract for sale of the facility at a price below the highest amount offered, the second highest price does not represent full fair value nor would sale at this price provide for the development of a competitive synthetic rubber industry. Sale of the plant at the $5.8 million figure would actually have constituted a Government subsidy to a private producer and would have given the purchaser an unwarranted competitive advantage over other producers.

2. It is important that, from the standpoint of national security and from the standpoint of healthy competition in the synthetic rubber industry, this facility, with its annual capacity of 122,000 long tons, be sold to private industry and reactivated. Burgeoning demand for synthetic rubber has been taxing the capacity of all other GR–S plants sold, and in order to meet the increased demand, publicly announced plans for expansion have been made by purchasers of the other plants. With the increasing needs for synthetic rubber, it is reasonable to anticipate increasing expansion to meet the needs. New plants will be built in the future, there will be sharp competition among present producers and new producers will undoubtedly enter the field.

3. The development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry would be better fostered by permitting this facility to begin producing than to allow it to lie idle. Increased production of synthetic rubber would naturally strengthen rather than stifle competition. This fact is recognized by the Attorney General who, in his opinion, stated that the proposed sale would not lessen competition on the production level, because it would create additional production and it would eliminate no competitior. He further emphasized that it would increase competition on the fabricating level.

4. The position of Goodrich-Gulf, should it acquire Institute, will not be one of control. Actually, if Goodrich-Gulf is to maintain its competitive position, it must either acquire Institute or expand at Port Neches. The Attorney General, in his statement of findings, said that the sale of the Institute plant to Goodrich-Gulf will result in its having 25.2 percent of the total GR–S capacity. He proceeded to add, however, that this percentage figure does not take into account any proposed expansion of existing capacities by other competitors. The 25.2-percent figure is based upon the total capacities of GR–S Government-owned plants at the time of the original sale in April 1955, and includes in the total the capacity of the three production lines at Institute. Since that time, the capacities of a number of the plants have been increased, and further increases in the capacities of these plants have been announced. Moreover, only one of the production lines at the Institute plant can be operated during the next 18 months because butadiene is unavailable for the operation of the other two lines. Following is a statistical table which appeared in the Disposal Commission's report, and which mirrors the production of the GR–S industry at various stages of disposal.

Plant	Original plant capacity (long tons)	Percent of 1st disposal (total capacity, 689,600)	Percent with Baytown (total capacity, 733,600)	Including Institute and current announced expansion to 1,091.9 thousand long tons	
				Thousands of long tons	Percent
Institute	122,000	----------	----------	122	[1] 11.2
Goodrich-Gulf	90,000	13.1	12.3	95	[1] 8.7
American Synthetic	44,000	6.4	6.0	44	4.0
Copolymer	49,000	7.1	6.7	61.3	5.6
Firestone-Akron	30,000	18.8	17.7	189.9	17.4
Firestone-L. C	99,600				
General Tire (new plant)	40,000	----------	----------	40	3.7
Goodyear-Akron	15,200	16.6	15.6	149.4	13.7
Goodyear-Houston	99,600				
Phillips	63,000	9.1	8.6	116.3	10.7
Shell	89,000	12.9	12.1	[2] 89	[2] 8.2
Texas-United States	88,000	12.8	12.0	118.8	10.9
United States Rubber	22,200	3.2	3.0	22.2	2.0
United Rubber & Chemical	44,000	----------	6.0	44	4.0
Total	895,000	----------	----------	1,091.9	----------

[1] Goodrich-Gulf plus Institute equals 217,000 long tons or 19.9 percent.
[2] Shell has announced that capacity will be "materially increased" but assigned no figures to the expansion. In the absence of a specific figure, no expansion could be reflected in the table. The effect of this expansion will be to reduce all other percentages.

5. Goodrich-Gulf has agreed to make available to small-business firms at fair-market prices 50 percent of the production of the first line at Institute, and 73 percent of the production of the next 2 lines. According to the Commission, this commitment in favor of small business is by far the largest firm commitment offered by any of the bidders for this plant.

6. The $11 million bid might well prove to be considerably higher than any which can be obtained at a future time under changed conditions in the rubber industry. Now is the time to sell, while conditions are most conducive. If Congress disapproves this proposed contract, the opportunity for sale of the plant doubtlessly will not return.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, an idle plant means unemployment and economic distress. Reactivation of the Institute plant would provide jobs for more than 700 men and women in an area which has been hard hit by mine closures and the economy of which has been severely affected by the loss of coal markets. Thousands of applications for work are on file at the plant now.

Thus, on every count, congressional approval of the sale of the Institute plant seems advantageous to the Government, to the West Virginia economy, and to the consumers of rubber products.

Regardless of the convictions of any Member of Congress at the time the original disposal legislation was passed in the 83d Congress, the facts are that 25 plants have been sold with the approval of an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress. One plant has been leased. The 27th plant, Institute, is now up for congressional review. To keep it idle and out of competition with the other 26 plants at this time would seem to be an empty gesture which contributes nothing to the present situation.

The die is cast. The Congress of the United States nearly a year ago decided that the synthetic-rubber industry, born a Government monopoly in World War II, should be denationalized and should revert to private enterprise. Even if the Institute sale is disapproved, it could not possibly change the concept or pattern of synthetic-rubber manufacture today.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to express my views before your great committee, and I urge that Senate Resolution 197 not be favorably considered. The way would then be open for final approval and consummation of the sale of the Institute facility.

One Treaty Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, Monday, January 30, 1956:

ONE TREATY IS ENOUGH

President Eisenhower's reply to Premier Bulganin of Russia was couched in language that will be clear to the Kremlin and should have the unanimous approval of all free governments.

In rejecting the Russian proposal for a 20-year friendship treaty between the United States and Russia, Mr. Eisenhower was frank. Perhaps diplomacy has changed. There are none of the complimentary phrases covering uncomplimentary intentions in the communications of the President. But the letter strikes to the point.

Perhaps the best clause was the one pointing out that we already have a treaty with Russia—a treaty shared by all members of the United Nations. That body was formed as the "United Nations Organization for Peace." Its purposes haven't changed. Its major failures have been caused by refusal of the Communist bloc to live up to the high purposes of the organization.

This was cited by the President. The record of the last 10 years is filled with efforts, often successful, of Russia to circumvent the aims of the U. N. How then can an under-the-table bilateral agreement, lacking the moral aid of the other free nations, be expected to accomplish more.

The purposes of the Kremlin are clear. A bilateral pact between this country and Russia would destroy the leadership of the non-Communist world. It would leave standed all other free nations. It would end the hope of freedom in slave countries. It would open the door to Red infiltration all over Asia, Europe, Africa, and even South and Central America.

There could be only two possible outcomes. Either we would eventually be encircled and engulfed by the Reds, or we would maintain strength so great as to force a working agreement with Russia by which our two countries would divide the world and the spoils. Americans want neither choice.

During the second great war, we were concerned by the possibility of Russia making a separate peace with Hitler. More recently, we feared West Germany might be enticed by prospects of Moscow's consent to reunification, a fear which happily proved groundless. Yet the thing Bulganin proposed would constitute a separate peace in the cold war—a conflict as determined as was the hot war.

The Kremlin probably had no expectation of American acceptance, but the Reds probably hoped to further their claims as a peace-loving nation and to confuse the meeting this week between Britains Eden and Eisenhower. If that was Bulganin's real purpose, it too is doomed to fail.

Shipments of Arms to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, concerned about the shipments of arms to Egypt by Czechoslovakia with the blessings of the Soviets and believing we cannot delay action on Israel's request for defensive arms, I present copies of letters I have directed to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles; also, a copy of a resolution adopted last Monday night by the American Zionist Council of Paterson, N. J.

The letters and resolution follow:

NOVEMBER 9, 1955.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply concerned that Czechoslovakia, with the approval of the Soviet Union, is furnishing arms to Egypt, obviously to be used against Israel.

Here is a definite threat to the peace of the Middle East and the whole free world.

While I do not advocate a competitive arms race, I am ever mindful of the oft-repeated aims of world conquest expressed by the Communist leaders of the Kremlin. The time to take strong preventative action against serious trouble is now, and in the event this fails we simply cannot permit the people of Israel to become defenseless.

I cannot help but feel that our Government, through your good offices, is properly appraising this dangerous situation and preparing to take swift action if such is warranted.

With assurances of my high esteem, believe me,

Very sincerely,

GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will recall I addressed you almost 3 months ago expressing my concern over the reported sale and shipment of arms to Egypt by Czechoslovakia with the apparent approval of the Soviet Government.

The little Republic of Israel, providing a long-sought homeland for so many of the persecuted and wandering Jews of Europe, was brought about in no little measure as a result of the interest and support of the American people and their Government. We have called it "a bastion of democracy in the Middle East," and we have helped nurture its rapid progress.

As one who has supported the movement for the homeland years before its consummation and all of our Government's programs extending needed aid in recent years, I hold we cannot delay action on Israel's request for defensive arms. According to reports, tension mounts daily, and it is unthinkable we would permit this small and friendly nation to be placed in a position it could not adequately protect its people because of any equivocal or unrealistic position on our part.

I am mindful of your own strong dedication to the maintenance of world peace, and I feel certain that you are aware of the threat in this Middle East area and will act accordingly.

With assurances of my high esteem, believe me,

Very sincerely,

GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL OF PATERSON, N. J.

We, the assembled members and friends of the American Zionist Council of Paterson, representing 20,000 citizens, are viewing with alarm the Communist arming of Egypt and other Arab states, the mounting Arab threats to the security of Israel, the attacks upon American institutions, and the insults to the American flag in Arab countries, and call upon the Government of the United States to strengthen the American position in the Middle East by supplying arms for defense to Israel, a stanch friend and reliable ally of the United States.

We welcome the effort of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to establish peace between Israel and her neighbors, but we call upon our Government to reject the proposal of the Prime Minister of Great Britain to appease the Arab dictators and to force the surrender to them of parts of Israel's territory. We trust that the United States will not swerve from the path of justice and will continue determinedly to uphold Israel's independence and the integrity of her borders.

Town Meeting on the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to serve with a number of distinguished Americans on both the first and second Commissions created by the Congress on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, which Commissions were known as the Hoover Commissions.

One distinguished American who served on both of these commissions was the former Postmaster General, Hon. James A. Farley. At a dinner meeting of the chamber of commerce on October 19, 1955, in Waterbury, Conn., Mr. Farley was the principal speaker, the subject of his address being Town Meeting on the Potomac.

Mr. President, I regard Mr. Farley's remarks on that occasion as most informative and challenging respecting the duty of the Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and the people, regarding the implementation of the reorganization recommendations submitted by the second Hoover Commission, which recommendations are now awaiting appropriate attention and action by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government.

I consider the thoughts he expressed worthy of the serious consideration of all of us, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that his address be published in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Also, Mr. President, the Waterbury Republican in its issue of October 21, 1955, published a splendid editorial on Mr. Farley's speech, entitled "Do Your Part."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be published in the Appendix of the RECORD immediately following Mr. Farley's address.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWN MEETING ON THE POTOMAC

(By James A. Farley)

It is indeed a pleasure to be here tonight, and I deeply appreciate the courtesy I have encountered on every hand. Of course, I am not a stranger to Waterbury for I have spoken before your political and civil gatherings on other occasions.

Tonight I am going to talk to you about one of the most exciting and encouraging governmental developments of our time. It has recently been my privilege to assist in the most searching and thoroughgoing study of our Federal Government that has ever been made. Today, nearly 4 months after the completion of the task, I am more enthusiastic about, and more deeply impressed by this experience than I was on the day it began.

You all know something about the Hoover Commission, of course. You will recall that the pattern was set in 1947, during a Democratic administration, when Congress voted unanimously to create the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—to give it its full, official name. This bipartisan, 12-man body made a 2-year study of the organization and management of the Government and submitted to Congress a series of recommendations for streamlining and strengthening the Federal structure.

Now, mind you, all through the Nation's history there have been committees and commissions without number, all seeking to impart order and efficiency to the Federal Government. They all worked diligently and reported at length. But nothing substantial ever came of their work. Against this dismaying precedent, some 72 percent of the first Hoover Commission's recommendations were accepted in the years between 1949 and 1953. The savings which can be clearly traced to the Commission's work have so far totaled nearly $7 billion and the nonmonetary benefits have been even more impressive. I wish I could dwell on them at length.

This was a phenomenal record of achievement, against great odds, and I for one attribute it primarily to the stature, the statesmanship, and the tireless and unselfish labors of the Commission's chairman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover. No one else could have done what he did.

It seems to me that the success of the first Hoover Commission marked a turning point of great significance in our national life. Through force of circumstance we as a people came suddenly into the era of "big government." I suppose this was concurrent with the breathtaking leap which the world has taken from the horse-and-buggy days of my boyhood to the atomic marvels of today.

At any rate, "big government" took us by surprise. It left us baffled by its complexity, frightened by its size, and constantly conscious that its overwhelming cost might, at any time, cause it to topple over on us, crushing the productive economy which supports its weight.

That danger exists importantly today. It has not been materially diminished in any way. But at least we know that the danger exists. And now we have a means, if we care to use it, of bringing the Leviathan of big government under control. In all honesty, I never fully realized the force of that point until I became a member of the second Hoover Commission.

Thanks to the precedent of the first Commission, it was logical that a Republican administration and a Republican Congress should carry forward this vital work. The first Hoover report was a good beginning but it was only a beginning. As the Honorable Harry S. Truman put it in 1951: "Reorganization is a never-ending task."

So it was that, in August 1953, Congress again unanimously, and I want to underscore that word unanimously, created the second Hooover Commission in the image of the first. And again Herbert Hoover responded to the call, as he has to every worthwhile invitation to public service in all his 81 years.

Frankly I felt deeply honored when President Eisenhower invited me to serve as a member of the new Commission. It meant a 2-year commitment, of course, but it meant also an unparalleled opportunity to look behind the scenes of big government and examine every aspect of its operations. It meant a chance to work closely with Mr. Hoover and the other 10 members of the Commission, to mull over the research reports, and formulate finally the report of the Commission to Congress.

You know, of course, that there were 19 research committees, or task forces, composed of more than 200 of the Nation's most eminent experts in many fields. Working largely as volunteers, they gave freely of their time and energy to amass the 3,500,000 words of facts and figures which provided the Commission with background for its findings.

I simply can't say enough for the quality and caliber of the task forces. No one asked and no one cared whether they were Republicans or Democrats. Regardless of their business or professional associations, they were just good Americans doing a job. Among them were 3 former Cabinet officers, 5 men who had served as under secretaries or assistant secretaries in Cabinet departments, and many former members of Federal regulatory commissions, 3 former governors of States, and 7 college presidents. To a man, they worked with the greatest objectivity, heeding faithfully the instructions of Chairman Hoover:

"First get the facts. Both sides. No preconceptions. When you get all the facts, come up with whatever conclusions they induce."

As the research work proceeded, the Commission met more and more frequently. Toward the end, in fact, we were in session 3 and sometimes 4 days a week, often at late hours. I think I can speak for the rest of the commissioners when I say that we all worked hard but none of us came close to matching the magnitude of our chairman's own labors. To every task force report and to each recommendation the Commission gave the most conscientious thought and study. Let me repeat here a statement I made at the time we completed the report:

"At no time did politics enter into the deliberations of the Commission. Where we differed, they were honest differences of opinion, and Mr. Hoover recognized the right of each member to give free expression of his views."

What we had, in effect, was a true "town meeting on the Potomac" in the best New England tradition. We had our disagreements, of course, and the report in its final form contained a number of dissents and separate statements. The dissents of the Hoover commissioners were not as numerous proportionately, however, as those recorded in an average session of the United States Supreme Court.

On June 30 of this year, the Commission sent the last of its 19 reports to the Congress and, on September 29, wound up its affairs and officially disbanded. I might add that, true to its own precept of economy, the Commission returned some $85,000 to the Treasury from the congressional appropriation which financed its operations.

The Commission's reports contain, in all, some 314 recommendations for modernizing the conduct of the Government's business, eliminating waste and duplication, and removing the Government from unjustifiable competition with private business. If fully applied, these recommendations would yield eventual savings of more than $5 billion a year—enough to balance the Federal budget. Additionally some $6 billion could be returned to the Treasury, thus helping to reduce the national debt, through the recommended mutualization or liquidation of the funds of certain Government lending agencies.

Great though its potential financial rewards may be, I believe that values of equal importance reside in the Commission's report as an educational document. By no other means could we have gotten the facts which reveal to the executive branch, the Congress, and the citizen the mountainous dimensions of the problem we face in trying to keep big government within bounds. Let me cite a few of the more important findings of the Commission and its task forces:

First, the magnitude of government today. You may recall that I entered the Federal service as Postmaster General in 1933. Looking back it seems to me that most of us thought we had a pretty extensive executive branch even then, with 572,000 employees, some 450 different departments and agencies, and a budget of approximately $4 billion.

But depression, war, emergency, cold war, more war, and the creation of a huge peacetime military establishment have brought about a mushroom growth in Government that is almost inconceivable. With 2,300,000 civilian employees and nearly 3 million more in uniform, we have built a vast structure of more than 2,100 departments, agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions which operate on a budget of $62 billion.

The Hoover Commission found the Government in possession of $115 billion worth of personal property; land equal to one-fourth of the acreage of the 48 States; and floor space equivalent to 1,250 Empire State Buildings. Government-owned storage space alone occupies acreage twice the size of Manhattan Island. The paperwork turned out by the Government each year would reach from here to Moscow; it absorbs the full-time energies of 75,000 persons and costs more than the whole Federal budget during the Taft adaministration.

I don't think I have been exactly asleep these last 20 years, yet I confess I shared some of the sensations of Rip Van Winkle as I studied the findings of the various task forces.

Second, the huge cost of government today. Only 25 years ago, the Federal budget called for taxes equivalent to $113 per average American family per year and the national debt amounted to $1,076 per family. Today Federal taxes come to $1,600 per family and the national debt to $7,000 per family.

In the race between inflation and productivity during the last 15 years, America's magnificent industrial machine has performed superbly. But taxes, debts, and deficits must be met from the profits of industry and the earnings and savings of the people. Facing, as we do, continuous immense expenditures for many years to come, we must be alert to the dangers of waste, confusion, and duplication in every area of Federal operations. We must stop the spreading trend toward Government competition with private industry. We are at the point of peril.

The full force of the danger is felt when we examine more closely the actual rather than the merely "visible," extent of our Government's "promise to pay." The official national debt stands at $274 billion, an appalling sum in itself, and the interest on

it is half again as much as the whole Federal budget 25 short years ago.

Yet this indebtedness is only the surface showing of the total obligations which the Nation has undertaken in "moral" terms. The Hoover Commission found that the Government is committed to a gross figure in the neighborhood of $240 billion additionally through loans, guaranties, and insuring activities conducted by some 104 different lending agencies.

Add to this the unfunded liabilities of the retirement program of $265 billion, and the real total of our national commitments is probably over $700 billion rather than $274 billion.

No nation, however rich its resources, however productive its industries, can long maintain its stability if it continues to pile unnecessary expenditures on top of a staggering debt.

Third, duplication and waste in government today. It is not my intention to belabor you tonight with the scores and hundreds of dramatic examples of confusion, delay, group favoritism, and sheer extravagance which the Hoover Commission uncovered in every area of government. I advise you, in fact I beseech you, to study these facts if you have not already done so. Digests of the Commission's findings can be obtained through such organizations as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

I do want to make it clear that the Hoover Commission pursued no human villains in its researches and never singled out individuals for personal reproach. The overwhelming majority of our Federal employees are sincere, diligent, and conscientious. They find red tape, delay, organizational confusion, and waste just as frustrating, just as appalling as other good citizens do. Without their active cooperation, the Hoover Commission and its task forces could never have amassed the facts it needed to complete the report.

The real root causes of our governmental dilemma, in any case, are to be found in haphazard, unplanned, mushroom growth; in hasty, ill-advised expansion; in tangled lines of authority and responsibility; in a welter of conflicting laws; in pressure spending; and in outmoded and ill-organized budgeting and accounting procedures.

These things manifest themselves in spectacular illustrations of duplication, waste, and sheer folly: The Government borrowing money at 3 percent and lending it at 2 percent, carloads of canned tomatoes shipped from the east coast to the west coast by one Defense Department branch while another ships carloads of the same commodity from the west coast to the east coast, 25,000 pounds of cement shipped by air to Bermuda, an 8-year supply of flashlight batteries on hand in one defense unit, a 128-year supply of simple gear drives in another, some 1,000 business-type establishments in needless competition with private business, new hospitals rising while thousand of beds stand idle in existing hospitals, waste of precious medical and technical skills already stretched paper-thin by modern requirements.

There is no end to these examples but they simply add up to a frightening picture of large-scale loss which we dare not ignore. The Hoover Commission sought to cure causes, not symptoms, and it provided constructive, practical remedies in the form of recommendations.

Some of these recommendations are arguable and will be argued. But no sensible citizen can face the facts in the Hoover report without acknowledging the gravity of the problems it reveals and the urgent necessity for affirmative action. This report is a majestic gift to the Nation. It gives us our big chance—at a critical juncture in our history—to get a grip on "Big Government" before it overwhelms us utterly.

Make no mistake: The Hoover report tells us plainly that we have been a foolish people in our use of our resources, both human and material; that our citizens have been neglectful of their responsibilities; and that we must, now or never, adopt some of the simple self-disciplines which free, self-governing people must practice if they hope to remain free.

This brings us to the big questions: What is the outlook for implementation of the Commission's 314 recommendations? Where does responsibility lie? What are the obstacles to action? And what can we, as citizens, do to make sure that the national benefits of this document are not lost and forgotten in the "dusty pigeonholes of Washington?"

The answer to the last question is the key to all the rest. There must be teamwork on a bipartisan basis between the administration and Congress—between any administration and any Congress. But first and foremost there must be strong, bipartisan citizen support. If we as citizens want maximum action, demand maximum action, and work for maximum action, there will be maximum action. If we are indifferent or neglectful, the results of the Commission's work will be negligible. It is just as simple as that.

As for the mechanics of implementing the Hoover report, some 45 percent of the Commission's recommendations can be put into effect by administrative action within the executive branch. Most of the balance will require congressional approval. At this point, the initiative rests with the administration. When the 1956 session of Congress begins, the legislative and executive branches of the Government must share responsibility for enactment of the Commission's proposals.

I feel strongly that forthright action by the administration and the various Cabinet departments is the real key to executive branch action on matters of this sort. In order to get economy there must be a "will" to economy and the impetus must come from the top.

We have so far heard certain announcements concerning action and plans for action in the executive branch. Defense Secretary Wilson has ordered the closing of some 50 business-type establishments competing with private businesses and has designated a special assistant to coordinate the utilization of those Commission recommendations which apply to the Defense Department.

Elsewhere in the executive branch, it has been announced that President Eisenhower has also named a special assistant to do something about the Commission's recommendations in all the departments and agencies and that an advisory committee of administration officials has been appointed to assist him. This is encouraging and I hope it is the preface to an early announcement of substantial and tangible actions already achieved. For unless the executive branch has a good record to point to, it will be in a rather poor position to take the lead on legislative action when Congress returns.

This is important, for two reasons: First, the administration encouraged the creation of the Commission in 1953 and thereby assumed its share of responsibility for the Commission's success. Second, at the administration's request, Congress has twice renewed the President's powers to submit reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1949 which will not expire until June 1, 1957. Ten such plans were submitted in 1953 and these, based on the report of the first Hoover Commission, were accepted by the Congress with very little question.

The reports of the first Hoover Commission were issued between February and May of 1949. By October of that year over 20 percent of the Commission's recommendations had been adopted through a combination of executive branch action, legislation, and Presidential plans. This is a much better performance than the record established since the first of the new Commission's reports made its appearance in February of this year. It seems to me that the public may justifiably become impatient unless there is a real speedup in executive branch application of the Hoover report between now and the first of the new year.

It is unfortunate, of course, that the Commission's report was completed so late in the 1955 session of Congress that there was time only for the introduction of a massive program of legislation but no time for congressional hearings and debate. At the start of the new session, undoubtedly, the legislation will again be introduced and I believe and hope that the congressional leaders of both parties will join in bipartisan sponsorship of the bills. It is also unfortunate that we are heading into a presidential year for, as the national party conventions draw closer, it will be increasingly difficult for the Congress—or the Nation as a whole, for that matter—to keep its mind on nonpolitical issues.

Nevertheless there is a strong possibility of substantial congressional action on important portions of the Hoover Commission's report during the early months of the 1956 session. Both political parties were pledged, by planks in their 1952 convention platforms, to support further Federal reorganization along lines laid down by the first Hoover Commission. I hope that both will repeat this avowal in the 1956 conventions with respect to the current report. In that case both will want to have good records on the issue.

There will, of course, be efforts to inject partisan considerations into our national discussion of the Hoover Commission's proposals. Special interest groups will seek to pull the parties one way or another in their effort to defeat certain portions of the report which they find displeasing. But I think we have learned by now that the Hoover report has no place in partisan politics. Both parties can make it succeed and share the credit or let it fail and share the blame.

There will also be vigorous efforts to discredit the entire Hoover report by finding fault with portions of it. It has already been said, on the one hand, that some of the Commission's recommendations are "socialistic" and, on the other that the Commission has tried to "turn the clock back." Now I don't for a moment contend that the Commission is completely infallible in every single recommendation. At the same time I deplore any tendency to restrict full, free, frank consideration of all the Commission's proposals—and prompt agreement on as many as possible. Only about 16 percent of the recommendations are deeply controversial, after all, in the sense that they face outright, organized opposition. We will be losing something precious if we become so preoccupied with the trees of controversy that we neglect the forest of fruitful and vital economies and improvements which are ours to command.

It is not the opposition of hostile groups, in the last analysis, that we have to fear so much as public indifference. Good citizens all over America must assume the vantage point afforded by the use of their own hind legs. They must express themselves in favor of sincere, forthright, bold official and legislative attention to the Hoover report and the issues underlying the report. Then the controversies will fall into perspective and we shall be back on the

path to national stability and solvency from which we have strayed so far.

To me it is not a matter of deciding whether to have, or not to have, action on the Hoover report. Such action is a plain and urgent national necessity. History tells us that more than one big, rich, foolish nation has perished because its citizens lost their sense of responsibility and learned to lean on government instead of taking an active hand in its wise and frugal management.

No nation on earth has ever undertaken the burdens which this Nation has borne, still bears, and will continue to bear for years to come. We simply cannot carry these burdens forward indefinitely and carry a single ounce of waste along with them.

So the real question is: Are we, as citizens, awake? Will we, as citizens, give thought and study and good hard work to the solution of the terrible problems we face? Do we realize that we can lose the struggle to preserve world peace and freedom through our own folly at home as easily as we can through any action of our foes abroad?

I believe we do, and I predict that we will seize the opportunity provided by the Hoover report to take the right turn in the road toward a glorious national future. Victor Hugo once said: "Greater than the power of armies is an idea whose time has come."

The idea is at hand. The time is now.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of October 21, 1955]

DO YOUR PART

That big government can become an intolerable weight, and, if not checked, can crush the nation is a commonly accepted truism. Talking about it is popular. Doing something about it can be achieved by steady support for the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

What James A. Farley had to say at the chamber of commerce banquet of the other night has all been said before. But it certainly bore reiteration as keynote for an organized effort to put the Hoover Commission's reforms into practice. We need a sobering sense that it is our money that is wasted by all the cross-purposes and effort duplications turned up by the commission's task forces in their study of government operation. And in commonsense protection of the interest of each and everyone of us, adding up to the national interest, we need to be alert to the course of legislation designed to put the Hoover recommendations into effect and vocal in their behalf. All this Mr. Farley was effective in advocating.

In what Mr. Farley had to say in tribute to the labors of Herbert Hoover and the inspiration Mr. Hoover has given the men associated with him in the arduous work of his commission, there was an historic irony of which the former Postmaster General and national Democratic chairman seemed altogether unaware. There used to be a disreputable straw man labeled "Herbert Hoover" whom Mr. Farley and the others in charge of the national campaigns of the 1930's loved to lambaste and deride. And in the Roosevelt Administrations which these tactics put in office came the tremendous impetus for the big government trend which now calls so strenuously for ordering and pruning.

But a lot of political and economic history has happened since then. The obvious reason and logic of the Hoover reforms command support from all good citizens irrespective of party party allegiance. And whatever scope any of us thinks government should have in the affairs of citizens, we can find common ground in wanting the role of government, big or small to be at least efficient and economic. Let's follow Mr. Hoover's and Mr. Farley's lead in creating an overwhelming public sentiment for putting the commission's proposals into effect.

Address by Wesley A. D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management, Before the American Society of Range Management, January 25, 1956, Denver, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows an address given by our distinguished former colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart. Mr. D'Ewart is now serving with distinction as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management. The following most comprehensive and analytical remarks were made before the American Society of Range Management on January 25, 1956, at Denver, Colo.:

It always gives me pleasure to meet with people who work with the land. This is especially true when the meeting involves a discussion of the problems and policies affecting the management of our range lands.

If you will pardon a rather obvious pun, I feel at "home on the range." Many years ago I was a ranger with the United States Forest Service. After leaving the Forest Service I put together a cattle operation in Montana. I still own that ranch, which is now managed by my son, and I am proud of the conservation measures taken by him and by myself to increase the productivity of its range. During the decade that I served as a Member of Congress from Montana a great many of my committee assignments involved studies of the administration of range and other public lands. A number of bills introduced by me, some of which became law, were designed to improve range management. When I was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Interior it became my job to direct the activities of 5 Federal land-use agencies. One of these agencies, the Bureau of Land Management, administers public range lands. It is with considerable pride that I say I can look back on more than 4 decades of first-hand experience with the conservation and development of our range lands and other natural resources.

Today, however, I would like to limit my remarks to a few of the more important things that have happened in the field of land management during the last 3 years. I have been accused, you know, of being a star member of what some people have chosen to call Secretary McKay's "giveaway gang" at the Department of Interior. Let me play that role for the moment and give away a number of facts regarding the recent and current operation of the Department of Interior. Perhaps I should say secrets instead of facts because many of our critics apparently have never heard of the facts, or if they have they have conveniently forgotten. But either way, facts or secrets, they add up to significant accomplishments, as I shall point out, and I give them to you for your unbiased appraisal.

Three years ago President Eisenhower laid down the basic philosophy for our guidance in carrying out the trust that is ours in managing our soil, water, mineral, and vegetative resources.

The President did this when he said in a message to Congress:

"Our basic problem is to carry forward the tradition of conservation, improvement, and wise use, and development of our land and water resources—a policy initiated 50 years ago under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt. To do this within the framework of a sound fiscal policy and in the light of defense needs will require the maximum cooperation among the States and local communities, farmers, businessmen, and other private citizens, and the Federal Government." Secretary of the Interior McKay is pledged to carry out this program.

As members of the American Society of Range Management you are well aware of the importance of partnership in the management of our natural resources. Land use is a dynamic thing. There is an increasing number of competitors for the privilege of this use. Growth in population and a rise in per capita income, currently at an alltime high, have contributed greatly to the pressures upon our land resources. This pressure is certain to grow and the use conflicts are sure to multiply. Few land uses are exclusive. But though multiple use of our lands has been accepted in principle we still have a lot to learn about putting it into practice. This is where the partnership concept becomes so important. Putting these lands to their highest use is a responsibility shared by private owners, and by local, State, and Federal Governments.

I think it would be helpful if at this point I would indicate more specifically what I am talking about. The Federal Government owns and administers nearly one-half billion acres of land in the continental United States. They are located in all of the 48 States, but are mainly concentrated in the western third of the country. This area is generally divided into two general categories, that is 408.6 million acres of public domain lands and 47 million acres of acquired lands. About half of all Federal lands have been withdrawn from entry under the public land laws for specific national requirements such as military reservations, national forests, national parks and monuments, reclamation withdrawals, wildlife refuges, Indian reservations, or similar management areas. That leaves 180 million acres or 39 percent of present Federal owned land, not including the Continental Shelf, located almost entirely in the 11 Western States as that portion of the original public domain which has not yet passed from Federal ownership and which has not been set aside for specific public uses. This area is exclusively managed under Secretary McKay by the Bureau of Land Management.

Present extensive landholding by the Federal Government in a Nation where private ownership of land has always been considered an essential feature of political and economic democracy, is largely the result of two major factors. First, the national interest has required that certain lands be set aside or acquired from time to time for national forests and parks, wildlife refuges, and military reservations, and other public purposes. Second, the remaining, vacant unreserved public domain is still in Federal ownership because of its submarginal or marginal character for private ownership and the lack of demand for private or State acquisition.

Three departments of the Government administer over 99 percent of all Federal lands. The Department of the Interior administers the largest area, 57.5 percent of the total, the Department of Agriculture 37 percent, the Department of Defense 5.1 percent, and all other agencies less than one-half of 1 percent.

It is my purpose today to discuss that portion under the Department of the Interior.

Reserved lands may have multiple use, but such multiple use must be subject to the primary purpose for which the area is reserved.

A reexamination of the policies under which public lands are withdrawn for military and other purposes is now underway in Washington. By tightening regulations governing the granting of withdrawals we have created a marked downward trend in the total acreages withdrawn from the public domain. Bureau of Land Management figures for 1955 show that a total of 1,238,000 acres was withdrawn for use of Federal agencies. This is only slightly more than half the total acreage withdrawn in 1952 and is more than 500,000 acres less than the total in 1951.

Under our new regulations withdrawal requests must now be filed in State land offices. Notices of proposed withdrawals are widely publicized, opportunity is given the public to object before any withdrawal is made, and public hearings are facilitated where circumstances warrant. At such hearings the requesting agency is asked to defend its need and the extent of acreage desired. Formerly applications were filed in Washington, D. C., processed on a case basis, and withdrawals were announced in the Federal Register without previous notice.

The Department of the Interior also has been cooperating with the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in studying the withdrawal problem. Toward this end we have suspended final action on all requests for withdrawals for military purposes until the committee concludes its hearings and we have had time to evaluate its findings and those of our own reviews.

When I discuss withdrawals and the other functions of the Bureau of Land Management I am always pleased to note that BLM is one of the few revenue-producing Federal agencies; that is it takes in more money than it spends. Last year BLM's gross revenue was $239,548,731. Its operating budget was $15,451,573. More than $142 million of the revenue total was made up of cash bonuses and first-year rentals from oil and gas leasing of Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, but even excluding this as more or less of a "windfall," BLM management of public domain resources last year earned approximately $97 million, or about $7 for each operational cost dollar. Grazing fees paid by users of the Federal range accounted for almost $2,500,000 of the total earnings.

The job being done by BLM takes on added importance when it is realized that fewer than 2,000 workers execute its multiplicity of duties. But to continue to do its fine job this Bureau needs additional personnel. New laws which add new responsibilities and workload will necessitate recruitment of more mining engineers, cadastral engineers, foresters, range conservationists, land law clerks and clerk stenographers. More hearing officers are needed, and to pare down the tremendous backlog of appeals the adjudication staff must be enlarged. Naturally we cannot increase the BLM staff without getting increased appropriations. We have asked Congress for the necessary additional funds to carry out our forward-looking program.

I mentioned a moment ago that land use is a dynamic thing. An example of what I mean is the interest in lease and purchase, under conservation restrictions, of public land tracts of 5 acres or less covered by the Small Tract Act. This interest stimulated a 50 percent increase in land use and disposal activities of BLM last year, and that was on top of a 100 percent increase in 1954. The demand for these small tracts has been highest in southern California and southern Nevada, although sizable acreages have been classified for application in the vicinity of Phoenix, Ariz.

The atomic age has had its impact on public land management, too. Enactment of Public Law 585, the multiple mineral development bill, and Public Law 359, which opened 7.2 million acres of public lands in power and water site withdrawals to mining location, greatly stimulated the rush for uranium on public domain and acquired lands. Although uranium claims are filed with county recorders, the expanded search for this precious and strategic material was reflected in a 49 percent increase last year in mining patent applications received by BLM. The total number of applications in 1955 was 334, as against 156 in 1954.

But let's leave uranium to the prospectors for the moment and get on with a report on some of our work at the Department of the Interior that deals more directly with the range.

Administration of the Taylor Grazing Act is a case in point. As you know, this act is the basic legislation governing the management of the vacant, unreserved and unappropriated public land in the United States. Contrary to its title, the Taylor Grazing Act does not include provisions for a single use only. It is a multiple-use conservation law. Recreation, mineral prospecting, wildlife, watershed development and flood control are among the other uses to which the act pertains.

During the past month, the Department of Interior has issued revised regulations under this 22-year-old act governing the use of grazing district lands. The revision was designed primarily to strengthen the regulatory controls under the act and to facilitate management of the range and improve the degree of conservation accomplishments. These revisions have been under intensive study during the past 3 years and their recent adoption seems to be mutually acceptable both to the Government and to the range users.

Another recent change inaugurated by this administration was the adoption about a year ago of a new basis for charging grazing fees on the public lands. This new formula ties the fees directly to livestock prices received by producers. It provides for a sliding scale of fees determined by average livestock prices at western markets during the previous calendar year. During the transition years of 1955 and 1956 the fee has been set at an arbitrary level with the sliding scale becoming effective on January 1, 1957. The majority of range users seem to regard this new system as fair and reasonable.

In tackling the problem of inadequate improvements on the range, the Department last year doubled the amount of grazing fee receipts returned for expenditure on range improvements. This move is accelerating the installation of stock waters, control fences, roads and other improvements essential to the proper management of the range. The long-standing lack of adequate improvements has caused a great many headaches. It has contributed to local over-use caused by poor distribution of livestock and a lack of uniform utilization of the available forage.

Range users have fully recognized the need for range improvements and last year contributed $2 million of the $5 million spent for this purpose. In some cases grazing district advisory boards have recommended charging special fees for speeding up the construction of badly-needed improvements. The Department of Interior has been in agreement with these recommendations.

It is the aim of my Department to reach the ultimate goal of completely replacing uncontrolled and destructive use of the range with orderly use. With this in mind Interior began an intensive drive 2 years ago to complete the adjudication of grazing privileges and stabilize range use on a permanent basis. When the adjudication program has been completed, major adjustments in range use will have been accomplished and the next step will be more emphasis on range supervision and improved management practices.

While continuing efforts have gradually cut down grazing trespass, this problem probably will be with us as long as we have unfenced common-use ranges. One measure that has been helpful in controlling trespass is the establishment of individual and small group range allotments. Here the individual is inclined to keep a watchful eye on his range and to quickly report any unauthorized use. Most of the Federal range in the Southwest has been divided into allotments and many more will be created in other States as the adjudication program moves forward. At present we are also considering new legislation to provide for a uniform trespass law on public land.

Now let us take a look at what we have accomplished in the way of improving the condition of the range, as contrasted with the achievements in the management phases.

Fully realizing the importance of range condition and trend studies in determining the success or failure of managing the Federal land, the Department of Interior embarked on such a study program a year ago last spring. The study included every grazing district under a uniform system. We started our program with training sessions for range technicians under the leadership of a specialist who had spent considerable time developing methods especially adaptable to the Federal range that were readily understandable by both technicians and stockmen. As this program picks up momentum we expect it to yield a reliable measure of range management practices locally. It will also be helpful in increasing the accuracy of the area of condition and trend classes in service-wide annual reports.

Getting down to the ground, so to speak, one of the major potentials for improving federally-owned rangeland is through reseeding. Gradually improved cultural methods have been developed for obtaining a fairly high degree of success in restoring the vegetal cover on depleted soils. It has been reliably estimated that there are nearly 10 million acres of depleted rangeland susceptible to successful reseeding.

The Bureau of Land Management has reseeded about 1,200,000 acres of rangeland with increasingly better results. Some of the earlier efforts, tempered principally by a desire to keep costs to an absolute minimum, met with only partial success. In the past 10 years nearly three-quarters of a million acres have been successfully reseeded. Productivity on the reseeded areas has been increased from almost zero grazing capacity to as high as 2 or 3 acres per animal unit month. Beef production on seeded areas has been increased from about 2 pounds per acre to as high as 40 pounds per acre. Currently the Bureau of Land Management is reseeding depleted range at the rate of 150,000 acres per year. This represents an enormous farming operation, but we find that the lasting results well justify the effort.

A striking example of putting sagebrush land into increased productivity through reseeding is a project in southeastern Idaho. Idahoans once called the area along Highway 40 between Rupert and American Falls "the desert." They don't anymore. More than 40,000 acres in this region now have been reseeded, and I don't need to tell you that the stockmen are pretty happy about this.

Not too far from this Idaho project is another operation that is a prime illustration of the value of reseeding. This one is located in northeast Nevada. Here we have reseeded a total of 63,000 acres in a series of big range pastures. These pastures, now all fenced, provide forage about 2 weeks earlier in the year than the surrounding open range. Utilizing this early growth in the fenced areas keeps the stock off the outside range until it has had a chance to get a good start. This pilot operation is now in its third year.

One of the measures which has aided materially in improving the success of range reseeding has been the joint effort by interested Federal and State agencies in developing new equipment for range seeding and new cultural techniques. While not considered as research, the investigations conducted by this joint effort, and with the assistance of the Forest Service Equipment Development Center, have been of benefit through the direct application of the findings. This is a continuing program and one which strives for constantly better success in improving public land ranges. Other research endeavors are conducted largely on a cooperative basis with the established research agencies, both Federal and State experiment stations. Of greatest benefit in managing the Federal range have been the findings on the use of specific range forage types. Recently completed studies in the intermountain area have pointed the way to better methods of managing winter sheep ranges. Continuing tests on the yields of reseeded range pastures have provided much-needed information in managing artificial stands.

Weed-control research now conducted in cooperation with several western land-grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture have aided materially in attacking serious range weed problems—halogeton, for example. This weed, with its poisonous qualities and its explosive character of spread, is by far the most serious weed on the Federal range. It poses a serious threat to the continued use by livestock of the Federal range, since a large part of the public lands is susceptible to halogeton invasion. Death losses to both sheep and cattle from the weed's poisoning, particularly in Utah and Idaho, continue in spite of the efforts of stockmen to escape them by avoiding areas of heavy infestations.

While halogeton does continue to spread, encouraging results have been obtained, and several hundred thousand acres are being successfully controlled. Experience has proved that range revegetation is the most practical known method of control for large areas. Chemical control is used to eradicate small isolated spot infestations to prevent seed production and reduce the rate of spread in perimeter areas and along avenues of spread. Since inception of the control program more than 402,900 acres have been successfully reseeded to hardy perennial grasses. Improvement practices have been completed on over 87,000 acres, and chemical treatment has been applied to more than 83,000 acres.

Cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, State departments of agriculture, universities and colleges, county weed organizations, railroads, State and county highway departments, and individuals in most instances has been very good. Research studies conducted by the Department of Agriculture and State land-grant colleges, with Bureau of Land Management cooperation, have developed information that will be very helpful in future control programs.

In 1956 it is expected that halogeton surveys will be carried out on more than 5 million acres of land. About 80,000 acres will be reseeded and improvement practices can be applied to an additional 6,500 acres of public land. Chemical control and other direct measures will be applied to about 25,000 acres of halogeton.

Next to the importance of livestock use of the Federal range, geographically speaking, is the use made by wildlife, principally big game. The amazing increase in big game numbers on the Federal range in recent years has resulted in a host of difficult problems in range management. Reasonable numbers of big game have priority for forage on the Federal rainge. The remainder is allotted for livestock when the adjudication is made. However, people differ in their opinions as to what constitutes "reasonable numbers." The big-game animals do not distribute themselves uniformly over the total range area, but tend to concentrate in areas of their particular liking. The result is conflicts in use and difficulty of management.

Faced with the increasing complexity of these problems, the range users, through the National Advisory Board Council for Grazing, recommended to the Department 2 years ago that wildlife interests be given an expanded representation on advisory boards. By law each of the 59 grazing district advisory boards has one wildlife representative. Under the new arrangement, each of the State boards has a wildlife member and the national council has three with the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service acting in an advisory capacity. After 1 year trial we adopted the recommendation last fall as permanent policy and accordingly provided for it in the recently revised Federal Range Code. Only by working together and joining forces in attacking these problems can we expect to resolve serious conflicts in the use of the range.

One of the major public lands conservation accomplishments in many years was the adoption by the Department of the Interior of a 20-year soil and moisture conservation program. Fiscal 1956 is the initial program year in this long-range endeavor.

Under the program, conservation plans have been made for public lands by major river sub-basins to take advantage of basic data accumulaed by the Department in various river basin studies. Short range operating plans are developed by community watersheds in priority order within the river sub-basin. This concept has been in a transitional stage for several years anticipating the eventual enactment by the Congress of small watershed legislation such as Public Law 566 in 1954.

The Department of the Interior is now ready to gear its watershed program with the small watershed program of the Department of Agriculture. In fact, initial work by the two departments is already underway in several watersheds having substantial areas of public land.

In the grazing districts watershed protection operations are now in progress in 128 community watersheds. Plans for fiscal year 157 include 137 community watersheds. The objective is to complete all needed conservation work before moving into the next priority watershed. Several completely treated pilot watersheds are under continuing study as a means of guiding future planning and operations in other watersheds. We have great hopes for the success of this program. If we can lick a problem like the one in the Rio Puerco drainage area in New Mexico—and we're licking it—this hope is justified. The 6,000-acre Rio Puerco watershed has been overgrazed literally for centuries—since the time of Coranado—and to say that its soil is badly depleted is an understatement. The river, emptying into Elephant Butte Reservoir, carries 56 percent of the reservoir's silt yet provides only 8 percent of its water. Work will continue on the Rio Puerco during the span of our 20-year program and by 1975 we'll have stabilized this area and learned a lot in the accomplishment.

Before I close I would like to say a few words about water. No element in this world is more important to us, not only as land users but ordinary citizens as well, than water. And this Nation is fast approaching a water crisis. The administration has formulated a comprehensive water policy to cope with this crisis. It was sent to the Congress last week by President Eisenhower and deserves your careful study.

In this brief report I have touched on a number of phases of our work at the Department of the Interior that I thought members of the American Society of Range Management would be especially interested in. However, in discussing the control, management, and use of our public lands we must always keep in mind the broad view—that our greatest asset of all is a strong, upright, free citizenry, the kind of people envisioned by our forefathers when they wrote the Constitution with its limited powers of Government. Such a citizenry can be developed—not by bureaucratic control, but by use of its capabilities through encouraging wise use of our great natural resources. Our public lands are a great heritage. Let us make sure that future generations find the range and the other God-given natural resources that go to make up this heritage wisely conserved, improved, and developed for their use and enjoyment.

Bestiality of Red China Communists Now Fully Exposed—Red China Must Not Be Admitted to United Nations—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the first article of a series now running in the Washington Daily News on the subject to Red bestiality toward American citizens imprisoned by the Chinese Communists.

The second article is inserted at this point:

FIVE YEARS OF TORTURE—THERE WAS NOBODY AT THE HOSPITAL TO TAKE OVER THINGS

(Second of a series)

(By John Troan)

PITTSBURGH, January 31.—Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw, medical missionary who landed in a Red prison because he's an American, was advised by the United States consul in Hong Kong to leave in May 1949, a good 22 months before the Reds seized him and his wife and tossed them into jail.

"But there was nobody at the hospital to take over things," Dr. Bradshaw recalls. "I just couldn't leave."

The hospital was the one at Linhsien, 250 miles above Canton. The Pittsburgh physician was operating it on behalf of the American Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Bradshaw and his wife, Wilda, a dietitian, had been Presbyterian missionaries since 1928, serving all their time in southeast China.

Things didn't seem so bad for a while. But by 1949 the Red tide was swirling over Free China.

It was then that some of the members of the American colony at Linhsien "went home expeditiously," as Dr. Bradshaw puts it. But the Bradshaws stayed on, along with a nurse, Miss Sarah Perkins, of Tennille, Ga., now 63, and a few others.

Canton, a neighbor of Hong Kong, fell to the Communists a few months later. But the Reds did not move on Linhsien "until the night of the 6 and 7 of December, 1949."

"The military came in first," Dr. Bradshaw relates. "They were not too bad.

"For example, they had to have space for their troops and wanted to take over the church for this. But we talked them out of it.

"Of course, our best talking point was the fact that 100 wounded soldiers were being cared for at the hospital. And we told

them the church belonged to the same group the hospital did."

RED TROOPS LEFT IN MARCH, 1950

The Red troops moved out of the town in March, 1950, a year before the Bradshaws were seized. And the civilian authorities—the agents of the Communist "People's Republic"—moved in.

Dr. Bradshaw says it was incredible how the Red officials went about "converting" the native teachers at the mission. By the opening of the fall school term, he says, the Communists had "infiltrated" both the grade and the high school and had started stirring up the students against all foreigners.

"On September 16, 1950, Mrs. Bradshaw and I made official application to leave," the doctor recalls. The Communist authorities demanded "a local guarantor."

"This had to be a local Chinese who would certify that we were not spies," Dr. Bradshaw explains. "We had no trouble getting one and on September 26 we sent in a second letter with the endorsement of a local guarantor.

"We were then told it would take about a month to get a permit to leave."

But the permit never came.

HE WROTE TO POLICE CHIEF THREE TIMES

Three times—"on November 27, 1950, and December 26, 1950, and January 7, 1951"—Dr. Bradshaw wrote to "the local bandit chief—excuse me, I was more polite then, and called him the chief of police."

"I reminded him of our request to leave, but he gave us the same acknowledgment for all letters—a stony silence."

Meanwhile, real trouble was brewing for the Bradshaws.

One afternoon, the doctor asked Miss Perkins, the nurse, to go over to the church with him "to practice a song we were going to sing together the following Sunday at the church service."

The piano was out of tune so Dr. Bradshaw asked the mission mechanic to go along and see if he could "fix it up." (The mechanic later was reported to have ended his life in a Communist prison.)

When the three arrived, however, they discovered the students attending a Communist rally—in the church auditorium.

Dr. Bradshaw says he and the nurse and the mechanic waited around. But when it looked like the meeting would never end, they gave up and went home.

"Meanwhile," the doctor says, "Communist interlopers among the students stirred them up by telling the students we were trying to bust up the meeting."

THEY PARADED THROUGH THE HOUSE

To Dr. Bradshaw, all of this was more or less like shadowboxing.

"But on January 19, 1951, came the McCoy," he says. "The 'home guard'—about 9 or 10 of them—came over to our residence and paraded through the house for an hour.

"They claimed they were looking for a radio transmitter. But all they found was a small gasoline-driven powerplant which I had got in May 1949, to operate an X-ray machine.

"I could never use it, though, because the British technician who agreed to install it was refused a travel permit by the Communists."

Dr. Bradshaw says the Commies "pasted a piece of paper" on the equipment and told him it had been "sealed off by the Government" so he couldn't use it.

The next night, he says, "another dozen or so Reds walked in again and gave the house a real going over."

This time, they sealed up his radio receiving set "and took a few papers out of our files."

Next came a student demonstration, during which tombstones in the foreign burial plot were wrecked.

Some of his native friends, incidentally, stuck by him as much as they dared even when the going got rough.

In fact, 5 months before Dr. Bradshaw and his wife were seized, "one of our Chinese friends told me I wouldn't be permitted to leave China because I had been in the United States Air Force and the Communists didn't like the Air Force."

Address by Ralph A. Tudor Before the National Conference on Water Resources Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, former Under Secretary of the Interior, Ralph A. Tudor, now president of the Tudor Engineering Co. of San Francisco, delivered an informative address before the National Conference on Water Resources Policy in St. Louis on January 25, 1956. Mr. Tudor's text was titled "Partnership in Water Resources Development and Conservation." The text of his address is as follows:

The concept of partnership in the development and conservation of the Nation's water resources has become a lively subject for discussion and debate during the past 2 or 3 years, and will be one of the prominent issues during the coming political campaign.

While the principles involved are to me quite simple, I am aware that a great many people are honestly very confused in the matter. They hear of the "tragedy of exploitation by big business" and then of "dictation by the bureaucrats and socialists." They hear of absentee ownership in Wall Street on the one hand, and in Washington on the other. They hear of "local rights" versus the "rights of all the people." I sometimes wonder if the debates of these issues and the resolution of the attendant political philosophies has not become more vital to many parties than the business of getting ahead with the Nation's construction progress and prosperity.

This confusion can, I believe, be reduced to a few simple and understandable questions that keep repeating themselves whenever the subject is discussed. These questions are:

1. What is meant by "partnership" insofar as developing our water resources is concerned?

2. Why should the Nation undertake a new method of developing its water resources?

3. Will this method work or is it just a fancy dream?

4. If others than Government agencies develop our water resources, how can proper conservation of these resources be assured?

These are very fair and reasonable questions and deserve to be answered. And the answers must be just and fair and reasonable. More particularly the answers must be clear and understandable. Actually the answers are not difficult to find or to state.

The response to the first question in this matter is that whenever local interests, be they private or public, are able to develop a water resource, they should do so and be permitted to do so without interference by the Federal Government other than reasonable regulations. When local interests are not able by themselves to complete a justified water resource development, the Federal Government should join with those interests and fairly assist them. When projects cannot be handled even in part by local interests and these projects are fully justified in the national interest, then and only then should the Federal Government undertake the whole project.

The answer to the question of why should the Nation undertake a new method of developing its water resource is very simply that this method is not at all new. This partnership is nearly as old as the Nation itself and has been employed innumerable times. The newness is not in the principle of partnership, but rather in the opposition to the principle.

The next question is a concern as to whether the partnership principle will work or if, perhaps, it might not be just a fancy dream. The answer has almost been given in the response to the second question. The very fact that partnership has been used so many times and is continuing to be used on new projects starting even now is the best proof that it is workable, practical, and successful. If it had been a failure it would not have been repeated again and again over such a long period of time.

Finally, there is the question of effecting sound conservation of the water resources if parties other than the Federal Government are permitted to develop them. To ask this question is to forget the regulatory functions performed by various established Government agencies or to assume these agencies do not fairly carry out their responsibilities. There is adequate Government regulatory authority and machinery to assure the application of proper conservation principles when any development is undertaken by private interests at least. If there is any weakness in this regulation, it is in the lack of aedquate regulation of the agencies of the Federal Government itself and, in some instances, of local public bodies.

What I have said really completes my talk. I have nothing more to add except some emphasis. And to me there is no more understandable or irrefutable way to supply this emphasis than to cite some historical and current examples of the application of the partnership principle. The list is amazingly long and varied.

Since partnership in hydroelectric power projects is probably the most vigorously debated item, let us look at its historical record. It goes way back to at least 1897 when the Federal Government built a navigation dam on the Kentucky River. This dam was capable of producing power, but machinery was not installed until 1926 when the Kentucky Utilities Co.—a private utility—was granted a license by the Federal Power Commission. The utility pays the Government for the falling water.

By 1953 there were at least 26 time-tested examples of partnership on this basis where the Federal Government built the dam and local interests installed the power facilities. The Government dams were for navigation, reclamation, flood control, or debris control. These plants are in 13 different States from Vermont to Florida on the east coast, and Washington to California on the west. The local partners include 14 public bodies, 10 private utilities, and 2 industrial users. Twelve partnership agreements have been concluded during Republican administration, and 14 during Democratic administration. These projects are tabulated in the accompanying table.

Partnership projects before 1953

State	Project name	Federal purpose	Power licensee or operator	Year of license or installation	Administration
Utah	Spanish Fork [1]	Reclamation	Water users	1908	T. Roosevelt.
Arizona	Roosevelt	do	do	1909	Taft.
Nevada	Lahontan	do	do	1911	Do.
Arizona	South Consolidated.	do	do	1912	Do.
Do	Arizona Falls	do	do	1913	Wilson.
Do	Cross Cut	do	do	1914	Do.
Washington	Rocky Ford	do	do	1916	Do.
Oregon	Link River	do	California-Oregon Power Co.	1917	Do.
Arizona	Chandler	do	Water users	1919	Do.
New York	Green Island	Navigation	Henry Ford & Sons, Inc.	1921	Do.
Minnesota	Twin City	do	Ford Motor Co.	1923	Coolidge.
Florida	Moss Bluff	do	Florida Power Co.	1924	Do.
Kentucky	Ohio Falls	do	Louisville Gas & Electric	1925	Do.
Do	United States Dam 7.	do	Kentucky Utility Co.	1926	Do.
Arizona	Morman Flat	Reclamation	Water users	1926	Do.
Do	Horse Mexa	do	do	1927	Do.
Do	Stewart mountain.	do	do	1930	Hoover.
Colorado	Grand Valley	do	do	1932	Do.
West Virginia	Marmet	Navigation	Kanawha Valley Power Co.	1934	F. Roosevelt.
Do	London	do	do	1934	Do.
Do	Winfield	do	do	1936	Do.
Oregon	C Canal Drop	Reclamation	Water users	1938	Do.
California	All-American Canal.	do	do	1941	Do.
Do	Narrows	Debris control	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	1941	Do.
Oregon	Cove	Reclamation	Pacific Power & Light Co.	1946	Truman.
Vermont	Waterbury	Flood control	Green Mountain Power Corp.	1951	Do.

[1] 3 plants.

Another project of large size and complication that attests to the practicability of the partnership principle is the construction of a series of dams on the Grand River in Oklahoma. This was started in 1937 and has been carried on under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. The most recent addition to this series of projects was successfully pushed through Congress by Senator KERR.

In 1937 the Federal Government loaned $16,200,000 and granted $10,800,000 to the Grand River Dam Authority to build the Pensacola dam. This was a flood control and power project. The Federal Power Commission issued a license to the Authority to install 90,000 kilowatts. Ownership of the entire project in this instance was in the hands of a local public agency.

Some years later the Federal Government alone built the Fort Gibson Dam also on the Grand River, and Congress provided that it should be operated in cooperation with the locally owned Pensacola Dam.

Finally in 1954 Senator KERR of Oklahoma gained a favorable vote in Congress on the Markham Ferry Dam—the third unit of this combined project. This legislation was supported by President Eisenhower, and when passed was approved by him.

The Markham Ferry Dam and Reservoir will be built, owned, and operated by the Grand River Dam Authority. The Federal Government will contribute to the Authority not to exceed $6,500,000 to pay for the flood control features of the project. Flood control operation will be in accordance with rules established by the Army engineers and to assure coordinated operation of the other two dams. The remaining cost of the project, estimated at about $32 million, will be provided by the Authority from the sale of revenue bonds secured by power revenues from this and other facilities of the Authority.

Thus there is here a partnership involving the coordinated operation of three dams built in the interests of flood control and power generation, with one dam built, owned, and operated by local interests using loaned and granted Federal funds; a second dam built, owned, and operated by the Federal Government; and a third dam to be built, owned, and operated by local interests with funds partially supplied by the Federal Government and the remainder by the local interests.

At Priest Rapids on the Columbia River in Washington, another partnership plan has been authorized. This project was earlier (1950) approved by Congress for Federal development. It is large and was estimated in 1950 to cost $364 million, of which $65 million would be for flood control, $10 million for navigation, and $289 million for power production.

In this instance the legislation, which was passed by the 83d Congress and approved by President Eisenhower in 1954, authorizes a local public utility district to develop the project. Its plan must be approved and a license issued by the Federal Power Commission to assure optimum development of the resource.

The legislation provides that if the Federal Government requires the local utility district to include navigation and flood-control facilities as a part of the initial construction, the cost allocated to these features will be paid for by the Federal Government in the form of a contribution to the district. If such features are not included in the initial construction, the district is required to provide basic features for future installation of these features and the cost of these basic facilities will be at the district's expense. Thus according to present cost estimates, the local district would finance approximately $289 million of the cost, and only if the Federal Government requires initial inclusion of navigation and flood-control facilities will it participate in the cost. This Federal participation is now estimated at a maximum of $75 million.

An unusual partnership provision in the legislation is authority for the local district to have the Army engineers act as the construction agency since the district is relatively small and has no adequate construction organization of its own.

One of the most interesting of the proposals under consideration by Congress is that of the John Day Dam on the lower Columbia River where it forms the boundary between the States of Oergon and Washington. This is a navigation and power dam estimated by the Army engineers to cost $310 million of which approximately $273 million would be allocated to power production.

A group of local utilities have proposed that they advance to the Federal Government the full cost of the power allocation and that in return they receive the power from the project for a period of 50 years, less any power needed to operate the dam and its locks. In effect these utilities would pay in advance for their power, and this advance payment would be used to pay for construction. Ownership and operation of the dam would remain with the Federal Government. The Federal contribution would be about $37 million.

The leigslation under consideration is such that any local utility wishing to do so may participate in the proposal, and if there are more applicants for power than there is power available, allocation is to be made by the Federal Power Commission. It also provides that the local utilities must pay their proportionate share of the costs of operation and maintenance of the power facilities and portions of the joint project costs allocated to power.

This plan has the merit of providing the navigation facilities which are badly needed now, and the power which the Pacific Northwest will surely need in a few years, without the delay that is inherent in waiting for large Federal appropriations.

It is significant to note that for the Priest Rapids and John Day projects on the Columbia River the Federal Government would be expected to invest an estimated $684 million exclusive of transmission-line costs, and to pay all maintenance and operating expenses unless some partnership arrangement is worked out. It is unlikely that this amount of money will be appropriated by Congress for this one geographical area without extended delay. If, on the other hand, the two partnership plans described above are effected, the Federal contribution will not exceed $112 million. If navigation and flood-control facilities are excluded in the Priest Rapids Dam, the Federal contribution will be nearer $37 million. This is a much more likely amount to expect Congress to appropriate in the reasonably near future.

In northern California there is a proposal to develop the upper reaches of the Trinity River for power and irrigation. The Bureau of Reclamation has a plan which is estimated to cost $219,067,000. Of this amount $156,528,000 would be allocated to power and the remainder to irrigation, municipal and industrial water, and fish and wildlife protection.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has made a proposal that it build all the powerplants and transmission facilities under the existing licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act in very much the same manner as was done in those numerous cases described in the first part of this talk. According to the company estimates, this would reduce the Federal investment by some $50 million and during the 50-year license period it would pay the Government $3,500,000 per year for the use of the falling water to generate power. This is estimated by the company to be $36 million more net revenue than the Federal Government would receive from power sales if it does its own generating and sells at existing Federal rates in this area. In addition, the company estimates it will pay $135 million in taxes, of which $70 million would be Federal and $65 million to State and local governing bodies.

This project was authorized just before the Congress adjourned in 1955. The authorization includes a condition that the Department of the Interior fully investigate the proposal of the company and report to Congress on this phase of the plan within 18 months.

The Hoover Dam project has partnership features worthy of note. The dam was built by the Federal Government. The power generating facilities are financed by the Government, but are only installed when local

interests make firm contracts for long-time purchases of the energy and provide the transmission lines at their own expense. These local interests are both public and private.

There are innumerable navigation projects in which local interests join with the Federal Government. The most usual responsibility of the local interests is to provide the areas into which the material dredged from the channel may be deposited. Local interests often provide other contributions. One such partnership arrangement may be found at Portland, Oreg. In this instance the Port of Portland provides a large dredge which is available to the Army engineers for channel dredging as needed and costs are shared. The port also provides deposit areas for the dredged material.

I must admit that I am a bit confused when the opponents of the partnership principle of developing our water resources contend that this is a natural resource that should not be touched by our free-enterprise system. I fail to understand why it is wrong to permit private enterprise, under fair regulation, to manufacture electricity from falling water. If this is wrong then it must similarly be wrong for private enterprise to use coal, or oil, or atomic energy to manufacture electricity, for all of these are also natural resources.

If to generate electricity from natural resources by private enterprise is wrong, then isn't it equally wrong to permit private enterprise to cut trees for lumber, mine minerals, or even use the soil to grow crops? Is there something separate and peculiar about our water resources that justify the application of a basically different set of rules and principles to their development than are applicable to our other natural resources?

I cannot satisfy myself that this is the case. I strongly believe that it is equally proper for local enterprises—public and private—to participate fully in the development of all our natural resources under fair and proper regulations.

The record of partnership in natural resource development is long and it is successful. It deserves more extended application rather than less, for if we are to proceed with needed development of our water resources it will require the combined efforts of all agencies—Federal, local public, and private.

The Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving considerable correspondence in opposition to the natural gas bill which is presently being debated by the other body. I know that the opponents of this measure are having a very difficult time of it because the public interest is not represented by any lobby in the Congress, whereas the gas interests are.

I am, therefore, grateful for the support that is being accorded my opposition to the pending bill such as received in the form of a resolution adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors.

In accordance with my previous statements and with the sense of that resolution, I reiterate my most vigorous opposition to the present legislation which seeks to nullify the existing law as enunciated by the United States Supreme Court.

I submit herewith the very helpful resolution adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors:

Whereas in 1954 the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate prices under the Natural Gas Act attached at the wellhead where gas is produced; and

Whereas the Harris-Fulbright bill would overcome the effect of that decision and exempt independent gas producers and gatherers so that the authority of the Commission would not attach until the gas is delivered at the depots of interstate carriers; and

Whereas the present regulation keeps prices down and that to remove it would up prices for ultimate consumers at distant points from the gas fields; and

Whereas an increase in the amount of gas bills would have an undesirable impact on the cost of living of the citizens of Erie County, many of whom are in the lower-income brackets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors memorialize the Congress of the United States to oppose this bill which would ultimately cause an undue burden upon the taxpayer; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors forward copies of this resolution to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate, to the following Representatives, Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Hon. EDMUND P. RADWAN, Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, and to the following Senators, Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN and Hon. IRVING M. IVES.

ALFORD J. FARLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

America's Shortage of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, an article in the New York Times describes the tremendous shortage of engineers now afflicting American business and industry.

It is excellent from the standpoint of young engineering graduates, no doubt, for them to find their services in sharp demand. No one begrudges them the benefits they gain from the competition between companies for their skills and knowledge.

It should be a sobering thing for the country, from the standpoint of national defense, to realize that we have more than twice as many job vacancies existing right now than the graduating college classes of engineers of this year can be expected to fill.

We are short of engineers and scientists for technical work. We are short of scientists for pure research. We are short of engineers and scientists in private industry and business, short of engineers and scientists for Government.

And all the time, the Soviet Union is pouring out more and more graduate scientists and engineers, cutting down on the quantitative lead we have previously held. The difference is now very small; it is growing smaller; the advantage soon will be with the Soviet power bloc.

Mr. Speaker, the President has belatedly recognized that our trained medical personnel is inadequate to meet the country's health needs. In his fourth year of office he has belatedly recommended a program he previously refused to support, a Democratic program for Federal grants to increase facilities for medical research and for training physicians, dentists, and other health personnel.

He has not yet acknowledged in any concrete form the country's desperate shortage of engineers and scientists.

The engineering schools and the great schools of science in our colleges and universities need Federal assistance to expand their facilities. They may need much more than that; this much, at least, they should have, and very quickly.

It would be extremely welcome if the proper departments would get the President to follow his message on health with another message, supplementing his education program by proposing Federal grants to encourage the speedy education of more scientific and engineering manpower.

Without objection, I offer the article from the New York Times:

(By Wayne Phillips)

In America today the engineer-scientist is king.

There are 5,000 organizations bidding for his services, and they have 50,000 job openings—twice as many as the number of new graduates expected this June.

Salaries are climbing—twice as high at the bottom as a decade ago, and rocketing out of sight at the top. Noncash inducements, pyramiding one atop the other, include moving expenses, free insurance, medical care, and education.

The companies concerned don't like to talk about it; they wish it were not so. They try to hold back the tidal wave of wage increases. They try to cushion the raiding of competitors. They minimize what often is desperation.

But the fact is that a wild scramble unlike anything the country has ever seen before is on to attract and hold technical personnel.

It is a scramble described by those caught in the middle of it as "panic," "frenzy," "chaos" and "stampede." And it is a competition waged with the vocabulary of war—"recruiters," "task forces," "invasions," "raids," "crash programs" and "logistics."

THREE THOUSAND DOLLAR BOUNTY OFFERED

All the characteristics of a situation in which the supply is short have cropped up. Companies are accused of inflating their needs and "squirreling away" talent against the future. Others are busy finding substitutes—less highly trained personnel who can take over routine duties.

A new profession has been born—the technical recruiter. Half technician and half personnel man, he tours the country in task forces, invading campuses in search of promising young students and raiding the staffs of competitors.

A new business has been created, the sale of services to aid in the search. Publishers, research organizations, advertising firms, and employment agencies are cashing in.

So, too, are the colleges and the universities, the professors, and the placement officers. Companies have been lavish with grants to institutions training technical personnel, and are liberal with cash and favors for educators.

The thin line between an honest interest in aiding the education of badly needed technical personnel and paying cash for the delivery of that personnel has become smudged. One company offers institutions $3,000 for every graduate it gets.

In the pirating of skilled men from other companies and activities there are no holds barred. Advertising in newspapers, through the mail and on television continually tries to lure the dissatisfied, the frustrated, the ambitious.

Every engineer or scientist a company employs is a potential recruiter, and he in turn is the target for his counterpart in another company. At social gatherings, over the telephone, at professional meetings—wherever engineers and scientists meet—the recruiting goes on.

The reason for the present situation is deep-rooted. The United States has entered upon a new age, the age of technology. The military forages on the frontiers of science, and civilians live in a mechanical wonderland.

To design and build hydrogen bombs and intercontinental ballistic missiles and earth satellites takes armies of engineers. And so, too, does the production of radar kitchens, television sets, computers, and mechanical monsters to vend cigarettes.

In 1900 United States industry employed 1 engineer for every 250 employees; in 1950 it was 1 for 60. Then came the Korean war, and the demand for technical personnel started on an upward swing that has not yet been checked.

A company like General Electric had in 1953, 1 engineer for every 15 employees; today it is closer to 1 in 10. With about 18,000 technical employees now, it needs 2,000 more. To get them it has only two sources, newly trained men and those already working in the field.

INFLUENCING THE EMBRYO

The effort to attract the embryo engineer begins when he is in high school—through literature telling of the advantages of a technical career, and by helping good students to enroll in good colleges.

It continues throughout college in the form of scholarships, fellowships, research grants, summer employment and trips to plants "to get acquainted." One company went so far as to hire selected college seniors and let them continue in school full time until they had graduated.

As graduation nears the efforts become intense. The student is bombarded with direct mail appeals. There are advertisements in the student newspapers—eight of them appeared in a recent issue of Lehigh University's Brown and White. And there are visits—at company expense—from recent graduates urging former schoolmates to follow in their footsteps.

The climax comes in the interview season from February to April, when companies beslege the campuses to sign up the June graduates not already committed. Columbia University has more than 250 such visits scheduled this spring—nearly as many as it has graduates seeking positions.

Some companies send recruiting teams of as many as 8 men to stay for 2 or 3 days—and on a given day as many as 10 companies may be talking to Columbia students.

Open money competition is avoided. The recruiters stress the intellectual challenge of their companys' work, the security it offers, the living advantages of areas where its plants are located, and opportunities for advancement.

But even so the rate for the starting and inexperienced engineer has jumped from $200 a month a decade ago to $300 3 years ago to more than $400 today.

THE RAIDS ARE STAGED

Companies cannot get all the technical personnel they need from the annual crop of graduates. The rest of their requirements are sought from competitors in industry, from college and university staffs, from Government laboratories, and from the Armed Forces.

The methods they use are not unusual—personal contact, field recruiting, advertising, professional placement services, and employment agencies. It is the intensity with which they are used that is new.

The companies have learned that its best recruiters are satisfied persons who work for them—engineers and scientists who will by word of mouth and personal letters attract their compatriots in other activities. No Machiavellian maneuver is left untried in encouraging such recruiting.

Advertising in newspapers and professional journals for technical personnel is heavier now than ever before—and has overflowed from classified sections to display ads in the news, business, sports, and other sections.

Teams of field recruiters are kept continually on the move by some companies, invading areas where there are heavy concentrations of engineers. There they set up shop in a hotel room, run an ad in the newspapers, sit back and hope for the telephone to ring.

One such team made forays within the last few weeks to Los Angeles, Oakland, Dallas, Fort Worth, Philadelphia, Boston, Atlanta, Miami, Pensacola, Seattle, Spokane, and El Paso—looking for engineers to work at a relatively small plant in Utica.

All these efforts are concentrated wherever professional meetings bring together a large number of skilled technicians.

The American Institute of Physics opens tomorrow at the New Yorker Hotel. Ten thousand physicists from all over the country will be there. And the meeting will be, in the words of one personnel worker, "the biggest flesh market in the world."

In the New York Times this morning there are more than 15 pages of advertising for technical personnel, both display and classified. It is spread from the regular help-wanted columns through the sports, financial, and Review of the Week sections. And much of it is aimed directly at those who will be at the meeting tomorrow.

The advertisements do not mention the meeting by name. But they are appeals from companies that could use the skills of those attending it. And many of them, far from New York, offer New York interviews during the period of the meeting.

Some attempt to regularize this stampede for technical talent is made by the placement service of the American Institute of Physics, a year-round operation.

It has prepared a directory of the qualifications of 217 physicists who are openly looking for jobs—fewer than 10 of them currently unemployed. And it has reservations from 300 employers who want to interview these men—or any others.

One company is sending a team of 15 recruiters, another a dozen. To provide space for this army the service has taken over two floors of the hotel for interview rooms—and expects an overflow.

The cost of such intensive recruiting is great, but companies are reluctant to say how great.

One concern that maintains a year-round recruiting activity in New York estimated its cost at $1,000 for every man hired—exclusive of moving costs. Another company sent 3 executives to New York recently, hired a hotel suite for 4 days, advertised extensively, and said it would be happy to return with 1 good engineer.

The result of it all has been a bonanza for technical personnel and for those who have found a way to contribute to the search for them.

AVERAGE PLACEMENT: $7,200

Engineering Societies Personnel Service, Inc., a nationwide service cooperating with professional societies, found its average placement last year was at $7,200 to $7,500 a year.

The year before the average placement was at $6,800 and 2 years before, $5,600. Already this year the service has placed 2 men at $18,000 and a third at $22,000—and has a list of jobs in the $18,000–$20,000 range that are going begging for lack of qualified men.

Commercial employment agencies are expanding their activities in the field. New agencies are cropping up. And companies report that some of them are demanding retainers as the price of even launching a search for a needed man.

Publishers, too, are benefited. The income from technical employment advertising is not small. For a college publication it is a windfall. For a metropolitan newspaper it is a hotly contested plum. Other publishers have moved into the field to make money by publishing directories financed by company advertising to be circulated to the career-shopping student.

Advertising agencies also profit, and some have appeared that specialize in such campaigns. One, Deutsch & Shea, of New York, maintains a research department to find and tap soft spots in the employment market.

EDUCATIONAL INDUCEMENTS

Big profits have been reaped by the educational institutions and those who work for them. Scholarships and fellowships have been set up. Professorial chairs have been endowed. Faculty members receive retainerships to serve as corporation consultants. Research projects are financed.

Summer work is provided for the college professor or the high school science teacher. Summer study is sponsored for them. They and the personnel directors of universities are invited on plush tours of company facilities and to expense-paid conferences where they get better acquainted.

Ostensibly this is all in the interest of better education. But its close link to influencing the minds of those who influence the students' choice of employment is lost on no one—and deplored by some. It is they, also, who deplore the effect of the competition on the young engineer.

Many of the technical students are confused and bewildered by the attention lavished upon them, the placement director of a large university reported. The transition from sought-after undergraduate to working employee is not always easy. And the discovery that high starting salaries sometimes imply slow future increases is painful.

But, he was quick to add, the disillusioned and dissatisfied graduate can always find his way to another and possibly greener pasture—as long as the present shortage continues.

Government Should Provide Disaster and Flood Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee is now conducting hearings on several disaster and flood insurance bills that have been introduced in this session.

The terrible destruction caused by the 1955 floods in the Northeastern States and in California has resulted in an open market for such insurance, but private companies are unable to offer the neces-

sary protection due to the enormous risk factor.

It is apparent that private citizens and private enterprise cannot for long sustain such great economic losses without it having an extremely detrimental effect on the overall economic condition of some of the Nation's most productive areas.

I am sure that private insurance companies are sympathetic to the need for such insurance, but cannot accept risks that might bring about bankruptcy and destroy the protection against other losses presently being given existing policyholders.

Therefore, I think it is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government to meet this need by providing disaster insurance. With this view in mind, I have filed a bill that will provide for an insurance and reinsurance program for citizens and business.

Farmers Not Covered by Extensively Advertised "Blanket of Good Times"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a Texas county judge which sets forth deeply disturbing facts about the situation faced by farmers in his area.

That situation is not, I am afraid, peculiar to those farmers. It exists on an alarming scale in agricultural regions all over the country.

Farmers simply are not receiving a fair share of the national income. The sad results of that fact are set forth plainly in the letter written me by the Honorable Merrill L. Connally, county judge of Wilson County, in south central Texas. I ask unanimous consent that Judge Connally's moving report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLORESVILLE, TEX., *January 21, 1956.*
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Office of the Democratic Leader,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In answer to your previous request I give you the following information to keep you abreast of conditions in this county and surrounding counties in this area.

It is a fact that we in Wilson County now have on the relief rolls (surplus commodities program) 178 families (772 individuals). This number is rapidly increasing as the drought condition continues its stranglehold on our people. In Karnes County, our neighbor to the south, as of January 13, 1956, they had 1,500 families on their rolls representing over 7,000 of their 17,000 population.

In view of this great wave of national well-being and prosperity we find ourselves outside this blanket of good times that we are continuously reminded of through the press and by our administration.

It might interest you to know that by and large the aforementioned recipients are our farmers and our stock farmers who were once not only their own bread winners but a part of that great segment of farmers known as the bread winners of our Nation.

Most concerned and sincerely,

MERRILL L. CONNALLY,
County Judge.

Latest Land Purchases Push Battle To Save Vital Watersheds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner of Saturday evening, January 28, 1956:

LATEST LAND PURCHASES PUSH BATTLE TO SAVE VITAL WATERSHEDS

"To rule the mountain is to rule the river."

An old proverb attributed to the Chinese, that statement is a good "rule of the thumb" for staying alive in all semiarid lands.

It was good advice for the people of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Lebanon, and for the people of China, who are apparently better at giving advice than acting wisely.

In all of those countries, and many more, great civilizations have died because they abused the mountains that supplied the water for their streams.

It is also good advice for the people of Weber, Davis, Box Elder, and Cache Counties in particular, Utah and the United States in general.

Here the wisdom of controlling the source of our water supply has been recognized. Action has been and will be taken. Our forests will not disappear as did the 2,000 square mile forests of Lebanon that flourished in the time of Solomon.

Archaeologists, 20 centuries hence, will not root our cities out from beneath 50 feet of soil, as they have done 11 Mesopotamian empires.

CONSERVATION REMEDY

Soil conservation, particularly in the high watersheds that feed water to our fields and bathtubs, is recognized as the only weapon to combat the evil of erosion.

Modern scientists, Soil Conservation people, Forest Service members, and others early recognized the symptoms of erosion along the Wasatch front.

Before action was taken, though, many of the watersheds that serve the people from Wellsville and Brigham City on the north to Bountiful on the south were already in bad shape.

It didn't take an expert to recognize something was wrong in the early 1920's, when a sudden heavy downpour sent boulders, trees, and tons of silt down on Willard and Farmington crushing homes and covering farms with several feet of rock, sand, and silt.

It was evident that water which once soaked in around the matted roots of heavy vegetation on the mountain slopes now hit bare soil and started rolling hellbent for the Great Salt Lake. The water carried giant portions of topsoil with it.

Those catastrophes which took eight lives were reenacted time after time along the Wasatch front.

NEW PIPELINE

Ogden ran a pipeline up Ogden Canyon to take culinary water from Snow Basin watershed. Officials found that a heavy runoff left the water to filthy with topsoil it couldn't be used for a shower, let alone to cook with.

Oldtimers in Liberty and Eden noticed that, besides the destructive floods that roared out of North Fork Canyon with every heavy rain, their late summer water supply was only half as great then as 50 years earlier.

What happened to the vegetation on the important watersheds? Some of it was destroyed by fire, most of it was gnawed away by sheep and cattle. It was privately owned land subject only to the will of the owner.

It was a typical late-summer storm that triggered action to correct the condition in Weber County. It fell on August 19, 1945.

A young man just out of the Army had bought a farm on the north edge of Ogden. A cloudburst roared out of Cold Water Canyon across the farm and a canal and down to Harrison Boulevard, spewing boulders, debris, and dirt in its path.

Not only conservationists but everybody was concerned. The next spring, A. L. Christensen, Weber County agent, called a meeting of officials and civic-minded groups at the site of the most recent catastrophe—the ruined farm.

NAME COMMITTEE

Julian Heppler, representing the Kiwanis Club at the meeting, was appointed chairman of a committee to investigate the condition and to take action.

The committee called in the Soil Conservation Service for an appraisal of the watersheds. The committee found the mountainsides in serious shape and recommended they be retired from grazing use and held for a higher use—watershed protection.

A second meeting was called on October 2, 1946, at Liberty, where people living below Cutler Basin, were concerned over the danger of flood and of losing a dependable water supply.

By coincidence, there was a heavy rain that night and a flood rumbled down North Fork Creek. One man brought a jar of water to the meeting he had taken from his house tap. It was heavy with mud.

The next month, on November 20, 1946, the Weber County Watershed Protective Association was formed. It was the means to end erosion and destruction of watersheds above Weber County communities.

Mr. Christensen was the first chairman. Other members included Harold Welch, John M. Mills, Charles A. Halverson, John Whitely, R. R. Rowell, and Charles Empey.

SNOW BASIN TROUBLES

When Ogden's trouble with Snow Basin developed, the city bought most of the watershed, stopped grazing on it, and started its rehabilitation. Willard took similar action, purchasing Willard Basin. Both areas were rehabilitated and now hold precipitation nearly as well as if they had never been grazed.

But smaller communities, like Eden, Liberty, and North Ogden, didn't have the means to buy huge tracts of mountain land. And what about areas where only a farm or two were directly dependent on a watershed?

The Weber County Watershed Protective Association was the legal entity that could take appropriate action, buy, barter, and beg watershed land.

The Ogden Kiwanis Club, with conservation-minded Julian Heppler stimulating the

drive, raised the first money and pledged $2,000 to the corporation.

With that sum to begin with the Weber County Watershed Protective Association started a land purchasing project that hit a peak this week with purchase of 2,400 acres of land at the head of North Fork Creek for $1,700.

The corporation made its first purchase in 1947—2,115 acres on Mount Ben Lomond for $8,463. Since then the corporation, which of course gets nothing for its efforts, has either purchased or negotiated the purchase of 9,300 acres of land in Weber County.

To complete the immediate job, only 3,840 acres of land must be purchased.

OTHER COUNTIES BUY

Box Elder, Cache, and Davis Counties have had similar programs underway and all counties along the Wasatch front have taken about 50,000 acres of land out of private ownership.

Once bought from private owners, the land is either donated or sold to the United States Forest Service, which then manages the watersheds and takes whatever action is necessary to put it back in good shape.

The Weber County Watershed Corp. finances its purchase under a complicated, and sometimes precarious plan. Some of the money is donated, like that from the Kiwanis and other civic clubs, irrigation companies and others.

With that money the corporation buys the land and then resells it to the Forest Service, always at a loss.

Also, with the mountains within Cache National Forest, a small share of the receipts from sale of timber, summer home leases, etc., is turned over to it for purchases—when it's okay with Congress.

Congress can approve $10,000 yearly for purchase of land in Cache National Forest. However, since 1952 Congress has been reluctant to give that approval.

In 1953 no money was appropriated and since then special lobbying has been necessary to get it. And that money is needed to complete payments for land purchased by the corporation.

To complete purchase of land in critical condition in the four counties will require about $200,000.

ASK FEDERAL AID

Hoping to wind up the job, the combined watershed corporations plan to ask Congress for that amount this year, besides the regular $10,000 from forest receipts. They would spend $65,000 of it this year.

In the meantime, however, the Watershed Corp. is in a tight squeeze.

To make this week's purchase in North Fork Canyon, it drained the treasury of its last cash, $5,000. But it is obligated to pay an additional $12,000, divided into $5,000 this year and $7,000 in 2 years.

But the corporation doesn't have the money, Stanley Brewer, president, said. "And we won't get Federal help in time—if we get it."

Mr. Brewer said the corporation plans to start a countywide community drive to raise the funds and hopes to enlist the aid of civic clubs.

This week's purchase virtually guarantees restoration of Cutler Basin, the watershed area above Liberty and Eden.

At the same time the Weber County commissioners spent $45,000 for a slightly smaller acreage just below the basin. It will eventually be used for recreational purposes.

The upper area, according to Clark Anderson, forest ranger, is in bad shape and before it is completely restored an expensive terracing program will be necessary.

Besides Mr. Brewer, present members of the corporation include Orson Slack, vice president; Elmer Carver, secretary-treasurer; and John Woodfield, Charles Empey, Melvin Burningham, and John Whitely.

Tribute to Adolf C. Robison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1955, a memorable dinner was held at the Teaneck, N. J., Jewish Community Center honoring one of my most distinguished constituents, Adolf C. Robison. A capacity crowd of over 500 leading citizens attended this testimonial dinner to Mr. Robison. A very fine tribute to the infant State of Israel and to the guest of honor was given by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who was the principal speaker at the dinner. Those present purchased an estimated $190,000 of bonds for Israel.

Adolf C. Robison is no ordinary citizen. Among many other honors, he is an elected member of the governing body of the township of Teaneck—population about 40,000—which is considered by many to be one of America's most outstanding and progressive communities. Mr. Robison, who is a highly successful businessman, was introduced by his longtime friend, the Honorable Edward Silver, district attorney of Brooklyn, N. Y. Mr. Silver described the great work which Mr. Robison has done over a period of many years for Israel, for members of the Jewish faith and for humanity. He also pointed out that Mr. Robison is the great-great-grandson of a German immigrant and that his grandfather, a Civil War captain, was the first member of his faith ever awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Robison's remarks on the occasion were so typically modest and inspiring that I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

It is a strange paradox that at this moment, one of the most important in my entire life, there is a mixture both of deep appreciation of the honor you have bestowed upon me, and a profound feeling of the insignificance of any one person's efforts in a word-shaking and world-changing cause. In fact, as Mrs. Roosevelt knows better than anyone, a man's claim to fame as an individual is at best a tenuous and ephemeral one; it is only the cause to which he cleaves that make his work significant.

For the past generation we have been witnesses to and participants in several cataclysmic struggles—the growth and overthrow of fascism, the rising peril of another totalitarian tyranny, the twilight of colonialism, the awakening of the peoples of Africa and Asia from the feudal age. And, overshadowed perhaps in size, but not in its spiritual and intellectual portents, is the return of Jews from all corners of the earth to their ancient homeland and the rebirth of the State of Israel.

To have been a part of all this has been doubly exciting, because events that usually are spread over several hundred years have been telescoped into barely 50. Think of our own country—the first settlers in the 17th century, painfully carved out of the wilderness and subjected to continuous harassment from the Indians—the growing feeling during the 18th century that a colonial status was an intolerable one, culminating in our War of Independence—the rush of immigration from all parts of the world that characterized the 19th century, thus giving our country the manpower necessary for our unparalleled economic upsurgence of the 20th.

These 4 phases, which took us 4 centuries, have been covered by Israel within the short span of a man's lifetime. There are people living today who were present at the first Zionist conference in Basle in 1897 when Theodor Herzy proclaimed his unique program for the establishment of a Jewish State. It has been a continuing privilege for me to be able to play a small role in a struggle that normally would have required the labor of a dozen generations. Looking at the history of Israel during the past 10 years has been like watching a science motion picture short, where, in 1 minute you can see a plant bud, leaf out, and blossom into bright, shining flowers.

A question which is frequently asked me, and which I am sure you have often asked yourself is "What has all this to do with you? Why have you identified yourself with the problems of a little country 5,000 miles away?" The answer is not a simple one, and surely must vary from person to person. I think it not inappropriate on this occasion to explain my own motivations as well as I can unravel them; perhaps what I say will parallel your own thinking on this very complex subject.

To begin with, my ties are those of consanguinity. What do I mean by consanguinity? The dictionary says, "A state of being related by blood or descended from a common ancestor." It is that tie which has one invite family to a Passover, a Thanksgiving, a Christmas dinner; it is the bond which causes you to lend money to Uncle Dave who is starting up a new business; it is the link which sends mom over to Aunt Mary's for a week because she is ill and the children need someone to take care of them. It is the magic ingredient that causes sisters who have been separated when they were babies and who have lived in different countries for 40 years to feel a warm kinship when they are finally reunited.

The emotions and the duties of consanguinity have been extolled by every civilization, by every religion, by every code of ethics from time immemorial. There is a tacit awareness that this is not in substitution for or in diminution of our love for our neighbor, our caring about the needy of the community, or for that matter the starving children of India, but surely the universal approval of all mankind of the fulfillment of the duties of consanguinity is an impressive one.

Secondly, as a citizen of the free world in general and these United States of America in particular, I have a deep feeling of gratitude toward that handful of people in the Middle East who have been valiantly fighting our fight for the past 20 years. Historians are agreed that the two decisive battles of World War II in the European theater were Stalingrad and El Alamein. If the Nazis had broken through in either place, the war could well have been lost for us. It is a fact little known and less publicized that a substantial percentage of the British Eighth Army fighting there were Jewish volunteers from Palestine. In all, some 40,000 Jewish Palestinian volunteers out of a total Jewish population of 600,000 entered the war to fight on our side as against less than 2,000 Arab Palestinians from an Arab Palestinian population of nearly a million.

At Tobruk there was a Palestinian Jewish regiment that played a vital part in the defense and final victory at that strategic and hotly contested spot. So much so that Gen. Richard O'Connor stated that "The capture of Tobruk would have been impossible without the help of the units of the Palestinian regiment."

The Palestinian Jewish units were of equally vital importance during the battle of El Alamein. No less a military authority

than General Wavell was prompted to say to Gen. Gordon Young about these troops that "the success of the campaign was in no small measure due to the Jewish units that brought the essential war materials through to the front lines." Who can say? Perhaps these thousands of our forgotten allies so tipped the balance in these battles that 160 million Americans are free men today because of them.

We are now faced with a terrifyingly grim coalition of Communist totalitarianism and Arab feudalism, both antitheses of our democratic way of life. In that whole area, there is one country upon which we can depend if the chips are down, for harbor facilities, for repairs and replacements, for sources of strategic materials, for trained manpower; and that country is Israel. We would be poor students of history were we to ignore the past in drawing up our blueprint for the future.

It is gratifying to feel that the dollars we have pledged this evening for the purchase of Israel bonds will act as a safeguard not only for the future of Israel but of our own country as well.

And finally, I cannot escape the mystical feeling that this ingathering of the people of the book is a portent of great events to come. We are daily witnesses of earth-shattering happenings, physically in the splitting of the atom, economically in the ever increasing abundance of articles for our daily use and comfort, socially in the breaking of outmoded, time-worn bonds by the multitudes of the underprivileged peoples of the world.

Why not spiritually? Can anyone deny that the need was never more desperate in that portion of the globe in which Israel is located? It is no more coincidence that from the confines of what is now Israel sprang two world religions that have caused hundreds of millions of people throughout the last three millennia to lift their faces to the stars. Is it too much to dream is it too much to hope, for the entire Middle East or any area of the world where freedom and the rights of man are still only empty phrases, that from this sun-soaked, tradition-soaked, blood-soaked, soil, the answer to some of our present problems will be found?

One hundred and sixty-five years ago, George Washington wrote a letter to the congregation of the synagogue at Newport, R. I. Like so much of what he said and wrote, its contents are applicable today to the people of Israel, to their Arab neighbors and to men of goodwill all over the world. I would like to end with his closing paragraph. "May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the goodwill of the other inhabitants while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy."

Libya: Official Washington Notes Its Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the independence of Libya was marked yesterday by the Libyan Embassy. The United Kingdom of Libya was proclaimed a free and independent state on December 24, 1951. It was officially celebrated yesterday with the opening of the new Libyan Embassy quarters. The independence of Libya stemmed from a United Nations resolution of November 21, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to have visited Libya last December. I was deeply impressed by the spirit of its people, the dedicated character of its leaders, and the progress toward a better life for its people which it is making under very difficult circumstances. The United Kingdom of Libya lies along the Mediterranean Sea and is bounded on the east by Egypt and the Sudan; on the south by French, West, and Equatorial Africa; and on the west by Tunisia and south Algeria. The country covers an area of 680,000 square miles—about one-fourth the size of the United States. It is divided into three provinces: Tripolitania, Cyrenaica, and the Fezzan. The total population is about 1,500,000, with 75 percent engaged in farming. Farming is difficult because the land is scarce and the methods are not modern. The agricultural land represents 5 percent of the area of Libya, with 1 percent being arable and 4 percent grazing land. However, the Libyan Government, with the assistance of the United States, is making great strides in teaching new farming methods and attempting to get more land under cultivation. I am pleased to inform the House that the United States officials are doing a magnificent job. Ambassador John L. Tappin, the Deputy Chief of Missions David G. Nes, the Director of the ICA Mission Mr. Marcus Gordon are men of whom the State Department can be proud. Their tremendous interest in Libya and their personality, together with that of their assistants, is bringing about a basic friendship with the Libyan Government and its people that augurs well for our future. Wheelus Air Force Base in Tripoli is one of the finest air bases in that part of the world. Its essentiality to the United States cannot be argued. The commanding officer of the field, Col. William Kane, is to be congratulated on the excellent manner in which he exercises his command.

Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to congratulate and felicitate King Idris I, Mustafa ben Halin, Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and his Cabinet, and the Ambassador to the United States, Saddigh Muntasser, on the celebration of Libyan Independence Day.

Family-Size Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRICE DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, under our present farm program we are making the corporate-size farms larger, while decreasing—if not entirely destroying—the small family-size farms.

The human equation is not being considered sufficiently under a program that has resulted in our State alone to losing half of its farm population. Something must be done about it if we are to preserve the economic and political philosophy which made America great.

On this subject I ask unanimous consent that an editorial by Mr. Walter Malec, appearing in the Hallettsville Tribune, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HISTORIC CHOICE

Congress will again have its historic choice.

It can go on subsidizing big farmers as they have been. That's what the present farm policies were doing. This especially the one of the ungraduated allotments, and only in acres, instead of also in lint.

That's what the soil bank will keep on doing. Big farmers get most of the cotton money, including most of the cotton loans. Hence they will be getting most of the soil bank money, too.

The soil bank is what the big farmers want and what they will get.

Favored as they have been, the big farmers were prospering and growing in numbers, while the family farmers were going down as never before. Texas alone lost a half of its farm population already and will keep on losing. This has been one choice so far.

Or Congress may take the other choice. Instead of subsidizing the big farmers, it may treat the family farmers as the foundation of this country, as they are.

No special favors are needed or asked. Just the same commonsense as in the income tax, making the cotton allotments too graduated.

Since it's the bales that count in the end, why not the bales at the beginning—in the allotments? Why not consider the lint, as well as acres in figuring the allotments?

Also why not free our cotton of its artificial handicap? Why not sell at the market price? Not merely a domestic allotment, but sell at the market price both abroad and here—to sell more cotton.

And why not pay the parity separately, limited more to the family farmers, to have more farmers?

This would not cost half as much as the soil bank would. And it would be safe and natural. It would be also a natural answer to our surpluses.

If Congress goes on subsidizing big farmers, that's what this country will have. We'll have mostly big farmers—and big cities. With small farmers, also, our small towns are bound to go down.

Today Congress is subsidizing big farmers.

Tomorrow it will have to subsidize, one way or other, those people driven from farms into big cities. They will still have votes and power to get almost anything they want.

This talk of big farms being more efficient and the age of small farmers being gone should fool no one. Communists evidently feel the same way when wiping out small farmers and making workers out of them.

Congress need only stop the policies destroying small farmers.

As Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON warns, "So many farmers are moving to the cities and so few young people stay on the farms, it's bad—very bad."

"It's very bad, indeed—far worse than the people, the press, and Congress generally realize so far. That's the core of our farm problem. And the soil bank will not even touch this problem.

Support for President Eisenhower in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Will Support Eisenhower in 1956," which was published in the Laredo Times on January 29, and was reprinted in the Washington Daily News of today, February 1.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1956]

WE WILL SUPPORT EISENHOWER IN 1956

Playing politics with the welfare of our Nation has been overindulged in, and the politicians generally have only considered what is good for themselves as individuals and their party first, and the well-being of our Nation and the blood of our young men second. The Korean War was a fine example of what happened when the party in power played politics and put young men in the front lines and then refused to protect them for fear of reprisal.

Thousands of our boys were sacrificed by seemingly good Democratic politicians, but inside the Democratic Party the fellow-travelers and Communists were telling those in the White House not to protect our boys in Korea beyond a certain point. And that point was death and sacrifice to Democratic corruption, influenced by fellow-travelers from Minnesota, from Illinois, from Michigan and New York.

President Eisenhower corrected this blood sacrifice and restored hope not only to our Nation, but hope and peace to the peoples of all nations, and we are going to support him for the Presidency in 1956.

A good example of Democratic fellow-travelerism is the sickening statements by the so-called Democrats in Congress who criticize Secretary Dulles for avoiding war by looking the Communists squarely in the eye and telling them, "This far and no further." These same Democrats in Congress, belonging to a party of which the writer has been a Member for many years, have gone far afield from the Democratic Party that brought many social gains.

The Democratic Party has ceased to exist for the good of the Nation, except in great men such as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Congressman SAM (Mr. SAM) RAYBURN, Governor Shivers of Texas, Senator GEORGE of Georgia, Senator BYRD of Virginia, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON of Washington; and of course there are a good many others in a minority, on the Democratic side who believe that the good of the country, the Nation and the world, comes ahead of playing foul and dirty politics.

The H-bomb, the atom bomb and guided missible, all fit into reelecting President Eisenhower for 4 more years.

The Democrats are demagogs, in some cases, and sit back and holler because President Eisenhower, through Secretary Dulles, has stopped the Communists repeatedly. This same type of vile politicians would have criticized Daniel in the lion's den because he looked the lions in the eye and said, "This far and no further."

In supporting President Eisenhower in the coming campaign, we must add up that he has calmed the seas of human bloodshed. Labor is receiving the highest per-hour take-home pay and has never had it so good. Little business and big business have never had it so good. And unions have never been freer of strikes and stoppages, and they have the highest number of dues-paying members in history.

The farmer and the rancher have not fared so well, but the Eisenhower-Benson plan seems to be the only real practical solution to the problem.

The Democratic Party was the first party to ask President Eisenhower to be its candidate, and he refused because of the hopeless mess which existed in the party.

Actually, 20 percent of the people in the United States are the ones who swing from party to party and finally elect the Congress and the President of the United States, and these people are too smart to be fouled up by partisan selfishness, partisan crookedness, where it involves the welfare of the Nation. And our three family-owned newspapers, the Montrose Press at Montrose, Colo., and the Daily Alaska Empire at Juneau, Alaska, will support President Eisenhower on the basis that he is going to bring peace to the world. It is our belief that this man has been inspired by God to carry out the mission of peace, rather than the mission of self-destruction; the mission of progress and prosperity for the peoples of all countries.

Now, let us see what the fellow travelers continue to try to do to the Eisenhower administration, by having the darling of the left-wing columnists keep hammering away at the administration. His Attorney General Brownell has brought credit to our country. The appointment of Chief Justice Earl Warren will go down in history as the greatest. The columnist charges the greatest Secretary of Interior we have ever had with a giveaway program, when the real facts are our national resources under Secretary McKay have increased and appreciated.

As far as voting for members of the United States Senate and United States Congress is concerned, we are going to support individually those candidates of either party who offer the greatest good to our Nation as a whole.

We can't escape the fact that the Democratic Party is controlled by the big-city bosses who are hand in glove with gangsters. And Eisenhower changed all that, and as far as we see, the only weakness in the Eisenhower administration is that the countries of Latin America have been shamefully sidetracked and ignored. (Editorial reprinted from the Laredo Times of Sunday, January 29, 1956.)

Financing of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, since becoming a member of the Senate I have been very much interested in public works as they relate to the various parts of our Nation. Recently there has come before the Public Works Committee a plan to issue bonds for the financing of TVA and its proposed expansion. I have had made a study and analysis of the various bills and proposals to finance the future expansion of TVA. I have also had prepared a statement showing the approximate amount paid toward the cost of TVA by the various States of the Union.

This study does not necessarily voice my own views.

The study so impressed me that I sent a copy to each member of the committee. Since that time I have had many requests for a copy of this study.

I have had an estimate made by the Government Printing Office, and I find that it will make 5¾ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $460.

In view of the importance of this study, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proportionate share of States in TVA appropriations of $1,950,000,000 (includes $45,000,000 of transfers of property from beginning) in fiscal year 1934 through fiscal year 1955

[Millions of dollars]

Alabama	$20.1
Arizona	7.6
Arkansas	11.1
California	170.5
Colorado	18.3
Connecticut	34.5
Delaware	9.0
Florida	27.5
Georgia	26.5
Idaho	5.6
Illinois	148.8
Indiana	45.8
Iowa	27.1
Kansas	20.9
Kentucky	21.2
Louisiana	22.0
Maine	8.0
Maryland	36.3
Massachusetts	65.3
Michigan	100.6
Minnesota	34.3
Mississippi	10.9
Missouri	51.3
Montana	6.4
Nebraska	15.8
Nevada	2.7
New Hampshire	5.5
New Jersey	66.9
New Mexico	5.9
New York	290.0
North Carolina	29.2
North Dakota	5.3
Ohio	118.4
Oklahoma	20.7
Oregon	19.3
Pennsylvania	145.3
Rhode Island	10.5
South Carolina	13.5
South Dakota	5.7
Tennessee	24.4
Texas	82.9
Utah	6.6
Vermont	3.3
Virginia	28.8
Washington	31.4
West Virginia	15.4
Wisconsin	40.2
Wyoming	3.3
District of Columbia and possessions	29.4
Total TVA appropriations, including transfers of property, fiscal year 1934 through fiscal year 1955	1,950.0

NOTE.—Proportionate shares borne by each State based on allocation of the Federal tax burden among the States and possessions as calculated by the Council of the State Chambers of Commerce and averaged for the fiscal years 1949 through 1956.

REVENUE BONDS FOR TVA

Proposals to finance the future expansion of TVA by means of revenue bonds are again before the Congress. The idea has considerable appeal to the public. It sounds good to the average citizen. It sounds like it will aid the taxpayer. It might remove the TVA from the political scene, and avoid the annual debate over appropriations for its expansion. It appears to be a self-liquidating step. These are advantages of considerable value to the public, and the idea might prevail because of them.

This memorandum is a factual analysis of the proposed legislation and its probable end results, with particular reference to its impact on the taxpayers, and is designed to promote further study of this important matter.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE CONGRESS

Four bills have been introduced in the Congress providing, among other things, for the future financing of additions to TVA power facilities by the sale of revenue bonds. These bills are: S. 2373, June 29, 1955, Mr. KERR; H. R. 6575, May 31, 1955, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee; H. R. 6576, May 31, 1955, Mr. JONES of Alabama; H. R. 6770, June 13, 1955, Mr. BUCKLEY (by request).

Hearings were held on the Kerr bill last summer by the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works, and it seems probable that it may receive prior consideration by the Congress. Therefore, these comments are primarily directed to the Kerr bill, but notes are appended explaining the differences between it and the other three bills.

The Senate bill introduced by Mr. KERR would repeal the last three paragraphs under the subtitle "Independent Agencies and Corporations" in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 576–577), and amend the present Tennessee Valley Authority Act by inserting a new section immediately after section 15c thereof (16 U. S. C., sec. 831n–3). In addition, the Kerr bill adds some language to paragraph 7 to section 5136 of the revised Statutes (12 U. S. C., sec. 24) which would make the proposed revenue bonds legal for investment purposes by national banks.

REPEAL PROVISIONS

The clauses of the Government Corporations Act, 1948, which the Kerr bill would repeal require TVA to repay to the United States Treasury a total of $348,239,240 over a term of years and in a specified manner.[1]

The $348,239,240 specifically stated in the Government Corporations Act was computed at the time the act was passed in the following manner:

Appropriations for power property through June 30, 1946	$287,771,841
Transfers of property from War Department	19,026,418
Bonds sold to Treasury and RFC	65,072,500
Total	371,870,759
Deduct repayments already made, including bond retirements	23,631,519
Remainder to be returned	348,239,240

The Government Corporations Act of 1948 further required that in addition to the above amount the total of all appropriations for power made after June 30, 1946, should be returned to the Treasury over a period of 40 years after the facilities go into operation. Thus, the repayment requirement as of June 30, 1955, was:

Appropriations for power property plus transfers as of June 30, 1955	$1,317,446,058
Remaining bonds	14,000,000
Total	1,331,446,058
Deduct repayments into general fund exclusive of bond retirements	$100,059,019
Present repayment obligation	1,231,387,039

A further provision of the Government Corporations Act of 1948 required an act of Congress for TVA to use any of its power revenues for construction of new power-producing projects.

The Kerr bill would repeal all these safeguards. The TVA would be under no specific requirement to repay the $1,231,387,039 obligation. Furthermore, it would be free to use its power revenues for any purpose it desired without the consent of the Congress.

Further repayments of appropriation investment would be made only "as the Board may consider desirable * * * having due regard for * * * the objective that power shall be sold at rates as low as are feasible."

Under such an option, the way would be opened immediately upon the Kerr bill becoming law, for repayments of appropriation investment to stop, and for the money to be diverted to building new facilities.

The total repayments made in fiscal year 1955 were over $55 million.[2] While payments in subsequent years probably would not be as large, nevertheless they constitute an important factor in the situation.

REVENUE BONDS

The new section to be added to the TVA Act would permit the Authority to issue revenue bonds at the sole discretion of its Board. The features of this permission would be—

The bonds would be confined to new money for construction, acquisition, and replacements of property in connection with facilities for the production and transmission of power or in conection with lease-purchase or any contract for such facilities.

This provision is so broad that TVA could carry on almost any operation or build any property it desired. The inclusion of replacements as one of the purposes for which revenue bonds can be issued will be commented on in a subsequent paragraph.

2. The term of the revenue bonds would not exceed 50 years. The Government Corporations Act of 1948 specifies 40 years as the repayment term.

3. No regulatory commission or board would have to pass on the bonds. They could be issued at will by the vote of two men constituting a majority of the TVA board.

Nor is there any provision for congressional or budgetary control. Under the bill the proceeds realized from issuance of such bonds are not included in the computation of receipts, expenditures, surpluses, or deficits in the budget of the United States. Certainly as long as the taxpayers have an investment in TVA Congress should and must retain and exercise control. The bill follows the principle of the dual budget theory, making possible the hiding of huge annual expenditures in a debt budget and thereby eliminating any effective control over the national debt. Also, TVA (and ultimately other Federal agencies as well) would be able to accomplish indirectly what Congress might be reluctant to do directly. Thus, in the final analysis, the bill would preempt congressional control over Federal spending and place it in the hands of Federal agencies.

4. The interest and amortization on such bonds would be a first lien on the net revenues ahead of depreciation and everything else.

Principal of and interest on the proposed revenue bonds would be payable solely from TVA's net power proceeds. The Kerr bill then goes on to define net power proceeds as what is left of revenues after operation and maintenance, including payments in lieu of State taxes but before depreciation and amortization of capital expenditures. It also includes in the amounts which can be used to pay interest and amortization on the revenue bonds, the net proceeds of the sale of other disposition of any power facility or interest therein, including reserves created from such sources.

Thus TVA could use depreciation accruals to service the revenue bonds, and, to the extent required, could issue revenue bonds to make replacements. The REA cooperatives are following this practice. The only difference is that arey are borrowing the needed money from the REA instead of issuing revenue bonds.

The depreciation assigned to power for fiscal year 1955 was as follows:

Total depreciation for year	$30,092,618
Retirements	2,736,907
Balance to reserve	[3] 27,355,711

To give an idea of the importance of this provision of the Kerr bill, the $27,355,711 balance to the reserve would pay interest and amortization on more than $700 million of 50-year 3-percent interest revenue bonds.

5. The bonds and interest on them would not be guaranteed by the United States. This has little meaning, as the Federal Government would be pressured into making good on any default.

In the hearings last summer Senator KERR, author of the bill, had this to say:

"I want to say, as far as I am concerned, I regard any bond issued by this Authority (TVA) of the same dignity and obligation as that of a Government bond. * * * My position would be at any time these bonds get into default, that I would sponsor legislation to hold the holders of these bonds secure."

6. The bonds would be exempt both as to principal and interest from all taxation by any State or local taxing authority except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes. For example, the bonds would be tax-free in respect to State income taxes.

7. TVA operations would not be included in the budget, except in respect to such repayments of the appropriation investment as may be made from time to time.

The net effect of the revenue bond proposals would be to free TVA from the control of the Congress and enable it to expand in any direction and to any extent it desired, on an extremely favorable financial basis.

DISPOSITION OF GROSS REVENUES FROM THE SALE OF POWER

The Kerr bill directs TVA to charge rates for power high enough to meet:

1. Operation, maintenance, and administration of the power system (exclusive of depreciation—see preceding section).

2. Payments to States and counties in lieu of taxes.

3. Debt service on outstanding bonds.

4. A return to the Treasury on the appropriation investment in the Corporation's power facilities. This return would be at the average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its total marketable public obligations.

As of June 30, 1955, the appropriation investment was $1,217,387,039.[4] The average interest rate on marketable public obligations of the Treasury (which includes Treasury bills) was 2.043 percent as of June 30, 1954, the latest date available. On this basis, the annual return in fiscal year 1955 would have been $24,871,216.

During fiscal year 1955, TVA had the following resources to meet the above return.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Net revenues from power operations	$47,900,665
Depreciation accruals	30,092,618
Total available	77,993,283

These figures emphasize the importance to TVA of being able to make depreciation accruals available for paying returns as outlined in the Kerr bill.

5. In addition to the above firm obligations, the Board as it may deem desirable, can charge enough to cover the following:

(a) Investment in power system assets.

(b) Retirement of outstanding bonds in advance of maturity.

(c) Reduction of appropriation investment.

(d) Other purposes connected with the corporation's power business.

Under such optional treatment the reduction of appropriation investment, now a prime obligation of TVA, would be the last on the list under the Kerr bill, as a reduction would be made only if the Board found it desirable so to do.

NET EFFECTS OF THE OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE KERR BILL

It is obvious that the provisions of the Kerr bill relating to the disposition of its gross revenues would greatly change the TVA situation. For example:

1. The taxpayers' money (retained earnings) that the TVA has reinvested would never be recovered nor would any return be paid on it.

2. Appropriations by the Congress would still be needed to meet the costs of the nonpower features of TVA. The bill does not prohibit further appropriations by the Congress to the power operations of TVA but would allow TVA to go ahead on its own if Congress did not desire to let TVA have the money. As no firm requirement would exist to pay back the appropriation so made TVA would be in the position of being able to get all the money it could from the Congress and issue revenue bonds when the Congress turned down the request.

3. The question would be raised as to the extent of further repayment of appropriations to the United States Treasury. Making repayments of this nature would be entirely permissive on the part of TVA.

4. The Federal Government would continue in the power business in the TVA area.

5. TVA would not stand on its own feet and pay its own way in full. On the contrary, it would become less of a self-liquidating undertaking than it is now.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO THE KERR BILL

The Kerr bill, with its modification of the Government Corporations Appropriations Act of 1948, the proposed sale of revenue bonds, and the other changes in the TVA situation, would adversely affect the public interest because:

1. Socialistic programs involving proprietary businesses are bad for the people of the United States. The proposed legislation would perpetuate, enlarge and strengthen such a program and remove the present controls which the Congress has over it.

The United States would still own the undertaking, and the taxpayers' money would still be invested in it. Congressional control should be strengthened rather than removed, to protect the national interest and the Federal taxpayers.

2. Government, at both the Federal and State levels very properly and wisely, regulates the electric utility companies in the public interest and as protection to investors sets up rules for financial structures which, among other things, require a reasonable proportion of equity money in the capital structure as a cushion for debt.

TVA asserts, of course, that the appropriations represent equity in the property, which is absurd, as the taxpayers' contributions to the enterprise were forced from them and the individual taxpayer cannot sell, pawn or control his so-called share in the undertaking.

Obviously the revenue bonds to be sold at TVA option, could and might be made large enough to cover all the cost of the facilities to be built.

A departure by the Federal Government in its own proprietary operations from the financial principles that it prescribes for its citizens, appears to be unjust and unwise.

3. The proposed legislation would remove whatever restrictions presently exist on the expansion of TVA's service area. TVA is an unregulated Government monopoly enjoying a long list of valuable special privileges that makes it an invincible competitor of the utilities.

As TVA could issue revenue bonds at will to pay for acquisitions and would not have to get the consent of the Congress, it would be free to move in on its utility neighbors anywhere it wished and destroy them, as it has done in the past in the area it now serves. The resulting loss of tax revenues would be serious to the Federal Government. Even more serious would be the further transfer of industries using large amounts of power from non-TVA areas to locations where they could obtain subsidized TVA power.

4. The legislation would not clean up the TVA mess. The authority would not stand on its own feet and pay its own way in full. None of the inequities which exist in the TVA situation would be removed or alleviated. TVA would continue to pay no Federal taxes and an insufficient amount of State and local taxes, and would remain a political and social issue.

5. If TVA would obey its own act, it would be unnecessary to supply additional facilities at this time.

The effect of the revenue bond financing approach to the TVA's problem is to imply that TVA (or the Federal Government) has a public utility responsibility to perform which of course it has not.

As to the future power supply in the TVA area are the following facts.

TVA has a preference clause, which reads as follows:

"In the sale of such current by the board it shall give preference to States, counties, municipalities and cooperative organizations of citizens or farmers, not organized or doing business for profit, but primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity to its own citizens or members."

In fiscal year 1955 the sales of energy by TVA were as follows:[4]

Class of customers	Proportion		Revenue mills per kilowatt-hour
	Kilowatt-hours	Revenue	
	Percent	*Percent*	
Preference customers:			
4 large cities	15.03	13.40	3.97
Smaller towns and cooperatives	17.21	17.67	4.65
Total preference customers	32.24	31.07	
Nonpreference customers:			
Industrials and others	15.98	13.98	4.09
Federal agencies and TVA itself	51.78	54.95	4.73
Total nonpreference customers	67.76	68.93	
Grand total	100.00	100.00	4.46

Footnotes at end of speech.

If the nonpreference users were to furnish their own needs, TVA's present power supply plus the capacity under construction would be sufficient to take care of the preference customers' needs for many years in the future.

There is no sound reason why this could not be done in respect to the industries served directly by TVA. They are all nonpreference customers. They have been the main beneficiaries of TVA subsidized power. All of them could construct their own powerplants and serve themselves.

The largest group of nonpreference customers consists of the Federal agencies, accounting for over one-half of TVA's energy sales. There is no reason why they could not construct their own facilities. It is not commonly realized that over one-half of TVA's revenue from the sale of power comes from the Federal Government itself—in other words, from the taxpayers. Obviously the service to the Federal Government is responsible for a substantial portion of the net power income, which is used in part to build new facilities, and from which repayments to the Treasury are made from time to time.

Inspection of TVA data discloses that, as a group, the Government agencies are paying the highest average rate for energy of any of the other groups served by TVA. As the Government service is mainly at high load factor and includes a large amount of nonfirm service, it should be at a very low average rate.

It seems probable that TVA is making a greater margin over bare-bones cost out of serving the Federal agencies, than it is out of its other groups of customers. In this way it is getting a large amount of taxpayers' money and using it to further subsidize service to other customers. A mill a kilowatt hour of undue margin on the service to Federal agencies in fiscal year 1955 would total $21,770,451.

If the Government agencies would undertake to build their own facilities as the TVA area needs additional power, they would release the required capacity for preference customer use, and at the same time clear up any discrimination against the taxpayers that may exist by reason of the rates charged the Federal agencies by TVA.

The end result would be to save money for the taxpayers.

6. These are other methods whereby the future power needs of the area could be met without further major expenditures by the Federal Government. One of there is the construction of steam-electric stations by the large municipalities now served exclusively by TVA.

This could be easily accomplished by requiring TVA to free the local municipalities from the stringent provisions of its "sole supplier" clause and relax its restrictive control of municipal resources derived from the resale of its power. This would enable the municipalities to use these financial resources to meet their future needs for power by providing their own facilities or purchasing supplemental power from outside sources. Once freed of TVA domination these municipalities would be free to choose public power by providing their own generating plants or, if they prefer, by purchasing what they want from neighboring electric companies.

The four largest cities in the TVA service area use an amount of energy equal to about 87½ percent of the remainder of the preference customers. Obviously if the four largest cities would supply their own power needs, which they could do just as cheaply as TVA, an abundant supply would be available for the smaller cities and the rural cooperatives.

The latest available information indicates peak demands of the four cities to be:

Twelve months ending October 31, 1955:

	Peak demand kilowatts
Nashville	428,765
Chattanooga	406,086
Memphis	392,532
Knoxville	262,032
Total	1,489,415

The city of Memphis is now undertaking to supply its own needs. The other three cities could do likewise.

It also is possible to get a substantial amount of additional power from outside the TVA area.

7. A rash of similar bills would certainly result if the Kerr bill becomes law. An REA bill (H. R. 8243) has already appeared. Every other Federal proprietary undertaking could be expected to follow.

For the reasons set forth in this section, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Kerr bill is not in the public interest.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO THE KERR BILL

If the Kerr bill is to be amended to meet the major objections to its end results, the following steps would be required:

1. The Congress should strengthen its control over TVA, and its approval should be required of every step taken by the Authority, especially in respect to the amount, terms and guaranties of the revenue bonds to be issued.

2. An effective and specific territorial limit should be set to keep TVA within reasonable limits.

3. In order to protect the taxpayers, amortization and interest on present investment should have first priority on the net income, and the interest and amortization on the revenue bonds should be subordinated to it.

4. Interest rates should be at least equal to the highest interest rate being paid by the Federal Government plus enough to cover overheads. The "average" rate proposed by the Kerr bill includes Treasury notes and other low-interest items that have no relation to long-term obligations.

5. All TVA costs should be included.

6. The taxpayers should come out "whole" at the end of the repayment period, making the project truly self-liquidating.

FACTS AND FIGURES

The amount of money that has passed through the hands of TVA since its beginning totals more than $3,131 million.[8] About $519 million of this went for operating its power facilities. Other large sums were spent for operating the other purposes of TVA, in retiring property and in writeoffs.

As of June 30, 1955, the general funds of TVA, exclusive of operating expenses, and net after various prior transactions totaled $2,488,420,626. (See tabulation marked "Exhibit A.") Not all of this total would be subject to repayment and interest (return).

The TVA has prepared figures on the present investment (June 30, 1955) in the power business which total $1,533,838,694. From the data given in the annual report of TVA for 1955 the appended tabulation (exhibit B) has been prepared which shows the total investment of TVA, divided between power and other. This appears to be a correct statement if the TVA allocations and other accounting practices are accepted.

Some question could be raised to treating repayments taken from net power revenues as a return of capital. Nevertheless the end result on the total investment is the same as it would be if they had been considered as a payment of "return," and it does not seem necessary to explore the question further.

The taxpayers have furnished additional large sums of money which do not appear on TVA's books, and which have been overlooked in the proposed legislation.

The first of these is taxes. The task force of the Hoover Commission computed the total taxes that TVA should have paid to June 30, 1953, to be $199,501,868. Projecting this ahead to June 30, 1955, gives a grand total of $285,666,588. This probably would divide about as follows:

Federal	$171,889,669
State and local	[7] 113,776,919
Total	[8] 285,666,588

TVA pays no Federal taxes of any kind. Therefore, the $171,889,669 represents Federal taxes which TVA avoided and which the other taxpayers had to contribute to the support of the Federal Government in addition to their proper share.

TVA has made token payments in lieu of State taxes which have totaled $37,208,229 to June 30, 1955. Deducting these from the total State and local taxes leaves $76,568,690 as the contribution of the people of the TVA service area to the project.

The second is interest. The taxpayers continue to pay interest on Government bonds that otherwise would not exist if the appropriations to TVA had not been made. A conservative estimate of the amount of this interest at 3 percent per year from the start of the project to June 30, 1955, is $279,733,275,[9] exclusive of interest on interest, and exclusive of the interest actually paid on the few TVA bonds that have been held by the Federal Government.

The third group of items are the miscellaneous operating items which other business pays, but which TVA escapes. For example, the social-security tax on its civil service employees is paid by the Federal Government, and does not appear on the books of TVA.

TVA gets freight rate rebates and is free of a number of excise taxes that other people pay. It franks some or all of its mail.

With the limited information available for this study, an estimate of the amount of money involved in this third group is not possible.

A fourth group concerns $95,781,420 of cash items (see exhibit B) that in the tabulation is included in "other." This money will no doubt be used for power operations, and if a break is to be considered as made as of June 30, 1955, it must be included in the total if it is to be ultimately recovered.

The fifth group includes writeoffs, allocations, and other items, such as:

1. The writeoff of over $92,500,000 [10] which took place at the start of TVA operations. This was a direct loss to the Federal taxpayers. One of the results of the writeoff was that the 64,000 kilowatt Wilson steam-electric station was taken on the books at zero dollars. It has been in operation ever since.

While a portion of the writeoff may have been justified, it seems evident that a substantial part, especially that applying to Wilson Dam and Wilson steam-electric station, were greater than the facts justified.

2. Past expenditures made by cooperating governmental agencies and not reimbursed by the Authority are not included in the amounts to be recovered under the proposed legislation. For example, the CCC furnished labor on the reservoirs, rights-of-way, and pole setting for transmission lines, office buildings, and on the streets and sewer system at Norris Town. The WPA also did work on the project, and so did the Army engineers.

3. Questionable allocations of property to navigation and flood control which have unduly favored the power end of the business. For example, a total of $158,142,107 [11] has been allocated to navigation. This is over double the $67 million cost of an equivalent low dam navigation channel.

The $183,995,636 [12] allocated to flood control is less easy of anlysis. A greater amount of land has been permanently flooded in the Tennessee Valley by the TVA works than was ever flooded under natural conditions. The total benefit in the valley probably is confined to the city of Chattanooga. Some benefits may be realized in the Ohio Valley but they are problematical.

None of the general property has been allocated to power, although a large part of it is used in the power operations.

A reasonable estimate of the amount including interest on the items in this fifth group that should have been charged to power required to make the taxpayers whole in respect to the items of this group would be $118,756,942.

The total required to make the taxpayers whole is summarized by the following tabulation:

Investment in power as of June 30, 1955, per TVA books	$1,533,838,694
Additional items necessary to make taxpayers-"whole":	
Additional cash items	95,781,420
Back interest	279,733,275
Back Federal taxes	171,889,669
Needed to clear up allocations and miscellaneous items	118,756,942
Total to make taxpayers whole	2,200,000,000

CONCLUSIONS

As a guiding and fundamental principle and to the extent that TVA is engaged in the public utility business, TVA should be subjected to regulation like private enterprise. It should pay its full share of Federal taxes like private enterprise and its full share of local taxes like private enterprise. Further, it should pay the same rates of interest as those paid by private enterprise and it should show its true costs of doing buisness by the same accounting methods and legal principles that private enterprise, under the law, is required to do. Yet at this moment, and under the several TVA revenue bond proposals under consideration, TVA has accepted only the privileges of private enterprise and few, if any, of its limitations.

The Kerr bill has as a base for interest ("return"), an investment of only $1,217,387,039. It does not include outstanding bonds. It proposes to charge only 2.043 percent interest on this, which would be $24,871,216 per year. A major omission is that no specific repayment program is set up for adequate interest payment or amortization.

If the Congress wishes to waive or make no attempt to clear up back matters, then the least amount to be considered as a base should be the investment admitted by TVA of $1,533,838,694.

Under existing law the investment in power must be repaid over not more than a 40-year period. In respect to the average investment remaining in the property 5 of the years have passed, leaving 35 years yet to go. The following table shows what the interest and amortization would be at 3 percent interest rate on several setups:

	Amount	Annual amount as of June 30, 1955	
		35-year amortization	40-year amortization
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
TVA's admitted investment in power	1,533,838,694	71,383,747	66,357,513
Plus cash on hand and back interest	1,900,353,389	88,859,952	82,603,193
Total to make taxpayers "whole"	2,200,000,000	102,386,460	95,177,280

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Cashwise, TVA would have available to pay the above—

Depreciation accrual	$30,092,618
Net income	47,513,278
Total	77,605,896

The Kerr bill certainly contemplates the use of these items for interest and amortization purposes. Any change in TVA procedure should include payment in lieu of Federal taxes in future years.

These figures emphasize the importance of TVA paying the equivalent of Federal taxes imposed upon electric companies in the general area.

There is precedent in other countries for the payment of Federal taxes or their equivalent by Government-owned power projects (see Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power, vol. 1, p. 204).

The British Electric Authority is liable for and pays both local and national taxes in the form of income, profits, and excess profits levies.

The State Power Board of Sweden pays local taxes the same as any private undertaking. Enough is allowed in the rates to cover national taxes on the same basis as if the power were supplied by a private undertaking subject to income tax.

Electric utilities owned by the State in Norway pay local taxes and the income and fortune tax imposed by the State. The rate of taxation is about the same for the State-owned and the private companies.

Electricite de France, a Government body, pays taxes equal to about 10 percent of income.

There is, in fact, precedent in the TVA itself for inclusion of taxes, and the other factors not covered by its present books, in the cost of the project.

Mr. Lilienthal, then a member of the TVA board, said in July 1938, during his testimony before the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, 75th Congress, 3d session:

"In fixing TVA wholesale rates, the liquidation of the actual total investment devoted to power purposes, fixed charges on that investment, including taxes, depreciation, interest, and all other appropriate items, and all operating expenses be accepted as a minimum below which those rates should not be permitted to go."

It seems reasonable to conclude that if any legislation is passed, it should be comprehensive, and settle, once for all, the past and future situation of TVA. The settlement should be based on the representations made to the public by the TVA at the time it was being "sold" to the American people.

EFFECTIVE DATE

It is, of course, impossible to estimate when the effective date might be. Obviously it will not be June 30, 1955. Any subsequent date will change the figures of this memorandum somewhat but not the principle.

OTHER BILLS

Three other bills having as their foundation the future financing of TVA by revenue bonds are: H. R. 6575, May 31, 1955, Mr. DAVIS; H. R. 6576, May 31, 1955, Mr. JONES; H. R. 6770, June 13, 1955, Mr. BUCKLEY.

H. R. 6575 and H. R. 6576

These are duplicate bills, and are almost the same as the Kerr bill, with one exception, which is the provision that the United States Treasury can buy the revenue bonds, either directly or in the market. This puts a ceiling on the interest rate, as the Treasury would buy the bonds if the rate were too low for them to sell on the open market. This provision for all practical purposes makes the bonds a Government obligation.

If the Treasury sells bonds to buy the TVA bonds, then these Treasury bonds are exempt from the debt limitation.

H. R. 6770

This is the Buckley bill, and is different in some particulars from the Kerr bill, as follows:

1. It does not cancel the last paragraph under the subtitle "Independent Agencies and Corporations" in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriations Act of 1948.

By leaving this paragraph in effect, the Buckley bill would require an act of Congress before power revenues of TVA could be used for the construction of new power-producing projects.

2. Revenue bonds would be limited to $750 million outstanding.

3. Revenue bonds could only be sold to the extent necessary to meet TVA's budget program as approved by the Congress.

4. No provision is made for the purchase of revenue bonds by the United States Treasury.

5. Interest on appropriation investment would be based on interest of Treasury marketable public obligations neither due nor callable in less than 15 years from date of issue. Just what this interest rate might be is not presently available, but inspection of the latest report of the Secretary of the Treasury indicates that it would be around 35 percent higher than the rate called for by the Kerr bill.

6. TVA would be retained under the Government Corporations Control Act.

7. TVA would be required to contribute to Government civil-service costs including administration.

8. The TVA would be required to pay into the Treasury each year from net power proceeds, an amount equal to the estimated annual depreciation on the appropriation investment until the appropriation investment shall be reduced to $250 million. Data are lacking to calculate what this might mean dollarwise but on a proration basis it would be about $24 milion a year under present conditions.

9. TVA would be required to charge rates sufficient to accomplish the above.

Obviously the Buckley bill is much more favorable to the taxpayers than either of the other three bills. But, except for a somewhat better financial setup and the retention by the Congress of some measure of control over the authority, the Buckley bill has all of the other infirmities of the Kerr bill.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S OPINION

On June 30, 1955, Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, requested the views of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, on this proposed TVA legislation. Mr. Campbell's letter in response appears in exhibit C and, in brief, points out—that if TVA is allowed to obtain funds through issuance of revenue bonds, provision should be made as follows:

1. TVA should be required to get congressional approval of each new power-producing project.

2. A ceiling should be placed on the total amount of bonds which can be outstanding at any time.

3. TVA should be subjected to geographical limitations.

4. The Secretary of the Treasury should have authority to approve in advance all terms and conditions under which such bonds were to be issued.

5. All provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act relating to deposit and investment of TVA power funds should be retained.

6. Provision should be made for a definite plan for repayment of the investment made in TVA.

7. Appropriate restrictions should be placed on TVA's authority to convey property.

8. Provision should be made for TVA to be paid for any engineering or other services furnished others by it.

EXHIBIT A.—*General Funds of TVA as of June 30, 1955*

Item	Amount	Reference to page in TVA annual report for fiscal year 1955
Appropriations and transfers of property net.	$1,950,418,029	A 7.
Net income from power operations.	301,427,523	A 7.
Depreciation reserve	222,271,657	A 6.
Debt	14,000,000	A 7.
Contributions in aid of construction.	303,417	A 7.
Total	2,488,420,626	
Used for—		
Fixed assets	2,034,418,811	A 6.
Net expense of non-income-producing programs.	159,290,652	A 7.
Payments into general fund U. S. Treasury.	127,563,390	A 7.
Cash	159,716,263	A 6.
Net current assets	7,431,510	Current receivables plus inventories minus current liabilities and deferred credit —see pages A 6 and A 7.
Total	2,488,420,626	

EXHIBIT B.—*Investment in TVA program, June 30, 1955*

Derivation	Total	Power	Other
Appropriations of Congress and transfers of property—net	$1,950,418,029	$1,317,446,058	$632,971,971
Less:			
Payments into general fund of U. S. Treasury	127,563,390	100,059,019	27,504,371
Net expense of non-income-producing property	159,290,652		159,290,652
Total	286,854,042	100,059,019	186,795,023
Balance	1,663,563,987	1,217,387,039	446,176,948
Long-term debt:			
Total bonds issued	65,072,500	65,072,500	
Less bonds redeemed	51,072,500	51,072,500	
Bonds outstanding	14,000,000	14,000,000	
Total investment of U. S. Treasury funds	1,677,563,987	1,231,387,039	446,176,948
Accumulated net power income	301,427,523	301,427,523	
Total investment of U. S. Government	1,978,991,510	1,532,814,562	446,176,948

EXHIBIT B.—*Investment in TVA program, June 30, 1955*—Continued

Derivation	Total	Power	Other
Rents and other collections in advance	$720, 715	$720, 715	
Contributions in aid of construction	303, 417	303, 417	
Total	1, 980, 015, 642	1, 533, 838, 694	$446, 176, 948
Investment:			
Completed plant	1, 774, 570, 981	1, 378, 830, 927	395, 740, 054
Construction work in progress	258, 531, 063	256, 533, 673	1, 997, 390
Investigations in progress	1, 316, 767	447, 015	869, 752
Total	2, 034, 418, 811	1, 635, 811, 615	398, 607, 196
Less reserve for depreciation	222, 271, 657	168, 211, 522	54, 060, 135
Net plant	1, 812, 147, 154	1, 467, 600, 093	344, 547, 061
Inventories	29, 168, 097	23, 319, 630	5, 848, 467
Funds held for future use	[1] 138, 700, 391	42, 918, 971	95, 781, 420
Total	1, 980, 015, 642	1, 533, 838, 694	446, 176, 948

[1] Breakdown is as follows:

Cash	$159, 716, 263
Accounts receivable	34, 363, 847
Total	194, 080, 110
Less accounts payable	55, 379, 719
Balance	138, 700, 391

EXHIBIT C

JULY 26, 1955.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of June 30, 1955, acknowledged by telephone July 1, enclosing a copy of S. 2373, 84th Congress, and requesting our views and recommendations thereon.

Since the purpose of the proposed bill is to provide for an expansion of the TVA system, we suggest the importance of obtaining a careful analysis of the power requirements of the several Government agencies presently dependent upon the system. Your attention is invited to various published statements to the effect that national-defense agencies of the Government will absorb half the total output of the system by 1957. Should these demands sharply decrease, the effect on the TVA power operation could be most serious, if not disastrous, to the power-rate structure as well as to the general economy of the area. We have particularly in mind the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

This great dependence of the system on a continued enormous Government-power demand leads to the suggestion that, in any expansion program, the affairs of the TVA should require unusually close control by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, the proposed bill, which, in essence, would grant unlimited authority to the TVA, seems highly inappropriate.

It is, in our view, basically undesirable to amend the TVA Act of 1933 in order to authorize the TVA to issue its own obligations to the public for the purpose of obtaining funds to finance the construction or acquisition of facilities for the generation or transmission of electric power.

In a press release dated April 5, 1955, the TVA suggests that the particular method of financing is proposed for the reason that in periods of national deficit financing there is a reluctance on the part of the executive branch and the Congress to increase budget deficits by using appropriations to finance new powerplant construction. To our mind this reasoning alone does not justify the financing of a Government activity by the sale of bonds to the public. In effect, such action would accomplish indirectly what Congress and the executive branch might be reluctant to do directly.

In our opinion, the financing of Government activities of this character should be by appropriations. If, to obtain needed funds, borrowing from the public is necessary, the Secretary of the Treasury should perform this function under the authority of the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended. This act provides, among other things, a limitation on the total amount of direct and guaranteed obligations which may be outstanding at any one time. Under the proposed legislation, the borrowing authority of TVA would be outside of the public debt ceiling and, as a result, the true financial facts of the Government's debt position would be obscured.

We do not think that agencies of the Government, other than the Treasury Department, should be authorized to borrow from the public for purposes of the character involved in this legislation, nor do we believe that the fiscal and debt management responsibilities of the Department should be weakened by authorizing other Government agencies to enter a field which is a normal function of the Treasury Department.

The proposal provides that the obligations issued by the TVA would not be obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States. However, despite such a declaration, we think that, so far as the investing public is concerned, they would be regarded as obligations of the United States Government and, as a practical matter, they would be moral and equitable obligations of the United States since they would be issued by a wholly owned and controlled corporate instrumentality of the United States Government.

By using the appropriation method of financing, two important results are achieved. First, the Congress is placed in a position to review, annually, TVA needs which can be weighed against the overall picture of revenue and expenditures of the Government. Second, any borrowings necessary to fund the appropriations granted by the Congress will be handled by the Treasury Department and automatically treated and disclosed as a part of the public debt of the Federal Government.

The proposed legislation would remove any effective control by the Congress over the TVA power operations. The provision of title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, requiring approval by the Congress for the construction of new power producing projects would be repealed. The TVA would be authorized to borrow from the public unlimited amounts to finance the construction, acquisition, enlargement, improvement, or replacement of electric power generation or transmission facilities. The only limit on expansion would be its ability to borrow. We do not believe that any agency of the Government should be granted such freedom from the normal controls exercised over Government activities.

The Government Corporation Control Act, 1945, was enacted by the Congress in order to exercise better controls over the corporations of the Government. The proposed legislation would exempt TVA from the provisions of section 302 of that act relating to the deposit of funds. We think the Secretary of the Treasury should continue to have control over the deposit of funds of the TVA, and we believe section 302 as now written is broad enough to take care of the conditions TVA seeks to meet. It should be noted that the Secretary of the Treasury is by law given authority to waive the requirements of section 302 under such conditions as he may determine.

Further, we see no reason to exempt TVA from the control of the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the issuance of obligations. Section 302 (a) of the Government Corporation Control Act requires the Secretary of the Treasury to approve the form, denomination, maturity, interest rate, terms and conditions, manner of issuance, and price of all obligations issued by Government corporations. The purpose of this provision was to formalize existing arrangements for cooperation between Government corporations and the Treasury in the issuance of corporate obligations and to assure unification of the financial policy of the Government. See House Report No. 856, 79th Congress, page 10.

In addition, we do not believe that TVA should be exempt from the provisions of section 303 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act relating to the sale and purchase of obligations of the Government. We think it necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain control over such purchases and sales when the amount involved is in excess of $100,000 at any one time.

In summary, it is our opinion that the proposed legislation is basically objectionable because of the extent to which it removes TVA from the controls now exercised over its activities by the Congress and the executive branch. If, notwithstanding the above considerations, it should be decided to authorize TVA to obtain funds through the issuance of its own bonds, we feel that the authority should be limited as follows:

1. Require congressional approval of each new power-producing project before the issuance of bonds to obtain the funds needed to build, lease, lease-purchase, or otherwise acquire power facilities, or, as a minimum alternative, place a ceiling on the total amount of bonds which can be outstanding at any one time and prescribe a definite geographical area in which TVA can construct or otherwise acquire power-producing facilities.

2. Leave with the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to approve, in advance, all terms and conditions of bonds to be issued and the time and manner in which they are to be issued, as now required by section 303 (a) of the Government Corporation Control Act.

3. Retain the applicability of sections 302 and 303 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act relating to the deposit and the investment of TVA power funds.

In addition, there are other provisions of the proposed legislation which we think are undesirable or should be clarified.

Section 15d (a) provides that the corporation is authorized to enter into binding covenants with the holders of bonds, and with the trustees, if any, with respect to the establishment of reserve funds and other funds, provisions for insurance, charges for supply of power, application of net power proceeds, restrictions upon the subsequent issuance of bonds, or the execution of leases

or lease-purchase agreements relating to power properties, and such other matters not inconsistent with the act as the TVA may deem necessary or desirable to enhance the marketability of the bonds. We have considerable concern over the possible effect of this provision for the reason that it could result in the bondholders having a strong control over the power operations of the TVA, notwithstanding TVA would be a wholly owned Federal agency.

Section 15 d (c) would authorize TVA to arrange for audits of its accounts and for reports concerning its financial condition and operations by commercial accounting firms, in addition to the audits and reports required by sections 105 and 106 of the Government Corporation Control Act, 1945. Insofar as the granting of authority to engage commercial accounting firms is concerned, we doubt such authority is necessary and have no reason to believe that the audit performed by the General Accounting Office will not serve the purposes of the TVA and the investors. However, should such authority be deemed advisable, we believe that the law should provide that it be exercised subject to the specific concurrence of the Comptroller General in order to assure avoidance of duplication and consistent classifications of revenues and expenditures in the determination of net power proceeds for all purposes.

Under the provisions of the Government Corporation Appropriations Act, 1948, TVA is required to repay the Federal appropriation investment over a definite period of years. Under the proposed legislation, the first section of this requirement would be repealed and, while, under section 15d (c), TVA would be directed to pay interest on the Government's investment, no definite plan for repayment of principal is substituted. We believe that a definite repayment plan should be established.

Section 15d (g) provides, among other things, that the TVA, in connection with the construction of a generating plant or other facilities under an agreement providing for lease or purchase of said facilities, or any interest therein by or on behalf of the corporation, or for the purchase of the output thereof, may convey in the name of United States by deed, lease, or otherwise, any real property in its possession or control, may perform engineering and construction work and other services, and may enter into any necessary contractual arrangements. We believe this authority is entirely too broad, particularly with reference to the granting of authority to convey real property. The term "real property" includes both improved and unimproved property, and consequently the language proposed would authorize TVA to convey an entire plant or other facility with the only criteria being that the TVA enter into a lease or lease-purchase agreement, or an agreement for the purchase of power output. We believe that, as a minimum, the authority to convey real property should be limited to unimproved real property. Also, the section should be clarified as to whether conveyances of real property, as well as the performance of engineering and construction work and other services by TVA may be without charge, or whether and when it is intended that TVA be paid for real property at the fair market value, and be paid for engineering and construction work and other services.

Accordingly, for the reasons indicated, we do not recommend favorable consideration of S. 2373, in its present form.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

---

[1] "Not later than June 30, 1948 and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,239,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding fiscal year from power operations, not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the 10-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in each succeeding 10-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $87,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948. Amounts equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph, to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period not to exceed 40 years after the year in which such facilities go into operation." (Government Corporations Appropriations Act of 1948, pp. 3 and 4.)

[2] Repayment made in 1955.

Payments into the general fund of the U. S. Treasury:	
On power investment	$35,000,000
Of nonpower proceeds	5,465,224
Retirement of bonds held by Treasury	15,000,000
	55,465,224

From U. S. 1956 Budget, p. 229.

[3] Depreciation: $30,092,618 from TVA annual report for fiscal 1955, p. A–12.

Balance to reserve for power properties:

Total at June 30, 1955: $168,211,522 from TVA annual report for fiscal 1955, p. A–32.

Total at June 30, 1954: $140,855,811 from TVA annual report for fiscal 1954, p. A–3.

Total for fiscal 1955: $27,355,711.

Difference: $30,092,618–$27,355,711. $2,736,907 represents retirements.

[4] Power investment at June 30, 1955:

Appropriations (U. S. budget, fiscal 1957, p. 227)	$1,298,081,000
Transfers of property (U. S. budget, fiscal 1957, p. 227)	19,365,000
Total (TVA annual report, June 30, 1955, p. A–4)	1,317,446,058
Payments into the general fund of the Treasury	100,059,019
Balance	1,217,387,039

Average interest rate on marketable public obligations from annual report of Secretary of the Treasury, June 30, 1954, p. 471.

[5] Sales by TVA in 1955, TVA annual report, June 30, 1955, pp. A–39 to A–41:

		Percent	Amount	Percent	Rev/kilowatt hour
4 large cities	6,320,502,090	15.03	$25,104,664	13.40	3.97
Towns and cooperatives	7,236,120,329	17.21	33,099,494	17.67	4.65
Total	13,556,622,419	32.24	58,204,158	31.07	
Industrial and other:					
Industrials	6,030,518,975		23,555,417		3.91
Private utilities	31,289,648		145,070		4.64
Interdivisional	656,072,300		2,493,851		3.80
Total	6,717,880,923	15.98	26,194,338	13.98	4.09
Federal agencies	21,770,450,713	51.78	102,962,859	54.95	4.73
Total	28,488,331,636	67.76	129,157,197	68.93	
Grand total	42,044,954,055	100.00	187,361,355	100.00	

[6] Money that has passed through hands of TVA:

Total power operating revenue	$896,194,921
Other gross revenues, disposition of fertilizer and munitions	219,651,948
Bonds issued	65,072,500
Appropriations and net transfers of property	1,950,418,029
Contributions in aid of construction	303,417
Total	3,131,640,815

Revenues were compiled from income statements in TVA annual reports. Remainder of figures from TVA annual report, June 30, 1955, pp. A–4 and A–7.

[7] The table is as follows:

Year	Total taxes	State and local taxes	Proportion	TVA State and local taxes
1955			[a] 39.18	$18,798,270
1954	1,437	563	39.18	14,961,106
1953	1,339	515	38.46	12,088,831
1952	1,224	471	38.48	9,561,578
1951	1,150	431	37.48	7,584,363

[a] Estimated.

Year	Total taxes	State and local taxes	Proportion	TVA State and local taxes
1950	948	387	40.82	$7,465,416
1949	794	352	44.33	7,057,098
1948	712	321	45.08	6,276,497
1947	664	290	43.67	5,720,490
1946	644	266	41.30	5,625,989
1945	652	241	36.96	4,849,437
1944	677	235	34.71	3,774,942
1943	680	232	34.12	3,128,670
1942	628	231	36.78	2,355,075
1941	520	226	43.46	1,718,948
1940	404	214	52.97	839,377
1939	352	212	60.23	532,838
1938	323	212	65.63	
1937	308	207	67.21	
1933–38			[b] 67.21	1,438,294
Total				113,776,919

[b] Used.

[8] Hoover Commission Task Force report, vol. 2, p. 441.

NOTES ON PROJECTIVE OF TVA TAXES

Page 441 Hoover Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power gives the total tax obligation to June 30, 1953, as $199,501,868.

Method of projecting taxes—TVA only

Fiscal year	Kilowatts installed including Army engineers plants	Average	Taxes	Per kilowatt	Fiscal year
1950	2,648,050	2,741,800	$20,235,761	7.38	1951
1951	2,835,550	3,347,230	24,848,176	7.42	1952
1952	3,859,910	4,305,480	31,432,219	7.30	1953
1953	4,751,050	5,230,900	38,185,570	7.30	1954
1954	5,710,750	6,572,500	47,979,250	7.30	1955
1955	7,434,250				
Subtotal			86,164,820		
			199,501,868		
Total			285,666,688		

Payments in lieu of State and local taxes:

1933–1953	$29,751,095
1954	3,578,668
1955	3,878,466
Total	37,208,229

Hoover Task Force Report, p. 242.

[9] Interest was figured by multiplying the average funds employed in the power program by 3 percent which gave a total of $290,370,791. From this was deducted the interest paid on bonds of $10,637,516, leaving $279,733,275.

[10] Page 52 of the 1940 TVA Annual Report.

Original cost	
Wilson Dam	$46,950,748
Steam plant	12,326,392
Nitrate plants, etc	65,073,387
Total	124,350,527
Took on books, see p. 55:	
Wilson Dam 31,300,000	
Equipment, etc 485,787	
	31,785,787
	92,564,740

[11] Allocation to navigation:

Navigation facilities, including locks, channel improvements, etc	$46,142,069
Allocation of multiple facilities	112,000,038
Total	158,142,107

(TVA annual report June 30, 1955, p. A–17.)

Cost of equivalent low dam navigation channel $67 million. From H. Doc. 328, 71st Cong., pt. I, p. 99. TVA did not build the large locks at all dams.

[12] Allocations to flood control:

Direct flood-control investment	$55,403,000
Allocation of multiple facilities	128,592,636
Total	183,995,636

(TVA annual report, June 30, 1955, p. A–17.)

Nomination of Wesley D'Ewart To Be Assistant Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there is shortly to come before the Senate the nomination of Mr. Wesley A. D'Ewart to the Post of Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Consideration is now being given in the Interior Committee, I believe, to this appointment.

I have received many protests against this appointment.

On October 18, of last year, the New York Post printed an editorial on Mr. D'Ewart. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNNY TEAM PLAY

The case of Wesley A. D'Ewart has received inadequate attention. It throws painful light on the heralded operations of "the team" that is alledgedly carrying on for Ike in Washington.

D'Ewart is a former GOP Congressman from Montana. During his tenure in the Capital his servitude to the wealthy cattle interests was so shameless that it evoked denunciation from Secretary of the Interior McKay, a man not previously considered a fighting foe of special interests. It was McKay who said of a bill introduced by D'Ewart back in 1953:

"The D'Ewart bill would give cattlemen vested rights to their grazing permits. I'm confident we'll live up to the campaign pledge and do something for the cattlemen, but not at the expense of all of the rest of the people. There's going to be no giveaway program on the public lands."

Lest there be any doubt as to the meaning of his words, McKay summed up his feelings by terming the O'Ewart bill "lousy." It was rejected by the Republican Congress.

Subsequently D'Ewart ran for the Senate seat occupied by Senator MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana. As Tom Stokes reported in this newspaper last week, his campaign was distinguished by the publication of a pamphlet called "Senator MURRAY and the Red Web Over Congress," a document rivaling any of the most scurrilous McCarthyite trash of the period.

D'Ewart lost and we had reason to assume he would not be heard from for a while. We were wrong. One of the first noncontroversial matters Sherman Adams rushed to the bedside of the President was the interim appointment of Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Development. In the face of Democratic criticism Secretary McKay now insists that D'Ewart is "a man of very very good judgment." The team marches on.

The Democratic-ruled Congress is likely to reject the D'Ewart appointment. Admittedly it is questionable how much damage he can do before it reconvenes. But the episode surely invites speculation as to how many other funny things wil be the product of the new era of teamwork.

Dismissal of Frederick B. Lee as Civil Aeronautics Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three excellent editorials regarding the dismissal of Frederick B. Lee as Civil Aeronautics Administrator. The first is an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 12, 1955; the second an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 13, 1955; and the third an editorial from the Denver Post of December 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 12, 1955]

POLITICS AT COMMERCE

Secretary of Commerce Weeks does not seem to have learned much from his abortive attempt to fire Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. His dismissal of Frederick B. Lee as Civil Aeronautics Administrator smacks of the same disdain for the career service and an inadequate appreciation of the importance of technically skilled administrators. Mr. Lee is a Vermont Republican with a wealth of background for the exacting requirements of his job. After aviation experience during the war, he entered the CAA as a civil-service employee. He rose rapidly and won the respect of his fellow employees and of the aircraft industry, the airlines, and the pilots. In 1953, President Eisenhower promoted him from the ranks to be Administrator.

Obviously, anyone in a position of this kind has provoked criticism. Mr. Lee has made decisions without regard to politics and has fought vigorously for improved safety regulations. Within the Department he has opposed budget cuts imposed on the CAA because of his belief that a rapidly expanding aviation industry requires a larger and more alert supervisory agency. Last month, without explaining why, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation Louis S. Rothschild demanded Mr. Lee's resignation. Secretary Weeks insisted that the resignation be handed in without delay. Mr. Lee, however, was unable to obtain any reasons for his dismissal. If there have been any complaints regarding his work, they have not been stated; on the contrary, many persons in informed positions assert that Mr. Lee's work as Administrator has been exemplary and that he is a man of integrity and unusual ability. He is being replaced by Charles J. Lowen, Jr., of Colorado, Deputy CAA Administrator since May. Mr. Lowen has considerably less transportation experience but he has strong political backing.

Chairman MAGNUSON, of the Senate Commerce Committee, is justified in calling for an investigation. Secretary Weeks has violated no law or regulation and is within his rights in dismissing the CAA Administrator if he believes a better man is available. But he should have a greater consideration than he has shown in this case for the morale of an agency employing 15,000 persons and which is intimately concerned with some of the most highly technical problems of

modern aviation, aircraft safety, and aircraft design. The outsider cannot make a final judgment in the matter.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 13, 1955]

WHAT'S GOING ON IN CAA AND CAB?

There is a crying need in the interest of good government and fair play to find out just why Frederick B. Lee has been forced out as head of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Joining the CAA 10 years ago, he became Administrator in March 1953 and nothing has been brought to light to indicate that he has not performed his duties ably.

The CAA, a unit of the Commerce Department, is a very important Federal office charged mainly with building and operating air navigation aids, enforcing air safety regulations, and promoting development of a national airport system. Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, charges that Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks ousted Lee as part of a campaign to obtain czar-like powers over civil aviation.

The appointment of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to succeed Lee is evidence of a plan to squeeze Lee out. For Lowen, who joined the CAA only last May, is reported to have been put in a job handpicked for him by Secretary Weeks and his Under Secretary, Lewis S. Rothschild. It was about this time that Lee testified in the Senate in favor of a bill authorizing a $250 million Federal outlay to aid in airport construction. Weeks and Rothschild, according to MONRONEY, fought this bill bitterly.

It is a sardonic coincidence that the Lee ouster comes right when the administration is launching a campaign to give recognition to career employees who have outstanding records. As Jerry Kluttz, Washington Post columnist, commented: "If officials such as Lee, who have worked themselves to the top, are fired for no good reason, the worthwhile campaign will be doomed as hollow and insincere."

In the opinion of Mr. MONRONEY, Secretary Weeks is also trying to get the CAB completely under his thumb. Someone blocked the reappointment of Josh Lee to the CAB. And Mr. Weeks, no doubt cognizant of the likelihood that Ross Rizley will resign as head of the CAB soon to take an Oklahoma judgeship, would have an opportunity to get a chairman of his own selection appointed.

Senator MONRONEY's announcement that the Senate Commerce Committee will start digging into Commerce Department policies under Weeks and Rothschild is most timely. The committee should dig into them deeply enough to determine whether it might not be wise to take the CAA and the CAB away from the Department of Commerce and let them have their freedom.

[From the Denver Post of December 14, 1955]

AIRING OUT THE CAA

The right of the President to oust Civil Aeronautics Administrator Frederick B. Lee and appoint Charles J. Lowen, Jr., in his place cannot be doubted. The job of administrator is not under civil service and he is one of those officials who serve at the pleasure of the President.

Neither can it be doubted that reasons for the ouster are matters of legitimate concern for Congress if they involve policy and appropriations which have been written into law.

Senator MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, believes the firing of Lee is the result of sentiment within the Department of Commerce which favors rail transportation and opposes the expansion of air transportation, particularly if such expansion would require Federal expenditures such as aid for the modernization and improvement of airports.

The Commerce Department attitude, Senator MONRONEY believes, comes from the top—Commerce Secretary Weeks and Under Secretary Louis B. Rothschild. The latter seems to be the sponsor of Lowen who has been with the CAA only a few months as Deputy Administrator.

Lee had been with the CAA for 10 years. Rothschild in discussing the ouster stressed the complaint that Lee lacked a desire for teamwork. Senator MONRONEY says Lee has been punished because he urged Congress to adopt a larger airport-aid bill than the Eisenhower administration had asked.

The expanded aid program will provide $63 million a year for 4 years beginning in 1956. In his testimony before the Senate subcommittee on the aid bill, Lee said many airports are overcrowded and only seven airports in the entire country are prepared to handle jet aircraft with safety.

Senator MONRONEY says the ground minded Commerce Department opposed the feeder airline bill which has given air service to many smaller communities which could not support trunkline service.

The Senator's charges or suspicions or whatever they are appear serious enough to justify a full airing of Commerce Department and CAA attitudes toward aviation development. The Congress and the people should be allowed to know just where Secretary Weeks stands on commercial airline policies.

If the Secretary should prove to be hostile to programs Congress has evolved, Congress can find ways of placing those programs in more sympathetic hands.

Address of Guatemalan Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an address by Lt. Col. Jose Luis Cruz Salazar, Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States, which was delivered at Rollins College on Saturday, January 21, 1956. The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate most deeply the honor you have paid my country, by inviting its ambassador to address such a select audience.

I cannot say, however, that I take any pleasure in discussing the topic that is before us. No sane man can derive the slightest pleasure in reviewing the subversion of his country by a ruthless, imperialistic foreign power, in collaboration with local dupes and traitors. To we Guatemalans the subject before us is a painful one.

Nevertheless, the case of Guatemala, when presented in its true perspective, contains some valuable lessons; lessons which, if they are studied well by the peoples of the Americas, will surely contribute to the safety of our hemisphere.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, even though the task is an unpleasant one, I must welcome the opportunity to discuss with you briefly, and attempt to analyze, the Guatemalan case.

Let me first try to put the topic in perspective. In recent years many thoughtful Latin Americans have become increasingly concerned at three factors prevalent throughout the hemisphere, which we feel, threatens the welfare of all of us. This concern is particularly felt by those of us in Guatemala, who participated in the liberation movement.

1. In many of the American nations there is a serious lack of understanding by the great majority of the people, as to the benefits and the responsibilities incurred by the individual in a democratic society. To most of us, I am sad to say, democracy is a subject that evokes much emotion, but too little thought.

2. It is equally true that in many of our countries there is among all classes of people a lack of knowledge as to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, of its peculiar techniques and tactics devised for this hemisphere, and, especially, of its imperialistic aims.

3. Many of us are too little aware of the very real threat that communism poses to the freedom and security of our hemisphere, and of the truly alarming progress it has made. Ironically, we are better informed on developments in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East than we are of those right here in the Americas.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe any objective analysis of the case of Guatemala must lead to the conclusion that the existence of those three factors enabled a small handful of ruthlessly efficient Communist agitators to gain control of my country, and to exercise that control, almost unnoticed by the rest of the American nations, for nearly a decade.

Guatemalans, in our country located in the very heart of the Americas, have enjoyed political freedom in only a few brief periods of our history. We have had little experience with democracy—except as a catch phrase by demagogic politicians. Most of our experience has been with the old-fashioned type of personal dictatorship.

As the Second World War drew toward a close, Guatemala was caught in a tide of political, social, and economic unrest which swept most of Latin America, and which still prevails in many countries. Jorge Ubico, the last of the old-school dictators, who had ruled for 14 years, was forced out of office by public pressure in 1944. A few months later, his successor, Gen. Federico Ponce Vaides, was unseated after a brief, but bloody, revolution, when it appeared that he, too, was following the policy of dictatorship.

General Ponce followed his predecessor, Ubico into exile, on October 20, 1944. And that date opened the gates for new hope by the people of Guatemala. But unfortunately, it also opened a new opportunity for international communism to secure a foothold in the Western Hemisphere after years of patient preparation and careful testing and revising of its subversive tactics.

Please note, ladies and gentlemen, that at that time our people had no real knowledge of democracy—we merely had the desire to possess it. Even our intellectuals lacked any real concept of the responsibilities that democracy invokes on all classes of individuals—private citizens as well as public officials. It is equally true that we were utterly lacking in knowledge of the Communist conspiracy, and of the real threat it presented to the achievement of our democratic aspirations. All three of the factors that I listed a few moments ago were prevalent. And the Communists immediately seized the advantage. They knew precisely what they wanted and had careful plans as to how they would achieve it. In Europe the Communists used as the tool for expansion the presence or the threat of the powerful Red army. In Asia they armed local masses and organized them into trained armies under Red instructors and advisers. But in Latin America, in Guatemala, they were forced to rely on guile, conspiracy, demagogery, and subversion.

So, in accordance with what was obviously a careful plan to exploit any similar opportunity, presenting itself anywhere in the

hemisphere, the Communist leader concentrated on Guatemala.

With almost unbelievable speed, they swung into action. Guatemalan Communists who had been living in exile returned to their homes and engaged in tireless, carefully coordinated political activity. They were joined by comrades from all over Latin America, and even from Spain.

I believe it is important that only a few of these, in the beginning, acknowledged their Communist beliefs. Most of them sailed under the false colors of liberals, or Marxian Socialists, or even the new spiritual socialism invented by President Arévalo.

Their early tactics have since become standard Communist practices throughout the hemisphere. They allied themselves with all of the revolutionary parties, and immediately set about winning the confidence of the more radical elements in our intellectual and working classes. And they succeeded so well that they were able to secure the nomination of Juan José Arévalo for the presidency by all of the revolutionary parties. And Arévalo, if he was not an actual card-carrying Communist at that time, was certainly a true Communist sympathizer.

Needless to say, Arévalo was elected by an overwhelming majority. Then came the second phase of the Communist program, a phase that was already well under way before the elections—the organization of the workers under Communist leaders. At the invitation of Arévalo, Vicente Lombardo Toledano came to Guatemala to supervise the organization of the unions. Toledano maneuvered into leadership of the labor movement a young Communist intellectual, Víctor Manuel Gutiérrez. Later Gutiérrez selected as his lieutenant a man whom many observers believe was the No. 2 Communist of Guatemala, Carlos Manuel Pellecer. The direct tie-in between the Guatemalan labor leaders and Moscow, was clearly revealed in 1951, when Louis Saillant, of France, head of the notorious World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) came to Guatemala to personally supervise the organization of a central labor body, the Confederación General de Trabajadores (CGTG), which, of course, became affiliated with the World Faderation of Trade Unions (WFTU) and Lombardo Toledano's Communist-controlled Latin American labor organization, Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina (CTAL).

Meanwhile the peons and the small farmers were also being organized into the Rural Confederation of Guatemala, under Leonardo Castillo Flores, an ardent advocate of communism, who made his pilgrimage to Moscow and to various so-called peace conferences. It was Castillo Flores who attempted to combat the liberation movement directed by Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, by organizing the rural workers into armed militia, and at one time even dared to give orders to the army's chief of staff.

Meanwhile the Communists were moving at top speed along three other highly important fronts. They were maneuvering controlling positions in the important government agencies, the educational system, and the political parties.

In the government they obtained control of the propaganda agencies, including the government-owned and subsidized newspapers, and the National Broadcasting System, the Social Security Institute, the Electoral Tribunal, the Labor Courts, the President's General Secretariat, and finally even the Congress. They put through a Communist designed agrarian reform program, and staffed its administrative agency with Communists. They took over the Foreign Office, and perverted the Guatemalan diplomatic corps into a Communist courier service. And finally, when a decision of the supreme court displeased the party leaders, at the request of a single Communist deputy the entire court was impeached by a fellow-traveling Congress, and sympathetic judges were appointed to replace them.

In the educational field, Mario Silva Jonama, a fanatic Communist teacher became virtually a dictator of the men teachers' school; María de Sellarés, another Communist, became director of the School for Women Teachers; Virginia Bravo Letelier, a Chilean Communist, headed the rural educational system; Rafael Tischler, a notorious Communist, became director of the Labor Union for Workers in Education. A Communist front was organized to penetrate San Carlos University, and with typical Communist irony, it was called the Democratic University Front. Thus, in our educational system, we soon found that the Communists were in control not only of the hiring and firing of teachers, but also of the selection of curricula.

And in the political field, using their control over the important labor and agrarian vote as a weapon, the Communists soon gained controlling positions in all of our major political parties.

I believe it is highly significant that through this period of securing control of the important fields of our political, social, and economic life, the Communists either remained in the background, or maintained the disguise of liberals. From the very beginning, however, a few of us knew, they were actively recruiting the young intellectuals and workers, organizing them into cells, and indoctrinating them in Marxist principles and tactics.

Then, shortly before the election of Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, the party came out into the open. In 1950 the Communist Party of Guatemala made its public appearance under the leadership of José Manuel Fortuny. About the same time another branch of the party came into being, apparently for the purpose of evading article 32 of the constitution, which in effect outlaws the Communist Party. This branch was called the Labor Revolutionary Party and was headed by Gutiérrez. After a trip to Moscow by Gutiérrez, however, the two parties were united into the Guatemalan Workers Party, under the leadership of Fortuny. An interesting aspect is that the Guatemalan Government directly subsidized the party's official newspaper, Octubre, which carried as its motto, "For a strong, large Communist Party," by placing complimentary ads in its issues.

I think that another highly significant aspect of the political tactics of the Communists in Guatemala, is that even after they came out in the open, with their own official party and candidates, the Communists continued their dominant positions in the other political parties. On more than one occasion, they supported their handpicked candidates from the other parties, over their own official party candidates.

After the election of Arbenz, the Communist tactics became increasingly bolder, and more apparent to the public. In Arbenz the Communists had a disciple who declared, shortly before his inauguration, and I quote: "The world is divided into two groups; on the one side the United States and the nations of the capitalistic system, with their great economic power; and on the other side the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics controlling a group of nations with the almost mystic ideology opposed to a decadent imperialistic system." And he added, "Perhaps we, the men of the present generation will not see it, but in this fight the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is going to win." This, of course, is the typical Leninist formula of reducing the political problems of the world into the oversimplification of the inevitable fight between communism and capitalism. Arbenz, on assuming office, named as his principal adviser, the Communist leader, Fortuny. It is small wonder that the Communist conspirators, in order to secure the election of Arbenz went even to the lengths of contriving the assassination of his popular opponent, Col. Francisco Javier Arana, and an outspoken anti-Communist.

I regret deeply, that I do not have the time to go into detail on the second aspect of the Guatemalan case, one in which I as all loyal Guatemalans can view with real pride—our liberation from the Communist tyranny. And ladies and gentlemen, it was a tyranny—of the most ruthless sort. From the very beginning of the Arévalo regime, the secret police resorted to search without warrant, and arrests without formal charges or trials. Hundreds of opponents to the Communists were forced into exile. After the murder of Arana and the election of Arbenz the oppressive tactics became increasingly harsh, and finally culminated in the reign of terror that preceded the liberation, a reign of terror during which hundreds of anti-Communists were seized, brutally tortured, mutilated and finally murdered.

It is not only lack of time, but my main purpose here is to analyze the tactics the Communists followed in Guatemala, and the factors that made them successful. In the discussion of these factors, I believe there is one aspect of the liberation movement which must be considered. For it was by attacking these factors that Colonel Castillo overthrew the Communist regime. It was ideas that won in Guatemala—not guns and tanks and planes. For months preceding the revolution, Colonel Castillo and his followers bombarded the people of Guatemala with a systematic barrage of pamphlets and newspapers published by groups in exile, and with broadcasts over the clandestine radio. All of these were aimed at exposing to the people of Guatemala the true nature of the Communist-controlled government and its ties with the Kremlin, and at convincing them of the superior advantages of democracy. So when the final test came, Arbenz and his Communist mentors found that not only were they unable to command the army and air force, but even the workers and the Campesinos deserted them. The people had become convinced, and in Castillo Armas they had found a leader. Permit me, for the sake of emphasis, to repeat those factors briefly; first, the lack of real understanding of the political and philosophical meaning of democracy; second, the lack of understanding of the tactics and imperialistic aims of communism; and third, the unawareness of the danger that communism presents, and the headway it has already made. To these I could add a fourth factor, although it is of a slightly different nature, the spirit of political, social and economic unrest. I did not list this in the beginning, because it is to a considerable degree, Communist inspired. The principal tactic being used by the Communists throughout the hemisphere today, is the fomenting of discontent and unrest, in an obvious plan to create a chaotic situation they will be able to exploit.

Those are the factors that made the Communist control of my country possible. And, also let me repeat, for emphasis, those factors are prevalent today in many nations in this hemisphere.

We in Guatemala do not believe that our fight against communism is won, by any means. That is why we are so determined to prove to our people that democracy, once properly understood and applied, offers to all individuals willing to accept its responsibilities, the better way of life. However, even then, we shall not feel secure. We know that we are part of this hemisphere. And as long as a single nation remains vulnerable, we in Guatemala, too, are vulnerable.

Therefore, speaking entirely unofficially, I should like to propose for your discussion and consideration, an idea that is provoking considerable thought in my country. Not a detailed solution, but at least an idea.

I am convinced that we must find a way to mobilize the anti-Communist thought in this hemisphere, into an effective force to cope with these prevailing ignorances that endanger our freedom. I suggest a movement on a hemispheric basis, which would:

A. Educate all classes of people, in all of our countries, in the full political and philosophical meaning of democracy; not only in the benefits that it offers the individual, but also in the duties, the responsibilities that it imposes on him if these benefits are to be enjoyed.

b. Educate all classes of our people in the true nature of communism, and particularly its tactics and its imperialistic aims.

C. Acquaint our peoples with the day-to-day, week-to-week, and year-to-year activities of the Communist conspiracy, so that we can better evaluate its gains, and so that our governments can devise methods to counterbalance them.

I present this idea not as a cure-all. But simply as one step to be taken in the continuing fight, which I fear will outlast our lives, between the two great ideological forces, democracy and communism. Surely the knowledge, not only of what we are fighting against, but also of what we are fighting for, is an indispensable weapon in this historic struggle. And since all of us in the hemisphere are the objects of Communist attack, and all are to a greater or lesser degree, vulnerable, I propose a defense on a hemispheric scale. I limit this particular program to this hemisphere, because, as I already pointed out, the imperialistic tactics of the Communist conspiracy here, differ from those followed in other critical areas of the world.

If this were possible, if we should team our resources in a common effort and bring the whole truth to the peoples of our hemisphere, we would have taken a long and sure step toward the goal of true freedom that only democracy can bring.

I once again thank Rollins College for the opportunity given me to address you here today and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention.

Social-Security Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW JERSEY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Trenton, N. J., February 1, 1956.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In connection with the very important matter of social security, which is now before you, this association has taken a poll of its 3,000 members with the following results:

1. Do you favor social security for self-employed lawyers? Yes, 1,368; no, 88.

2. Do you favor their complete exclusion? Yes, 89; no, 1,064.

3. Do you favor voluntary coverage? Yes, 959; no, 248.

4. Do you favor compulsory coverage? Yes, 555; no, 658.

5. If voluntary coverage cannot be obtained, do you favor compulsory coverage? Yes, 1,098; no, 242.

While this poll was taken primarily to advise the American Bar Association of our opinion in the matter, we felt that you would like to have the feeling from New Jersey separately.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please advise us.

Sincerely,

EMMA E. DILLON,
Secretary.

The Middle Eastern Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the challenge in the Middle East must be met now, with true leadership and courage and without any further appeasement. By our indecision, bewilderment, and confusion we have suffered the problem to become too acute and much too explosive and can no longer afford to vacillate and sit on both sides of the fence. This is not merely a challenge to the life of Israel but to the very peace of the entire world.

When the Communists began to pour arms into the Middle East, we should have shown a little more of that boldness we read about in Life magazine. Instead, we sat back doing absolutely nothing affirmative, while the military balance is being, and perhaps has been, upset.

Certainly no decent thinking individual or country wants to see an arms race in the Middle East. But is there anyone who would like to see Egypt and the other Arab countries, all avowedly dedicated to destroy Israel, so strong that the only democracy in the Middle East may be overrun?

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late if we act immediately. We must grant the request of Israel for arms and enter into a security pact guaranteeing the present border. If we do this, we still can avoid open conflict and reassure our allies and friends all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are again at the brink. Let us not go over it.

At this point I would like to insert an editorial entitled "The Middle Eastern Danger," which originally appeared in the Manchester Guardian Weekly, and which has been reprinted in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, as a public service by International Latex Corp.

I urge all the Members to read the article and to give it very serious consideration.

The article follows:

THE MIDDLE EASTERN DANGER

If Russian MIG fighters have been seen over Cairo, as the Minister of Defense suggested in the House of Commons on Tuesday, the supply of ancient British Valentine tanks to Egypt appears comparatively trivial. Indeed, much of the debate in the House on Tuesday seemed to be on secondary issues. It is important, of course, that any laxity in the administration of arms exports should be tracked down, and Mr. Gaitskell made the most of the failings which there have evidently been. But a trickle of old tanks to the Middle East—and it has been no more than that—is insignificant beside the delivery of fairly new arms both by Communist countries and by the British Government. The Minister of Defense was justified in his contention that, even if the obsolete tanks which have been allowed out of this country were remilitarised, they would not add materially to Egypt's armed strength. It is a different story with Centurion tanks and jet fighters from this country as with Stalin tanks and MIG aircraft from Russia and Czechoslovakia. These have added greatly to Egypt's power and have unbalanced the military situation in the Middle East. The British Government has placed itself in a weak position to complain about Communist supplies, because it was first in the field. Sir Walter Monckton refused to give details of the arms sold by the Government to Egypt, taking refuge behind the old excuse that it would be "contrary to all practice" to disclose what had been sent. (Why should it be contrary to all practice when in Jordan and Iraq only a few weeks ago we held public ceremonies, with ambassadors and press photographers in attendance, to hand over tanks and aircraft?) There is, however, no doubt that Centurions and Vampires went to Egypt before the first Soviet deliveries began.

The preponderant supply of arms to Egypt, as Mr. Gaitskell said, has created grave danger. The hope of the Arab States for revenge against Israel has been enhanced, and they may soon feel tempted to try to drive the Jews into the sea. The Israelis, too, may feel that because the balance is clearly going against them for the first time since the war, they should strike before the situation becomes worse. The danger is in part of the British Government's own making. It has been aggravated by the Soviet intervention, but Britain itself must bear part of the preliminary blame. For that reason action ought to be taken to make more plain our intentions under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. Jointly with the United States and France, we ought to say what we shall do both to restore a balance of arms and to deal with any renewal of the war. The promise of supplies to Israel would do much to remove her feeling that she should strike while there is time, and the promise of military action against the violation of frontiers by either side would help to deter Egypt. It is ironical that, having said in the 1950 declaration that an arms race ought to be avoided, Britain has promoted one to the extent that she ought now to send extra supplies. But the damage has been done, and Israel cannot safely be left weak. As to violation of frontiers, the wording of the 1950 declaration was plain enough. It said:

"The three governments, should they find that any of these States was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action both within and outside the United Nations to prevent such violation."

Our obligation to defend the present dividing line is evident. (The meaning of Sir Anthony Eden's intervention last Tuesday, when he told Mr. Gaitskell that the language of the declaration was not so clear as Mr. Gaitskell thought, is puzzling.) That undertaking ought, nevertheless, to be reinforced by a statement that Britain and the United States would, if necessary, take military action. Britain has its troops in Cyprus and Libya, and the United States has a fleet handy. In Washington this week their readiness should be reaffirmed.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*...3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Adams 2-6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	District 7-4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	
Vacancy	

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Hilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill.*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

American Bar Membership Week, February 10–17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the week of February 10 to 17 will be observed by the legal profession nationally as American Bar Membership Week, in which an organized effort will be made by lawyers all over the Nation to increase the membership list of the American Bar Association.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with this effort be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Formed in 1878 by a small group of lawyers in Saratoga Springs, N. Y., the American Bar Association has evolved from semisocial beginnings into the largest legal organization in the world. While it has grown steadily although not spectacularly, in size, it has wielded great influence for the benefit not only of its members but of the general public as well.

This month, during the week of February 10 to 17, 10,000 lawyers, volunteering their time and effort, will go out in every city and town in the United States in a synchronized, mass personal interview campaign to double the size of the national association of the legal profession.

The lawyers joining in this unusual campaign are themselves members of the American Bar Association. Their immediate goal is to enroll, in that single week, 50,000 new members of the association. The present membership of the ABA is about 60,000.

Its membership doubled in the 20 years between 1916 and 1936, and redoubled in the last 20 years, but the American Bar Association has never before undertaken a membership development campaign such as that to be carried out this month.

E. Smythe Gambrell, of Atlanta, Ga., president of the American Bar Association, and Cecil E. Burney, of Corpus Christi, Tex., former president of the State bar of Texas and present national chairman of the Conference of Bar Presidents, have provided national leadership for this great organizing effort. Mr. Burney, as chairman of the campaign, heads a national executive committee made up of distinguished leaders of the bar from every section of the country.

The public, as well as the legal profession itself, has a direct interest in this project. The bar associations—National, State, and local—traditionally devote a large proportion of their time and energies to activities and services that are in the public interest and for the protection of the public. The maintenance of high standards of legal education; enforcement of discipline in the profession; improvements in the administration of justice; citizenship training programs, and civic activities of all kinds—all these and many other subjects are constantly the concerns of the organized bar.

The legal profession includes some 241,000 judges, lawyers and law teachers. They are organized into more than 1,400 bar associations, which together constitute the "organized bar." While the State and local bar associations are organically independent, they work in close cooperation with the American Bar Association in many professional and public enterprises.

All of the State associations and many of the local bar associations are represented in the house of delegates, which is the policy-making body of the association. Members of the house of delegates directly represent more than 200,000 lawyers.

The American Bar Association is a voluntary organization. Its members are under no compulsion to join. The lawyers, judges and law teachers who serve on its 64 committees and in its 17 sections do so out of a sense of professional duty and dedication. Some outstanding figures of the law—men like Elihu Root, Simeon E. Baldwin, Charles Evans Hughes, and John W. Davis—have been among its presidents.

The association is entirely nonpartisan, and its recommendations as to legislation have frequently been invited by the Congress. It has performed many valuable services through the years in providing congressional committees with information and expert guidance in the drafting of legislation in many fields.

Some of the American Bar Association's accomplishments have been truly notable. For example, the ABA was responsible for the promulgation of the canons of professional and judicial ethics. The ABA has worked and is working for uniform State laws. The ABA has consistently opposed efforts to impair an independent judiciary. The ABA has exerted strong influence in the promotion of responsible American citizenship.

Efforts of the ABA helped lead to the enactment by the Congress of the law establishing the Federal codes of civil and criminal procedure.

The association has furnished the leadership through which the organized bar has made legal services available, by means of the legal aid and lawyer referral programs, to many thousands of persons with no resources or limited resources for employing counsel.

In recent years the American Bar Association was active in helping to achieve the enactment by Congress of the Administrative Procedure Act and the 1955 bill adjusting upward the compensation of Federal judges and Members of Congress.

The association advises the Justice Department as to qualifications of nominees for the Federal bench.

Among other functions, the ABA has the responsibility of approving, or not approving, law schools after examination of their curricula and facilities.

In short, the American Bar Association has been the focal point through which the legal profession has discharged its professional responsibilities through the years. It seeks, through the present membership effort, to enlarge its resources to perform all the tasks to which it has committed itself.

In discussing the membership-development program, ABA President Gambrell recently stated:

"The American Bar Association is embarking on a long-overdue campaign to double its membership and its personal and financial resources—to bring the rank and file of the country's lawyers into its fellowship and its civic and educational enterprises.

"The association seeks to guide the profession into a future of broader and richer service and usefulness. To do this we need the personal participation of a substantial majority of the legal profession, to claim public respect, to have influence and to finance the institutes, studies, surveys, research, and publications which are so vital to our great objectives. Nothing short of a mass revival can marshal our forces and keep us spiritually, culturally, and technically fit and in step with the amazing developments of this era."

Mr. President, success of this membership campaign will result in future benefits both to the legal profession and to the American people.

Interview of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Over Mutual Broadcasting System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I was intereviewed over the Mutual Broadcasting System. The interview concerned the importance and significance of Africa in the world today. I have the text of the questions and answers of that interview, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Senator WILEY, what is your feeling concerning the importance of Africa in the world today?

Answer. I believe Africa—with its 200 million people—is one of the most strategic areas in the world of 1956, and for many years to come.

There is a tremendous ferment all over what was formerly known as the Dark Continent—the unknown continent.

World communism is shifting more and more of its focus to Africa. It is trying to exploit issues in every land which would help increase tensions, issues like the racial issue, fanning hatred by the colored peoples against the white race.

Question. What other issues is communism trying to exploit?

Answer. Obviously, the issue of colonialism.

Ever since World War II, there has been a tremendous stirring among the underdeveloped countries which had been held as colonies, protectorates, and dependencies of the various European powers.

The Bandung Conference last year in Indonesia—attended by 29 Asian-African nations—showed that the colonial and ex-colonial areas regard freedom from colonialism as the No. 1 issue today in the world.

Unfortunately, many of these peoples do not seem to want to recognize that the Western Powers have obviously largely been giving up their colonial controls. Since the end of World War II, more than 600 million peoples have gained their independence from western rule. Great countries like India, Pakistan, and Burma, for example, have emerged free and independent.

On the other hand, during that same period, more than 700 million people have been enslaved under the new Red colonial rule—the bloody imperialism of the Kremlin. This is the most savage imperialism in the history of the world.

But regrettably, many Africans, like many south Asians, don't seem to be concerned about Soviet colonialism, only about western colonialism.

Question. What is America's position?

Answer. We have no time for colonialism. We are ex-colonies ourselves. Where we controlled nations, like Cuba and the Philippines, we gladly and promptly freed them.

But we don't want communism to move into Africa or anywhere else. We don't want peoples to be unprepared for their own self-government.

Question. What action have you personally taken with regard to Africa's self-government?

Answer. I have been glad to take several steps.

For example, I have been glad to join as a cosponsor of a resolution offered by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, to convey the greetings of the people and the Government of the United States to the new sovereign nation of the Sudan.

We are hoping the Sudan will join with the western lands in striving for freedom prosperity and peace. Already, however, we note that the Soviet Union is making overtures to the Sudan.

Question. What else has been done, Senator, by yourself and others with regard to African nations' sovereignty?

Answer. Well, it was at my suggestion that the Senate adopted a resolution last year to convey our greetings to the Gold Coast and to Nigeria.

These countries are two of the best demonstrations in Africa, of orderly progress toward self-government.

The Gold Coast has been moving ahead in a commendable way toward control of its own affairs. It is the first colony in Africa to have an all-African legislature and an all-African cabinet.

Nigeria, with a population of 13½ million, has also made a good deal of progress toward freedom.

Question. Why do you feel the Gold Coast and Nigeria are so important?

Answer. Well, you see, the important question today is whether th African countries are going to be ready for freedom when it is granted to them. Fortunately, the Gold Coast and Nigeria are making splendid progress, as I have indicated. I point out however that if Western powers grant freedom prematurely, they might only be playing into the Communists' hands unwittingly, because freedom without the real ability to govern oneself, can lead to chaos. And communism thrives on chaos.

Question. Would you have any other reactions to the African situation as a whole?

Answer. Well, it should be pointed out that there are really many Africas, and many African problems.

By that, I mean that each of the areas trends to have its own special needs, although there are a good many common needs.

For example, North Africa, with its 23 million Arab—Berbar people, and its 2½ million Frenchmen, has its own special problems. The recent riots and disturbances in Morocco and Algeria involve special legal, military, economic, political, and social problems in relation to France.

On the other hand, it is obvious that far to the south, the Union of South Africa, with its concept of apartheid involves special problems.

Then, there are the separate problems of the free nations of Africa—countries like Liberia, Egypt, the Sudan, Ethiopia. Their problems today obviously are not a matter of gaining freedom, because they already have it. Rather it is to raise depressed standards of living.

Question. What would you say would be some of the common factors throughout the whole continent?

Answer. Well, of course, the most common factor is the terribly low economic condition of most of the natives of Africa. I refer, too, to depressed education and health standards—vast illiteracy and disease.

Another common factor is, of course, the most of Africa lives within communal organization, in family, village, or primitive tribal units with all sorts of ancient superstitions and ideologies.

Question. Any other common problem?

Answer. Yes; a problem of most of Africa south of the Sahara is that it is not the land which is poor, but the people who are poor.

In other words, the land is rich. It is rich with agricultural possibilities. It is rich with minerals. More than 90 percent of the world's known deposits of uranium, for example, are in the interior of Africa. The continent holds most of the world's reserves of industrial diamonds, cobalt, columbium, and chromite. It has copper, manganese, tin, iron ore, and other strategic materials.

So the real problem is how to translate these riches into a higher standard of living for the Africans themselves.

Question. Turning back to your own work, what else have you done, Senator WILEY, affecting Africa?

Answer. Well, I have been glad to do my part to help strengthen the various U. N. specialized agencies which have performed so excellently in the African area.

I am thinking, for example, of the World Health Organization, which has sent in wonderful medical teams to combat all sorts of disease in Africa—whether it be malaria, traechoma, yaws, sleeping sickness, or other dread scourges.

I am thinking, too, of the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund, which has done such a great job for the children of Africa, as it has done for the children of Asia and of South America.

Question. Are there any other fronts in which you have been active?

Answer. Yes, I have been glad to do my part to strengthen the International Exchange Program.

I want more African youngsters to visit America to get to know us better, to study in American colleges and universities.

Of course, it is a fact that some of them may encounter a racial problem here. But we should ask ourselves: Would we prefer that these youngsters study in universities in Moscow—to be trained in revolution, in sabotage, in espionage—or would we prefer them to become more familiar with America—with our free-enterprise system, with our anticolonial history, with our progressive and welcome rise in the standards of our own Negro citizens.

Question. What is your feeling about the point 4 program?

Answer. I believe that it offers one the best opportunities for constructive American work in Africa.

I mean point 4 help in sanitation, in farming, in education, in handicrafts, in housing.

Of course, we want to make sure that the assistance is genuinely tailored to meet the individual needs of each country and people or tribe. In some instances, throughout the world, we have sent in supermodern, expensive equipment which simply could not be used.

What Africa needs is simple know-how, whether it is in the use of farm implements, or insecticides, or seeds.

Question. Do you have any further suggestions for our future program toward Africa?

Answer. Yes. One of my suggestions is that we use more of our own skilled American Negro manpower in our diplomatic, economic, and information contacts with the African peoples.

Report after report has stated how able American Negroes, serving as visiting point 4 aids, or lecturers, teachers, missionaries, can do a wonderful job as they travel around African areas.

They, themselves, can best answer Soviet lies concerning our treatment of our Americans of Negro ancestry.

Question. Just how serious is the Soviet threat in Africa?

Answer. It is growing more serious with each passing day.

The Soviets are obviously committing themselves to spending a great deal of time, money, and manpower to win over African leadership and to stir up African tensions.

You can see increasing Soviet activity in Africa, in everything from more Red trade delegations, expansion of Soviet embassies, additional Soviet propaganda broadcasts in native languages, Soviet shipments of literature, Soviet and satellite conclusion of new trade agreements.

And what you don't see beneath the surface is even more important than what you do see openly.

Question. How do you feel about the overall prospects for the future?

Answer. I am certainly not a pessimist as regards Africa, or any other area of the world.

I believe that if we take sound, intelligent, well-planned action there is no reason why the free world should lose Africa or, for that matter, any additional area or country of the world.

We have learned lessons from our difficulties in the past. We and our friends don't intend to see the Communist pattern of mainland China or the pattern of communism in Indochina or communism in Malaya repeated in Africa.

We hope for example that the dreaded Mau Mau movement in Kenya, instead of being duplicated in other African countries, will be eliminated for the good of the African peoples themselves.

There is a limit, of course, to what we ourselves can do as regards Africa. But we can render reasonable, sympathetic assistance.

And we can urge our Western European friends to continue to help the African peoples to move, as they are ready, toward more and more self-government in an orderly, democratic fashion.

Address Given by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be

printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address made by the Korean Ambassador to the United States before the Rotary Club at Phoenix, Ariz., on January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My dear American friends, the truth is in distress in this world today. Russia's foremost journal, Pravda, can be translated only as the truth. But is it? It tells the story of a little group of men who occupy the Kremlin. They are not truthful men. They are far beyond our conception of the truth. They misuse it for their own purposes, and they misuse it to the detriment of mankind everywhere.

So resorting to the truth as we know it, may I say I deeply appreciate being with you and the opportunity you have given me to address you.

I am conscious of the fact that you are honoring my people, still the most beaten-up and battered people on the face of the globe. I am their servant in this country, and I am most grateful that you have asked their servant to talk to you.

I should like today, with your permission, to talk about foreign affairs. They are far removed from domestic affairs with which you and I are more familiar. Yet, at this stage of the sad and weary world, foreign affairs seem to dominate. Your great Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, has commented on them. They dominate also the headlines of your press. They are a part of the fabric of your everyday life. Yet, are not domestic affairs equally important?

If one has heat in the house and food in the dwelling, one has his domestic affairs basically taken care of. His foreign affairs are far off.

My country lacked food in its houses and heat in its dwellings because an enemy overran it. The enemy came to kill. The enemy was and is aggressive communism.

I wonder if the danger of aggressive communism can be transmitted to you, my listeners? You have not experienced it. We in Korea have. The Communists came down out of the north and set our homes on fire. They dispersed our people. They left us without food. And we shall never forget or forgive what they did to us. I pray God they shall never be able to do the same thing to you good people.

In this time of ordeal we were blessed by having a man among men, Syngman Rhee. He told us that we would have to fight the enemy. We did fight the enemy. The magnificent spirit of this man was behind us in the fight we made. We would have lost the fight had it not been for the United States coming to our rescue. You helped us win it part way. I think we should have won it the full way. But that is something for historians to debate and write about. My country, since the war, has been a shambles. You can see gutted-out buildings and ruined towns and villages all over Korea. But we have hope. We have hope because the United States of America has given us hope. Your aid has been tremendous. It has taken many forms. It has taken the form of fertilizer for our farms; it has taken the form of new and different kinds of buildings for our families. It has enabled us to repair our railroads and resurface many of our streets. Has your aid been entirely one way?

I shall let you give the answer to that. There is in Korea today an army of 750,000 men who will fight for freedom to the end. If you should come with me to the last frontier of freedom, I could show you these men and the munitions they possess. All of these have come from you, but there is something infinitely more valuable that you have given this army. In my mind it is the spirit that activated your own soldiers at Valley Forge. Korea is a long, long way from Valley Forge, but the battle still is the same. Are we to remain freemen or are we to be enslaved by a system which freemen have fought for almost a thousand years? My fellow Koreans out there on the firing line are to me your fellow Americans of days gone by. They have the same purpose. They are willing to fight to the end for liberty.

At one time in my experience in America, I was asked to talk about foreign affairs. I am much more familiar with domestic affairs. They are part and parcel of your personal life. I try to think of how domestic affairs can intrude on foreign affairs and I must be honest in telling you they cannot. Switzerland has never declared war on Korea. Korea has never declared war on Switzerland. We lived far apart. When a Swiss comes to my country he is regarded as a stranger and a man of good will. He is not in possession of a gun and a person who wants to shoot somebody. He is a traveler in a far-away place and he conducts himself as a decent, ordinary person. He is not an enemy in any way, shape, or form.

I wonder why nations can't be that way? The stranger coming to you and receiving your hospitality and in turn giving you his friendship. Wouldn't it be a lovely world if we dealt this way with one another?

There is a story I must tell you about my country. There are two million dead out there, all Koreans. There are many thousands of American dead out there. Why did we fight and why did we perish? There is only one reason, and it is a desire deep within us to preserve decency. It is a desire within us to fight as long as we can for all the things we respect. It is a desire to make the greatest sacrifice of all for the one thing we respect above all others—liberty.

My country is a sad, sad land. It has had the devastation of a tremendous war. It has seen conflicting armies marching up and down our little peninsula four times. It has seen death rained out of the skies. It has seen napalm bombs which spread fire almost electrically. It has seen the handicraft of the men and women go up in sudden smoke. Yet we still are not without hope, because we have the pledged faith of the United States of America.

We are not without hope for another reason, because we have the largest anti-Communist army in the world. We are 750,000 strong. We manned the hills and the valleys right next door to communism. From our bombproof shelters we look out upon the enemy. He is scarcely 20 miles away. He is only 8 minutes from our ancient capital city of Seoul, that is, if he boards a Russian MIG with bombs. So you see, we live on tenterhooks out there. We are closer to death and destruction than any people on the face of the earth. But I want to tell you, my dear American friends, that we remain unafraid.

Again, I repeat, we have the assurance that the United States is behind us. Then we have other assurance—a Korean one, that Syngman Rhee is our leader. He is a great and gentle man, who has worked for 5 decades to redeem the liberty of his people. After World War II, and the signing of the peace, when the Japanese aggressor which had held my country in bondage for 45 years, had been sent back to his own land, Syngman Rhee came home to his own country and his own people. He is out there now, and I am the recipient of his faith. I cannot tell you how humble I feel. I see him, not as just a Korean, but as a symbol of everything we believe in, in the free world of today.

My great President and Patriot, Syngman Rhee, is a frail, little man in appearance, but with a great spirit. He possesses the gift that God gives to certain men—great men—and that is a design to fight for freedom up to the final and dying moment, and never for an instant to let go of that flaming torch. He is the epitome of what I want for my people. He is Korean Independence. He is Korean Liberty. He is Korean Freedom, and as a Korean, I am greatly disturbed by the Communist propaganda which has so many times made our great Patriot misunderstood. I have heard him referred to as "an obstinate, unyielding man." Men of great courage do not yield to the enemy.

I wonder how many fathers are remembered here in America for those same qualities? I remember the story of Mark Twain. He said that he had to live until he was 25 years of age, before he discovered that his father had a grain of sense.

There is not much difference between the farther in Korea, and a father in the United States. Both have lived and learned by experience. Both have had to provide for their families. It is not an unusual thing, but rather the usual thing, that the father has to provide for the child. Our great President has provided for his Nation, and he had to be firm in his beliefs, and firm in his courage, in order to obtain that objective.

Let me tell you just a few facts about this great and good man. He is a frail figure. He has an undying conception of the rights of man. He has a sublime belief in man's right to be free, and he has a limitless amount of courage. He has not been wrong and he will never be wrong. He is so right that if one follows his footsteps, that person cannot do wrong. He mystifies human beings yet, he possesses the qualities of the Saviour, and he has been for his country and his people. You follow him, either clear-eyed or otherwise, but you follow him.

Now, having talked about the man, may I talk about the land? Please do not misunderstand me if I refer to it as a part of the American homeland. It is and it will forever be in the souls of many, many American persons—mothers and fathers who have given us their sons.

My country is a very ancient land. As a matter of fact, when I was in Korea last November we commemorated our 4,288th birthday. Our nation has a recorded history of almost 43 centuries. Our nation was founded on the principle of peace, freedom, charity, and equality.

At very simple but impressive ceremonies marking our National Foundation Day the speakers recalled that since its birth as a nation, Korea has been a country of common race, common language, common customs, and common culture.

They also pointed out what is deep in the heart of every Korean—namely, to see that our country is reunited, the Red invaders driven out of the north, communism eradicated from every phase of our life so that we may, as a republic patterned after your own, progress and thus command the respectful attention and admiration not only of freeman in the Orient, but of freemen and women and nations all over the world.

You see, the division of Korea was not one of her own making. It was arbitrarily forced upon her. It was the result of big power politics. It stemmed from the Yalta Conference. Like any people, proud of its heritage, Koreans will never accept it. When disunity threatened the United States, you fought to preserve your Union. We Koreans are prepared to do the same. There can be no assurance of a lasting peace in Asia or the entire Far East for that matter, until Korea receives her just rights—and is again an undivided nation.

In this strange world where we live today, we, in our outpost of freedom, must maintain a large army. It happens to be the largest battle-tested, anti-Communist army today. We maintain this army largely through American help. But if we did not maintain it, our peninslua which is about the size of the State of Minnesota, would fall entirely under Communist control. Were this to happen Japan would be an

easy prey for the Reds. So, too, would be the Philippines, Formosa, what is left of Indochina, Thailand, the Malayan region, and the islands of Indonesia.

Our centuries-old principle of peace, freedom, charity, and equality would be the first victim of the Reds; even mighty America would be threatened, for conquest feeds upon conquest, and the Communists have not altered their philosophy in the slightest. Their aim is not only known, but confirmed by everyone in the Kremlin from the time of Lenin onward.

Now, it is a very difficult thing for any nation to maintain peaceful progress when the circumstances of the day demand adequate military preparation. It is especially difficult in Korea, which was virtually ruined by the war. It is difficult even in your great country. Your burden of taxes is a heavy one. But, because of your vast wealth and resources, your know-how, and above all your love of liberty, you are able to do this because the spirit of freedom is so deeply imbedded in you that should such a test ever come, you would willingly go out to fight to preserve the altars of your sires, as you have so many times in the past. You would fight to the limit to prevent any Communists from coming around your home, for you do not want a rap on your door in the middle of the night, and secret police seizing you or a member of your family, and take them away to torture or certain death. This has been done in many lands by the Communists, and they would not hesitate to do it to you, if they could but get a foothold on this land of yours.

You do not want the fear of this or other unnatural things intruding or encroaching upon what, with God's help, you have earned in this great country; namely, the right to live and let live.

May I at this point give you a quick bird's-eye view of Korea. It is, as I have said, a relatively small peninsula, jutting out from the mainland of Asia. Its geographical position has been against it from the very beginning. It is both a highroad to the continent, with all of its millions of human beings, and a highroad for continental conquest of the teeming islands of Japan. In the past it has been used for both purposes. The Manchus swept down upon us and the Japanese swept up upon us. In each instance, Korea was the innocent bystander, and had to suffer the consequences of alien invasion.

For ourselves, over our long, long time as a nation, we have never visited aggression or aggressive war upon a neighbor. We have, however, fought like wildcats when aggressive neighbors attempted to invade our territory and conquer us, and we will fight again if need be.

When we saw what the visitation of ancient invaders did to us, we tried isolationism, and it worked for nearly 500 years. And, in the period of our isolationism we developed our culture and made many contributions, which later found their way into European and Western life. Arabian seagoers, for example, got from us the great boon of the navigator—the magnetic compass. Our people also produced the oldest solar observatory in the Far East. Long before radio and television, we contrived an instantaneous "all is well" for the security of our government. From the Yalu River, our northern boundary, to the straits of Shimonoseki on the south, we utilized our mountain ridges for bonfires of good tidings. A signal fire atop a mountain would indicate that everything in the region was peaceful; the next succeeding mountain would have another signal fire, and so on. They would be lighted and expire to attest to the fact that there was no disorder throughout the land. We loved peace so much that instead of saying "hello" or "goodbye," our greetings and farewells were "come in peace," or "go in peace," or "sleep in peace."

Wherever I go all over the world, I find a Rotary Club. My trade is that of a diplomat. But wherever I find a Rotary Club, I find human kindness, understanding, and thoughtfulness about other persons. The last Rotary Club I found was in Seoul, Korea.

I thank you.

The Impact of Atomic Energy on the Oil and Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent speech entitled "The Impact of Atomic Energy on the Oil and Gas Industry," by the Honorable Gordon Dean, associate, Lehman Bros., of New York City, N. Y., formerly the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is a very important speech, dealing with the development of nuclear energy and its relationship to our present energy resources. Mr. Dean is one of the foremost authorities on the development of atomic energy, both for peacetime uses and for the purposes of nuclear weapons.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ON THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

(Remarks by Gordon Dean, associate, Lehman Bros., New York, N. Y., senior vice president, nuclear energy, General Dynamics Corp., New York, N. Y., delivered at eighth annual meeting of Pipe Line Contractors Association of America, Boca Raton Hotel and Club, Boca Raton, Fla., January 16, 1956)

I have been asked today to talk to you concerning the possible impact of atomic energy on the petroleum and natural-gas industry. As a group engaged in the construction of pipelines for these two fuels, you are naturally interested in whether the new fuel, uranium, is going to make a serious dent in your business.

Let me say at the outset that I do not think that the impact of atomic energy on the oil and gas industry is something to be feared. I visualize this new force as supplementing existing fuels, rather than replacing them, and I'd like explain to you why I think so.

First, let's examine what we are talking about when we speak of atomic energy. One of the things which distinguishes uranium is that only seven-tenths of 1 percent of it is really useful in the production of energy. In any given portion of uranium, there are 139 atoms of U–238 which are, for all intents and purposes, useless, and there is one atom of U–235 in which we are interested—for this is the atom which will fission, or, if you will, explode and produce heat.

When uranium metal is brought together in sufficient amount and in certain geometric arrangements, we get what is known as a chain reaction; that is, the U–235 atom fissions, releasing neutrons which hit other U–235 atoms which, in turn, split, and so on. The splitting, or fissioning, releases great quantities of heat, and that is why we speak of the gadget in which the uranium is placed as a reactor, or pile, or nuclear furnace. What we have accomplished by all this is simply to produce a new source of heat, and we produce it by a new kind of fuel—uranium.

To convert this into electricity, thus making it useful, we must still go through the same steps as any powerhouse—capture the heat, convert it to steam, take the steam to the turbines and to the generators, and finally to the transmission line. As you well know, in this process 80 percent of our energy is lost, but there is no way of getting electricity directly from fission.

Uranium faces the same heat loss problems as any other fuel. Now the problem is how competitive is this new source of heat with the heat which we get from oil, gas, wood and coal? This is important to the oil and the gas industry because whereas in 1918 oil and gas supplied 15 percent of the total energy of the country, today it supplies close to 60 percent, and a great industry has been built around it.

One of the first things that is quite clear is that the United States is going to be the last affected by the encroachment of the atom simply because we have, not unlimited, but very large, amounts of coil, oil, and gas. Other countries of the world, on the other hand, are less privileged, some having no fuel, and others, such as England, high-cost fuel. In England, the need for a power source, independent of coal, has led the British to build about a dozen rather large reactors, and Britain, by 1975, expects atomic energy to meet 40 percent of her power requirements.

A similar situation faces West Germany, and it is this very incentive to get cheap power which will probably bring Germany very fast among the leading atomic energy countries of the world, even with her slow start.

In the United States in the larger cities we can furnish power at 6 or 7 or 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. In parts of Australia and Japan, it will run from 18 to 30 mills per kilowatt-hour; in Belgium, about 12 to 15 mills per kilowatt-hour, and in some of the remote regions of the world, as high as 4 or 5 cents per kilowatt-hour. The incentive, therefore, to get the most out of the atom is much greater in other countries than it is in the United States. It is hard, and it is risky, to crystal ball, but I would probably not be far off to say that by 1975 in this country, only about 10 percent of our power needs will come from atomic energy, and much of that is not in competition with oil or gas, but rather with coal.

The place where atomic energy is most apt to be utilized is in electric power plants, and even when the day comes that it is substantially used for this purpose, it can have very little effect on the oil industry—for the total amount of residual fuel used for power generation in the United States in 1953 represented only 3.3 percent of the total volume of crude run. As Mr. Robert Wilson, Chairman of the Board of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, observed, "Even if we lost our central power-plant business entirely during the next 25 years, we would hardly notice it; in fact, we might well lose it to coal long before that, and no tears would be shed."

Of course, natural gas is also used to make electricity, but the amount used represents only about 18 percent of the country's total fuel for electric power.

Just about the biggest single use for fuel oil today is for ships, including tankers. Is this market likely to be invaded by the atom? You are all aware of the fact that the *Nautilus* and the *Sea Wolf* submarines are propelled by an atomic-power plant. This is not to say, however, that the cost of the power in such a plant is competitive with the cost of other fuels. It is very far from it, but there was a special reason for putting an

atomic-power plant in a submarine. A submarine below the surface runs on batteries because a combustion engine requires oxygen for its operation; in order to survive, it must surface to recharge the batteries. When it surfaces it's a target for the enemy. But with an atomic-power plant it can remain submerged for an almost unlimited period. During the ship's shakedown cruise, in the spring of 1955, the *Nautilus* made a 1,300-mile run from New London, Conn., to San Juan, P. R., comletely submerged. It was the greatest distance, by a factor of 10, ever steamed, completely submerged, by any submarine, and it maintained, submerged, an average speed of 16 knots for the entire voyage. In short, the *Nautilus* is able to cruise around the world without refueling. For this, the Navy is willing to pay a price—a price far greater than that of a regular powerplant, simply because it gives to her a far more effective weapon. The likelihood is, therefore, that the Navy, in its new construction of submarines, aircraft carriers, and even escort vessels will go the nuclear route.

But does this mean that our merchant marine, our commercial ships, will do likewise? As of today, the atomic reactor, costwise, cannot beat oil. It may be that in a period of 15 years the oil industry will lose the fuel-oil business of some of the larger new ships. But, again, as Mr. Wilson says, "What of it?" The impact would be slight.

Another field in which atomic power has its attractions is in the field of nuclear propulsion of aircraft. This, today, is a military necessity. The primary advantage of such aircraft is, as in the case of the submarine, one of unlimited range. If we can develop a powerplant for a large bomber, and various groups are working on this in the United States today, there is no reason why it should ever face fuel limitations. There is no reason, for example, why it should not be able to fly nonstop around the world, or, if it made any sense, twice around the world. The weight of fuel is the serious limiting factor in all airplane designs, and a nuclear powerplant would solve the problem. One of these days, we will have it. There is nothing inherently impossible in the situation. I should point out, however, that it presents some serious problems, and these are the problems which arise from radiation. The crew must be carefully shielded from the radiation. Those on the ground at takeoff and landing must be shielded from the radiation. And the flight patterns of the plane must be carefully worked out so that in the event of a crash, dangerous radioactivity is not spread in a populated area. It is this very troublesome problem of radiation which, today, keeps one from thinking too optimistically about the incorporation of reactors into the commercial planes of the future. If all flights could be over water, this would not be too serious, if there were a real cost incentive. But I seriously doubt that any commercial airline will ever wish to equip its planes with reactor powerplants.

What of the railroads? Will we some day see nuclear propulsion of trains? There are some who think we will. I, for one, think we will not. I say this, not because there is any reason why a nuclear powerplant cannot be developed which will fit into an engine and pull a string of cars—if you can put one in a submarine, you can obviously put one on some kind of a mobile platform which will operate on rails—but, again, I think that the problem of radiation will come up to haunt us, as well as the problem of cost. There is no particular incentive to secure unlimited range in a railroad engine as there is in the case of the military submarine or the military aircraft. Trains must stop frequently and in populated areas. A railroad station is almost synonymous with a crowd, and an accident involving a nuclear-propelled engine would present extremely nasty contamination.

Turning to costs for a moment, the railroads would have to completely reequip their rights-of-way with special crews and heavily shielded facilities to load the reactors into the engines and unload the reactor cores containing the spent fuel elements. This would require very extensive facilities.

Again we come back to the question, "Why put one in an engine?" The chances are that it will cost considerably more than coal or oil, and that it will present so many radiation problems that the railroads would regret the day they ever entered the business.

And what of trucks and automobiles? Will they some day be propelled by nuclear powerplants? I, for one, think not. Present fuels are quite adequate for this purpose. Reactors are necessarily bulky. They require heavy shielding and they involve many dollars. They are not going to get down to the size of a gas tank, and as for the radiation problems which would be presented along our highways, I hate to contemplate them.

Another comforting thing to anyone in the oil and gas industry arises from the tremendous growth in the power demand in the years ahead. World population today is a little less than 2½ billion. By 1975, it will be approximately 3 billion, and by the end of the century, 3.7 billion. The demand for energy grows even faster than population. The energy demand in 1975 will be nearly double that of 1950. In fact, the President's Materials Policy Commission predicted that America's electrical energy output in 1975 would be more than triple that of 1950. That same commission predicted that by 1975 Americans would need 5 billion barrels of oil for every 2½ billions they consumed in 1950, and worldwide, one authority has estimated that we may need 40 million barrels a day in 1975, in contrast to 14 million a day in 1950. As R. G. Follis, chairman of the board of Standard of California, predicts: "To meet the energy demand, conventional fuel output will have to rise swiftly, and we will still need the help of the atom."

I have found no one in the oil industry today who fears the atom's encroachment. They look upon it, rather, as a necessary supplement to present-day fuels. Something could come along, of course, to change this picture. You read, this summer, accounts of the Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy, and the statements made there that within 20 years, it is possible that the scientists will master the control of the thermonuclear, or fusion, reaction, thus reproducing on earth the reactions which take place in the sun. This is a possibility. It is far from a probability. But even should it come, its impact on oil and gas would only be felt in that rather small percentage of your product which today goes for power generation. You are not going to have a thermonuclear powerplant on a ship or a plane, much less in the home and automobile.

I probably should make brief reference to the fact that the atom, as of today, is assisting the oil industry more than it is competing with it. Rather extensive research work is being carried on by several of the oil-refining companies into studying the effects of radiation on the molecules of petroleum. Out of this may come some significant changes in the refining process.

Oil well "logging" is helping greatly to take the guesswork and the risk out of oil production and exploration, and the applications of nuclear science are increasingly important to the well logger. Low levels of natural radioactivity provide a valuable means for identifying many of the strata in the earth's crust. From his gamma measurements, the logger determines the oil and water content and, hence, the porosity of oil-bearing strata.

You are all familiar with the use of radioisotopes in the study of flow problems, and the use which is today being made to tag liquids in pipelines by introducing isotopes into the pipes themselves. Virtually all of the large oil companies today have sizable technical teams studying the scientific relationship between oil and the atom. In engine test laboratories, the amount of wear for moving parts, such as piston rings, is now determined in a small fraction of the time formerly required. This is done by irradiating the parts to be studied, and measuring, only after a brief test run, the radioactivity of the lubricating oil in which the worn-off metal collects. Many other illustrations might be given of the atom's contribution, even today, to the oil industry. Certainly, one can summarize by saying it's helped more than it's hurt.

In summary, it would seem that the industry has little to fear from the atom—that in the field of central station power, perhaps 10 or 15 percent, at the most, will be supplied by atomic energy in 1975—that in the foreseeable future, in the field of transportation, nuclear power has its first appeal to the military—both at sea and in the air. It has some prospect of being useful in the commercial field for surface vessels although the costs presently seem to make this application commercially unwise. As for the railroads, the incentive for unlimited range is not present, and the dangers of radiation are great. And as for our highways, forget it.

In short, my advice would be to enjoy this Florida sunshine as long as you can, and look for bigger and better profits in 1956.

Postal Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the following statement regarding decentralization of post-office administration and operations which I have sent to my colleagues on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

I wish to make a brief statement with respect to the report of the Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations which the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service today voted to make a House document.

In making this statement I speak for myself alone and entirely on my own initiative, and at the request or suggestion of no one else.

I do so with misgivings because of my great respect for the chairman and every member of the subcommittee, as well as for the two ex officio members of the subcommittee. In what I have to say, I would not knowingly transgress any rule of propriety or courtesy toward my colleagues. Particularly I do not want to appear to arrogate to myself knowledge or wisdom equal to that of the subcommittee in a field which has been the subcommittee's special area of investigation. My sole motive is to seek more information.

My comments are directed to the section of this subcommittee report dealing with postal reorganization and decentralization, covering pages 4 to 18, inclusive, of the committee print.

This section contains what appear to me to be very categorical findings and conclusions. I shall itemize the particular findings and conclusions with which I am concerned later in this statement. First of all, however, I

should like to make a few very brief comments about these findings and conclusions.

1. It is my understanding, and I state this simply as a matter of fact and not critically, that these findings and conclusions are not documented by any printed hearings and lack any detailed elaboration within the subcommittee report itself.

2. The scope and character of these findings and conclusions constitute, in my judgment, a definite and severe indictment either of the soundness and validity of much of the postal decentralization program or the soundness of its present administration and operation.

3. These findings and conclusions, and the publicity already given to them, seem to me to cast a shadow of concern and uncertainty over the Post Office Department, over the key personnel of the regional and district offices, and over the postmasters in relation to the decentralization program, which ought to be cleared up as speedily as possible in the interests of the postal service.

4. It seems to me that because of these considerations it is desirable that the Post Office Committee as a whole, or through this same subcommittee, further explore and disclose the full facts on which its findings and conclusions are based, to the end of either correcting any mistaken impressions or of recommending further constructive corrective procedures by the Post Office Department.

5. For the same reasons, it would seem to me that the Post Office Department should and would welcome further exploration of the matter, with a full opportunity for Department officials to present all relevant information and views they may have to offer on the matter. My feeling on this score is strengthened by the fact that simultaneously with the release of this subcommittee report, the Post Office Department prepared and issued to the committee members a mimeographed statement in the nature of an analysis and rebuttal of some of the subcommittee's findings and conclusions. Indeed, I believe the Department has an obligation to present in even greater detail its views with respect to the subcommittee's findings and conclusions.

6. Finally, I am deeply interested, as a member of this committee, in further clearing up the entire picture because the findings and conclusions of the subcommittee are, in so many particulars, completely opposite to the impression I have gained with respect to the decentralization program. My impressions, admittedly limited, are based on conversations with postmasters and other members of the postal service both within and outside my own district, and on my own most satisfactory experience with the services extended to my constituents and to me under the regional and district office setup.

Let me say, at this point, that I am not posing as a champion of the Post Office Department in this matter, beyond being concerned that full justice should be done the Department in view of the herculean efforts it has devoted to the decentralization program and in view of its vast importance, for good or ill, to the postal service.

Certainly I do not contend—and I am sure the Department would not contend—that the program is perfect, either as to plan or operation. Certainly I share the concern of the subcommittee that no topheavy or costly and unproductive bureaucracy be set up under this program. I do not wish any facts to be concealed for any imagined benefit to the Post Office Department or its present administration. On the contrary, I hope there will be an opportunity to secure more facts—many more facts. I am simply concerned that the findings and conclusions contained in the subcommittee report do not prove to be a verdict based on inadequate facts.

Now permit me to cite some of the specific findings and conclusions in this subcommittee report which are the basis of the concern I have expressed:

1. The statement (p. 14) that "analysis by the subcommittee of the organizational structure which has been placed in effect within the regions visited discloses information and evidence that the present provision for 91 district managers, with office staffs, is neither essential nor desirable to the efficient functioning of the regional organizations."

2. The statement (also p. 14) that "the interposition of this additional layer of supervision * * * will, it is believed, create a serious impediment to postmasters in the management of their offices which would not exist if the plan were revised to require that the postmasters report direct to the heads of the regional offices."

3. The statement (p. 15) that "the subcommittee found that there is no clear-cut definition of authority retained by the Department and that delegated to posmasters," and that "such a condition obviously tends to foster confusion and misunderstanding."

4. The statement (again on p. 15) that "the establishment of district managers to function between the regional organizations and the postmaster would seem to bring about conflict in authority and might eventually make the postmaster an impotent figurehead."

5. The further statement (p. 16) that "any increase in staff or authority for the district managers would cause further conflict in authority and eventually place the postmasters who, in 23,000 offices, are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, in a rather unimportant position."

6. The statement (also on p. 16)—and one to which I must respectfully take exception both as to content and tone—that "it is not believed to be the intention of the Department to eliminate the position of postmaster and replace that official with a lower-salaried supervisor."

7. The statement (p. 15) that "Postmasters have been and should continue to be the local managers of the postal service." It had been my understanding that because of the necessity, prior to decentralization, for postmasters to clear so many details of authority and operation with Washington, they previously fell far short of any business concept of being true local managers. It has also been my understanding that by bringing the Department closer to the postmasters through decentralization, their role as local managers has been greatly improved.

8. The statement (again on p. 16) that "the subcommittee believes that in any reorganization of the Department's affairs a great deal more authority should be delegated to the postmaster"—which statement I cite particularly because of an impression I have gained that the postmasters feel that the present decentralization program has, in intent and in fact, actually served to enhance and strengthen the efficiency, authority, and prestige of the postmaster by providing him a more direct and prompt contact with the Post Office Department.

9. The statement (p. 17) that "if the Department considers it desirable to have field representatives in the areas where district offices have presently been established, these district managers could remain at their same locations, not in the capacity of supervisors of postmasters but in the capacity of service representatives of the regional operations manager or the regional director." I cite this statement particularly because I believe that any confusion (either in fact or in the subcommittee's mind) as to the supervisory versus service representative status of the district manager needs to be cleared up.

10. A final statement, appearing on page 8 of the report, that "Since the Department has undertaken this reorganization program, it is the judgment of the subcommittee that it should be accomplished expeditiously." I cite this statement because it seems to me to stand in absolute contradiction to the clearly critical and condemnatory content of so much of the report with respect to the decentralization program. If the program is as bad, and is fraught with as grave evils as much of the report seems to imply, the consistency of urging a speeding up of the completion of the program somehow escapes me.

In conclusion—In view of what seems to me to be the great importance of the findings and conclusions I have cited, and because I believe there should be further opportunity for the architects of this decentralization program to review that program with the subcommittee or the full committee, I feel I must reserve judgment on the subcommittee report and await more information. I hope this committee will, in its wisdom, be of like mind.

The Forced Resignation of Civil Aeronautics Administrator Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in a recent edition of Flight magazine, which is an old and well established aviation magazine. The editorial is entitled "The Forced Resignation of Administrator Lee." The editorial deals with his firing and replacement by a purely Republican partisan appointee to this highly technical task of keeping our airlines safe and providing for adequate and safe means of traffic control and airport development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORCED RESIGNATION OF ADMINISTRATOR LEE

Recent issues of this magazine have pointed out the major factors responsible for the unfortunate return of the Civil Aeronautics Administration into the public arena as a political football. It all came to a head last month when Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks forced the resignation of Mr. Fred Lee as CAA Administrator.

Boiled down to one simple statement of fact, the situation can be summed up as follows: The CAA has been placed in the untenable position of trying to carry on its constitutional responsibilities in the face of tremendous aviation growth without sufficient money to handle that growth, especially insofar as increased air traffic is concerned. Mr. Lee is simply the goat, the fall guy, of this impasse.

The people responsible for this hot seat are Under Secretary of Commerce Rothschild (and before him Under Secretary Robert Murray), Secretary Weeks, and the executive branch of the Government headed up by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. A portion of the blame for the untenable position of the CAA must be shouldered by the Congress, who found it too easy to take the recommendations of the Budget Bureau and the Department of Commerce planners when it came time to write and pass the appropriations. Mr. Lee's warnings and requests went unheard.

These columns predicted that the situation would get worse before it started to improve.

While we did not contemplate anything as drastic as the removal of Fred Lee as CAA Administrator, it was very clear that something had to give and actually Lee's forced resignation is more deplorable than it is surprising. We all might as well face the fact that there's a new aviation mess in Washington and the politicians are in the saddle.

The departure of Mr. Lee has brought CAA to its lowest morale level in recent history. It won't take long for the bad morale situation in Washington to spread out into the field. What hurts most is the realization that we need more, not less, technically trained CAA career men of experience as the many complex jobs right now and can ill afford the exodus of many fine men who can no longer stomach petty Department of Commerce interference with problems and matters Department officials simply don't comprehend.

There is very little consolation in the knowledge that Messrs. Weeks and Rothschild will inherit the mess they helped to create and that it could conceivably be their own political undoing and the end of Department of Commerce control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, a proposal which has been threatened by Senator MIKE MONRONEY. He is fairly well up on his civil aviation and is generally conceded to be the natural replacement in the Senate for that stanch supporter of civil aviation and author of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, Senator Pat McCarran, who passed to his final reward 2 years ago. At least four congressional committees have shown an interest in full investigation of the recent Department of Commerce manipulations to get a strangle hold on both the CAA and the CAB. With election year coming up there's a good chance that Messrs. Weeks et al. will inherit the hot seat unintentionally and end up with a White House request for their resignations, too. Usually there's not that much simple justice in Washington politics but any intelligent observer can not overlook the possibility.

While some sideliners see in all these recent developments certain nefarious schemes afoot to put ground transportation people in command of aviation, or read into Lee's forced resignation the multimillion dollar argument over Tacan versus VOR DME, we take the considered view that these are only minor actors and plots in a much larger drama in which basic United States aviation policy is again up for debate and basic improvement.

It is truly unfortunate that a man of Fred Lee's ability, character, and airmanship had to be scuttled after 33 months of intelligent CAA leadership under almost impossible budgetary and administrative conditions. Yet, if his forced resignation serves to focus the spotlight of public and industry attention on the near-fatal weaknesses in sound Government aviation policy, planning, and implementation and brings about a full-fledged congressional investigation with eventual independent status for the CAA, then Mr. Lee will not have been knifed in vain.

Statement on Israel and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the statement which I endorsed on the Middle East situation on October 10, 1955. Today, with the situation more tense, I stand on this statement even more strongly than I did previously.

STATEMENT ON ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Recent developments in the Middle East have reemphasized the necessity of establishing peace in that troubled area. Widespread sale of arms to Egypt and other Arab powers by the Communists countries is an ominous indication of the unwillingness of these States to maintain peace and is further proof of the instability of the Arab countries. Under these conditions, the United States should reassert its willingness to guarantee Arab-Israel borders through formal treaty obligations.

The declaration of such a plan by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on August 26, 1955, encouraged those of us who believe that our own security and the prevention of Communist expansion is dependent upon a peaceful solution of Middle Eastern tension. Unless this Government takes such a strong position, border clashes and a tragic arms race will ensue. A conflict could only result in an increment to Communist strength and unnecessary harm to the democratic State of Israel, whose very existence under United Nations sponsorship is a responsibility shared by our Government.

Therefore, I urge that an additional assurance be given to Israel that it will be protected and that warnings be made to Egypt that aggression with Communist-supplied arms will be regarded by the United States in a most serious light.

The Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent statement on the dairy industry by Assistant Secretary Earl L. Butz, of the Department of Agriculture. I think it is an interesting and encouraging report on the great strides dairymen have made in solving their problems during the past 3 years.

THE EXPANDING AMERICAN MARKET

(Address by Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Agriculture, at the annual convention of the Ohio Dairy Products Association, Columbus, Ohio, January 24, 1956)

During the past couple of years dairy farmers and the dairy industry have increasingly been merchandising their products and moving them into human consumption. The American dairy industry has been teaching a great and fundamental lesson in farm economics. It has demonstrated that effective pricing and aggressive merchandising, teamed together, can move dairy products into human stomachs rather than into Government warehouses.

During the last couple of year especially, the dairy industry has greatly increased its efforts in promoting and merchandising dairy products. We in the Department of Agriculture commend all of you for your splendid efforts in this direction.

In the past years, I believe, weak merchandising, complacency and resistance to change often have hampered the possibility of bringing about increased consumption of your products. We are therefore pleased to see the fine manner in which your industry has come forth with the vigor, boldness, and imagination it needs to meet the challenge of substitutes, imitations, and competition of other goods for the consumer's dollar.

A year and a half ago the dairy industry was faced with frightening surpluses. Government stocks of butter, cheese, and powdered milk were at an all-time high, and were increasing at alarming rates. This occurred under the price stimulus of 90 percent of parity supports. Under this stimulation, production increased rapidly while per capita consumption of nearly all dairy products decreased. Something had to be done.

You are all familiar with the story. The Department of Agriculture, recognizing that the country simply was not buying all the milk products produced at the high rigid price support level, adjusted dairy supports to 75 percent of parity. About the same time, the American Dairy Association, State associations, dairy-marketing organizations, and dairy-producer groups intensified their advertising and sales promotion activities.

Everyone is pleased with the results. Consumption of nearly all dairy products is up, both on a per capita basis and in total. Government price support purchases of dairy products dropped sharply. For example, dairy price support purchases of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids in 1955 were down 35 percent from purchases in 1954. Continued heavy disposals of dairy products through 1955 brought Commodity Credit Corporation inventories at the end of the year to the lowest point for butter and cheese since 1953, and for nonfat dry milk since 1951. Last December 31, the uncommitted holdings of CCC amounted to 47 million pounds of butter, 264 million pounds of cheese, and only 3.1 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids. These figures compare with peak holdings of 466 million pounds of butter in July 1954, 436 million pounds of cheese in September 1954, and 599 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids in April 1954. Butter purchases during 1955 were down 50 percent from 1954 butter purchases.

But the most heartening thing of all is that the average prices received by producers for milk in 1955 averaged above 1954, even under the lower price support levels. This reflects the increased proportion of milk going into higher level utilization.

What is happening in the dairy industry is a living demonstration that a flexible price support program, judiciously handled, can turn a great farm enterprise off the road toward financial ruin, and down the road of economic stability with increasing sales in nongovernmental markets.

The important lesson in sound farm economics the dairy industry is writing should be watched closely by other sectors of the American farm economy.

CONSUMPTION RATES ARE UP

The most heartening note in the dairy picture in recent months is the increase in per capita consumption of the principal dairy items. The annual rates of consumption of milk, butter, and cheese showed encouraging increases in 1954 over the previous year when the 90 percent of parity supports were still in effect for dairy products. 1955 showed still further increases.

It is particularly encouraging to note the higher rate of fluid milk consumption. Nearly half of the available production of milk is consumed as fluid milk and cream. For that reason even a small percentage increase in the use of milk in fluid form brings a substantial improvement in the supply-demand balance. Consumption information for a group of Federal order market areas indicates that in 1955 consumption of fluid whole milk ran about 4 percent above a year earlier. A part of this increase in milk sales in city markets must be attributed to

increased population. However, the general rate of population increase has been less than 2 percent per year. It therefore appears that per capita consumption has increased about 2 percent.

Per capita consumption of butter increased 6 percent during 1954 over the previous year, and increased another 2 percent in 1955.

This means that 166 million people in the United States are now eating butter at a rate of 9.2 pounds a year. Last year per capita consumption was 9 pounds. This is in contrast with 1953, when consumption was 8.5 pounds for each person, with high price supports holding butter off the market.

The consumption of American cheese per person rose 8 percent in 1954 over 1953, and continued up in 1955.

AGGRESSIVE MERCHANDISING IS STILL NEEDED

You have made a good start in publicizing your product and in moving it into consumption. You must not relax on your efforts to sell dairy products. The great American market is expanding rapidly both in numbers and purchasing power.

In total, about 121 billion pounds of milk was used for food products in 1955 compared with about 120 billion pounds in 1954. The Census Bureau indicates that if the present birth rate continues, our 1960 population will approximate 179 million. This is equivalent to adding a city about the size of Philadelphia each year to the dairy market, or a market for 2 billion additional pounds of milk.

Even though substantial progress has been made so far in increasing total consumption in the United States, the fact still remains that the per capita consumption of dairy products in this country ranks 13th among 15 countries for which information is available.

In 1955 our per capita consumption of milk and dairy products in terms of whole milk equivalent approximated 710 pounds, which was about half that of the 2 leaders, Ireland and New Zealand, where consumption per person is somewhat more than 1,400 pounds a year. It might also be pointed out that we rank 13th in butter consumption; 11th in cheese; 6th in fluid milk; 4th in dried milk; and lead in only 1 category, that of canned milk.

These figures indicate strongly that we have a long way to go if we are to realize fully the market potential of dairy products here in America.

Although most Americans today are well fed, dietary surveys show that many families still need to consume more milk if they are to have adequately balanced diets. I think that we can increase consumption among these families if we continue to educate the consumer sufficiently in the uses and advantages of our dairy products. In fact, it might be well if we tried to match the increase that took place over recent years in the meat industry. The consumption per person of red meat in the United States increased from approximately 143 pounds in 1949 to 161 pounds in 1955. During the past decade there has also been a significant increase in the utilization of the nonfat solids of milk. Such high quality food proteins should find a ready market in a diet-conscious America, which is steadily swinging away from some traditional starchy foods.

The goals mentioned here illustrate some of the incentives for industry efforts to develop broader markets for dairy products here at home. Such industry promotion is a necessary part of the overall program to reduce dairy surpluses by increasing consumption here at home and building a larger market for them abroad.

There is a potential market also in expanding our foreign outlets. The Federal Government, in disposing of its surpluses, has done much to acquaint foreign governments and other foreign purchasers with the quality of our dairy products. These foreign-disposal programs have been carried on with the same care as with our domestic-distribution programs to develop new demands for dairy products without displacing sales normally made by the dairy industry of the United States or of friendly foreign countries.

GOVERNMENT STOCKS REDUCED

The total quantity of dairy products moved out of Government warehouses in the marketing year ending March 1955 totaled 1.5 billion pounds. This was 3½ times the amount disposed of in the previous marketing year. Disposals in the 7-month period, April through October 1955, totaled 800 million pounds.

During the 1954–55 marketing year a total of 761 million pounds of dairy products from the inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation were moved into consumer channels through donations to nonprofit school-lunch programs and to needy groups both here and overseas. This represented an increase of 431 million pounds over the previous year.

With the cooperation of school officials and the efforts of local dairy industry and citiben groups, a large market for milk has been developed among schoolchildren. There are now two important programs through which the Federal Government participates in promoting milk consumption by schoolchildren—the national school-lunch program and the special school-milk program.

In the 1953–54 school year, 10 million children in secondary and elementary schools out of a total enrollment of 34 million participated in the national school-lunch program. They consumed 1,600 million half pints of milk in this program. This was double the amount used by participating schools in the first year of operation under the National School Lunch Act, 1946–47. Last year participation in the school-lunch program increased to 11 million children and milk consumption rose to 1,765 million half pints.

The special school milk program which was started in 1954 has encouraged even more the consumption of milk by school children. During the 1954–55 school year a total of 8.7 million children in 41,400 schools participated in the special school milk program. The increased consumption under this program totaled 451 million half pints for the school year, an amount equivalent to the total milk produced during June 1955 in the State of Tennessee. Changes were made in this program for the 1955–56 school year to eliminate some operating problems that limited its full development the year earlier.

Secretary Benson has recommended to the Congress that authority for the special school milk program be increased from 50 million to 75 million annually. This will bring still more schools and additional pupils into the program next year.

Consumption of fluid milk by Army, Navy, and Marine personnel has also been increased by about 40 percent through a supplemental program authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954. Under similar arrangements, the Veterans' Administration hospital patients increased their consumption of milk 1,187,000 pounds over a 4-month period. In addition to the fluid milk program, over 86 million pounds of butter, more than 3 million pounds of cheese, and 7 million pounds of nonfat dry milk were transferred by Commodity Credit Corporation to the Armed Services through the end of December 1955. Most of these supplies represent an addition to the normal market purchases of the military agencies. Commodity Credit Corporation has also transferred 3.6 million pounds of butter to the Veterans' Administration.

Under all these programs, the Department of Agriculture has aimed at increasing the consumption and at the same time has attempted to build a market for future sales to persons who have acquired the habit of consuming milk and dairy products.

In order to increase consumption further, all of us must do an even better job of marketing and merchandising. In doing this, we not only will reduce surpluses, but we will also shift emphasis away from price supports as the chief assurance of fair prices and reasonable incomes. Experience has shown that price supports cannot increase consumption. This can only be brought about by realistic pricing and more aggressive selling that will encourage increased consumer buying and expanding consumption.

The future for the dairy industry is hopeful. Consumer incomes are increasing at a rate in excess of $1 billion a month which means that the demand for dairy products in 1956 should be at least as strong or stronger than in 1955. Population continues to grow, and last but not least, the dairy industry shows no sign of diminishing its promotional efforts.

The lesson is clear that dairy farmers, processors, distributors, and Government, working together cooperatively and imaginatively, have accomplished in the short span of a couple of years a marked consumption increase, and an improved income situation which could never have been achieved with Government working alone on the high price-support route.

Our sincere congratulations go to the entire dairy industry for the splendid job it has done. The lesson it has taught American agriculture stands as a beacon light in this age of increasing clamor for governmental assistance.

Use of United States Ships in Disposal of Surplus Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been holding open hearings on the administration and operation under Public Law 664, 83d Congress, the so-called preference law. The committee has been particularly interested to ascertain the effect on disposal of surplus agricultural products of the 50–50 law which requires that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of Government-financed or owned cargoes be transported on private or United States flag commercial vessels, to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates.

It was gratifying to me as a member of the committee to have Mr. Gwynn Garnett, Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service, in direct answer to my question, say that the disposal program has been successful. This morning a representative of the State Department agreed that the program has been successful also. It should me emphasized that this program has not cost the farmers of this country one cent. The cost to the Government has been very modest in relation to the benefits. Since there are certain foreign governments with merchant marines of their own which

have been pressing for the elimination of the cargo-preference clause, and the matter may come up for consideration, I have introduced H. R. 8997, a bill providing that 100 percent of these cargoes be transported in American vessels. In all fairness, I have thought that if consideration is going to be given to a change that it might well include a change that would help our national interest rather than one which would hurt it. I have advised the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that I shall not ask for a hearing on this measure, unless the interests opposing the preference cargo become active.

Meanwhile, I do hope the Members of Congress who represent agricultural districts will recognize the advantage to agriculture of maintaining a merchant marine. Particularly, the interest to exporters should be stressed in having American ships on the sea routes and in shipping conferences in order to protect them against manipulation by foreign dominance of ocean freight structures. We are helpless in competing in world markets without the American merchant marine.

Secondly, it should be recognized that the entire program of disposing of surplus agricultural products may well be jeopardized if shortsighted efforts are made to eliminate the 50–50 preference cargoes.

Refuges Doomed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I request that the attached article by Michael Hudoba entitled "Refuges Doomed?" which was carried in the February 1956 issue of Sports Afield, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REFUGES DOOMED?—INTERIOR SECRETARY MCKAY OPENS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM TO OIL AND GAS EXPLOITATION

(By Michael Hudoba)

This is it. Sports Afield, alarmed over the immense power in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, last June warned: One man can wipe out our wildlife refuges. Now it has happened. One man has proven that he has the power to defeat the very purpose of the entire refuge system.

With the plaudits of sportsmen still ringing in his ears for saving the 10,700 acres of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay has thrown the 17 million acres of national wildlife refuges wide open to exploitation.

Secretary McKay has made the lands of the national wildlife refuge system available to oil and gas leases. He has encouraged oil and gas drilling operations on these lands, reserved for wildlife restoration and vital to the future of our wildlife.

McKay has done what other Interior Secretaries have stoutly resisted over the years. He has reversed a long-standing policy to preserve the integrity of the wildlife refuges for wildlife conservation needs. He has put the Fish and Wildlife Service back on the sacrificial spot to try to defend every acre of national wildlife refuge lands against oil and gas exploitation.

In the past only several refuge areas acquired with public funds were potentially subject to oil and gas exploitation because the landowners who sold the lands to the Government reserved the mineral rights. McKay's action cancels the 2-year stop on any leasing of refuge lands and offers an invitation to exploit the refuge lands.

We can't charge an outright giveaway. While applications for oil and gas leases flooded the Fish and Wildlife Service the minute the gates were flung open, applicants will have to pay fees to the Government for the leases. Some 10 of the 272 refuges were exempted from leases. Among these were the ones conservationists defended with individual battles: Wichita, the Arkansas whooping crane refuge, the Red Rock Lakes trumpeter swan refuge. And the leasors may be required to spend some money to do some things to prevent undue damage to the refuge land and protected wildlife in the oil- and gas-drilling areas. They won't be allowed to pollute the waters of the refuge area. Theoretically, the land will still be reserved for wildlife conservation.

But the fact that these national wildlife refuges are now open to oil- and gas-leasing applications will force refuge personnel who should be allowed to continue devoting their time to improvement of refuge lands for wildlife restoration, to become oil and gas experts. They will have to match wits with the exploiters to try to suggest ways exploring and drilling operations may be carried on to ease expected damage to the wildlife refuge purposes.

McKay's order, which had the approval of Assistant Secretary D'Ewart's office, piously says that wildlife values will be given first consideration in making leases for oil and gas operations. We thought all along that the refuge purpose was for wildlife. The order also sets up a code that gives the Fish and Wildlife Service the right to require the oil and gas lessees to submit proposed plans for drilling and operations on refuge lands to soften the damage to wildlife of the refuge area.

On the face of it, this seemed enough for the Interior Department and the administration to do for the public's national wildlife refuge system. Secretary McKay and those who got him into this may feel he should be commended for making the Fish and Wildlife Service the agency to monitor the oil- and gas-lease program plans by the drillers and exploiters. No thinking conservationist will be kidded by this token sop of conscience salve, however.

In reality, this order, opening the refuge lands to exploitation for the highly profitable mineral leases and fortified by Government tax incentive to do a lot of drilling, defeats and nullifies the basic refuge purposes. The refuges can now be only partially managed for the primary reason for which they were established. The refuge managers who represent the public interest must now divide their work and wildlife programs to save and salvage wildlife values on the lands which were specifically set aside for the primary wildlife needs. The management of the refuges for the public interest is now prostituted.

While we appreciate the secretary's seeming concern to have wildlife values protected on the refuges, it is little comfort to have the order outline details for the Fish and Wildlife Service to examine proposed drilling and exploitation operations for refuge lands. The effect of McKay's order openly invites the leasing of every acre of refuge land with but several exceptions.

We dislike to point out that the powerful pressures which forced the Interior Department under this administration to open up the refuge system (and which coincidentally got into the choice oil leases real early), have other points in their favor which could so easily nullify the intent of the wildlife protection factors in the oil and gas order.

Sports Afield readers will recall our serious concern over one of the first actions of this administration in taking office. That was to take the directorship and assistant directorships of the Fish and Wildlife Service from under the protection of career civil service and making these subject to political appointment—with all the vulnerability that such appointments have to face, especially when concerned with protecting public interest values holding valuable resources in their programs.

In the face of the oil- and gas-leasing order, it would be almost too much to ask protection for national wildlife refuges by administrators who had the backing of civil service. Even at that, no human being should be required to try to insist on wildlife values in the refuge system while subject to all the torments that political pressure can apply—especially when big money is at stake, as it is in this oil- and gas-lease operations program.

With McKay's signature on the order, the Fish and Wildlife Service was almost immediately swamped with applications for oil and gas leases. The Service now has to prove the value of the wildlife and the wildlife restoration lands against each oil- and gas-lease application and against each proposed drilling operation.

Prior to Secretary McKay's order, it was the other way round. It has been a long-standing policy that the 17½ million acres of refuge land—those bought with sportsmen's duck-stamp dollars, those with appropriations by Congress for specific and primary wildlife conservation needs, and even those signed over from unwanted public lands—should be maintained as the last remnants of lands needed to hold hope for wildlife futures.

Where do we go from here?

Conservationists felt that Congress had taken steps to protect wildlife refuges when a last-ditch and last-minute effort brought amendments into the Atomic Energy and Mineral Leasing Acts during the last hours of the 83d Congress. These provided that any leases for national park, monument and wildlife land could be made only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interest of national defense.

Is Secretary McKay's order legal in view of this intent of Congress?

Is there any integrity in the administration that can rise to defend the limited lands reserved for the public interest?

Is it too much to hope that Secretary McKay will see the damage he has wrought and take steps to repair it?

Was this done with President Eisenhower's approval and will the President take the necessary prompt steps to save the national wildlife refuge system?

We can only hope that Congress will take a hard look at this order, and that the sportsman-conservationists of the country will take a harder look—with articulate expression.

A Positive Program for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has come to me as a shock the

knowledge that despite the horrifying ravages occasioned by cancer, very little is being spent in the basic research necessary to finding and remedying or the causes of cancer. Maurice Goldblatt, outstanding merchant in the city of Chicago, for years has been giving of his time and his money and his effort in this vital field. Mr. Goldblatt is the chairman of the University of Chicago Research Foundation.

I am extending my remarks to include an article by Mr. Goldblatt setting forth a positive program in cancer research that should reach the thoughtful reading of my colleagues and I trust will be followed promptly by legislative action promoting the program set forth in Mr. Goldblatts' article.

Mr. Goldblatt's article follows:

For many years I have had a deep interest in health problems, especially cancer. I have tried to persuade other private citizens to support medical research and have given help myself. Because of your deep interest in the problems of health, I want to bring the following information to your attention:

THE BOTTLENECK TO FINDING A CURE FOR CANCER

There is a lack of modern facilities and adequate numbers of thoroughly trained researchers devoted to finding a solution to the cancer problem.

There is too little money supporting cancer research.

This year almost a quarter of a million persons will die of cancer.

Today—as every day—cancer will kill approximately 650 individuals.

Unless something is done about it 50 million Americans now living will develop cancer. Half of them will die from it.

Cancer is a major public-health problem and we cannot afford to be complacent about it.

The American medical profession, American business and industry, the Federal Government, and the American public and the Congress are not taking full advantage of the opportunities available to them to help solve the riddles of cancer.

The medical profession is doing a splendid job in caring for the sick and applying new discoveries to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer but enough doctors are not being trained in the special problems of cancer and enough doctors and other scientists are not concentrating on research in this field.

American business and industry is well aware of the staggering economic loss due to cancer—the loss of millions of man-hours of work involving many more millions of dollars worth of products and skills and the resultant drain on the Nation's financial resources. Yet, American business and industry is not lending its support to the attack on this problem in the same vigorous fashion it is accustomed to eliminate other causes of waste and business inefficiency.

The Federal Government, the philanthropic foundation, the voluntary agencies have all stepped up their efforts to support cancer research in recent years, but are not doing enough to solve the problems of cancer. Compared with past decades there has been a great deal of cancer research in recent years. The $50 million spent by these agencies on cancer (partly for research) in 1955 is not an appropriate share of our gross national product of $390 billion in the same year.

To avert eventual socialized medicine the cooperation of both the Government and the medical profession in disbursing adequate funds for medical education, research projects, and research scientists is essential. Government support is now being given without control and could be increased without control.

The American public is not sufficiently aware of the tremendous need for additional research facilities and trained researchers in the cancer field. If they did know, they would write their Congressmen and Senators demanding that they take a greater interest in these problems.

In spite of the lack of manpower and facilities, many good proposals for cancer research had to be rejected because of insufficient funds.

To solve the deadly cancer riddle, more money is needed to supply more researchers with the most modern research equipment and facilities. Stating the problem simply, a researcher today must be truly a dedicated person. Not only that, but his family must be dedicated, too. They must be able to live on the inadequate salaries we pay our researchers today.

A young doctor entering research work after completing 3 to 4 years in college, 4 years in medical school, a year's intership, 3 years residency, and 2 years Army training will probably earn about $3,000 to $5,000 a year. The average salary of the full-time medical research doctor, many of whom have dedicated their lives to research and many more of whom have won the Nobel prize for their work, is $4,800 a year. Had they entered private practice, they could have commanded from $10,000 to $15,000 in their earliest years and much more than this after a few years.

A medical education is expensive. The cost per year for a medical student is about $2,350 for tuition, books, living expenses, etc. A medical education will cost about $10,000 for 4 years of medical school besides the cost of premedical education which consists of at least 3 to 4 years of undergraduate work. In spite of this cost, medical schools are losing an equal amount on each student.

How can we attract more intelligent young men into research work with a situation like this?

The entire salary structure of medical institutions must be improved. The chief obstacle of raising a new young doctor's salary is the salaries of the established older staff members of the institutions. In view of current cost of living, their salaries, too, are much too low. Many top men dedicated to their work are far less concerned with the monetary return than they are with the opportunity to carry out their research ideas, but they are increasingly worried by their inability to attract junior members to their research staffs at salaries they now are able to offer. The recent generous gifts of the Ford Foundation will relieve very little of the salary problem for teachers in our private medical schools.

Most of the teaching facilities of our medical schools are antiquated and old fashioned.

Many of our research laboratories are antiquated, too.

They just don't have the up-to-date equipment they need. Many have had no additions to their preclinical teaching space and research laboratories since early in the century. The deans have estimated that a one-half billion dollar program is needed just to bring facilities up to date. Because of inadequate funds, very few of the things which should be accomplished are actually being achieved.

For the 1955 fiscal year, Congress appropriated $8,160,000 to the National Cancer Institute for cancer research projects and gave the Atomic Energy Commission about $2,800,000 for this purpose. Grants from private sources in 1955 included $5,519,600 from the American Cancer Society, $909,522 from the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund, and $1,023,142 from private foundations.

Ten times that amount would be very little in comparison to the other expenditures, and the importance of the lives that could be saved as a result of research findings. Why doesn't the Government provide more funds? Why doesn't the American public provide more funds? Why doesn't American business and industry provide more funds?

The citizens committee, of which I am a member, is comprised of a handful of lay people as well as outstanding physicians and scientists. Each year we plead with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to boost the appropriations for research projects. Each of us in our various capacities is also seeking funds from voluntary sources but, though we are proud of the support we have received, we all know that much more should be done.

Actually, there is no information as to how much more money is needed.

All that we do know is that amounts available are not getting the job done on a large enough scale and rapidly enough.

When I visited Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, last year, I told him that more research is needed and I recommended that he ask Congress to appoint a committee to survey medical research needs throughout the Nation. Since then the President has asked for a 46 percent increase in research grant funds for the Public Health Service program. He also asked that research fellowship training be stepped up by 49.1 percent.

As a solution I recommend the following:

1. The Congress should pass a bill appointing a board consisting of businessmen, doctors, and Congressmen to make a survey of existing problems and needs.

2. At the present time about $500 million is needed to bring existing facilities up to date. I recommend the Government provide $250 million and institutions should organize fund-raising programs to provide $250 million from private sources.

3. Our institutions should pay a living wage to research doctors, thus encouraging more graduating medical students to make research a career.

4. Funds should be provided for long-range research projects thus assuring the researcher continuity in his work.

5. The American people should be informed of research needs and they would demand the Government do more. Unless the steady climb of this dread disease is halted, 50 million Americans now living will become cancer victims. Half of them will die of it.

In this paper I have discussed cancer, but the same arguments apply to research in heart disease, mental disease, and other major causes of illness.

I hope that you will vote for the research and teaching construction support bills now before Congress and also for more generous support for medical research and research training. The proposals before Congress must have your full support.

Sincerely,

MAURICE GOLDBLATT.

Beastiality of Red China Communists Now Fully Exposed—Red China Must Not Be Admitted to United Nations—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the third of a series of five articles by Mr. John Troan, of the Washington News, on the inhuman treatment by the Chinese Communists to American

prisoners. I trust that Members of the House are interested enough to read this article. It will not be long before the Chinese Reds will be demanding entrance into the United Nations.

The third article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1956]

"THE COMMIE GESTAPO BREEZED IN ON US AND WE LANDED IN JAIL"

(NOTE.—"The Communists are just plain beasts," said Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw, who landed in a Red prison because he's an American. Dr. Bradshaw and his wife, Wilda, a dietitian, had been Presbyterian missionaries in southeast China since 1928. When the Communist storm clouds began to gather in 1949, the Bradshaws were "arrested" by the Reds, subjected to torture and bestiality, breaking Dr. Bradshow physically and Mrs. Bradshaw mentally.)

(By John Troan)

PITTSBURGH, February 1.—Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw and his wife, Wilda, were just getting ready to go to sleep at the tiny Presbyterian mission in southeast China which they had come to regard as their second home.

It was 10 p. m. on March 2, 1951.

Most of their belongings were packed because the Bradshaws had heard, via the Chinese grapevine, that they were going to be "kicked out" of the country in a couple of days.

But the Reds did a switch. Two days before the scheduled ouster, "the Communist Gestapo breezed in on us," said Dr. Bradshaw.

And instead of kicking the Pittsburgh missionary couple out of China, the Commies kicked them into jail.

"A couple of the Reds had pistols," Dr. Bradshaw continued, "and some of the 'home guard' carried automatic rifles. They demanded the keys to the house and ordered us to unpack everything and spread it on the floor.

Then they told us to get going to the mission hospital, where we'd be told what it was all about. That was just about 5 years ago and we still haven't been told."

THEY WERE USHERED INTO A SMALL ROOM

At the mission hospital the Bradshaws were ushered into a small room which had served as a chapel.

There they discovered the Communists also had rounded up Miss Sarah Perkins, the 58-year-old mission nurse from Georgia; and Mrs. David Lau, another American missionary from Pittsburgh who had married a Chinese Protestant clergyman.

Dr. Bradshaw says he sat in his hospital prison for 5 days before anyone came to question him.

"Then, on March 7," he relates, "I was questioned in Chinese for about an hour. It wasn't too bad. All they wanted was some general information about the mission.

Dr. Bradshaw then resumed his solitary confinement—until midnight March 18 "when the commies brought along an interpreter for the inquisition."

"They also brought along a sheet of paper for me to sign," said the doctor. "It contained a list of 6 or 8 things I was supposed to admit and they all added up to espionage."

Dr. Bradshaw says the Reds harped "mostly on my supposed refusal to fly the Communist flag at the mission school."

"I denied responsibility. After all, I wasn't in charge of the school. It was under a Chinese superintendent.

"I told them the truth. I told them when the question of flying a Communist flag came up, I referred it to the American authorities because the school was American property.

"I was advised to turn the whole problem over to the local Chinese authorities to let them decide. And that's what I did."

THIRD DEGREE FINALLY SIMMERS OUT

The third degree finally simmered out after 6 a. m. when Dr. Bradshaw wrote a statement of his own and gave it to the Commies. In it he admitted he had a movie camera and film.

Eleven days later the Red quiz artists were back in Dr. Bradshaw's prison room.

This time, the doctor says, the Communists wanted to know what had happened "to the guns in the compound."

"Actually, there were just two guns there," Dr. Bradshaw explains. "They were given to us to keep at the hospital to chase away bandits and petty thieves."

The doctor says the guns, plus "a couple hundred rounds of ammunition," never were used at all. No one even remembered them until some time after the Commies had occupied the place.

"I urged then that they be turned in, but my Chinese friends were afraid to take the guns over.

"Finally, my friends dismantled the guns and dumped them in the river."

Dr. Bradshaw says he told the Reds this but he doesn't know whether they believed him because "they can always twist things around."

INQUISITIONS AT HOSPITAL PRISON CEASED

In any event, the inquisitions at the Linhsien hospital prison ceased.

A little over a month later, on April 30, 1951, Dr. Bradshaw, Mrs. Bradshaw, Miss Perkins, and Mrs. Lau were placed aboard a bus—destination unknown.

The doctor had not been permitted to talk to his wife since their arrest though he caught glimpses of her in the hospital corridor.

Now, on the bus, silence was still the rule. Dr. Bradshaw was assigned a seat up front and Mrs. Bradshaw was taken to the back. Four armed guards were on hand to police the "no talking" rule.

For 8 hours they rumbled along in the bus in dead silence, wondering where the Communists were taking them.

Finally, at a town named Pingshek, Dr. Bradshaw says, they were ordered to climb out of the bus and board a train.

"On the train, Mrs. Bradshaw and I were placed in the same compartment so I finally got the chance to talk to her."

But the joy in Dr. Bradshaw's heart quickly died in shock.

"It was the first I knew she was mentally abnormal," he says. "Whatever the Communist bandits did to cause this, they did before we ever left Linhsien."

Farm Journal Reports Further on Question of "Who Made the Money on Hogs?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, following is an article in a recent issue of the Farm Journal:

Hog prices in 1955 skidded to the lowest level in 14 years, while the margin between farm hog prices and retail pork prices ballooned to the highest levels on record. Beef margins also widened. We now have better figures on who got the money.

Remember Who's Making the Money on Your Hogs? in the December Farm Journal? Dean Wolf reported that organized labor all along the line was doing considerably better, but he had trouble learning just how well packers and meat counters were doing.

This will help complete the picture now that six major packing companies have reported earnings to their stockholders (however, all their earnings aren't made on meat):

Swift & Co.: Sales tonnage reached a new high; net income topped $22 million, a 20 percent increase over 1954.

Armour & Co.: Net is $10.1 million, 5½ times more than in 1954.

Wilson & Co.: Declared its first dividend on common stock since 1952. Last year it cleared $3.1 million; is expected to clear more than $4 million for 1955.

Cudahy Packing Co.: Net earnings in 1955, $2.7 million, are the highest since 1950.

Geo. A. Hormel & Co.: Dollar sales hit a new record; net earnings reached $3.7 million, more than double a year earlier.

John Morrell & Co.: Sales up considerably; net reached $2.7 million, an increase of more than 4 times over last year.

"Some of the companies didn't do very well in 1954," reports an observer close to the scene, "but they did a great deal better in 1955."

It's still too early to know how the food chains did last year, but they'll be reporting earnings soon. Their meat counters account for about a fourth of their volume.

To the foregoing may be added figures obtained from the annual report of the Rath Packing Co. which show net earnings of $2,637,300 for 1955 compared with net earnings in 1954 of $1,411,860.

GOP Attacks Labor With One-Two Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the Members' attention the following article which appeared in the September 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest concerning the antilabor activities of the Eisenhower administration.

GOP ATTACKS LABOR WITH ONE-TWO PUNCH

After carefully and cautiously preparing the way, the long-time Republican objective of putting labor in its place is now emerging into the open.

The present move to throttle unions and undermine their effectiveness differs from previous GOP antiunion activities. It is more subtle and more indirect than the open attacks of recent years. But it is all the more dangerous for that very reason.

In 1947, after the Republicans gained control of Congress for the first time in many years, their pent-up feelings against organized labor were so violent that no effort was made to conceal them. They rammed through the antilabor Taft-Hartley Act.

But the Republicans' drive of 1955 is a very different matter, for they learned a lesson when the Taft-Hartley Act boomeranged in 1948 with the reelection of Harry Truman, who had vetoed the bill. Today, instead of concentrating their antilabor activities at the national level, under the spotlight of national publicity, Republicans are now embarked on a State-by-State campaign against the labor unions.

This new 1955 drive seems to spring mainly from labor's increasingly effective political

activity which, in some cases, provided part of the margin of victory for Democratic candidates supported by labor in the 1954 elections. Since those elections, the Republican Party has combined its efforts on the Federal level to hamper and weaken labor with a campaign in the State legislatures to curb political activities of union members, in a sort of one-two punch at labor unions.

Recent events in Michigan offer a perfect example in this one-two punch. Apparently aroused by Senator McNAMARA's surprise defeat of Republican Senator Ferguson in last fall's election, with labor's help, John Feikens, GOP State chairman, has launched a two-pronged campaign to curb labor's future political activities.

At the State level, he has been the driving force behind a bill to bar political contributions by unions. He succeeded in lining up every GOP State senator behind his bill so that, despite opposition by every Democratic senator, the bill cleared the Michigan Senate.

But Mr. Feikens did not stop there. Attacking on the national as well as the State level, Feikens journeyed to Washington to charge, before a Senate committee, that the CIO United Auto Workers had violated the Federal Corrupt Practices Act in sponsoring a radio program endorsing certain candidates.

That is where the Eisenhower administration stepped in to complete the one-two punch. Acting on the Feikens complaints, the Justice Department brought the case before a Federal grand jury and obtained an indictment against the UAW-CIO.

Emil Mazey, the union's treasurer, has charged that Attorney General Brownell issued the indictment on orders from the White House, and a UAW statement "deplores the fact that Republican politicians have been able to use the courts in their frantic efforts to save face."

Wisconsin offers another striking example of a GOP campaign to curb labor's political activities. When Democratic candidates scored victories in 1953 and 1954, with the help of labor, the Republican-dominated legislature lost no time in passing a law which imposes sweeping restrictions on the rights of unions and workers to engage in political activities. This law bears the stamp of Republican Party leadership in Wisconsin, in that it was sponsored by and bears the name of the Republican leader in the assembly, Speaker Mark Catlin, Jr. It has been denounced by the State Federation of Labor as the "worst in history."

In an historic 25-hour debate, the Democratic minority fought to defeat the measure and when the vote came up, every Democrat voted against it. Republican pressure, however, succeeded in marshaling the support of every Republican member and the bill was signed into law by Governor Kohler.

Public indignation in Ohio helped to kill an equally restrictive bill sponsored by Republican representative Elton Kyle. The Toledo Blade called it outrageous, and the Akron Beacon-Journal warned that if the political rights of a union member can be curtailed, the rights of the farmer or any other citizen are in danger.

That the Kyle bill had the official stamp of approval of the Republican Party was revealed when two GOP members of the House Elections Committee refused to go along with the bill until they were called to task by the Republican Speaker of the House. One of them emerged from the conference in favor of it, and cast the deciding vote that gained committee approval of the bill. Thus far the bill has not become law.

Failure to enact a similar bill in Indiana, sponsored by Republican State Senator Bontrager, has driven the GOP to a vocal antilabor campaign. A United Press dispatch on June 29 reports that Thomas Mahaffey, Jr., treasurer of the GOP State organization, is urging Republican nominees for mayor to sponsor meetings locally for businessmen to tell them of the viciousness of the CIO campaigning.

Back of all these efforts at restrictive State legislation aimed at American working men and women lies the Taft-Hartley Act, giving priority in certain respects to more stringent State laws over Federal laws. One result of Taft-Hartley, which labor unions are fighting is the so-called State right-to-work laws, which labor has denounced as the right-to-wreck laws. When Labor Secretary Mitchell denounced these laws last year, organized labor looked for a more friendly attitude on the part of the administration, but President Eisenhower promptly repudiated his own Secretary's statement.

The problem of inadequate State unemployment benefits is another instance where trade-union leaders feel that President Eisenhower has let them down. During the campaign last year the GOP made much of President Eisenhower's request to the States to raise their benefit levels, but his request has been largely ignored by Republican-controlled legislatures.

Ohio furnishes a good example of how GOP legislatures gave rough handling to the unemployment benefit issue. There, Democratic efforts to get adequate increases brought from Republican State Representative Horace Troop, chairman of the house industry and labor committee, a threat to kill the bill entirely.

It was in the Ohio Legislature, also, where the unanimous vote of the GOP State senators beat down a Democratic effort to tie the unemployment benefits in with the new guaranteed annual wage system agreed to by Ford and General Motors. But in Michigan a ruling by Democratic State Attorney General Thomas Kavanagh seems to mean that no legislative action will be needed to allow GAW to go into effect.

This 1955 drive against the unions in the State legislatures comes on the heels of 2 years of subtle but effective antilabor actions on the part of the Eisenhower administration. Top Republican strategists, recalling the political repercussions of the Taft-Hartley Act, have tried to give a more moderate tone to the administration's activities in the field of labor. The appointment of the AFL's Martin Durkin as Secretary of Labor was part of that effort, and his successor, James Mitchell, is generally regarded as a moderate man. But events have shown that the real power behind the administration's labor policies is not Mitchell but conservative Commerce Secretary Weeks, who openly favors a return to the pre-Hoover days when labor unions were subject to antitrust laws, and when the courts became the principal instrument for union busting.

Weeks' power in the labor field is illustrated by press reports which indicate that one of the most controversial Taft-Hartley amendments favored by President Eisenhower (requiring a vote of union members prior to any strike) was slipped into the President's message by Weeks just before it went to Congress. Labor Secretary Mitchell reportedly first learned of the proposal through the newspapers.

Although no Taft-Hartley amendments have been enacted since President Eisenhower took office, none were necessary to achieve Republican ends. Early in 1953 the GOP took advantage of the opportunity to appoint a majority of the members of the National Labor Relations Board, which administers and interprets Taft-Hartley. None of three men could be considered wholly disinterested—one had previously represented management in cases before the Board, another was discovered to have retained his pension rights with a California manufacturer; and the third was a protege of the late Senator Taft. The result: Taft-Hartley has been toughened up in practice through NLRB interpretations, even though the law itself remains unchanged. The AFL research division reports a series of NLRB decisions condoning discharge of employees for union activities.

Commented the business magazine, Fortune: "For the first time in the 19-year history of the NLRB, a majority of its members are Republican appointees. * * * Management is unquestionably getting a better break at NLRB than it has had in many years."

The pattern of antilabor appointees continues; both Boyd Leedom, President Eisenhower's most recent choice for the NLRB, and Theophile Kammholz, chosen for the powerful post of NLRB General Counsel, had taken management's side in previous labor-management cases. And to administer the minimum wage law the President named Newell Brown, who, according to the Textile Workers Union, "is opposed to the whole concept of the legislation he would administer. He has several times described the minimum wage law as unsound legislation.

Moreover, the Department of Labor has suffered from severe budget cuts dictated by the budget balancers of the Eisenhower administration. For example, although Secretary Mitchell has warned that the level of workers' skills has deteriorated dangerously, the Labor Department's section responsible for training apprentice workers has had to close 31 of its field offices because of budget cuts.

In contrast to his backdowns on many programs affecting working men and women (such as his acquiescence in Congress gutting of the public-housing program in 1953), President Eisenhower has stubbornly insisted on his 90-cent minimum-wage recommendation, even though rising living costs and increased labor efficiency justify the $1 enacted by Congress. Said the President in a July press conference: "I have not had any economic advice that I should change my position [on 90 cents]."

It is hardly to be expected that President Eisenhower would get such advice, surrounded as he is by such men as—

Defense Secretary Wilson, who believes that "What is good for General Motors is good for the country," and who prefers a bird dog over a kennel-fed dog because he'll "get out and hunt for food rather than sit on his fanny and yell."

Interior Secretary McKay, who said, "We are here in the saddle representing business and industry."

Treasury Secretary Humphrey, who considers 4 million unemployed a relatively low figure.

Commerce Secretary Weeks, who said, during the 1954 recession that unemployment is "coming along in a satisfactory manner."

On the eve of his election in 1952, General Eisenhower promised to defend the American workers "so that at the end of my service the workers of America can honestly say: He has been fair. He has been my friend."

In late July, at least a year before President Eisenhower's end of service, one labor leader had reached his own conclusion as to whether the President has been fair. Ray Mills, president of the Iowa Federation of Labor, and a lifelong Republican, switched his party affiliation and became a Democrat because, he said, the Republican Party had failed to go through with what it promised to labor people.

Those "Hayshakers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there are reasons not readily apparent to some,

why a great many people prefer to live in the rural areas of America.

Patty Johnson, woman's page editor of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, cogently states some of these reasons in one of her columns, which appears each Sunday in the Courier and other newspapers. The column follows:

People in Iowa get sick of being depicted as hayshakers. People in Vermont get tired of cracker barrels and chin whiskers.

People in Kentucky are fed up with old saws about revenuers and people in Georgia eat more crackers than they see.

The reason I know this is that people like me are purty durn nauseated at being considered hicks because we live in small towns and like it.

I like to fell in love with a city slicker oncet. But he kept trying to brush the sticks out of my hair. I like the sticks and I do not like traffic jams and carbon monoxide. Clover smells better.

This does not label me Maud Muller. I happen to think I got me enough git-up-and-git to earn a living where I want to. So far my dollar bills are legal tender anyplace.

I think I have country manners, too. Us hicks don't tolerate city ones. If a feller falls down on the street, we don't step around him. We see if we can help a little.

Out here in the sticks we manage to read a book or two and the newspaper. We like station wagons better than surreys and we figured out that it ain't necessary to trap a bear when winter comes. We can always wear mink.

Occasionally I pack my portmanteau and tie my cash in my corset and set off for the big city. Sometimes I meet a city feller, like the big butter-and-egg merchant who had a yen to play post office. He thought us Sunnybrook Farm girls didn't know about the birds and bees.

Out here in the wide open spaces I don't have to get a move on afore daybreak to get to work. I don't stand around in a subway because I part my car right outside my office. And every day I meet folks who know about Arnold Toynbee and the New Yorker magazine.

Sometimes my cheeks get windburned and sometimes my hands are chapped. In the summer I get freckles on my nose.

But in the sticks it's a doggone sight easier to remember that I'm my brother's keeper. The way I remember is easy.

He never forgets that he's mine.

Wilderness Society Ends Colorado River Project Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Utah, and Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, recently notified leading conservation organizations that an alternate site had been obtained for the Echo Park Dam in the upper Colorado River storage project. Echo Park Dam will not be part of this project. It has been deleted by agreement of Representatives and Senators in the upper basin States, and an amendment is being proposed to the project act to insure the integrity of the national park system.

Members of these national conservation organizations, of which the Wilderness Society is typical, are aware of the vital need of these four States to put their water resources to use. For the information of the Members of Congress, I am submitting herewith a letter to Representative DAWSON from Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society.

FEBRUARY 1, 1956.

The Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: I am glad to reply in behalf of the Wilderness Society to the January 26 letter in which you and Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL report both the elimination of the proposed Echo Park Dam from the Colorado River project and the agreement to include in the bill authorizing this project the two amendments (1) providing protection for the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, and (2) declaring it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

You conclude your letter by asking: "Now that we have agreed upon these amendments protecting the national park and monument areas, may we have assurance to pass on to others that any opposition that you or your organization has heretofore had will now be withdrawn?"

I am deeply pleased to be able to reply: You most certainly do have this assurance.

You may recall that when I responded to the invitation of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and submitted, on March 28, 1955, the statement that appears on pages 1086 to 1098 of the hearings on the Colorado River storage project, I pointed out at the beginning:

"I do not wish to be considered an opponent of the upper Colorado River storage project except as it does threaten areas dedicated for preservation. It is rather my purpose to urge that any bill reported out by this subcommittee be one from which all such threats have been carefully excluded and in which provision is made for the protection of national parks and monuments. It is my belief that such a bill can be prepared that will adequately meet the needs for a sound upper Colorado River storage project, and after 5 years of deep concern with the problems we are here discussing I can assure you that I should welcome such a bill with great eagerness."

Later in the course of the statement I said with further emphasis:

"I do wish, Mr. Chairman, to be understood as being interested in the welfare and prosperity of this great upper Colorado region of our country and its people. Just as I have come to value the privilege of visiting this region and breathing a little deeper in its outdoors, so also I have valued the privilege of knowing the people who live there. I value highly their hospitality and friendship. I share their aspirations, and wish accordingly to be understood as approaching this controversy with hope and confidence that it will be so resolved as not only to preserve the areas which have been set aside for preservation but also to provide for the wise development of the region."

And again, stressing the common interest of those in the Colorado region and those of us in other regions of the United States, I said:

"I recognize that our national welfare depends on the welfare of this region, and I feel that my own personal welfare is related to the personal welfare of fellow citizens in Utah and Colorado. I am interested in the national importance of the upper Colorado River program for the benefit of this region and its people. At the same time I would urge all of them to keep faith with all of us throughout the Nation, and with those of future generations, by cherishing these scenic wild canyons and helping to preserve them unimpaired."

In concluding this statement in behalf of the Wilderness Society, I said:

"I would, therefore, recommend, Mr. Chairman—

"(1) That the Echo Park Dam be deleted from any of the bills now under consideration which the subcommittee may consider for approval and that the Echo Park Dam be omitted from any authorization recommended for approval;

"(2) That any bill recommended for passage by Congress include a provision that the Glen Canyon project be so constructed that it shall not impair the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, a protection that we are assured by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior can be provided, but one that should be specified by Congress as a requirement; and

"(3) That any bill authorizing an upper Colorado River project should include a provision that no project constructed under the authorization of this act shall be built within, or impair any of the natural features within, any areas within the national park system.

"Thus, Mr. Chairman, not only does it seem possible to see authorized a sound project for the development and conservation of the water resources of the upper Colorado River region, but also, by reaffirming here in Congress the sanctity of the areas that the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can resolve this long controversy in such a manner as to make more secure than ever our great American policy for preserving some areas of our land forever wild and unspoiled in their natural beauty and grandeur.

"It will be an achievement that I am sure will bring us the gratitude of American citizens during a long, long future, and accomplishment that all of us, I am sure, will be satisfied to share. As I said before, we cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound."

This statement, I am glad to reassure you now, was presented in all earnestness and sincerity. And I am glad to say further that the way in which the proponents of the Colorado project have agreed to amend the bill that will authorize the project has fully met our recommendations and has indeed merited our commendations, and we are accordingly deeply pleased to give you these assurances.

I should like also to express to you personally, Mr. DAWSON, a special appreciation for the contribution that you have made in helping to resolve the controversy that arose over the proposed Echo Park Dam. It is often much easier to start and carry on a controversy than it is to settle one, and it has seemed to me that you have shown a special magnanimity in helping to resolve this one. Without your candor and confidence and your good will in seeking an agreement we might still be contending. As it is, I believe we have arrived at a significant understanding in the public interest and that we can now go forward the more confidently with resource-development projects that will serve the general welfare not only in themselves but as part of an over-all land and water conservation program which likewise includes the preservation of areas of wilderness and wildness. No region can better reveal the benefits of such a policy to its own citizens and to all of us throughout the Nation than can the Colorado region with its wealth of resources and its marvelous areas of wild beauty and splendor, and I look forward to seeing these expectations realized to our mutual satisfaction.

It has been both pleasant and reassuring to have been associated with you in dealing with these problems and prospects, and I thank you very much for the personal kindness you have shown me.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Executive Secretary and Editor.

Those Who Came to Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from Irwin E. Klass, the brilliant editor of the Federation News, published by the Chicago Federation of Labor, I have received an interesting letter calling my attention to the introduction of bills seeking to bar unions from contributing to political parties. Editor Klass correctly states that the Taft-Hartley Act effectively bars unions from making treasury contributions to political candidates; and that these funds are raised voluntarily by local unions.

In view of the constant harping about labor's political activity, Editor Klass in an editorial in the Federation News of January 28, 1956, shows how the large corporations go about filling up their political coffers directly from corporation funds which are deducted in income-tax returns. I think my colleagues will find the editorial, which follows, well worth their thoughtful reading:

THE MEN WHO CAME TO DINNER

At the International Amphitheater, the choice was roast beef or brook trout.

In New York's Madison Square Garden, they ate lobster.

That was the fare at the nationwide $100 a plate dinners labeled "Salute to Eisenhower." We haven't had any reports on the food, but at those prices, there should be no complaints. There were tuna and sardine sandwiches at $12.50 in the balconies.

And who do you think paid for these expensive morsels that added $5 million to various units of the Republican Party?

You, as a taxpayer, or consumer, or stockholder.

Remember how some Senators recently tossed political slush fund charges at unions because labor was going to endorse candidates for office?

And you'll recall that the editorials complained that corporations were barred by law from contributing to political campaigns.

Well—it seems that if a corporation wants to pay $100 for a plateful of roast beef or brook trout or lobster—that's its privilege. So, as many tables in the stockyards amphitheater were loaded with eager junior executives, the men who came to dinner could sip their after-dinner coffee with the knowledge that the profit-and-loss statement wasn't budgeted very much.

As entertainment, the $100-a-plate dinner is deductible when computing taxes.

These functions are becoming traditional ways of sweetening coffers of both parties. It seems that the Republicans have been far more successful in their fund-raising ventures.

There's a reason: this administration's been more than friendly with business, and that's where the money is, if you'll glance at the reports of profits and dividends in the financial columns of any local paper.

Chicago area promoters of the salute-to-Eisenhower dinner read like a directors' list of our town's largest corporations. It was headed up by the president of a railroad which is pushing a fight against the union shop.

On the list of the 73 Chicago sponsors are investment brokers, bank executives, advertising agency chiefs, steel makers, hog butchers, real estate operators who loathe public housing, publisher of a large non-union magazine, grain merchants, farm implement makers, former presidents of the Illinois Manufacturers' Associaiton, oil refiners, mail order house executives, etc.

There wasn't anyone on the list who could be accused of being a liberal or assoicated in any way with the labor movement. At the drop of a gavel, any guest could spout endlessly about the trend to socialism and the "right to work."

Now supposing you're a manufacturer of railroad equipment. In comes a letter asking you to buy a $1,000 table for the salute-to-Eisenhower dinner. You're in political agreement with the idea, and no one likes Ike more than you do. But $1,000 is a lot of money—and you hesitate.

You look at the letter head—and find the names of railroad presidents—men who help make decisions on where they buy their supplies. Out comes the company's checkbook. The $1,000 for the dinner is not a political contribution, which the law officially doesn't allow corporations to make. It's not too hard on the firm, since it's an expense and helps cut the tax bill. The $1,000 won't go to workers in the form of pay hikes or to stockholders as dividends.

So it's no wonder that 6,000 people attended the dinner at International Amphitheater. We're surprised they didn' use the stadium. That wouldn't have been practical. The man who owns the amphitheater was a member of the sponsoring committee, and in the business of politics and politics of business, one hand washes the other.

Anyone for baked beans? We'll treat—and give the difference between that hearty fare and a steak to labor's Committee on Political Education.

Observations on the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, appended herewith is an unsolicited letter from a practicing geologist who has spent many years exploring the Colorado River Basin.

I am sure the Members will be interested in Mr. Hager's observations, particularly as it pertains to the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir—keystone unit of the upper Colorado River storage project.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *January 31, 1956.*
The Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have seen the recent statements of the Californians regarding the Chinle shale. In the first place, anyone who knows anything about the thicknesses of the Chinle along the Colorado River on the Utah and on the upper Arizona side knows the Chinle is not 1,000 feet or more in thickness. It is more in the nature of 400 to 700 feet along the Colorado River, and in the Glen Canyon area particulary from 500 to 600 feet.

I have studied the Chinle beds through northeast Arizona and Utah, and, again, anyone who has studied the Chinle will find it consists of red shales and calcareous sandstones. The calcareous sandstone is tough and some very well cemented and resistant to water action. The beds do not yield to solution. Of course, some of the shale beds are softer than others, but on the whole the formation stands up well.

It seems to me the Californians are "tilting at a windmill." It would be easy to grab a few samples to get a solubility test. What must be done is to study the section as a whole. Granted, there might be some minor sluffing in some of the beds but I think the formation as a whole will be consistently resistant.

Ask the California geologists to make carefully measured sections and study the formation, foot by foot. I think then they will come to the same conclusion obtained by the reclamation engineers and by the geologists of Utah.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

DORSEY HAGER.

Pilferage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, instead of making a whipping boy of the rugged longshoreman who now has to be fingerprinted and made to pass a character test for the poor privilege of taking his life in his hands everytime he goes in the hold of a ship to earn his daily bread, people should open their hearts and their eyes.

Harry Bridges is working for control of the waterfront in New York and on all the east coast right under our noses.

With this in mind I was pleased to read the following fair and dispassionate editorial of the New York Journal of Commerce in its issue of January 13, 1956:

PILFERAGE

The old story of extensive pilferage on the docks in the port of New York has been hitting the headlines again after a long period of neglect.

This subject is always good for a play when the flow of news is slow and doubtless convinces a lot of people who do not look beyond the printed word that looting on a grand scale still prevails along the New York waterfront.

That pilferage exists is certainly a fact, and every bottle of Scotch, carton of perfume or nylons, or watches that disappear represent a loss to someone, both in money and paperwork in adjusting claims and lading bills.

But, exactly how extensive is this pilferage? The only fair way to measure it is to stack the estimated value of goods which disappear against the value of goods which are available for those handling this merchandise to surreptitiously cart away.

We say "estimated" value of pilferage advisedly. Those concerned with this problem

say it is difficult to give an exact figure because when goods disappear it frequently is impossible to tell whether the actual removal was in a foreign port or while stowed aboard ship or while on the dock.

However, it was brought out in the Crime Commission hearings 2 years ago that the sticky-finger boys on the docks in New York were taking goods valued at $4 million each year.

This is no small item and it is not our purpose to dismiss it lightly. The question is whether it is a significant item and whether it represents such an unusual condition as to warrant the big play in print that frequently is seen.

Here are some facts that should be considered in trying to arrive at an answer to these questions. The actual value of export and import general cargo going through New York in 1954 (the latest figures available) was $6.4 billion. This eliminates bulk items, such as petroleum, which would be difficult to take away unnoticed.

When you match the value of these goods, available for thievery, against the value of merchandise actually stolen, you get $4 of pilferage for every $6,400 of property that moved through the port of New York. Reduced to simpler terms, it comes to $1 for each $1,600.

What is the score in other industries in the city of New York? An overall estimate made early last year placed the annual value of goods stolen, outside of actual burglaries, at approximately $100 million. The 10 largest department stores report annual losses through shoplifting at $10 million. New York's 400 hotels say their annual losses in property removed comes to $25 million. Even the subway gum and candy machines are not immune. They are tapped for $100,000 annually.

When you consider the confusion that exists on most piers when a ship is in port, the fact that some of the labor is casual and the fact that many others have not been reared with a high code of ethics, the actual amount of dockside stealing takes on a different look.

It is still a serious problem and is being constantly battled by management through its special agency, the Security Bureau. Losses are being steadily reduced through this vigilance. They have been cut between 10 and 20 percent in recent years, it is estimated.

Stealing never will be entirely eliminated. But it is getting to be more and more hazardous on the docks, for in addition to industry efforts to halt the practice there is the waterfront commission with the power to cancel a worker's registration.

These are some facts to keep in mind the next time someone breaks into print or is interviewed on TV concerning widespread pilferage on New York's waterfront.

These statements do the port of New York no good and they should be challenged every time they appear by those who are trying to restore this port to its proper position.

We will always have crooks, just as we always seem to have freewheelers with facts. Thank heaven, both are in the minority.

Hosmer Scores a Telling Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "HOSMER Scores a Telling Argument," which appeared in the Press Telegram of Long Beach, Calif., on January 11, 1956:

HOSMER SCORES A TELLING ARGUMENT

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of the 18th Congressional District (Long Beach-Lakewood), scored another telling argument this week in his battle to protect southern California water rights in the Colorado River.

Speaking of the controversial upper Colorado River Basin proposal, he stated: "The Bureau of Reclamation would have us believe that we must spend billions to develop projects like the upper Colorado in order to provide food and fiber for our growing population.

"That simply is not true. On the presently producing farmlands we are growing so much food and fiber that we cannot find adequate space to store it. Despite plans for reducing this output, we are faced again this year with enormous surpluses, in some products record yields."

And when you stop to think about it, it does seem contradictory to bring into production more than half a million acres in barren, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico and at the same time spend millions of dollars to buy up the surpluses from the land already in overproduction.

But assuming that it is necessary to bring into production new land, why build the upper basin project at a cost of $5,000 an acre when right now at least 20,937,153 acres of the best American cropland are unused for any purpose?

Historical Summary of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives has had a long and outstanding service in the legislative work of the House since its creation as will be readily seen from the following summary of its activities:

ITS CREATION

Chronologically it was third in the order of creation of committees. It was created December 1, 1795, at the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures. In point of time only two committees, Elections—April 13, 1789—and Claims—November 13, 1794—preceded it.

JURISDICTION

In 1819—Annals, pages 708 and 709—the subjects of commerce and manufactures were separated. In early times the Committee on Commerce was sometimes in conflict with Ways and Means over the jurisdiction of subjects relating to duties—volumes 1 to 17, Annals, page 530. In the revision of the rules of 1880 the Committee on Rules reported in favor of restoring to the Appropriations Committee the river and harbor bill, which had more recently been reported from the Committee on Commerce, allowing the Committee on Commerce to frame the bill, but requiring it to be reported to the Committee on Appropriations—volumes 2–46, RECORD, page 200.

The House dissented from this plan, and after long debate agreed to a rule in this form:

To commence, life saving service, and lighthouses, other than appropriations for life-saving service and lighthouses; to the Committee on Commerce. And the Committee on Commerce shall have the same privileges in reporting bills making appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors as is accorded to the Committee on Appropriations in reporting general appropriation bills. (Vols. 2–46, RECORD, pp. 663, 1261).

On December 19, 1883, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was established, and took the jurisdiction of the river and harbor bill, with its privileges—volumes 1–48, RECORD, pages 196, 214.

CHANGE OF TITLE TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

In 1892 the present name of Interstate and Foreign Commerce was adopted—volumes 1–52, RECORD, page 653.

This change of title was brought about as the result of a triangular contest for speakership of the 52d Congress. The candidates before the Democratic caucus were Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia; Roger Q. Mills, of Texas; and William M. Springer, of Illinois.

After 30 ballots were cast a majority was finally secured for Crisp. This was effected by the Springer following going over to Crisp, and in return Springer was rewarded by appointment by Crisp as chairman of the important Committee on Ways and Means. Those who supported Mills were highly indignant because they regarded Mills as the natural man to be appointed as chairman of Ways and Means, he having held that post when the Democrats controlled the previous Democratic House in the 50th Congress. He was author of the famous Mills tariff bill. In order, as it was supposed, to appease Mills and his following, Speaker Crisp appointed Mills as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, but instead of mollifying the angry Millsites they regarded this appointment as sop and a demotion of Mills.

Then, in order to further pacify them the Committee on Commerce was given the more high sounding title of "Interstate and Foreign Commerce." It was freely rumored that Mills would not accept nor serve as its chairman. Be that as it may, the matter was removed from further controversy by the election of Mills to the United States Senate resulting in George D. Wise, of Virginia, the ranking Democrat on the committee becoming its chairman.

JURISDICTION UNDER NEW TITLE

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce remained as formerly until 1935, when the committee was deprived of its jurisdiction over bills dealing with water transportation, Coast Guard, life saving service, lighthouses, lightships, ocean derelicts, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Panama Canal, and jurisdiction over those subjects was vested in the Committee on the Merchant Marine and

Fisheries—volumes 1–74, RECORD, page 2627.

JURISDICTION UNDER THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Pursuant to amendments of rule XI of the House of Representatives as covered by title I, part 2, section 121 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—Public Law No. 601, 79th Congress—approved August 2, 1946, the jurisdiction of the committee was not changed from above except as follows:

Title V of the Legislative Reorganization Act—the General Bridge Act—was a general consent of Congress relating to construction, maintenance and operation of bridges over navigable waters, other than international bridges, thereby removing the necessity for individual bridge bills being considered by Congress. Under this act these requests go direct to the War Department.

The transfer to the Committee on Agriculture of legislation relating to the Rural Electrification Act.

The addition of legislation relating to the Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system.

Clarifying committee jurisdiction to cover interstate and foreign transportation by water, except that not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Generally speaking, the present jurisdiction of the committee includes the following:

First. Interstate and foreign commerce in general;

Second. Interstate Commerce Commission, having jurisdiction over all forms of interstate transportation, such as railroads, motor vehicles and trucks, and inland waterways, and so forth;

Third. Civil Aeronautics Board and Civil Aeronautics Commission, including all forms of civil aviation, domestic and foreign;

Fourth. Federal Communications Commission, having jurisdiction over radio, television, telephones, telegraphs, and cables;

Fifth. Federal Power Commission, regulating interstate transmission of power;

Sixth. Securities and Exchange Commission, regulating stock exchanges and investment securities;

Seventh. Petroleum, natural gas pipelines, and interstate oil compacts;

Eighth. Public health, in all its phases;

Ninth. Food and drugs, to insure quality and safety;

Tenth. Alien property and claims;

Eleventh. Railroad Retirement, Unemployment and Mediation Service; and

Twelfth. Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and Weather Bureau, Fair Trade Commission, investigation of newsprint shortage, and a few other incidentals.

Chairmen of Committee on Commerce

Congress	Year	
4	1795	Benjamin Goodhue, Massachusetts.
5	1797	John Swanwick, Pennsylvania.
6	1799	Samuel Smith, Maryland.
7	1801	Do.
8	1803	Samuel L. Mitchell, New York.

Chairmen of the Committee on Commerce—Continued

Congress	Year	
9	1805	Jacob Crowninshield, Massachusetts.
10	1807	Thomas Newton, Virginia.
11	1809	Do.
12	1811	Do.
13	1813	Do.
14	1815	Do.
15	1817	Do.
16	1819	Do.
17	1821	Do.
18	1823	Do.
19	1825	Do.
20	1827	Churchill C. Cambreleng, New York.
21	1829	Do.
22	1831	Do.
23	1833	John B. Sutherland, Pennsylvania.
24	1835	Do.
25	1837	Francis O. J. Smith, Maine.
26	1839	Edward Cwetis, New York.
27	1841	John P. Kennedy, Maryland.
28	1843	Isaac G. Holmes, North Carolina.
29	1845	Robert McClelland, Michigan.
30	1847	Washington Hunt, New York.
31	1849	Robert H. McLane, Maryland.
32	1851	David L. Seymour, New York.
33	1853	Thomas J. B. Fuller, Maine.
34	1855	Elihu B. Washburn, Illinois.
35	1857	John Cochrane, New York.
36	1859	Elihu B. Washburn, Illinois.
37	1861	Do.
38	1863	Do.
39	1865	Do.
40	1867	Do.
41	1869	Nathan T. Dixon, Rhode Island.
42	1871	Samuel Shallabarger, Ohio.
43	1873	William A. Wheeler, New York.
44	1875	Frank Hereford, West Virginia.
45	1877	John H. Reagan, Texas.
46	1879	Do.
47	1881	Horace F. Page, California.
48	1883	John H. Reagan, Texas.
49	1885	Do.
50	1887	Martin L. Clardy, Missouri.
51	1889	Charles S. Baker, New York.

Chairmen of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Congress	Year	
52	1891	Roger Q. Mills, Texas. George D. Wise, Virginia.
53	1893	Do.
54	1895	William P. Hepburn, Iowa.
55	1897	Do.
56	1899	Do.
57	1901	Do.
58	1903	Do.
59	1905	Do.
60	1907	Do.
61	1909	James R. Mann, Illinois.
62	1911	William C. Adamson, Georgia.
63	1913	Do.
64	1915	Do.
65	1917	Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee.
66	1919	John J. Esch, Wisconsin.
67	1921	Samuel E. Winslow, Massachusetts.
68	1923	Do.
69	1925	James S. Parker, New York.
70	1927	Do.
71	1929	Do.
72	1931	Sam Rayburn, Texas.
73	1933	Do.
74	1935	Do.
75	1937	Clarence F. Lea, California.
76	1939	Do.
77	1941	Do.
78	1943	Do.
79	1945	Do.
80	1947	Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey.
81	1949	Robert Crosser, Ohio.
82	1951	Do.
83	1953	Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey.
84	1955	J. Percy Priest, Tennessee.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 84th Congress: J. Percy Priest, Tennessee, chairman; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Arthur G. Klein, New York; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; F. Ertel Carlyle, North Carolina; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Martin Dies, Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia; Torbert MacDonald, Massachusetts; Don Hayworth, Michigan; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Robert Hale, Maine; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois; John V. Beamer, Indiana; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Steven B. Derounian, New York; Elton J. Layton, clerk.

School Integration in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, school integration in the District of Columbia is not what the country has been told. Quite often we hear and read statements glorifying the highly satisfactory manner in which school integration has been accepted and worked in the District. Most of these statements come from people who either hold public office or expect to hold it.

The facts are that integration has not been accepted and it has not worked satisfactorily in the District of Columbia. On the contrary, it has only been tolerated. There is quite a difference between acceptance and toleration. Special police details have been assigned to some schools to maintain order. Furthermore, it has been necessary for school authorities to frequently impose disciplinary action in order to maintain peace on the grounds and in the school buildings. The number of such instances and the extent of the violent differences seldom reach the papers. When they do, the reports are almost invariably hidden in the back pages under small headlines.

But integration's greatest failure lies in the fact that it has resulted in a severe drop in District school standards to accommodate the grade advancement of Negro children. White children are held back and deprived of educational opportunities because of the achievement lag of the minority group which, incidentally, has now become the majority by a very large margin. White children are being discriminated against in the District of Columbia. They are being forced to accept a second-rate education in order to accommodate the inability of colored students to keep up.

This might also be an appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, to again point out that integration has resulted in an exodus of people from the District of Columbia. They have moved out and are continuing to move out to neighborhoods removed from the District so as to get away from the intolerable school situation that exists here. Also, the demand

for entrance to private schools has been highly accelerated. Such schools are filled to capacities. Like some high in political circles of this Government, hundreds of just plain ordinary families are looking for all-white private schools in which to educate their children.

We were told by the integrationists that integration would result in more education at less cost. It was said that integration would result in fewer school plants, fewer teachers, a smaller executive personnel, and so on. Just the contrary has been the case. School officials are now pleading for more and more teachers. With these extra teachers they intend to give extra tutoring to the backward students with the hope that they can keep pace with the average, thereby removing the necessity of lowering educational standards in the District.

In connection with this deplorable situation, I am including as a part of my remarks a statement made on yesterday by David Lawrence, well known editor and columnist. I trust that it will be widely read so that the people of the country will know what the facts are when they read statements from the President and others expressing gratification over the "highly satisfactory" manner in which school integration has worked here. On the contrary, schools in the District of Columbia are on the downgrade at a fast clip, as anyone who is willing to impartially examine and speak on the facts will agree.

The article follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTEGRATION ANALYZED—PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT-LEVEL DROP MAY POSE NEW QUESTIONS FOR COURT

(By David Lawrence)

Right here in the National Capital, almost on the doorstep of the Supreme Court of the United States, some facts have been uncovered which may have a far-reaching influence on how segregation or integration works out in the schools of America.

For the tests conducted in the Washington schools show that, since Negro and white children were put in the same classes, the educational level has dropped below the national average. Previous tests in all-white schools in Washington showed that national averages had been generally maintained.

Citywide achievement tests—made after segregation was ended in the local schools—were given in the 3d, 6th, 9th, and 12th grades. In almost all these grades the results lagged behind the national averages.

Thus, out of 4,155 pupils in the 9th grade—tested in reading—only 1,583, or 38 percent, were at the 9th-grade level or above.

Also, out of 3,979 pupils in the 9th grade—tested in arithmetic—only 955 pupils, or 24 percent, were at the 9th-grade level or above.

As for the 6th grade here, 47 percent showed a reading level of 4th grade or lower. In arithmetic, 37 percent qualified at the 4th-grade level or below.

Both white and Negro teachers agree on these facts, but they also agree that it doesn't necessarily prove that the Negro children have any less intelligence. There is, for example, the suggestion that Negro children in the past have not been given satisfactory education in separate schools and that remedial instruction with special teachers hereafter will be necessary. More than 64 percent of the pupils in Washington schools now are Negroes. The Superintendent of Schools is asking for money to double the number of special teachers.

An additional reason for the drop-off is given by Dr. Irene C. Hypps, a Negro who is assistant superintendent of schools. She says:

"But, since the heart of the problem is the low economic level of many Negro families, the educational problem won't be solved until the economic problem is solved. I think that will take a great many years."

Meanwhile, what becomes of the doctrine unanimously enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, declaring that "even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible factors' may be equal," the children "of the minority group" are deprived of equal educational opportunities when there is segregation "solely on the basis of race." The question now will be asked whether the children of the majority group are not being deprived of educational opportunities because of the achievement lag of children in the minority group who are put in the same schools with them.

Already the problem is being tackled by attempting to put in subdivisions in the same classrooms, children of differing achievement levels. Where there is a sincere effort, as in Washington, to handle the matter so that bright children aren't held back by reason of the lag of the less-bright pupils, there probably will be no furor of complaint. But what about States, especially in the South, where there is no wholehearted interest in avoiding racial discrimination and where the school authorities may finally conclude that separate schools will have to be maintained solely on the basis of achievement or mental ability?

Under such circumstances, will the Supreme Court set up a system of measurement of the sincerity or efficiency of local school authorities? Will the Federal Government be compelled to create a department to police the States and see that they are applying the proper educational standards? That could mean complete control of education by the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court entered the realm of psychological knowledge in its decision and, in a sense, took jurisdiction over the scope of educational operations when it said:

"To separate them (Negroes) from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

But if there is an achievement lag, as the educators call it, and the net effect in some school areas is to put a predominant number of white children in a class with an occasional sprinkling of Negroes, will this not create the same feeling of inferiority? Will parents of the Negro children concerned ever be satisfied that the separation is really due to educational qualifications and not solely because of race?

Irrespective of the merits of the dispute concerning the social effects of mixed schools, the legal questions appear to be growing more instead of less complicated. For, after what the tests in the Washington schools show, any form of segregation as between those at an advanced educational level and those lagging behind will be open to suspicion. The burden of proof in each case will be upon the school authorities to prove that it isn't racial discrimination.

This could introduce timidity among teachers and hesitation to classify pupils according to grades of achievement where the racial question is involved.

Likewise, the parents of white children may be petitioning the Federal courts some day with the argument that the phychological effects upon their children are adverse. It looks as if the Supreme Court will be plagued with the segregation issue for years to come.

Construction of an Adequate Great Lakes Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, after considerable study and deliberation, I have introduced a resolution designed to encourage the construction and maintenance of a fleet of privately owned United States-flag Great Lakes vessels adequate to supply the demands of essential industries with the basic bulk commodities in time of peace and in time of national emergency. This resolution proposes that American shipowners be permitted to transfer existing Great Lakes vessels to the United States Government as they become obsolete in exchange for an allowance of credit to be applied upon the cost of new vessels constructed in the United States. This credit allowance would be based, at least in part, upon the inherent cost advantage which foreign-flag operators enjoy in constructing similar vessels abroad. Vessels turned over to the Government would be placed in the reserve fleet for use during periods of emergency.

The legislation I have introduced today is the result of lengthy discussions I have had with representatives of the Lake Carriers Association, with individual operators and with maritime labor officials. I have also discussed the matter in detail with my learned colleague, the Honorable A. D. BAUMHART, JR., of the 13th Ohio District, whose judgment we all respect. We are all in substantial agreement that foreign shipping competition is a matter of real concern to shipping interests on the Great Lakes—to American lake carriers, the inland shipbuilding industry, to labor, and to the vast and various industries which depend upon reliable water transportation facilities.

We cannot allow our national defense to be threatened, nor an important part of our national economy to be jeopardized. We all know that our American merchant marine is the fourth arm of our national defense, and this applies to our maritime activity on the Great Lakes as well as on the high seas.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, two distinct trends have developed in Great Lakes commerce: First, international trade between the United States and Canada has increased; and second, the portion of such trade transported in United States-flag vessels has become less and less—from 76 percent in 1925 to 29 percent in 1955. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, becomes clear when we consider that the ship construction costs abroad average only about 40 percent of present United States costs. Even our close neighbor, Canada, has construction costs approximately two-thirds of our own. Since United States-

Canadian commerce is open to vessels of all countries, completion of the St. Lawrence seaway will expose United States-flag vessels to even stronger competition from large, modern low-cost vessels of other countries.

Mr. Speaker, our American-flag fleet is growing old and obsolete while our foreign competitors are building modern bulk-cargo vessels which will soon be able to operate on the Great Lakes. Today, 343 United States-flag vessels operate on the Great Lakes, representing a total trip capacity of 3.38 million tons. But 103 of these, one-third of our United States Great Lakes vessels, Mr. Speaker, are 50 or more years old. By 1960, 201—about 60 percent—will be 50 or more years old, representing a total trip capacity of 1.9 million tons, or only enough to handle peacetime domestic commerce.

It is obvious to all, I believe, that in time of war, overseas sources of iron ore for our Nation's steel industry will be cut off, at least in part. It is equally apparent from the above figures that our aging Great Lakes fleet would be wholly inadequate to handle the accelerated demands of a war economy if such an economy were forced upon us.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced my resolution today.

I feel constrained to say, however, that there is another aspect to this general problem which continues to cause me considerable concern and certain misgivings. As a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and as a member of the subcommittee appointed to hold hearings on labor-management problems in the maritime industry, I have come to the reluctant, but inescapable conclusion that the American merchant marine today does not meet the standards or possess the characteristics set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In the last 10 years, American taxpayers have subsidized this industry to the extent of $625 million.

Last year alone, total subsidies amounted to over $100 million. Yet, the fact remains that today we have 600 or 700 fewer vessels in our active fleet than military authorities estimate are necessary for national defense purposes; the domestic and intercoastal trades have all but vanished from the seas; the tramp fleet, which is being subsidized almost entirely by the 50–50 law, and Government-aid cargoes, is doomed to obsolescence and eventual liquidation; the United States has dropped far down among the nations of the world in the number of ships being built; and the maritime unions have thousands of men on the beach. These are hardly the characteristics of a strong merchant marine. Speaking only as an individual member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine, I must say that I feel the responsibility for this deplorable situation to rest upon our Federal Government as well as upon management and labor. There simply is no other conclusion but that there has been an almost complete failure among those directly concerned to accept the increased responsibility which Federal subsidy to this industry should entail.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to introduce legislation which, if passed, would add to the deplorable record which has now become so clearly apparent to all.

On the contrary, it will be my intention to make certain, in every way I can, that real substance and meaning are given to the full title of the Merhant Marine Act of 1936, to insure that we are passing legislation "to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, and to aid in the national defense."

School Savings in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following article which appeared in the United States Investor, issue of January 7, 1956, on school savings which was initiated by the East New York Savings Bank of Brooklyn under the inspiring and able leadership of Judge Edward A. Richards, its president. It cannot be gainsaid but that the thrift practices of our country have aided immeasurably in its growth and development. Nothing is more important than inculcating those practices among the school children of our community. This Judge Richards, a pioneer in the mutual savings bank field, has developed beyond all reasonable expectations, and it will be forever a tribute to his wisdom and foresight.

Judge Richards was recently awarded the gold medal of the year for outstanding service to the Borough of Brooklyn by the Downtown Brooklyn Association, a tribute of considerable distinction but which in his case was most merited. The article follows:

CREDIT TO SCHOOL SAVINGS

In the Borough of Brooklyn, a portion of New York City which is of itself larger, populationwise, than any other borough, and would be among the very largest cities of the country if it were a separate municipality, is a mutual savings bank which has had an amazingly satisfactory experience with school savings. We thing our readers will be interested in the story of that bank because a good many savings bank people still turn thumbs down on any such department for their bank and a lot of other bankers are in agreement with them. Among the 529 mutual savings banks of this country, only 207 are offering savings opportunities to the pupils in the schools of their respective areas. The remaining banks are either indifferent to the idea or are convinced that it involves more trouble or more expense than it is worth. Here, however, is a bank which is increasingly enthusiastic over school savings and has been so for lo, these many years.

For the critic who declares that schoolteachers, themselves, are averse to this activity, this bank has a mass of teachers' letters testifying to quite contrary effect. For the critic who pronounces this activity as too expensive to operate, it has a convincing response taken stranght from its own books. And for all critics added together, including these two groups and all others, it points to its own really astonishing growth in resources and in number of depositors and attributes this result to its school-savings program. When we tell you that this institution—the East New York Savings Bank—had only about $6 million of resources in the early days of this school-savings program, that is, around 1919, that on July 1 of this year it had resources of over $481 million and that it can fairly expect to cross the half-billion-dollar figure ($500 million) very shortly, you get some conception of the story we are about to tell.

The bank was organized in 1868 when Brooklyn was a separate city and east New York not yet become just another closely settled section of the world's largest city. It was enough of a community, however, to give its savings bank a quiet, healthy growth, and at the end of 50 years, in 1918, it had accumulated something like $6 million of resources. There was nothing in its record up to that time to suggest that in this, its 87th year, it would be one of the fastest growing banks in the whole United States.

A CHANGE OF PACE

The change of pace began in 1919 when the present president, Edward A. Richards, became the head of the bank. Probably Judge Richards himself sensed from the beginning that the area all about his bank would become more and more thickly settled because of its nearness to New York and that city's ever-increasing commercial importance. Nevertheless, he began at once a policy of bringing his bank closer and closer to the people. Thus the growth which the bank's happy location on a main artery of travel to downtown Brooklyn would have given it has been multiplied many times by the bank's own alertness. Through school savings on a large scale it has made the name of the bank familiar in every home, certainly in every home where there are children.

We have no intention of wearying our readers with long arrays of statistics, but here are some figures which are not wearisome to anybody who is interested either in school savings or in savings banks. In 1921, the bank had 10,000 school savings accounts. For a bank of its then size—total resources on December 31, 1921, were $13,108,276—this was an interesting and promising activity. But note how this activity has steadily taken on greater size. In 1931 its school savings accounts numbered 53,000 and in 1941, numbered 83,000. In 20 years, you see, the number had increased by 730 percent. In 1951 the number of school savings accounts had become 107,000, and at present writing it is 121,607. Think what that means in contacts with the homes of Brooklyn. The president of the bank has a favorite expression. It is that this figure means that the East New York Savings Bank has 121,607 salesmen going into and out of the homes, telling to parents and to the young folks of their neighborhood as well, the story of the service which this bank has for them. It costs money to handle school savings on so ambitious a scale. The East New York Savings Bank spends about $100,000 a year on this one activity. But again quoting the president, the bank is getting its salesmen into the homes at less than $1 per salesman, and the results which the bank is getting speak well for the story which this army of salesmen is telling.

ADVERTISING IN HUMAN FORM

Let us make note at this point that in 1921, when school savings accounts numbered 10,000, the bank had total resources of $13,108,276. Twenty years later, in 1941, when

school savings accounts had become 83,000 in number, the total resources at the end of that year had become $97,835,966. Now, as of October 31, 1955, the resources are $488,371,904. The immediate goal of half a billion seems clearly to be in sight. The bank increases in size not only every year, but every month in every year, and one can almost say it grows with every day of every month. Those young salesfolk constitute in human form an exceedingly productive type of bank advertising. Obviously their homes are impressed and their parents and neighbors bring dollars for deposit to the place where the children bring pennies, dimes, and quarters.

Looking back to the bank's figures, for July 1, 1955, which for a bank growing as rapidly as this one is almost a dive into ancient history, the bank had 228,301 depositors with passbook accounts, 112,898 school savings accounts, and 24,851 with Christmas club accounts, or a total of 366,050 depositors of the three types. One is not surprised to discover that the bank has had to enlarge its modest home office building on Atlantic Avenue to six times its original size and that it now also has branches in attractive buildings of their own at Eastern Parkway and at Pitkin Avenue.

A common criticism of school savings is that it lays an unwelcome burden upon the schoolteachers. It would seem that the figures we have already quoted are sufficient to brush that complaint aside as having little warrant in the case of this bank. A system of activity within the schools that has not only persisted for so many decades but has grown immensely in volume would have made no such record if the teaching profession had found it a distasteful task. Probably whatever substance there is for this complaint at some banks is due to the system which it uses. The East New York Savings Bank serves 108 schoolbuildings and its system is simplicity itself.

A SIMPLE SYSTEM

At every school, 1 day of each week is bank day. The envelopes of the pupil depositors are placed by the teacher in a master envelope and then this is passed on to the one teacher of the building assigned by the principal to receive all the master envelopes. When the bank collector calls, she hands him the envelopes, he counts the number of master envelopes and gives her a receipt for the same and brings them to the bank. There is a minimum of effort. What do the teachers really think of the whole affair? The bank has a perfect mound of letters received from the teachers expressing their satisfaction with the system and speaking highly of the bank itself. It clearly is not an inherent feature of the school savings idea for teachers to endure it as a necessary evil and one of which they would be gladly rid. Give them the right system of operation, and this difficulty simply does not exist.

Before turning away from procedure at the school, we must not overlook a quite original feature which this bank carries on. It spends $10,000 a year of the $100,000 on an attractive newspaper, School Bank News. It distributes this through the schools to the pupils. This is an attractive publication, made up of good, fresh material, not canned news, and it is welcomed in the homes when the children bring it there. There are 10 issues of this publication each year. Thus the army of young salespeople is backed up by this newspaper.

When a bank has been an enthusiast over school savings for a good deal more than a generation, as this bank has, it has made some interesting discoveries. It has seen the pupils move on from grade to grade, and then off into the adult world. It must be serving thousands of children today whose parents were among the bank's early school savers. It is safe to say that among those 228,301 passbook depositors above mentioned are great numbers of people who began their relation with the bank through the envelopes which they handed in with their pennies, dimes, or quarters on school bank day. When their accounts grew sufficiently, they received passbooks and have held these and used them down through the years that have followed. A great many millions of dollars have been transferred, over the years, from school-savings accounts to straight passbook accounts.

A PLEASING BYPRODUCT

And there is a byproduct of all this which must be very satisfactory to President Richards and the officers and trustees of the bank and their associates. It is the effect which accounts originating in the public schools and becoming passbook accounts have on the average age of the bank's customers. Savings banks, as perhaps you know, are paying more and more attention, nowadays, to this subject. If a large fraction of any savings bank's depositors are elderly people, the time is coming when their passbooks will become inactive and then go into the hands of their heirs. The closing out of such accounts is not uncommon. We have known banks to experience very substantial declines in the number of their depositors from the aging of their people. In fact, we could provide our readers with some surprising figures along this line. It is worth the while of any bank to make a survey every few years of the average age of its depositors, just to see whether it needs to do something to keep the average age down. We should say that the East New York Savings Bank has made ample provision against an uncomfortable rise in the average age of its depositors by the flood of new accounts which it is constantly bringing on its books because of its widespread service at the schools.

Middle East's Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time when our Government and the British Government are negotiating on matters concerned with the Near East, I wish to call attention to the following timely editorial from the Newark News of February 1 entitled "Middle East's Crises." As the editorial states, it is essential that Israel and the Arab States reach a peaceful settlement of their differences. It is vital that our Government take the leadership in ending the threat of war, but in our eagerness for peace we must not yield the right of Israel to exist as a free and independent nation. To sacrifice the legitimate rights of this fine democratic nation will not lead to peace; rather, it is an overture to war.

The editorial reads:

MIDDLE EAST'S CRISES

Recent events in the Middle East should correct any impression that a conciliation or even an abatement of Arab-Israeli hostility would automatically dispose of the problem which that vital area presents to President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden.

Unquestionably, the imminent danger of war between Israel and its Arab neighbors puts that issue to the fore, but it cannot and should not obscure other sources of tension that require the attention of the United States and Britain.

Russia, for instance, cannot be expected to confine itself to supplying Egypt with arms. Soviet efforts at economic and political penetration will surely continue throughout the Middle East, whatever the outcome of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

Within the Arab League itself, Iraq's entry into the pro-Western Baghdad Alliance has brought into the open its long-standing power conflict with Egypt as well as the dynastic feud in which the ruling Hashemites of Iraq and Jordan have bene embroiled with the Saud monarchy of Saudi Arabia.

Even between the United States and Britain, latent rivalry over Middle Eastern oil seems to be figuring in the current flareup over the Buraimi Oasis in the southeast corner of the Arabian Peninsula.

Saudi Arabia, which claims the potentially oil-rich oasis, threatens to call United Nations attention to its forceful occupation by British-led forces acting for the Sheik of Abu Dhabi and the Sultan of Muscat, both of whom are under treaty protection of Britain.

In the background there are the oil prospecting crews of the British-owned Iraq Petroleum Co. (IPC) and the Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco), which operates under agreement with Saudi Arabia.

Furthermore, the British formally accuse Saudi Arabia of using its American oil revenues in other Arab nations, notably Jordan and Iraq, to stir up hostility to Britain and, by association, to the United States as well.

All of these problems have, of necessity, been subordinated to the more explosive situation in Palestine. Still they exist, which is all the more reason why the United States and Britain must act swiftly to damp down, if not extinguish, the fuse of war between the Arabs and Israel.

Anniversary of Independence of Ceylon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, I said I would address from the floor of Congress each one of the participating countries, except the two Communist ones, Red China and North Vietnam, on the occasions of their independence celebrations.

I wish to extend to the people of Ceylon: His Excellency the Governor General of Ceylon, Sir Oliver Ernest Goonetilleke, G. C. M. G., K. C. V. O., K. B. E.; the Right Honorable Sir John Lionel Kotelawala, P. C., K. B. E., Prime Minister of Ceylon; and His Excellency Sir Senerap R. S. S. Gunewardene, K. P., Ambassador of Ceylon in the United States, sincere felicitations and best wishes on the occasion on their 8th anniversary of Independence Day, February 4, 1956.

Ceylon achieved nationhood in the postwar era. Although a small country, Ceylon is one of the important new states of Asia. Having broken the stranglehold of colonialism, the lifeline of imperialism, Ceylon has in her a young democ-

racy of great strength which can be turned to the lasting good of the entire nation. They have a treasure house of love and affection from people around them, which is a great asset to a young nation.

Colonialism left Ceylon with many problems which war-scarred Europe never had—the problem of underdevelopment, overpopulation, poverty, and a low standard of living. Such conditions contrive to force men to be driven by their stomachs rather than their heads.

For Ceylon, as other new states of south and southeast Asia, political independence did not bring with it economic emancipation. Development in this respect has been slow due to the lack of technical knowhow and the shortage of capital. The Prime Minister of Ceylon, the Right Honorable Sir John Kotelawala, in an address to the Ceylon Association in London on November 22, 1954, stated:

Political freedom means nothing unless it brings its people a general improvement in the standard of living and the benefits of economic freedom. * * * We have many problems confronting us. Some of them are most urgent and vital from the people's point of view, but yet remain to be tackled for the sole reason that we had necessarily to take first things first. We have yet a great deal of poverty in our land, besides landlessness, unemployment, an acute housing shortage, a very unsatisfactory dependence on other countries for our basic requirements of food, and an inability to develop our natural resources to the optimum extent for lack of capital.

Ceylon has forthrightly attacked these numerous challenging problems in many ways. Her capital was the scene of the signing of the Colombo plan for south and southeast Asia. Sixteen nations are members of the Colombo undertaking to improve the economies of the non-Communist lands of Asia. The Government of Ceylon reports that:

The Colombo plan is working smoothly and effectively today. It is a form of international cooperation not based on rules and procedure. It is as imprecisely defined as the institution of the commonwealth itself, which created it. It is a cooperation of peoples of different races, different religions, and different ways of life. The aid given by one country to another is not given in a spirit of charity or of patronage. There is no quid pro quo. The aid is given without any strings and does not imply the creation of any obligation. It simply implies the recognition of the fact that poverty anywhere is a danger to prosperity everywhere.

Resurgent Asia needs peace if she is to play her part in the affairs of the world. Peace is a religion. Either we believe in it, set our minds on it, work for it, or we do not. There is no halfway house in the matter. "If we are to end war we must forget war," opines the venerable Prime Minister of Ceylon, who is himself an ardent champion of peace, Speaking before the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Right Honorable Sir John Kotelawala averred:

I am a great believer in international cooperation, based on goodwill and understanding, as the surest means of achieving our individual aspirations. Ceylon has accordingly participated, readily and wholeheartedly, in the work that has been undertaken by the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the various other international bodies in bringing about a better world understanding and improving the lot of its peoples. I do not for a moment concede that only because we are a small nation we have no significant part to play in the solution of world problems. * * * I think the time has come when all nations must realize that, if the world is to be saved from a third catastrophe, the law of the jungle can have no place in international relations, that might is not necessarily right, and that every country, big or small, must regulate its conduct by moral principles and the rule of law.

Ceylon is an independent country which makes its own foreign policy and has earned its right to control its own affairs. The Right Honorable Sir John Kotelawala has distinguished himself by the independent stand he has taken in his relations with the big powers and with other Asian countries. He has refused to recognize any Communist nation. At the same time, he has declined to be the pawn or satellite of any other country.

Ceylon has attained her freedom; she has again the priceless possession, which, for several centuries had been taken away from her. The nation has emerged into a very complex world, where simple things are made intricate and the things that matter least seem to matter the most.

In wishing Ceylon life's choicest blessings as she embarks upon a new year of independence, let me implore her to continue her resolve of friendship, goodwill, and understanding in the truest sense of that often misunderstood word.

A Creed for Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune of January 29, 1956, carried as its lead an editorial entitled "A Creed for Republicans." The Chicago Tribune is known throughout the length and breadth of this land as a Republican newspaper, and it has fought for Republican principles since the party's inception in 1856. In my opinion the views set forth by the Chicago Tribune in this editorial are certainly most worthy of study.

The editorial is as follows:

A CREED FOR REPUBLICANS

At the Republican National Convention of 1880 John P. Douglass, of New York, sought to define the Republican Party. "The Republican Party," he said, "is the ship, all else is the sea." The metaphor was, and remains, impressive. But, as we suggested here a few days ago, the party vessel has shipped a lot of water in the years since then. It has been boarded on occasion by pirates, offering political ambiguities and even, sometimes, former Democrats, as its candidates. Its national program today has been borrowed without acknowledgement from the opposition party.

Why does a party do such things? Principally, we believe, because the desire to be elected is the controlling motive of politicians. The proper objects in governing are forgotten, or rendered subsidiary, because power and political perquisites are considered the goals of the chase.

But, even so, we do not think a party undergoes so radical a transformation as has the Republican Party in recent years purely as the result of accident. We cannot escape the feeling that some shrewdly malign agency has been at work. And the purpose of that agency, we are convinced, is to protect certain pet predilections in the formation of national policy by denying the people any real or effective choice between parties and doctrines.

When we see the domestic New Deal institutionalized under Republican auspices, we are pretty sure that that is the fact. And when we see the New Deal foreign policy of internationalism and interventionism maintained unchanged under Republican stewardship, we are more than ever certain that some manipulating force has planned it that way, to the end that the people can be played from both ends against the middle.

Therefore, the task of determining the characteristics of a Republican seems almost as extravagant as Diogenes' sallying forth with a lantern at midday to look for an honest man. Who embodies the principles that the party ought to cherish when its titular leadership for many years has disowned them or been ignorant of them?

Nevertheless, though politicians may wander, principles remain fixed. We believe that the character ordained for the Republican Party is that it be conservative. To conserve means to guard or protect a social order and political system which in turn guard and protect individual liberty. Variety and individuality are the fruits of a civilized society. They are not long preserved against the pressures of an all-power centralized state, whether that state is the product of personal or party despotism, as in Hitler's Germany or the Soviet Union, or whether it pretends to be democratic because it rests upon the tyranny of the majority.

A Republican, therefore, affirms the fact that the people must limit their power over themselves. For if they agree to unlimited power exercised in their name through Government, their political agents will seize it and exercise it as a personal prerogative, saying that they have had a mandate from the people.

Society, as Mill has remarked, does execute its own mandates. If it issues wrong mandates instead of right, or any mandates at all in things with which it ought not to meddle, it practices a soical tyranny more formidable than many kinds of political oppression, for the tyranny penetrates deeply into the details of life and leaves fewer means of escape.

So it should be the Republican determination to permit each citizen to frame the plan of his life to suit his own character, to do as he likes, subject to such consequences as may follow, without impediment from his fellow creatures. For when the State assumes to guide and direct every action, justifying its intervention by reference to the "general welfare" or some other ambiguous sanction, it interferes with the liberty of person. When it seeks to present the citizen with a readymade life, drafted to its own ordination, it defies the elementary fact that no two men are alike, in capacity, in outlook, or in taste. So all the State can offer is a Procrustean bed.

This being the general philosophy that should govern Republicans, it follows that the party must dedicate itself to government on the most limited scale, must avoid all interference with the economy and the social order, must turn from all unwarranted attempts at intrusion and regulation which

characterize systems such as socialism, collectivism, or the welfare state, and must accept a role of modesty rather than of arrogance and assumed infallibility. Given such a political dispensation, the people will rally to the party as their trusted champion of liberty.

The Powell Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to Mr. Walter Lippmann's column on the Powell amendment, which appears in the Washington Post and Times Herald for February 2, 1956. Mr. Lippmann states:

THE POWELL AMENDMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Kelley bill to appropriate Federal money in aid of the construction of schools has run into the conflict—which is still unresolved in the Southern States—over the Supreme Court's decision on segregation. Representative ADAM C. POWELL, of New York, is proposing an amendment to the bill which would deny Federal funds to States or local school districts which continue to maintain segregated schools. The money which is denied them would be held in escrow and paid out whenever a local district complied with the decision of the Supreme Court.

The amendment, which has the support of Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the Republican leader in the House, might well, if adopted, bring about the defeat of the bill and the hope of Federal aid for the schools. It would be expecting too much that the southern Senators and Congressmen would vote for the bill with this amendment in it. The southerners, plus many northerners who are really opposed to Federal aid on principle or on grounds of economy, would be a formidable opposition. But even if the bill could be passed over their opposition, it would complicate and obstruct, rather than assist and promote, the movement to end segregation in the schools.

"I think I shall vote for the Powell amendment," said Representative MARTIN the other day, "because of the position of the Supreme Court, I don't think you can do otherwise." Mr. MARTIN is entirely mistaken. The truth of the matter is that because of the position of the Supreme Court, Congress ought to reject the Powell amendment. For that amendment, far from upholding the Supreme Court's decision, would subvert it.

The position taken by the Supreme Court is that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, being a denial of the equal protection of the laws, and that the Court will pass upon the adequacy of any plans that State and school authorities may propose to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases.

The Supreme Court, recognizing that the changeover from segregated schools is a difficult and complex matter, has refrained from demanding immediate and unconditional application of its ruling. It has recognized that there must be a period of transition—a period of persuasion and accommodation—and the Supreme Court has accepted the burden of presiding over this transition.

The Powell amendment runs counter to the letter and the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision. For the amendment proposes to have Congress take over from the Court the burden of getting the rule against segregation observed. It proposes to punish the localities which are slow about or opposed to complying, and to give to administrative officials, rather than to the Supreme Court, the power to determine whether the law is being observed. No one, I submit, who understands and believes in the Supreme Court's decision, can vote for the Powell amendment.

If the amendment is adopted and the school-aid bill is defeated, the cause of integration will suffer. Federal aid for school construction will be withheld from precisely those States and school districts where it is most needed. Integration, since it means that Negro children will have the same education as white children, requires much money. In the segregated school systems the Negro children are for the most part less well provided for. One of the necessary means to the integration of the schools is to build more schools. Otherwise, under integration the education of the white children will be pulled down toward the standards now prevailing for the Negro children.

Any true and understanding friend of integration in the Southern States should realize that when he proposes to starve the southern schools, he is making it more difficult to bring about integration. The South now has a dual school system, the white one better than the Negro. It will take money to bring about one school system at the level of the schools for white children. The worse the two systems are allowed to become, being deprived of money that is indispensable, the harder it will be in fact to integrate them. And the more acute will be the passions aroused.

Mr. POWELL is a Democrat and Mr. MARTIN is a Republican. They would do well not to play politics with the public schools.

Hon. Wilton E. Hall, South Carolina's Man of the South for 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "South Carolina's Man of the South for 1955," appearing in the February 1956 issue of the South Carolina magazine.

Hon. Wilton E. Hall, who has been named man of the South for 1955, will be remembered by many as a former United States Senator from South Carolina.

He has been nominated and served many times as a Democrat elector in the presidential campaigns. Mr. Hall is the owner and publisher of two of the most progressive daily newspapers of the South, as well as owner and operator of radio and television stations. Many, many more achievements could be enumerated. However, this article bespeaks those achievements and the sentiments of all of us who know Wilton E. Hall best.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILTON EARLE HALL, SOUTH CAROLINA'S MAN OF THE SOUTH

(By Millwee Owens, radio executive of Augusta, Ga.)

Big doors swing on little hinges. Many of history's most important events have grown out of what appeared in the beginning to be trivial incidents.

It was not "trivial" to Wilton Earle Hall, at the age of 15, to suffer a ruptured appendix. But it was to shape his whole life and it in turn make in later years a deep imprint upon the political, social, and economic life of the great State of South Carolina, as well as those States that border upon it.

When Hall had to leave Furman University at 15 because of an unruly appendix, he gave up what his parents and many of his friends had hoped would be a distinguished law career. In spite of the lack of antibiotics in those days, the husky Hall boy overcame his bodily upset and upon his return to Starr in Hall Township, Anderson County, his birthplace, his ambitious and restless nature soon led him to the nearby city of Anderson to seek a job.

The boy had had no dreams of becoming a great journalist, or even a good newspaper reporter. And so when he went to work as a cub on the old Anderson Tribune, it was to him just a job—a job that paid $5 per week and enabled him to pay his own way.

In that year the Big Berthas of the Kaiser were shelling the outskirts of Paris and our daily newspapers told of increasingly bold attacks of German submarines upon our vessels on the high seas. Then came the sinking of the Lusitania and its accompanying frightful loss of life. President Woodrow Wilson could hesitate no longer. He asked the Congress to approve a declaration of war.

All of this greatly impressed young Hall. But he was too young to take part, and so he finally went back to Furman to study law.

But, as they say in the newsrooms, he had gotten newspaper ink upon his fingers and from then on out he would find this to be a harder virus to conquer than the scourge of peritonitis that had turned him around in his tracks a year or so before.

So at the age of 21 he forsook his law course and turned back to journalism. We now find him on the staff of the Greenville (S. C.) News as State news editor, a fancy title with small pay in those days.

Even at 21 Hall was not one to scare easily. It can be understood how he defied the Ku Klux Klan and the powerful CIO labor union in later years when one learns the story of how a sheeted ghost tried to scare the wits out of him while he worked with the News in Greenville.

A practical joker on the paper, noting Hall's youth and inexperience, decided to have some fun at the boy's expense. He began to leave notes for Hall on Hall's desk, setting out that he was the ghost of a young friend Hall had known in college. The ghost even reminded Hall that he owed Hall $5 and wanted to repay the loan. After a series of notes to bait the boy's interest, the practical joker wrote Hall to invite him to meet the ghost in the city cemetery at 2 a. m. on a Sunday morning, at which time the ghost would reveal his identity and repay Hall the $5.

Hall did not know the source of the plot, but he was not afraid to go through with it. Another young friend on the paper was persuaded by Hall to bedeck himself in his mother's best sheets and hide in the cemetery to watch the unfolding of the plot. Just as Hall appeared in the cemetery gate to meet his ghostly "friend", Hall's sheet-bedecked friend, leaped out into the moonlit scene and the plotters, with a wild shriek, fled in every direction.

This little story is told to illustrate the fact that Wilton Hall, as boy or man, has

never stepped back from a challenge. He loves a fight—that is, if it is a fight for the rights of the poor and oppressed, or for the public weal as a whole. He has never asked that any holds be barred.

Wilton Earle Hall, as recorded in Who's Who in America, was born in Hall Township, Anderson County, March 11, 1901. He is the son of Thomas Dean and Sarah Tucker Hall. His education was received in Starr at the high school and at Furman University in Greenville. He married Mary Elizabeth Lightsey, of Hampton, S. C., February 1, 1925. They have 4 children, 2 boys and 2 girls.

That is purely a statistical description of Wilton Hall. It does not, by any means, begin to describe the dynamic and brilliant Wilton Hall who, in 1924, just 1 year after he married the attractive Mary Lightsey, hied himself to the bank to borrow $2,000 with which to found the Anderson Independent.

Today he owns both the Independent and Daily Mail, morning and evening papers, respectively, in Anderson, not to mention radio station WAIM and television station WAIM–TV. His financial success is best portrayed by the fact that Dun & Bradstreet gives him the highest rating an individual can obtain.

Wilton Hall's newspapers have won more local, State, and national awards than Bobby Jones has won cups for golf excellence. Anderson County is noted in South Carolina and in the South, as well as throughout the Nation, for its many industries and its fine farms, but it is distinguished chiefly because of the excellence of the Hall newspapers and their rating as community builders.

Wilton Hall is one of those who, more than two decades ago, envisioned the Savannah River Valley as an industrial empire that would someday rate with Europe's Saar region or the Tennessee Valley.

Successful institutions, it has been said, are but the lengthened shadows of one man. Anderson newspapers are such institutions and the lengthened shadow is Wilton Hall.

Hall's newspapers attracted wide attention in the early days of his ownership, as well as in later years. Publisher Hall was awarded in 1941 the National Editorial Association's journalism silver plaque for having rendered the greatest community service in the United States. Three years later the award was again made to him, the first time in the association's history that it had been presented twice to the same publisher.

Unlike Topsy, the Anderson newspapers have not just "growed." They have grown because of the atomic force of one person behind them—Wilton Hall. Although, Mr. Hall, with characteristic modesty, says credit is due to his coworkers.

"We are just a team," he says. "I happen to be the captain."

Hall's newspapers outgrew all other such publications in the two Carolinas during the past decade. Percentagewise, the increase was 406 percent, although the immediate area has no military camps or other Federal installations.

One is amazed to learn that these newspapers, in a city no larger than Anderson, can boast of a paid circulation greater than 50,000.

The papers were awarded the Editor and Publisher blue ribbon for writing and publishing the best advertisement in the United States in 1941; in 1943 NEA awarded them the top honor for circulation promotion and carrier salesmen welfare. Through nationwide radio broadcasts, the newspapers gave publicity to the natural resources of South Carolina. This attracted wide attention.

One cannot write of Hall's career without interjecting statistical matter. It may make dry reading to some, but Anderson folk, and other thousands throughout South Carolina, delight in reading of the accomplishments of Wilton Hall and his newspapers.

President of the Anderson Chamber of Commerce, civic club president, chairman of the Democratic county convention, presidential elector, and last, but not least, United States Senator, tell in part the recognition that has come to this amazing newspaper man.

He is a former chairman of the South Carolina Planning Board, member Clemson College Board of Visitors, past president South Carolina Press Association, member National Press Club, South Carolina, chairman of the Navy League, and chairman of Anderson County War Finance Committee.

The adage that a man is not without honor save in his own land and among his own people does not apply to Wilton Hall. In his own city and county he was made Optimist of the year for civic leadership; the Jaycees elected him man of the year, and he served as chairman of the postwar planning survey for Anderson, which was described as model by CLINTON P. ANDERSON, who was then Secretary of Agriculture.

Others have been called Mr. Democrat, but the title really fits Wilton Hall, whose party loyalty, devotion, and service to the cause have been such as to attract national attention.

Some enterprising business or manufacturing journal could get an inspiring story of management-employee relations by studying Wilton Hall's policy in dealing with newspaper and radio workers.

First, he believes the purpose of a good newspaper or radio station is not solely to make money. It might be said that Hall makes money because of this policy, and not in spite of it.

No department head could hire an office boy and keep him for any length of time without the big boss knowing all about the boy, his home life, his capacity for work, and his ambitions. He calls his men and women coworkers. He knows their birthdays, and the high and the low each receive a birthday greeting with a $10 bill attached. Also, each gets a Christmas bonus check and hospital insurance, while department heads receive rent-free seashore apartments for summer vacations if wanted. The annual Christmas bonuses in 1955 were in excess of $25,000.

Hall's newspapers pay all insurance and retirement benefits for employes, and at this time insurance in the aggregate represents a coverage of $1 million. He encourages all of his coworkers to own their homes, and only for the purchase of a home will he endorse a note for them.

The very name Hall is synonymous with service—public service. He pioneered in both radio and television. His newspapers, as an illustration of service unmatched in the whole Nation, make their own deliveries on legal holidays along rural routes.

So valiantly did the Hall newspapers support the Democratic ticket in 1954, playing a conspicuous role in wresting control of Congress from the Republican Party, that the national party awarded him a special plaque for distinguished service in its behalf.

Wilton Hall is recognized as one of those largely responsible for the construction of the gigantic Clark Hill Dam on the Savannah River between Augusta and Anderson at a cost of $90 million. He now heads the committee promoting the Hartwell Dam, above Clark Hill, which is already being built, and which will ultimately cost close to $100 million.

Now comes the crowning achievement of a long and notable career. Dixie magazine, a publication of southwide importance, has through a popular poll among business and professional leaders, named Wilton Earle Hall as man of the South for 1955. This is a distinction that has come to but a handful of Southern leaders, among these being Robert Tyre Jones, of Atlanta, Ga., and James C. Self, of Greenwood, S. C.

In appreciation of this fine recognition of Wilton Hall, the Anderson Chamber of Commerce will give him a testimonial dinner at Clemson College on the evening of February 11, at which time the award will be made with proper ceremony. Many dignitaries from the South will attend.

There are those in western South Carolina and eastern Georgia who envision the Savannah River Valley as a vast industrial empire within the lifetime of most citizens now living. The valley has abundant water supply (something lacking in many sections of the country) and it has rich soil and abundant timberlands. It can, and surely will, become a valley of wealth and population unmatched in this part of the world, or even throughout the universe. Certainly it has all of the potentialities.

Like Abou Ben Adhem, Wilton Hall's name heads the list of those who have been a friend to their fellow man. Also, it heads the list of those who, for a quarter of a century, often at the neglect of their own personal affairs, have worked for and dreamed and prayed that this rich valley would someday become a veritable utopia.

Hold on to Your Hat, Mr. Benson, There's a Big Storm Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under the above heading the January 21, 1956, issue of the farm publication, Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead, carries the results of a poll it carried on among Iowa farm people on this question: "On the whole, what kind of a job do you think Ezra T. Benson is doing as Secretary of Agriculture?"

Following are the results and an article in connection therewith:

WHAT FARMERS THINK OF BENSON

For several years, the Wallace-Homestead poll has been asking Iowa farm people this question: "On the whole, what kind of a job do you think Ezra T. Benson is doing as Secretary of Agriculture?" Replies, by both men and women, follow. Note the shift from February 1955 to December 1955:

	July 1953	July 1954	February 1955	December 1955
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Good	17	18	15	7
2. Fair	46	44	43	28
3. Poor	25	26	27	48
4. Not sure	12	12	15	17

Almost half of Iowa's farm people think Secretary Benson is doing a poor job as Secretary of Agriculture. And only 7 percent think he is doing a good job.

That's what the latest Wallace-Homestead poll shows. Republican Congressmen in the Corn Belt, with ears to the ground, had already figured this out. That's why there is increasing pressure within the GOP to get rid of Benson before the campaign starts.

Most striking feature of the poll is Benson's decline from February 1955 to December 1955. Benson never was popular in Iowa. But in February 1955 only 27 percent of the farm people interviewed were willing to say he was doing a poor job. By De-

cember, this figure had gone up to 48 percent.

What kind of folks are against Benson? What kind are for him?

If we take farm people who favored MARTIN for Senator in 1954 as Republicans; and those who favored Gillette as Democrats, then the Benson vote looks like this:

1. Good, Republican, 13 percent; Democrat, 1 percent.
2. Fair, Republican, 34 percent; Democrat, 22 percent.
3. Poor, Republican, 47 percent; Democrat, 51 percent.
4. Not sure, Republican, 7 percent; Democrat, 26 percent.

Notice that the "poor" vote is practically the same for both Republicans and Democrats.

How do Farm Bureau members and nonmembers vote on this? About the same:

Good, Farm Bureau, 8 percent; nonmember, 5 percent.

Poor, Farm Bureau, 46 percent; nonmember, 50 percent.

The most striking differences show up in the vote among age groups. Older men dislike Benson much less than younger men.

In polls on production payments for hogs, younger farm men—those 20-34—show much greater approval than middle-aged and older men. But on Benson, the young group and the middle-aged group seem to unite against those 50 and over.

Even though older men are slightly less hostile to Benson than younger men, they still vote 39 percent for "poor" and only 14 percent vote Benson as "good."

Here is the record for men:

	Years		
	20 to 34	35 to 49	50 and up
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Good	2	3	14
2. Fair	32	29	30
3. Poor	52	53	39
4. Not sure	14	15	16

Most of the comments on Secretary Benson were bitter. A farm woman in Bremer County told the interviewer: "I could write a whole page on what I don't like about Benson." A Clay County farmer said: "No words can describe Benson. He's impossible."

But a supporter in Plymouth County declared: "Secretary Benson has a tough job. I'd hate being in his shoes. I'm sure he's trying.

"I hope President Eisenhower and Benson keep on seeing eye to eye and won't back down and give in to a few radicals."

A farmer in Muscatine County added: "I think Benson's doing as good as he can, considering the fact that farmers don't cooperate with him. He needs Congress' support, but doesn't get it."

However, more of the farmers interviewed were like the man in Decatur County. Speaking to a woman interviewer, he said: "Write him down 'poor.' It probably wouldn't do for me to tell you what I really think."

Agriculture in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting letter I have received from Louis A. Webster, director, division of markets, department of agriculture, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, containing some very worthy suggestions for our consideration and attention here in the Congress.

The letter follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Boston, January 31, 1956.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: In all my years of reading farm news, I have never heard so much clamor about the cost-price squeeze of the farmers, and, of course, there is no avoiding the fact that nearly every type of agriculture in recent months and years has been plagued by surpluses, whether food, fiber, or flowers. The third biggest income producer in agriculture in Massachusetts is flowers and nursery stock, with a gross farm value of about $22 million. Middlesex County is the fifth greatest producer of flowers and nursery stock among all the 3,000 counties in the country. There is little, if any, more greenhouse space in Massachusetts than there was a generation ago, but the flower market is frequently overloaded.

Once last summer an orchid grower gave me two big boxes of first-class, fresh, Cypripedium orchids consisting of 216 flowers to present to people in this office and the State House just as a public relations gesture rather than for them to be thrown away. Another time a rose grower took a panel truck and with my assistance we went around and presented a dozen roses to each of the food and fashion editors of the Boston newspapers and radio stations. We covered 16 different offices.

This department has been instrumental in furnishing native apples and decorations of native flowers to various conventions and banquets around Boston and has had the cooperation of several radio stations in putting on all-day promotional ventures for such delicious native items as asparagus, strawberries, and sweet corn.

Here in Massachusets, at least, there is a question of publicizing the surplus and eating it up. In fact, nationally, I believe, more can be done for farm surpluses along the lines of "Eat it up, wear it out, or use it up."

This Department, as I have mentioned in previous letters, has enjoyed the active cooperation of the Department of Commerce in promotion of native products, all of which have appeared to show substantial results, and the way the present budget is showing up, we will probably continue to do an increasing amount of agricultural promotion.

National farm programs have generally left Massachusetts at a disadvantage, and from a personal standpoint, it has always seemed to me that the 90-percent rigid farm supports have been particularly disadvantageous for Massachusetts farmers. Naturally, farm people, even here in Massachusetts, are not happy with decreasing prices when everybody else in the country seems to be enjoying increased prosperity. However, there are some Massachusetts farmers who have taken advantage of new and attractive methods of packaging, of retail sales, and economies in production, and are still making a profit.

I think most Massachusetts farmers would join me in saying that the thing that is going to help them most is better market facilities, more research in the use and sale of farm products, and a better understanding between farmers and city people, comparable to the national program of the Kiwanis Club last year of establishing a farm-city week.

For your information, I am including the most recent figures on agriculture in Massachusetts as published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston last September:

Massachusetts

Commodity	Value	Percent change from 1953	Percent of State total
	Thous.		
Poultry	$68,249	−15.7	36.2
Dairy:			
Milk and milk products	46,990	−1.2	24.9
Veal calves and cull cows	4,672	−9.5	2.5
Total diary	51,662	−2.0	27.4
Greenhouse and nursery	21,934	−0.3	11.6
Truck crops	13,158	−6.3	7.0
Tobacco	8,759	−0.5	4.6
Fruit	7,029	8.9	3.7
Cranberries	6,825	−31.5	3.6
Miscellaneous	4,542	4.4	2.4
Other meat animals	4,113	−21.3	2.2
Potatoes	2,466	15.7	1.3
Total	188,737	−8.7	100.0

Very truly yours,
LOUIS A. WEBSTER,
Director, Division of Markets.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to authorize the Interstate Sanitation Commission of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to proceed with much-needed research on air pollution which has already been authorized by the States. New Jersey Congressman HUGH J. ADDONIZIO; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.; PETER W. RODINO, JR.; FRANK THOMPSON, JR.; T. JAMES TUMULTY, and I are joining with Congressman JOHN RAY, of New York, in sponsoring this resolution.

Congressional action is needed for the reasons outlined in the following statement, which was prepared for submission to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT STATEMENT OF SIX NEW JERSEY CONGRESSMEN URGING THE CONGRESS TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION OF NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, AND CONNECTICUT TO CONDUCT RESEARCH INTO AIR POLLUTION FOR SUBMISSION TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF THEIR JOINTLY SPONSORED RESOLUTION

The New York metropolitan area, including large sections of northern New Jersey, has long been struggling with a serious air-pollution problem. This problem adversely affects the health of the people of the area, as well as possibilities for its economic growth and development. New York and New Jersey have enacted legislation which would permit the Interstate Sanitation Commission to make a study and in addition have appropriated money for this purpose. An act known as chapter 422 of the Laws of New York, 1955, became law in that State on April 18, 1955, and a similar act known as chapter 46 became law in New Jersey on June 6, 1955.

Obviously the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by compact to deal with

water pollution in New York Harbor and adjacent areas, is the only interstate agency in the metropolitan area which can handle such a study with facility because of its regular duties in a related field. However, the problem has become complicated by the fact Connecticut, a party to the Interstate Sanitation Commission, is not interested in such a study at this time since there is no pressing air-pollution problem along the New York-Connecticut boundary. It was agreed that Connecticut would pass legislation consenting to the Interstate Sanitation Commisison making the study for New York and New Jersey. However, the act passed by Connecticut specified that the consent of Congress had to be obtained, while New York and New Jersey did not take this view.

Regardless of the merits of the legal argument, the fact is that the much-needed air pollution research has been blocked. In an effort to untangle this situation, we have joined with Congressman RAY, of New York, and others from the area in sponsoring this joint resolution which would extend necessary congressional authority for the study to proceed. We are happy to inform you that Gov. Robert B. Meyner has just written that in his view the legislation we propose would, if it prevails, permit the study to move ahead.

Clearly this need is most urgent. We hope the resolution will obtain congressional approval in the very near future.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO.
PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.
T. JAMES TUMULTY.
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.

The "Dorchester"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which was forwarded to me by Mr. Frank O. Braynard, director, Bureau of Information, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.:

THE "DORCHESTER," COASTAL LINER OF FOUR CHAPLAINS FAME

The custom of naming ships with standard suffixes or prefixes is common practice. One famed American coastwise company had a naming system we think must have been unique. It was their habit to have one ship's name begin with each letter of the alphabet. All were named after counties in States served. For example, in 1927 they had the *Alleghany, Berkshire, Chatham,* and *Dorchester* as the first four ships in their fleet. Since they had only 20 ships, they skipped a few letters, but the pattern was there.

The *Dorchester,* one of the three newest of the merchants and miners fleet, was destined to figure in one of the second war's sagas of heroism. She is the ship on which the four chaplains joined together as she was sinking, gave their lifebelts to others, and went to their death arm in arm. Two were Protestants, one Jewish, and the fourth Catholic.

The *Dorchester* was the newest ship built for the famous Boston to Baltimore service founded in 1852. She was similar to the "city" boats of the Savannah Line—large, comfortable, reasonably fast. French telephones were in every cabin. Felt-lined windows eliminated the "annoying rattle often experienced with windows on board ship," it was stated. A berth light, thermos bottle, and electric fan was in each room. All rooms had running hot and cold water, quite an innovation for 1926. Three rooms and the 4 suites had private tub baths, while 16 rooms had shower baths.

With virtually every other coastwise liner, the *Dorchester* was taken over for the war effort. Her identical sister the *Chatham* was the first American troopship sunk in the war, going down en route from Nova Scotia to Greenland with the loss of 27. The sinking of the *Dorchester,* February 3, 1943, was much more costly in human life. Of the 904 on board, 605 were drowned or froze to death before rescue came. The loss would have been even greater had not Coast Guard volunteers jumped into the icy waters in heavy rubber suits. Secured with lines from their ships, these heroes helped the survivors to safety, as many of them were too numbed to hold on to lines from rescue boats. Those of the *Dorchester's* naval guards who survived are convinced that their guns made the *U–456* pay dearly for her conquest.

Government indifference, competitive factors such as the truck and airplane and the trebled cost of shipbuilding when the war ended forced the *Dorchester's* owners to throw in the sponge. The line had no ships, could not afford new ones. It was liquidated along with so many other famous old American coastal concerns. Gone forever were the colorful houseflags of the Morgan Line, the Mallory Line, Clyde Line, Puerto Rico Line, Savannah Line, Eastern Steamship Lines, Colonial Line, Old Dominion Line, and the Merchants and Miners Transportation Co.

Today the *Dorchester* and her four heroic chaplains are remembered by a wide variety of memorials. A 3-cent postage stamp was issued in 1948 in their honor by the United States. A swimming pool in the Bronx is named for their memory. The beautiful Four Chaplain's Chapel in Philadelphia honors their deed. Congressman PETER RODINO, of New Jersey, is seeking to have Federal recognition of February 3, as *Dorchester* Day.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the care and cure of the mentally ill is a problem of national concern. There is a great deal of confusion and, too often, complete despair as to a proper solution of this problem. Concerned with the manner in which Texas has been meeting the needs of the mentally ill, two outstandinging newspaper women, Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco, writers for the Amarillo Globe-Times, did a tremendous job of research and study of the whole problem of the mentally ill. They have boiled down the facts they discovered in 10 articles which were printed in the Globe-Times.

While Miss Evans and Miss Rasco were primarily concerned with Texas, the problem in our State may be multiplied by 48 because the same situation confronts every section of the Nation. Because the facts brought out in these articles are of such importance to the whole Nation, I plan to insert them in the RECORD beginning with the first one which follows. I sincerely commend this series to all the Members of the House:

[From the Amarillo Globe-Times of January 4, 1956]

MENTAL ILLNESS CAN BE CURED—ONE OF EVERY 10 WILL NEED CARE

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco, Globe-Times Staff Writers)

One billion dollars annually for the care of the American mentall ill—$2½ million daily; 54 percent of all hospital beds in the United States of America occupied by mentally ill; 1 out of 10 Americans at some time will be hospitalized for severe mental illness; 1 out of 4 families will have a member in a mental hospital. Of the 14½ million Americans who need psychiatric care, mental hospitals reasonably can hope to treat about 600,000. In the past 10 years the United States of America population has increased 20 percent; the number in mental hospitals has increased 44 percent. In some States, such as New York, one-third of the State budget is devoted to the cure of the mentally ill. Only 3 percent of medical research dollars is used on mental illness. The Veterans' Administration operates 40 mental hospitals with 62,000 beds, compared to only 45,000 in 1954.

Let us not be morbidly frustrated by this mass of statistics. None of it proves that, as a Nation, we are headed into the psychotic ward.

With typical American intensity we are winding up to throw a pitch into a problem, and when we wind up in this country, we really coil. Therefore, we build up a mass of frightening statistics on the mentally ill.

But it is fairly easy to lie with statistics. Comparative figures are more likely to tell the truth. These, in 1955, we do not have, because we cannot compare America of today with America of 50 years ago in matters of mental illness.

We are becoming an urban nation, and old Aunt Annie, who occupied the northwest room in a farmhouse for 50 years, is now a statistic, but she wasn't a generation ago. In fact, even the neighbors might not have known she was there. Mental illness must be diagnosed and treated in these days when families occupy apartments and 5-room houses. We are not necessarily having a larger percentage of mental illness; we simply are getting better diagnosis.

We are becoming an aging population. In 1900, a child could expect to live only 47 years. Today the average life span is over 68 years. So it is wise to consider the comparative statistics Massachusetts created after a study of its mental hospital population of today and 100 years ago. The population ratio of hospitalized cases for those between the ages of 20 and 50 years of age is the same.

The tremendous rise in State hospital population lies among those who have passed the age of 50. In 1855, few lived past 50 years, so there can be no comparative statistics to see whether the old are showing an increase in mental illness. Just as eyesight and hearing dim as we grow older, so do minds. Diseases that attack the brain, for instance, arteriosclerosis, increase in later years. But advances in geriatrics (the medical science dealing with the diseases and problems of the aged) may well forestall much of this mental illness in coming generations.

We have a large population of veterans from this century's wars, conflicts which did not provide the release of emotions that did the spirited hand-to-hand fighting of earlier ages. No more mentally unhealthy environment can be imagined than the trenches of

Flanders Field or the malarial jungles of New Guinea.

The casualties of World War II happily were below the statistical average of World War I, but by keeping bodies alive we increased the chances for those bodies to develop the mental breakdowns modern warfare brings. The 55 percent of Veterans' Administration beds that are occupied by mentally ill are an indictment of our inability to find a more peaceful way than war of settling conflicts, but they do not prove the average American is on a merry-go-round of madness.

Consider also that there is an awareness of mental illness never before possible in civilization. As medical science found the cause and treatment for thousands of physical diseases, the mental aberrations that might have been explained by physical illness a century ago came out into the open for exactly what they are.

As health diagnosis has improved, so has social diagnosis. What was once a "bad boy" is now a "sick boy." Youth and adults who would have gone to reform schools and prisons a generation ago are going to mental hospitals these days. But a clearing recognition of what is wrong basically with a personality does not mean that statistically the Americans are going mad at a faster rate than did their forefathers.

None of these reassurances will solve our present dilemma. We have overcrowded mental institutions. We have the back-breaking cost of mental illness on the economy. We need treatment programs for the mentally ill and preventive programs to forestall mental illness. We need to do something, and if we have to be frightened into believing that all of us are doomed to the psychotic ward before we will take action, let's be frightened and act.

Mental illness is no phenomenon of modern society. It is as old as mankind.

As usual, the Greeks had a word for it; they gave us the modern word for treatment—psychiatry; "psyche"—the soul, mind, emotion; and "iatrela"—the treating thereof. In fact, the Greeks had about the same types of treatment we have now—diet, baths, massage, exercise, drugs, electric eels for shock treatment, and even the psychoanalytical couch, with a philosopher as the analyst. There seems to be some evidence they practiced the group therapy that is now offering treatment and prevention of mental illness in many American cities.

In the great darkness that fell on Europe as the Roman Empire disintegrated, the knowledge from the scientific-minded Greeks disappeared. Mental illness because lunacy, supposed to be associated with changes in the moon (luna). By the 19th century, when some scientific interest in mental illness began to emerge, the insane had become wards of the State, prohibited of movement much as were criminals.

Keep in mind this silly superstition as you study the laws surrounding the care of the mentally ill and the responsibilities the States have today in such care. Maybe you will understand why we might as well have carved Abandon All Hope, Ye Who Enter Here above our State hospital doors. The theory inside was custody, not treatment.

However, it was the superintendents of these hospitals who took the first steps toward trying to overcome the hopelessness of their patients. In 1844, the Association of Medical Superintendents of American Institutions for the Insane was formed. It later became the American Psychiatric Association.

It was a group of European doctors working with the patients of French and Austrian hospitals that began to lay the techniques for modern treatment of mental illness. Americans tend to know the names of Freud, Jung, and Adler, but there were many dedicated observers before their time.

What furnished the spur for the heightened interest in the care of the mentally ill in America?

Wide-scale examinations of American youths in 1917 for the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I disclosed how many could not read and write and how many were suffering from physical ailments. Education and public health programs were accentuated after 1918 until the United States reached virtual 100 percent literacy and had a standard of general physical health never before known to mankind.

Of the 688,000 rejections from the 2,500,000 draftees of 1917–18, only 93,000 were refused for neuropsychiatric reasons. This did not bespeak much mental illness.

But between World War I and World War II, the Veterans' Administration spent well over a billion dollars on the care of the "shell-shocked" victims of World War I, and on those who entered the VA hosiptals for neuropsychiatric symptoms which could be traced to war service.

When the World War II draftees and enlistees marched before the medical authorities for their examinations, 1,600,000 of the more than 4,800,000 rejections were for neuropsychiatric reasons. Even with heavy rejection, the stresses of World War II crowded the service hospitals with so many servicemen that in April 1945 there were 49,315 hospitalized for neuropsychiatric reasons.

In 1943, the Surgeon General called Dr. William Menninger, of the Menninger Clinic, to Washington to formulate health programs for the 10 million Americans in Army service. Basing the action upon this war discovery of widespread mental illness, Congress passed the Mental Health Act of 1946 which provided Federal funds for research, training, and certain community facilities. In 1949, the National Institute of Mental Health took over the administration of the Federal program. Previously the Federal program had been the mental hygiene division of the Public Health Service.

The emphasis on mental health at last reached down into the States, traditionally responsible for the custody of the insane. By the late forties most of the States had worked out some reforms, spurred by the need for assigning to some State agency (or a newly created one) the responsibility for using the Federal funds which had to be matched with State dollars.

What causes mental illness and how should it be treated? Frankly no one knows the whole answer. Most of today's treatments have been devised on a trial-and-error basis. They work, but in many cases no one is prepared to say exactly why.

Treatment of mental disease until recently could be compared roughly to the time when doctors were putting leeches on the patient to bleed him as treatment for a great many diseases they couldn't diagnose. No one knew why it worked but sometimes it did.

Yet in the United States, only 3 cents of each dollar assigned to medical research is spent on mental illness.

The new branch of medicine called psychiatry (remember the Greeks) made up an elaborate table of names, most of them unpronounceable, for the various psychoses. Now comes Dr. Menninger with a statement:

"A few of us suspect that there is essentially only one kind of mental disease—the unsuccessful effort to maintain some measure of emotional equilibrium in the face of internal and external stress."

Certain so-called "insanities" of earlier generations have yielded to purely physical treatments. For instance, the terrible paresis of syphilis is disappearing under the use of penicillin to treat the parent disease. Pellagra, with its sure end-effect of mental illnes, yielded to vitamins. As little as 25 years ago involutional melancholia associated with menopause was considered hopeless; today electric-shock treatment has two-thirds of the patients out of the hospitals in less than a year.

So at last it has been recognized that mental illness is identical to physical illness, varying in its intensity, amenable to treatment and only in some percentage, fatal.

If this be true, then State hospitals truly must become hospitals, with no more plan for becoming a "human warehouse" than are hospitals for the cure of physical ailments, which, too, end with a certain percentage of cases which are incurable and must be given custodial care.

Then there is the preventive program of mental health. To use an example: To become aged does not necessarily mean to become senile. Yet senility must be pushed off even so early as the middle-aged years through use of basic physical and mental health programs. Another example: A child in a high state of emotional disturbance need not travel on to insanity. In fact, he need not necessarily reach that highly emotional disturbance, if parents, teachers and other adults about him correct the environmental factors which may create disturbance.

There will always be a percentage of insane just as there always will be a percentage of criminal—that is, in the foreseeable future. Heredity, accident, and certain physical diseases will continue to bring fatal mental illness just as the same factors bring fatal physical illness. The percentage can be reduced, and apparently the use of some new drugs can offer comfort to those who are incurable.

Just as calculated sanitation and preventive physical health programs have brought increasing good physical health to our Nation, so can a calculated mental health program reduce today's enormous expenditure of tax and personal funds on mental illness.

The Texas Research League gives a soberly realistic picture of what the State of Texas must spend by 1975 to house the mentally ill and senile—unless we change our ways: $235 million.

In the fiscal year of 1952–53, the staggering cost of annual operations for Texas was $20 million, and that didn't count cost of new construction. (Some special school operations and other State hospitals were included in the figure.) It's higher now.

The present 16,500 Texans in mental hospitals will increase to 28,000 by 1975 as population increases—and ages. Expect, therefore, operational costs to almost double—unless we change our ways.

Texas can do what other States are doing—rehabilitate the mentally ill, get them out of the "human warehouses," save money and human lives.

It can be done. The State of Kansas reduced its hospital population for 5 straight years—its number of patients decreased by 7 percent while that of the Nation rose by 15 percent.

Texas can do it, too.

TYPES OF ILLNESSES OF PATIENTS ADMITTED EACH YEAR TO STATE MENTAL HOSPITALS

Schizophrenic reaction (disturbance of thinking), 22 percent.

Psychosis of old age (senility, arteriosclerosis), 27 percent.

Manic-depressive reaction (disturbance of feeling), 6 percent.

Involuntary reaction (agitation-depression during menopause), 5 percent.

Alcoholic psychosis (delirium, delusions, imaginary images), 5 percent.

General paresis (syphilis of the brain), 4 percent.

Alcoholism without psychosis (problem drinking), 6 percent.

Psychoneurosis (only part of person is mentally ill or "dis-eased"), 4 percent.

Miscellaneous (variety of disorders, each less than 2 percent incidence), 21 percent.

(From the 1952 report of the National Association of Mental Health. Harry Milt, director of public relations for the association, told the Globe-Times last week that "research has established the fact that there has been little variation in the past 10 years on the types of patients admitted and the percentages for each diagnosis. The admissions for schizophrenia, for example, have been between 20 percent and 25 percent consistently. Possibly the only diagnoses for which there has been a rise during the past 10 years are cerebral arteriosclerosis and senile psychosis. These two diagnoses together probably account for between 30 percent and 35 percent of first admissions today, compared with some 28 percent or so 10 years ago.)

Why Free Enterprise Works Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Ford Foundation, an organization financed by gifts from the Ford family and pledged to a variety of good works, made a gift of $550 million to the Nation's private hospitals, colleges, and medical schools. It was the largest single charitable act in world history. Heartwarming as it was as a pure act of kindness, its real significance, in my opinion, is that it could not have been possible anywhere else in the world. Only our free democratic form of government and our system of free enterprise applied to our wealth of natural resources, could form the background for this amazing act of philanthropy.

Because of our climate of free enterprise, Henry Ford, who had a new idea and a good one, could pioneer it. He promoted the idea of mass-producing motorcars at a low unit cost, so that they were brought within the financial means of the average family. While he was helping the average family solve its transportation problem as it has been solved no place else in the world, he was furnishing more and more jobs to Americans, and here again he pioneered. He paid better than prevailing wage rates. In fact, wages which were unheard of at that time. He exploited no one. He benefited the public, and labor, and even his own competitors, by creating a vast market for cars. By earning a small profit on each of the millions of cars that he sold, he grew immensely wealthy in the process.

Because of his genius, the Ford family was able to produce far more wealth than it could personally consume. A great deal of this wealth was plowed back into research and design, modernization, and expansion to further benefit the consuming public and to create many more jobs, and it created even more wealth. But the consumption of wealth is very limited. A person can only wear one outfit of clothing at a time, and the body can consume but a limited amount of food each day. Beyond these basic needs, and even allowing for many luxuries, the wealth produced by private enterprise inevitably sifts its way back to the general welfare through taxation, through reinvestment in industry, new jobs, higher standards of living, and finally through gifts and legacies. No one can spend money without helping someone else. And while the system of free enterprise encourages better than all others the development of individual achievement and the production of wealth, ceiling unlimited, it also allows for the dissemination of that created wealth for the public good.

The above story is typical of many American success stories, and it proves once again why our system is far and away the best for individual man and for mankind as a whole. But the thing that started me off on this subject is that we all just received an extra dividend, the icing on the cake as it were, in the form of that amazing $550 million private gift. Just think what it means just right here in Buffalo. Our outstanding western New York colleges, which have had to scrounge around for funds to pay decent salaries to their staffs, get a cool $2,444,000. Think what that means to our community. And our hospitals, who have long struggled with their own charitable load in providing better service despite rising costs—they will receive right here in western New York $2,623,200.

Does it not make you proud to live in the good old U. S. A.?

Balanced Budget—If It Sticks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Lancaster Eagle-Gazette a few days ago. Lancaster is the largest city in my congressional district and the Lancaster Eagle-Gazette is a highly reputable newspaper with a wide circulation in that section of the State of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent as their Congressman. I think the facts set forth in this editorial are worthy of comment.

The editorial is as follows:

BALANCED BUDGET—IF IT STICKS

President Eisenhower has presented Congress with two rarities, two prospective balanced budgets. There is no magic in the fact, but there is an amazing amount of stable comfort reflected in its accomplishment.

As matters now stand, the Federal Government will be in the black by some $200 million on June 30, 1956. In the coming fiscal year, ending June 30, 1957, Uncle Sam expects to spend some $66 billion and hopes to collect about $400 million more. These figures are based upon estimates of continued prosperity in 1957.

Of our huge spending program 64 percent is earmarked for the protection of the Nation. Thirty-five and one-half billions are slated for military purposes directly. Our Atomic Energy Commission receives almost $7 billion. If we can manage to cut down on our national debt some day, we should be able to ease up the interest charges which now amount to $7 billion annually. This debt is now at $274 billion.

Under the circumstances, a balanced budget becomes something of a minor miracle. Two in a row will qualify the President for fiscal immortality.

The Oconomowoc Enterprise Deals With National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Oconomowoc Enterprise, published in my congressional district by Mr. C. W. Brown, is a weekly paper with an editorial page which would do credit to a daily newspaper supporting a sizable editorial staff.

In a recent issue Mr. Brown published two editorials which are typical. They indicate his willingness to deal with some of the major economic and political issues which confront the people of the United States. These, I might add, are in addition to his incisive editorials taking a clear-cut stand on issues of a local nature.

The two editorials referred to are set forth below:

IF THESE ARE ISSUES, THEN DEMOCRATS WILL HAVE TO DEFEND, RATHER THAN ATTACK

The Democratic National Committee has listed the 10 top issues for 1956. They are:

Falling farm income.
Tax favoritism for the rich.
The public power giveaway.
Favoritism to big business.
Misconduct in government.
The rising cost of living.
Small-business failures.
GOP antilabor policy.
The school crisis.
The growth of monopolies.

If these are the issues the Democrats will argue in the forthcoming election campaign, they will be in a position of defense rather than attack. Let's look at them.

Falling farm income: Farm income was falling steadily when the Republicans took office. The emergency Government buying program was cracking under its own weight. The last Democratic Congress did not change the program. The party as yet has not offered a solution, just criticisms.

Tax favoritism for the rich: Personal income taxes reach a top of 91 percent, leaving 9 percent for the individual.

The public power giveaway: Unnumbered millions have gone into TVA paid for by tax money and only token taxes paid by TVA have gone back to the Government. TVA put private industry out of business and is now not producing enough power to serve its going area. Its expansion has been denied funds by the votes of Democratic legislators.

"Favoritism in big business." Is the situation any different than when the so-called big business was the backbone of war material production? Without big business, America would not be what it is, with its highest standard of living. Big business, so-called, is

owned by millions of stockholders with their number rapidly increasing.

"Misconduct in Government." What misconduct? This administration or the previous one?

"The rising cost of living." Again, what rising cost? The stabilization against inflation has been one of the outstanding successes the past 2 to 3 years.

"Small-business failures." Should the Government subsidize business? The greatest cause of business failure has always been inadequate financing and poor management.

"GOP antilabor policy." Employment is at an all-time high for war or peace. Wages have continued to advance. The number involved in strikes has been relatively low.

"The school crisis." The Government is not in the baby business but President Eisenhower has a very active and large program for aid to education.

"The growth of monopolies." Name them.

INCREASED CONSUMPTION THE FINAL ANSWER

A solution to the agricultural prices and surpluses plaguing the farmer and giving the Government a man-sized headache in its effort to find a sound and permanent workable solution to stabilize this vital segment of American industry might be found in examining what is happening in newsprint.

One year ago, paper jobbers and the newsprint mills were taking on new customers and the market was adequately supplied. Approximately 6,500,000 tons were produced in 1955. Production was increased 7 percent. Consumption was increased 8 percent. This has resulted in many mills cutting newsprint deliveries from 7 percent to 13 percent in the first quarter of 1956. Newspapers are critically short of newsprint and as a result some are rationing space and others are importing foreign newsprint at premium prices. That 1 percent increase in consumption over production completely changed the supply-and-demand picture. Newsprint mills increased their price while reporting large profits, further squeezing the newspapers already faced with high production costs.

If a 1 percent difference between production and consumption in newsprint brings this result, isn't there a lesson there for agriculture, particularly dairying?

The experts tell us that if milk consumption were increased 1 glass per person a day or 1 pad of butter per meal, the dairy surplus would become a shortage. In other words, promotion of consumption holds the key to the answer.

Consider, too, that a great deal of dairying is in an area which grows trees. Wisconsin is carrying on an extensive program of replanting trees. The cooperative effort of private industry and the conservation department results in the planting of millions of trees annually, putting idle land back to use, taking other land out of other production, and, under the long-term program which in this case will take 40 to 50 years, will change the extreme shortage of pulp supply to a surplus.

The Government's new soil bank proposal may fit into this picture.

There must be a lesson to be learned in this example, that the law of supply and demand is a delicate balance and that increased consumption is vital in the final solution.

The land bank idea, that was promotion of consumption, makes far more sense than a program of making production of surpluses profitable.

Secretary McKay Misinformed by Subordinates on Chinle Shale Facts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as a copy of a letter to me, dated February 2, from the Secretary of the Interior will be found in the proceedings of the other body, I am availing myself of this extension granted on an earlier date to set forth some facts that should prove rather embarrassing to the Secretary. Had he not placed a copy of his letter to me in the hands of a Member of the other body before the letter itself was actually delivered to me, I would have taken a less peremptory and public means of remarking on this discourtesy.

The plain fact appears to be that the Secretary of the Interior is not getting facts from his subordinates, and, as a consequence, he is persisting with a recommendation that may force the American taxpayers to pay for a billion dollar mud puddle out in the wilds of southern Utah.

The following letter, together with its enclosures, which I have today directed to the Secretary, explains it all. I am only sorry that the picture mentioned in the letter cannot be reproduced here in the RECORD. It shows that in 5 short minutes the Chinle shale which his Bureau of Reclamation geologist told Congress was impermeable soaks up so much water it falls to pieces and becomes nothing but mud:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1956.

Re: The upper Colorado River storage project.

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY MCKAY: Under date of January 27, 1956, I furnished you information that Glen Canyon Dam reservoir contained about 50 miles of exposed Chinle shale, which when touched by the reservoir's water could disintegrate and cause landslides of tremendous proportions. As you know Glen Canyon Dam is the key "cash register" unit of the upper Colorado River storage project, and if it is found to be unworkable because of geological difficulties the entire financial structure of the upper Colorado River proposal collapses and the taxpayers would in effect be buying a billion-dollar mud puddle instead of a good project.

I made public release of this information on January 30. On the evening of January 30 the Bureau of Reclamation phoned a press release to numerous papers and followed it up with a release in writing dated January 31. The release stated that the "Chinle shale would be touched by the reservoir waters in three separate stretches * * * aggregating about 15 miles of the reservoir's length."

In truth and in fact, the Chinle shale is exposed for approximately 47 miles. This figure is taken directly from a special topographic-geologic map prepared for me by the United States Geological Survey within the past few weeks. It is the only such map in existence. It reveals that the Chinle shale is exposed between mile 96 and 101 and miles 141 and 164 on the Colorado River where the reservoir would be located. On the San Juan River it is exposed between miles 8 and 14, miles 20 and 28, miles 36 and 38, and miles 47 and 40, this is the total of 47 miles.

This erroneous statement by the Bureau of Reclamation indicates that they do not know geologically of the area, and that any advice received by you from them should be checked by an independent source, possibly the United States Army engineers.

The above-mentioned press release further states that the Bureau's geologists have been completely aware of the existenec in the nature of Chinle shale formation for decades. I am attaching certain extracts from the hearings before the House irrigation and reclamation subcommittee during 1955, in which Commissioner of Reclamation Dexheimer, told the committee that it was impossible for him to say what the geology in the Glen Canyon Dam site is. Further, J. Neil Murdock, the Bureau's regional geologist in the Denver office, when asked by me if he had any figure for the Triassic formations in the area which includes the Chinle, said he had no laboratory figures but volunteered that the shale formations are recognized as impermeable I am attaching a photograph disclosing that rather than being impermeable the Chinle formation of the Triassic group is exceptionally absorbative and disintegrates when touched by water.

I point this out again, in order to emphasize the fact that the Bureau appears not actually to know the nature of the Chinle shale formation, and to again point out that any statements to you with regard to it should be reviewed with caution and checked by an independent source.

To further reinforce this view, I am enclosing extra extracts from two Geological Survey professional papers describing the Chinle formation and the tremendous landslides which can occur when other formations overlying it are undermined by disintegration of the Chinle. Although this information was prepared by an agency of the Department of the Interior, it apparently was not studied by the Bureau of Reclamation.

It is further respectfully requested that a press release be issued by the Bureau of Reclamation forthwith correcting the factual errors in the Januuary 31 release.

In closing let me reinforce my request that nothing be done by way of further legislative proceeding with the proposed upper Colorado River storage project until a complete geologic survey and invesigation can be completed in the Glen Canyon Dam site.

Since dictating the foregoing, your wholly unsatisfactory reply under date of February 2 to my January 27 letter has reached my office.

If, as you say, the Bureau of Reclamation has been cognizant of the shale since 1922, why was any mention of them not made during the committee's hearings?

What are these studies that you claim to have conducted via public and private agencies with respect to the site and the implication of Chinle shale? In the face of the information I have attached hereto, how can you say that your conclusion with respect to the reservoir's site was carefully considered? I am certain as you must be that the Bureau of Reclamation completely fell on its face with respect to this one and that the press

release it put out was either deliberately misleading or misleading because of ignorance. It seems to me time that some of these people in your Public Relations Department and the Bureau of Reclamation be fired and replaced by people who know their jobs.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, 18th District, California.

EXTRACTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, 1955

PART I—COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Page 246:

Mr. HOSMER: Have you done any work upstream from this site? (Glen Canyon dam site.)

Mr. DEXHEIMER (Commissioner of Reclamation). Nothing but geological exploration, of course, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What is that—surface exploration?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Largely.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far back up the stream from the proposed dam site would the reservoir extend?

Mr. LARSON. 186 miles up the Colorado and 71 miles up the San Juan. I mentioned it in my statement.

Mr. HOSMER. Then you have taken visual surface geology in those extensive areas only?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes. I am sure that our geologists have covered that reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. Well, surface geology?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes.

Mr. HOSMER. You were in the office 6 years. Do you know of any of the results of that work?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. It has been some time since I went over the geologist's reports, and I am not familiar enough now to say that I remember just what they were. But those reports, of course, were fundamental to the selection of this site and the reservoir area.

Mr. HOSMER. You cannot tell us what is in them at the present time?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. No, I cannot.

Page 362:

Mr. HOSMER. Now, I believe the proposed lake would extend about 190 miles up the Colorado River?

Mr. MURDOCK (J. Neil Murdock, regional geologist, Bureau of Reclamation). Approximately that. River miles.

Mr. HOSMER. And how far us the other river?

Mr. MURDOCK. 61 miles, approximately.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the San Juan River?

Mr. MURDOCK. The San Juan River.

Mr. HOSMER. During all this time, are you in the Navaho sandstone formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. No, sir.

Mr. HOSMER. What else do you get into?

Mr MURDOCK. Well, you go up the Colorado River and you get into the older shales, Triassic shales, and into the limestones.

Mr. HOSMER. Is that the Kayenta formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; you get into the Keyenta formation and the Triassic formations, too.

Mr. HOSMER. What is the Kayenta formation?

Mr MURDOCK. It is a shale and sandstone.

Mr. HOSMER. It is more permeable than the Navaho sandstone; is it?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. All the formations are more permeable in that area than the Navaho.

Mr. HOSMER. It is a less homogeneous formation than the Navaho; is it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. It contains some sand and some gravel?

Mr MURDOCK. Well, shale and sandstone.

Mr HOSMER. What is the permeability of this formation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Very low. We did not make any tests on it. But it is very tight.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures whatsoever?

Mr MURDOCK. No.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you have any figures for the Triassic, which includes Chinle?

Mr. MURDOCK. No laboratory figures, but shale formations are recognized as impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. That is not altogether true, is it, Mr. Murdock?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, you might find exceptions, but in the oil business they utilize this, because the shales are impermeable and they trap the oil in the sands.

Mr. HOSMER. That is true with a subsurface formation, but I am talking about a formation that is fairly close to the surface.

Mr. MURDOCK. Surface formation has nothing to do with the permeability of the shale. It breaks down into a clay, which again is impermeable.

Mr. HOSMER. Depending upon its extent of saturation at the time you measured it; is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I don't think saturation has anything to do with permeability.

[Extracts from U. S. Geological Survey publication Describing Chinle]

THE KAIPAROWITS REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 164 (1931) by Herbert E. Gregory and Raymond C. Moore)

The Chinle formation includes the group of shales, "marls," thin soft sandstones, and limestone conglomerates lying between the Shinarump conglomerate and the Wingate sandstone.

Records show that the Chinle is thickest in northeastern Arizona and southwestern Utah—320 to 393 feet in upper Glen Canyon, and 830 feet in the San Juan Canyon (p. 53).

A fragment of fresh rock immersed in water swells to nearly twice its bulk, and after drying is nothing more than a pile of disconnected, irregular grains; alternate drying and wetting produces a substance part of which passes through filter paper. Under the microscope most of the material appears to be colloidal (p. 57).

When the Chinle "marls" and shales on steep slopes are saturated they seem to move by their own weight, carrying their broken strata and talus blocks to lower levels. At the south base of the Paria Plateau slides in the Chinle have spilled over the Shinarump conglomerate and down the Moenkopi cliffs to the Kaibab below, and at a place about 14 miles south of the Burr trail the Chinle beds have lost their hold and have slid, accompanied by huge fragments, over the upturned beds of Navaho sandstone, down the west side of the Halls Creek Valley in a jumbled mass that is roughly three-fourths of a mile wide, 1½ miles long, and 80 feet deep (p. 145).

As viewed from the rim of the Kaiparowits Plateau at Fiftymile Point the landslides are impressive. The slopes below the capping Cretaceous sandstone constitute a field about 2 miles wide and 10 miles long, everywhere strewn with boulders, the largest of which are square blocks of sandstone 40 feet thick. Successive slides have banked the materials in huge ridges like a series of terminal and lateral moraines.

Except in areas of Chinle and Tropic shales, landslides were not observed. The steep slopes of other formations are bare or coated with only ribbons and scattered patches of debris (p. 146).

THE SAN JUAN REGION

(U. S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey, professional paper 188 (1938) by Herbert E. Gregory)

The position of the relatively soft Chinle between two cliff makers accounts for its preservation in a region where erosion is vigorous (p. 49).

In the Chinle formation the conditions for producing slides are exceptionally favorable. The thin sandstone beds readily break into talus fragments and the "marl" beds when saturated seem to move by their own weight. Instability is further shown by mud flows that after heavy rainfall issue from the base of slides. In places recurrent movement is indicated by the arrangement of material in parallel ridges on Chinle slopes and by unconformities in the piles of debris successively pushed over cliffs (p. 102).

New England Wants Insurance Against Flood Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

NEW ENGLAND WANTS INSURANCE AGAINST FLOOD LOSSES

(Statement of Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on Disaster Insurance Legislation, February 2, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, the best way to insure against flood losses is to prevent them, by flood-control projects that work. Paper plans, without construction, protect no one.

Of course, New England needs flood insurance, because we have suffered loss of lives and devastating damage on several occasions during this generation due to the failure of the Federal Government to provide dams, reservoirs, and insurance.

As your committee, through these hearings, is helped in its responsibility of developing a practical plan of disaster insurance, I am sure it will also recognize the need for flood-control works to minimize the effects of future floods.

The element of risk must be reduced to keep any insurance plan solvent.

Therefore, the proposed legislation should include emphasis on the need of more flood-control projects in the areas where such disasters have caused the heaviest losses, in order to provide the greatest measure of real protection, which will in turn, reduce the carrying charges of the insurance.

New England is noted for its independence, but sometimes its waterways carry this to excess, with an anarchy that is fearful to behold.

Last year alone, as a result of two disastrous floods, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of homes, industries, and public facilities weer damaged or destroyed. This was not a partial loss, retrieved or compensated for, by insurance. The washout was complete. The discouraged victims had to rebuild all over again from zero.

Since 1927, Congress has spent $4.5 billion on flood control for the whole country. Only $53 million of that total was appropriated to protect the 6 New England States.

In the face of inadequate defenses against rampaging waters, and the lack of indemnities that would enable us to recoup our losses, we have suffered severely.

The realization that we must be covered by some form of disaster insurance, has widespread support. For who knows, in view of our mercurial weather, where the next deluge will send swollen waters over their banks?

On January 3, 1956, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7923, to be known as the National Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

Similar bills have been introduced by other Members.

The President has recommended that we initiate such legislation on an experimental basis with a reasonable limit on the amount of insurance for any individual or firm, and on the basis of coinsurance, under which individuals would assume part of the loss, in order to hold down premium rates.

In his budget message for the fiscal year 1957, the President proposed $100 million of new authority for an indemnity and reinsurance program under which costs of flood damage would be carried by the individuals protected, the States, and the Federal Government.

Private insurance companies would participate to the fullest extent possible.

Among the various proposals suggested, I am sure that there will be a meeting of the minds on the common denominators necessary to make such legislation practical and effective.

There is no argument as to why we must have flood insurance. The only questions concern "how?" and "when?"

What Our President Has Done To Bring Freedom to the Peoples of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the text of a speech which I delivered last evening entitled "What Our President Has Done To Bring Freedom to the Peoples of the World." The occasion for my remarks was the celebration of National Freedom Day at the Department of Labor, and the National Freedom Day Association presented President Eisenhower with a citation for his contribution toward abolishing second-class citizenship in this country as well as his contribution toward the freeing of the peoples of the world:

REMARKS OF HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, OF MICHIGAN, IN CONNECTION WITH FREEDOM DAY CELEBRATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 1, 1956

I am honored and delighted to meet with you this evening in connection with the celebration of National Freedom Day, the anniversary of the signing of the 13th amendment by Abraham Lincoln. I understand that this particular anniversary is also for the purpose of honoring President Eisenhower for his contribution toward freeing the nations of the world from fear and tyranny as well as his abolishing second-class citizenship in this country. It is for his work in the international sphere, both as a soldier and as President of this country, that I wish to speak for a few moments this evening.

One of Abraham Lincoln's greatest remarks was the famous quotation to the effect that this country could not endure, half slave and half free. The truth of this statement is likewise applicable to the world in which we live, that it too cannot endure, half slave and half free. No one has recognized this better and with more perception than has our great President.

His accomplishments as a soldier in the freeing of millions of people from Nazi and Fascist tyranny during World War II are so well known that I shall touch on them only briefly. But it must be emphasized that Dwight Eisenhower, more than any other one man, was responsible for the final triumph of the forces of democracy that culminated in 1945. No matter how hard the Soviet Communists try to rewrite the history of that great struggle, it was due chiefly to the military genius and leadership of our commander in chief that victory in the European theater was eventually ours.

Take the action which was perhaps the turning point of the entire war—the landing in Normandy. This opening of a second front on the European Continent—an event unparalleled in military history—decisively broke the back of Nazi Germany. While Hitler was able to concentrate his forces in Russia and in Italy, victory, or, at least, a stalemate, was yet within his grasp. But the establishment and the expansion of the beachhead in France marked a decisive reversal of the Axis fortunes of war. From that day onward theirs was a losing cause, and the end was inevitable.

The decision, the timnig of this landing—that belonged to Eisenhower. In the face of adverse weather warnings, he gave the order to proceed according to the planned schedule. If the landing had been delayed, if the enemy had been given more time to prepare his defense, to concentrate his forces, who knows what the result might have been? This one decision alone would be enough to mark Dwight Eisenhower as a champion of freedom, even if his other contributions as a general and a statesman were forgotten. The millions of people who were freed from totalitarian rule as a result—the French, Dutch, Belgians, Italians, Poles, Czechs, Russians, the German people themselves—all have full and sufficient reason to honor our great President as their true liberator in 1945. As a soldier and a leader of our great Allied armies, his service to the cause of freedom will go down in history.

But the Allied victory in World War II did not, unfortunately, mean the end of tyranny and oppression in the world. Instead, it replaced one ruthless form of totalitarianism with another that is even more brutal and terrible. Communist slavery replaced the Nazi and Fascist version and extended itself, in Europe and elsewhere, until today more than 800 million souls lie behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains in bondage.

It is perhaps appropriate that I should be speaking of such things on this anniversary due to my own experiences which are unique for a Member of Congress. Before entering the political field, I served our State Department abroad for 9 years, two of which were spent behind the Iron Curtain in eastern Europe. I had the opportunity to witness in two countries, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the Communist take-over and the complete loss of all freedom which ensued. Ever since that time, I have attempted to be in the front rank of those who wish to see liberty restored in that part of the world.

My own experiences behind the Iron Curtain led me to realize how ardently and passionately the people living under Communist tyranny desire once again to be free. There is, frankly, little that we can do for them in the way of material, concrete assistance but there is one thing which can and must be done and that is to let them know that we have not forgotten them in their plight and that we will never agree to the domination and the tyranny under which they live today.

President Eisenhower recognized this from the very beginning. Listen to this part of his inaugural address delivered at the Capitol here in Washington on January 20, 1953:

"Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed all free men, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

You can well imagine what hope those brave words stirred in the minds of the enslaved peoples whose only previous experience with the foreign policy of this Government had been thorough the shameful betrayals at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. This hope and the faith in President Eisenhower's promises was renewed a month later when the President asked the Congress to go on record as rejecting any interpretations or applications of any wartime agreements or understandings which had been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples. The request was also made to the Congress to join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples who had been subjected to the captivity of Soviet depotism would again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which would sustain the peace; that they would again have the right to choose the form of government under which they would live; and that sovereign rights of self-government would be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

The President also recognized from the start that this country could not continue to act as the champion of freemen everywhere unless it acquired and maintained that position of strength which would give weight and meaning to its words. With the incomparable background of his own military experience, he personally saw to it that the defensive posture of this country was kept at a peak which would permit assurances of the defense of our own freedom and also allow us to move in the field of international relations with the respect that comes from such strength.

One of the great reasons that the American people accept so willingly the leadership of freemen in a free world is because the history of our own country is closely interwoven with the cause of freedom from its earliest days. As the President said in his Christmas message in 1953:

"More precisely than in any other way, prayer places freedom and communism in opposition, one to another. The Communist can find no reserve of strength in prayer because his doctrine of materialism and statism denies the dignity of man and consequently the existence of God. But in America, George Washington long ago rejected exclusive dependence upon mere materialistic values. In the bitter and critical winter at Valley Forge, when the cause of liberty was so near defeat, his recourse was sincere and earnest prayer. From it he received new hope and new strength of purpose, out of which grew the freedom in which we celebrate this Christmas season.

"As religious faith is the foundation of free government, so is prayer an indispensable part of that faith.

"Tonight, richly endowed in the good things of the earth, in the fellowship of our neighbors and the love of our families, would it not be fitting for each of us to speak in prayer to the Father of all men and women on this earth, of whatever nation, and of every race and creed, to ask that he help us and teach us and strengthen us and receive our thanks.

"Should we not pray that he help us? Help us to remember that the founders of this, our country, came first to these shores in search of freedom, freedom of man to walk in dignity; to live without fear; beyond the yoke of tyranny; ever to progress. Help us to cherish freedom, for each of us and for all nations."

This is a powerful and a moving message, uttered by a man who is passionately and sincerely devoted to the cause of freedom, for this great country and for the entire

world. His prayer to the Almighty to help us recall this precious heritage, his devotion and belief in the power of prayer itself is of particular appeal to me who had occasion only 2 short years ago, here in Washington, to be a living example of the power of prayer itself.

The fact that among all the blessings which this country of ours enjoys today the greatest one is that of freedom and liberty for our people, the most divine blessing of all, is a fact that we have long accepted. And if we accept that this is the most precious blessing that the good Lord could bestow upon us, have we not a sacred obligation, by our conduct at home and abroad, to see that the same blessing reaches as many of our fellowmen throughout the world as possible. If we regard freedom as something peculiarly American, as a commodity not for export, are we not in effect saying that we achieved it by our own efforts and not through the Almighty? But if, on the other hand, we do admit that this blessing is Heaven-sent, have we a right to try and restrict it to our own shores? No, freedom is an international, not a national, word and our most sacred traditions demand that we, who have received this blessing from above, do all in our power to see that its effects are felt throughout the four corners of the earth. As the President said in April of 1954: "The flame of liberty symbolizes the determination of America always to remain free to remain a haven of the oppressed and a ready acknowledgment that all men in the attainment of human aspirations and worthy aspirations are dependent upon an Almighty." And listen to his remarks a few months later before the American Legion Convention here in Washington: "* * * We must preach, demonstrate, and tirelessly sell the vitality and value of freedom in the world. Nothing is more dangerous to our cause than to expect America's message to be heard if we don't bother to tell it.

"We must reaffirm to the oppressed masses of the earth the great truth that the God who gave life to humanity, at the same time gave the right of liberty to man. And in our own interest we must apply both our own intelligence and the necessary material means to assist other peoples to realize for themselves the blessings of freedom and of self-government."

It is just about impossible to speak words that come from the heart with more dignity than those.

There are many, of course, who say that mere expressions are not enough, that deeds are required as well as words. Very well, let us look at the world and see how the cause of freedom has progressed during the Eisenhower administration.

While Korea remains a divided country, a peace treaty was concluded which maintained freedom for the people of South Korea. We did not agree to the partition of Vietnam but we are helping the people of South Vietnam, the free part, to maintain their independence. We have promised our protection to Formosa against those who would annex that island to Communist slavery. We are helping the people of Iran to maintain their independence after nearly losing it. We have urged that self-determination, at least in a limited sense, be granted the people of Cyprus. We signed a peace treaty which gave freedom to the Austrian people for the first time in 18 years. In our own hemisphere, we rejoiced that the people of Guatemala and Argentina, by their own efforts, regained their freedom from totalitarian rule and we are likewise assisting them. Wherever free peoples stand up for the cause of independence throughout the world, we encourage them in that fight and help them to preserve their liberty insofar as it lies within our power.

I want to say a word or two here about the Geneva Conference of last summer when the President went to Switzerland to meet with the heads of government from Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. There were persons, who, playing on the memories of the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, alleged or hinted that the President planned to conclude another such agreement that would confirm the status of the captive peoples living today under Soviet tyranny. Let me set the record straight on that issue.

When the President broadcast from the White House on July 15 last, just before leaving for Geneva, he mentioned some of the problems which did then and which still do plague the world today. Among those he mentioned: "The problem of the captive states, once proud people that are not allowed their own form of government, freely chosen by themselves and under individuals freely elected by themselves." Does this sound like the words of a man who was planning to sell the captive peoples "down the river"?

On July 18, the President issued a statement from his offices at Geneva. It included this paragraph: "On a broader plane, this is the problem of respecting the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and of restoring sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of them. The American people feel strongly that certain peoples of Eastern Europe, many with a long and proud record of national existence, have not yet been given the benefit of this pledge of our United Nations wartime declaration, reinforced by other wartime agreements."

And, finally, when the President returned from Geneva, he stated on July 25 that the pursuit of peace, the reason why he went to Geneva in the first instance, involved, among other questions, freedom and security for all nations, great and small. He added that, in conversations which he and Secretary Dulles had held with other delegations and specifically the Soviet delegation, the matter of the satellites of Eastern Europe had been brought up more than once and that it had been made crystal clear what American beliefs about this matter were.

As convincing proof that, no matter how great his desire for peace, the President would never attempt to trade peace for our people in exchange for slavery for others, listen to this paragraph from his speech to the American Bar Association last August:

"Eagerness to avoid war—if we think no deeper than this single desire—can produce outright or implicit agreement that injustices and wrongs of the present shall be perpetuated in the future. We must not participate in any such false agreement. Thereby, we would outrage our own conscience. In the eyes of those who suffer injustice, we would become partners with their oppressors. In the judgment of history, we would have sold out the freedom of man for the pottage of a false peace. Moreover, we would assure future conflict."

This determination of President Eisenhower not to purchase peace at the risk of honor and not to traffic with the freedom of other peoples is as strong with him today as it has always been. When he broadcast over radio free Europe to the captive peoples at Christmastime a message of hope and encouragement from the American people, the Soviet leaders protested that "this is not in accord with the spirit of Geneva." On behalf of the President, Mr. Hagerty replied that it had been made abundantly clear at Geneva to the Soviet rulers that the spirit of Geneva could not and did not involve any relaxing of the peaceful purpose of the United States to achieve liberty and justice for the oppressed peoples of the world. He added, "The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, and is, and until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy." Even in the most recent example, the exchange of correspondence which took place between the President and Soviet Premier Bulganin only a few days ago, Mr. Eisenhower referred to "our wartime pledge to respect the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

And, finally, in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 5, the President referred to grave injustices throughout the world including the oppressive division of the German people and the bondage of millions elsewhere. I might say, at this point, that I have introduced a resolution which would put the House of Representatives on record as supporting the President in his efforts to right these wrongs.

I have quoted at considerable length this evening from the President's public statements over the last 3 years. I have done so because it is in such messages of hope and encouragement to the enslaved peoples that I feel President Eisenhower has made his greatest contribution toward freeing the world from tyranny. His sincere and earnest desire for peace, repeated on so many occasions, has done a great deal toward relieving international dread of an atomic war. But peace must yield to freedom if the two conflict and the inspiration that the words of the President have given to free men everywhere is, to me, one of his greatest accomplishments during the last 3 years of his administration.

We do not know how long the Kremlin will continue to exercise its domination over millions of once-free people. But we do know that, as long as this unhappy situation continues, the American people will continue to express their dissatisfaction and their hope that freedom will one day reign over the entire earth. In speaking as he has done for his fellow countrymen, the President has at least equaled, if not surpassed, the military contribution he made during World War II which was also in behalf of liberty and independence for oppressed peoples. That is why it is such a great pleasure to join you here tonight on this memorable anniversary to pay tribute to that great champion of freedom, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Thank you.

Gracious and Patriotic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the February 1, 1956, issue of the Newark Star-Ledger entitled "Gracious and Patriotic":

GRACIOUS AND PATRIOTIC

Former President Truman has performed a gracious, but what is far more important, a patriotic act of enormous value in lauding President Eisenhower's answer to Russian Premier Bulganin as the finest act of this administration.

This, coming after somewhat similar statements by Adlai Stevenson and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, contenders for the Democratic nomination for President, should show the Communists and the world that the United States is truly united on the basic principles of foreign policy.

The President's reply stressed that Russia would have to prove its peaceful intentions by positive acts, and could not fool the world

by substituting propaganda words. The President called for freedom for the peoples of the satellite countries, a lifting of the Iron Curtain, and unification of Germany, among other major steps required of Russia.

The Truman endorsement, coming on the eve of the election season, which will inevitably produce noisy and bitter-sounding debate, is especially valuable for its timing.

National Debt and Our Changed World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column apearing on Wednesday, February 1, in the New York Journal American by George E. Sokolsky, one of America's most respected and widely read commentators:

NATIONAL DEBT AND OUR CHANGED WORLD

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Nobody can ever actually see the ball and chain of $280 billion that we call our public debt. But then there are so many realities in life that we do not see, or feel, or touch, or smell. The public debt is an imponderable that affects the value of our currency, the stability of Government, the credit of Government. And as we are all part of the Government, it affects us all.

One of the things one learns in a hospital is that there is literally no use crying over spilt milk. It is like trying to find out why a heart muscle has rusted away. You can get a thousand different explanations and one will make you more unhappy than the other. The fact is that it happened and you lie about waiting for it to heal, if it can.

VALUES ARE DIFFERENT

The same thing is true of all the battles we conservatives lost during the past 20 years or more. They are lost. Already a new world has come into existence, not a better world nor a more satisfactory world but a different one. The emphasis on values is different. For instance, when I was a young man at college, the goal was great achievement—possibly great money achievement, to be somebody like Andrew Carnegie or John D. Rockefeller, or to head some corporation or institution.

Today, a young man's goal is security—he wants to be sure that he will not be without a pay envelope. Even the modest among us planned to write books or plays that would put them on easy street; today, the best one can hope for is that the income tax can be spread over a period of years. The fellow whose goal is achievement is a risk-taker; the fellow whose goal is security can become a coward. He has too much to preserve to risk even a little. He conforms to the current pattern.

Maybe he is just as happy. He works 40 hours a week, grows roses in the spring, listens to good music at night and reads papercovered books on his way to sleep. But his productive outlook is nothing to get excited about. The Russians, who are in the upbuilding stage, are now like we used to be. They offer all kinds of bonuses and incentives as though they were capitalists and nobody thinks of only working 40 hours a week because such limited productivity is practically sabotage. They are pushing as we pushed in the 1890's and the results are showing.

BUREAUCRATIC ATTITUDE

The question with them as with us is, what does the individual get out of it? When taxes and the high cost of living consume so great a share of a man's earnings that he can leave little for his family beyond living up to the Joneses, the incentive is not enough and many fall into the normal attitude of bureaucrats which is to do what one has to do and no more. The job is written up and that is it; to do more is to impinge on somebody else's job. Such people are even disliked personalities, although they are the only kind of human beings who make the wheels of life or industry go round.

And that brings us back to our national debt and a great many mistakes that were made over the past 20 years by a bureaucracy that really governed us for the first time in our history. We accepted their rule because it is more convenient to obey than to be a dissenter. Besides dissenters have bad names; they are not pleasant people. So we as a Nation let a flock of bureaucrats take hold of us and govern us. They told us what to do.

Now we need to straighten things out and we cannot, because historic errors, once made, move so rapidly and fix themselves so rigidly that only wars or revolutions can change them. So, we shall have to live in this new world or not live at all.

Ground Hog Day Every Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following:

We have listened to an account of the origin and meaning of Groundhog Day. It is my earnest wish that the health-giving food staple—ground hog—be on the American dining table. I wish it were there, not for just 1 day out of the year, but rather, for every day in the year.

Ground Iowa hog is an all-American dish.

The farmers who raise these hogs should get—and by right, ought to receive—a fair price for the product which has given, is giving, and will give such vast inner satisfaction to their fellow countrymen.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday morning 800 persons, including the President, members of the Cabinet, the courts, Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, Government officials, delegates to the conference, and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership Groups attended the Presidential prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. Conrad Hilton was host on the occasion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service.

In my opinion, this prayer breakfast, attended by outstanding leaders in every field, will add much to the religious life of our Nation.

There being no objection, the program and transcript of proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL BREAKFAST, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1956, 8 A. M., MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Presiding: Hon. FRANK CARLSON, United States Senate, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.

Invocation: Hon. JAMES B. UTT, Member of Congress.

Message from the Old Testament: The Honorable Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President (Psalm 24).

Message from the New Testament: Senator PRICE DANIEL (Texas) (Colossians 1: 12–20).

Breakfast.

Message of welcome: Senator FRANK CARLSON.

Greetings: Mr. Conrad Hilton.

The President of the United States.

Solo: Mr. Fague Springman.

Greetings from the Senate breakfast group: Senator JOHN STENNIS (Mississippi).

Greetings from the House of Representatives breakfast group: Hon. D. R. MATTHEWS (Florida).

Address, The Call To Advance: Mr. Howard E. Butt, Jr., Corpus Christi, Tex.

Prayer of dedication: Abraham Vereide.

Group singing (first verse and chorus of Battle Hymn of the Republic).

(The fourth annual prayer breakfast was opened by Senator FRANK CARLSON, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.)

Senator CARLSON. We will have the opening prayer this morning by Congressman UTT, of California.

Mr. UTT. Almighty and eternal God, we ask Thy grace upon this convocation of Thy servants. Help us to be thankful for Thy manifold blessings, those seen and those unseen. Help us to seek knowledge, wisdom, understanding and truth. Help us to work for the salvation of this Republic and the salvation of this world.

Help us to main our own self-respect and to respect the rights and dignities of our fellow men. Help us to search for that inner peace among men through which all the world will be at peace.

Bless this food to our use for the Lord, His good—with mercy everlasting which endureth through all generations.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, Amen.

Senator CARLSON. We would like very much at this time to have two portions of the Scripture read before we proceed with the breakfast. The first portion of the Old Testament will be read by Gov. Sherman Adams and the second portion by Senator Price Daniel.

The Scripture read was the 24th Psalm and Colossians 1: 12 to 20.

Senator CARLSON. First I want to express my sincere appreciation for the very fine response that we have had this morning to the invitation of our host, from whom you will hear later.

We meet this morning at a breakfast of prayer and devotion. In order that we may be in keeping with the reverence and the dignity of this occasion, I am going to ask that you withhold your applause during this entire period. I know there are going to be times when you will want to applaud, but kindly do not do so.

We have two people at the head table this morning who will not participate in the program, but I want to present them at this time. First, Lt. Gen. William S. Paul, president of the International Christian Leadership of the United States.

Secondly, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, Congressman from Arkansas and vice president of the International Council of Christian Leadership.

This morning is the first session of the International Council for Christian Leadership. We deeply appreciate the presence of the President of the United States, who by precept and deed is setting an example that worship of our Creator should be a part of our everyday life.

The theme of this meeting will be Worldwide Christian Action. In my opinion, in Christian leadership we must find ways and means of awakening people to a spiritual understanding. If we cannot do this, human personalities and personal freedom as we know them in this Nation are in danger of being lost to the other nations of the world. Somehow, some way, we must discover and bring about a collective strength of spiritual fellowship.

Increasingly the leaders of the world are expressing their conviction that the only hope for mankind lies in a renaissance—spiritual revival. When men cry to God in utter helplessness, His heart goes out to them.

This morning you are the guests of a Christian layman with whom I have had the privilege of working in the last few years. He is a most generous host who has not hesitated to give of his time and the use of his means in advancing Christian programs. It is a distinct hnor to present one of the outstanding businessmen of the Nation who has done so much and will do much more in the interests of this cause—Mr. Conrad Hilton.

Mr. HILTON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the most effective story or picture of prayer in action that I know is 2,000 years old and was told by the greatest storyteller of all time. As I recall it, a man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers. They beat him, robbed him, and left him dying by the side of the road.

A number of people passed by, looked, and went on. I suppose they were very busy people. Finally, a man came along on a donkey and stopped, cared for the injured man's wounds, put him on his animal, and took him to an inn—incidentally, one of the first hotels mentioned in history. There he found him a room and left the injured man in good hands. That is what I call prayer in action.

The good samaritan showed great compassion and great thoughtfulness. He must have been a prayerful man, inasmuch as one does not and cannot act in this religious fashion unless he is warmed by the friendship of God in prayer.

This great short story, one of the finest in any language, seems to be applicable today in a number of ways. It can be applied within our families, in our neighborhoods, our cities and States, in fact, it could be an illustration of our national ideal.

More than that, since so many modern nations are lying by the side of the road, injured economically, politically or culturally that it might very well be our obligation, our privilege, to pick them up and take them along with us to greater assurance of security, peace and happiness.

We in America have been born very rich indeed, as individuals and as a Nation. We have inherited great wealth economically, culturally and spiritually. I think it is our obligation to share it.

Some of these nations, large and small, have fallen among robbers and there is great danger of more of them falling among the same robbers. There are bands of them now crawling in the Near East, the Middle East, the Far East. Others are in Africa and Latin America. I think we will be showing ourselves internationally prayerful men and an internationally prayerful Nation if we show a willingness to stop on the road along the broad highway of political and economic prosperity long enough to assist these nations. In fact, I would say that what this world needs more than anything else today is an awareness of its own unity, and admission of the fact that not only men but also nations are brothers, that we have a right to expect another nation to assist us if we fall among robbers.

The alarming fact is that almost half the world today is being taught to put its hope in the robbers.

This is not the time nor the place to discuss political implications of this international fact, but this much I will say: prayer is not sufficient. We must, as a gentleman told me some time ago, pray as if it all depended upon God and act as if it all depended on ourselves. When we have done this on an international level, we shall indeed be good samaritans, indeed men of prayer, indeed religious men. I think a thousand years from now men will speak of our goodness as a nation just as we recall today the goodness of the man who helped another man on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho.

Speaking of prayer, one of the most inspiring prayers I ever heard was offered by President Eisenhower during his inauguration.

When I learned that this prayer was written in the presidential suite of the Statler Hotel the morning of the inauguration, I had it inscribed on a silver plaque.

I would like to present this plaque, together with the desk and the chair, to you, Mr. President, with our best wishes for your continued good health and happiness.

President Eisenhower. I am afraid the applause of you kind people doesn't speak well for Senator CARLSON's discipline over you.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Hilton and my friends, this is a touching thing which Mr. Hilton has done in presenting to me this plaque and the desk and the chair from which I wrote the little prayer that I used at the inauguration some 3 years ago.

That incident brought to me a great message. It seemed to me a perfectly natural thing to do. I was seeking some way to impress upon the audience at that moment that all of us realized a new chief executive would be inaugurated over a nation that was founded on a religious faith. Our founding documents so state in explaining our Government and what we intended to do.

In the Declaration of Independence are found references to the Creator which gave us certain rights in our Government, and it was set up to sustain them. That seemed to me a perfectly natural thing to do as a method of showing that I also believed.

It was with some astonishment that I began to see this response. Literally thousands of messages came in, some of them from people who did not particularly think I was the man to occupy that place. They still applauded that act.

Here is the lesson, as I see it. I know very few men, very few people, who tell me they are atheists or agnostics. But we find among the laity a curious diffidence in merely stating the fact that they believe that there is a God and He is more powerful than they and they depend upon him.

That is what the prayer was for. It was because a layman did do so, and of course in such a position, that this response came in.

I think that prayer is somewhat related to these prayer breakfasts. We can pray in our quarters, but we can also come to gatherings occasionally—and I understand this whole meeting is a week long—announcing to the world that we come as laymen and meet, making the same acknowledgment that was made in that prayer and doing exactly the same thing. We are telling people that this Nation is still a Nation under God. This is terrifically important today.

There has been too much of the world that believes the United States to be completely materialistic, boastful, proud, and arrogant. It makes no difference how they have achieved that understanding or how they have been misinformed in order to achieve such a belief. Traveler after traveler has reported the same thing.

It is meetings such as this, continual, repeated, that has helped to dispel this very great illusion. It still is a nation that is founded on a religious faith with great concern for the sentiments and compassion and mercy that Mr. Hilton so elegantly spoke about. That is what we want others to think about when they think of the United States.

People have talked about the spirit of Geneva. The thing that the spirit of Geneva did accomplish and that so far has not been destroyed is that people in watching that conference gained the belief that the United States was truly trying to follow the footsteps and the principles of religion and to establish a just peace for the world. That is a tremendous gain in this day of fear, hysteria, and a sometimes too great reliance on force.

I believe, if I am not misquoting, that even the Bible says when a strong man is armed he keepeth his palace. We intend to remain strong, but let us always do it with the certainty that anyone who comes in integrity, observing the moral values that we know are imbedded in this great religious faith, will be received as a friend and taken with us down the road to future happiness.

I had no intention of making a speech. As a matter of fact, I was promised I didn't have to, and I don't know how I got started.

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. President. We appreciate not only your presence but your statements this morning.

We will now be favored with a solo by Mr. Fague Springman.

(Solo.)

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Springman, for that beautiful solo.

Over this Nation there are a number of prayer breakfast groups that meet weekly in many cities, held by businessmen, industrial leaders, Government officials, and professional people.

At the United States Capitol every week we have 2 prayer groups that meet, 1 in the United States Senate and 1 in the House of Representatives. This morning we are going to have short greetings from representatives of these two groups, from the Senate group the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS, and from the House group, the Congresman from the State of Florida, Mr. MATTHEWS.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hilton, and distinguished guests, it is my special privilege to bring you greetings from the Senate breakfast group which, as Senator CARLSON has said, meets in the Senate restaurant on Wednesday morning of each week where from 12 to 20 Members of the Senate meet for a brief social period around the breakfast table and then for a few minutes of prayer and the exchange of spiritual experiences.

Let me commend the idea to this great council at its present meeting, to your leadership in forming more of these groups.

I came here a few years ago, as everyone else, at first overwhelmed by invitations to come to breakfast, to lunch, to dinner, to this and that, and I was tired of all of it. And finally someone said, "Come to breakfast next Wednesday morning and we will discuss spiritual matters." I had already determined to refuse until that last clause but came on the strength of it.

I found a great source of strength from week to week and year to year, where men meet together under the responsibilities and burdens of making decisions for many millions of people without party lines or sectionalism or partisanship or denominationalism. Their exchange of ideas all proves to be a great source of spiritual and also moral strength. I think that applies with equal force to business leaders, professional men and women, groups everywhere throughout this great land.

I am personally grateful, as we all are, for your fine leadership in this great work so far. I commend it most highly to your dedicated services throughout this great land in giving us more groups that gain strength from each other, wisdom and power, and pass it on to others.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. President and friends. I would like to bring you greetings from our House breakfast group. I would like to say that it is perhaps the most perfect example of nonpartisan activity in Congress. The only inevitable rule of organization that we have is that if the president be a Republican the vice president must be a Democrat. I cannot indulge my political preference before such a wonderful group, but let me say that next year the president will be a distinguished Republican.

I would like, in telling you a little about our particular group, to give you several statements that I have heard made by my colleagues, some forty, who come every Thursday morning, some hundred who come irregularly.

One of my colleagues said in a wonderful talk one day that too much has been said about what has been said about what Jesus said and not enough has been said about what He said.

Then on another occasion a colleague said that Christ never went to Rome to get a law passed, that he realized that only as you change the hearts of men can this world be saved.

On another occasion a distinguished colleague said, "I try to make as a daily part of my life the practice of praying for the people that I pass in the streets. I see those who are troubled and weary, and instead of thinking about my own burdens I pray for them."

Then I think another colleague summed it up so wonderfully when he said that of all the experiences he had had in the Congress—and he has had a distinguished career—he has felt that the experiences of our House breakfast group have been those that have meant the most to him.

I think these experiences mean so much to us because they do resolve tensions. We do have the spirit of spiritual fellowship. We do, I think, become more confirmed with the fact that although in this day of ours we are faced with Golgotha we also stand at Kadesch. The good Lord says to you and to me, "Come, look, and see this land which I have prepared for you."

Finally, I think we are confirmed as we meet together humbly, craving unanimity as we do, because we recognize the personal intimacy of man's relationship with his God, we realize that in this weary world of ours we can gain strength through prayer and fellowship to rise to those occasions which will make us superior to our embodiment. After all, that is the real promise of the spiritual life.

Senator CARLSON. Thank you.

We are now going to be favored with a personal testimony of one of our outstanding Christian laymen who is devoting much of his time to the work of God. He is a successful businessman. I now present to you Mr. Howard E. Butt, Jr., of Texas.

Mr. BUTT, Mr. President, Senator CARLSON, ladies and gentlemen, last Saturday night H. L. Mencken died in his Baltimore home. He was a great scholar, a scintillating writer, known as the magnificent dissenter. He was famed for his caustic wit and his biting cynicism.

Mr. Mencken regarded faith in God as a pious but unsupported sentimentality. He called faith the illogical belief in improbable occurrences. To many, in a sense, H. L. Mencken's death will be regarded as a fresh signification of the end of an era, for the intellectual climate of H. L. Mencken's day was a climate of skepticism and unbelief. Doubt was popular and a sure sign of culture and enlightenment was the sophisticated scholar.

You recall the story of the American soldiers in France on leave who made a tour of one of those magnificent French cathedrals. The priests showed them a sacred shrine, a niche of that great cathedral, and showed them a candle burning there. He gestured and then in tones of hushed reverence and awe he said, "There has been a candle burning in this shrine continuously for over 300 years."

The American GI nudged his buddy and said, "There has been a candle burning there for over 300 years continuously" and he blew it out. He said, "It is out now." And somehow that characterized that age in American life, a generation of candle blowers who felt it smart to snuff out sacred flames of faith, faith in God, faith in old truths, old principles, the old Book.

But in our day that has changed. The climate is different, perhaps not totally but certainly obviously and basically the climate is changed for the climate of our day is one

of searching and praying and finding. It is an atmosphere of faith.

What produced that? World War II with its consequences militarily and scientifically that have been evolved.

You recall when a British lord stood at the close of the First World War before the British House of Lords and spoke of the bright optimism and quoting from Shelley he said, "The world's great age begins anew, the golden years return."

He was wrong. Those words have a sardonic ring now for the golden years did not return. The bloody years returned. Why? Because we had been deceived into thinking the optimism of Coue, that every day in every way we were getting better and better and we had neglected those basic truths that the Bible so clearly enunciates about human nature.

We came up short to realize that once we encounter what God has revealed about human nature we know that there is something basically wrong with the human race and that the problem of the world is the problem of the human spirit. When we realize that our problems are spiritual, that they demand a spiritual solution, suddenly it dawns freshly on our generation that the way out is the way up, and consequently in these last 10 years there has been a great sweeping wave of spiritual interest.

The signs have been magnificently hopeful. The churches are crowded. They grow with marvelous rapidity. Great preachers have captured the attention of the American people. Our best selling books are religious books. A nostalgia for God has somehow gripped countless millions, a search for some sure haven of rest for the soul in the midst of a stormy day; and for that we give our humble thanks.

But the peril lies precisely here, that the people of God in America, that the people who name the name of Jesus Christ in this land, will regard what has happened thus far as a victory rather than an opportunity. This spiritual awareness is a preliminary victory, but basically it is a golden opportunity and if we relax in some sort of self-congratulation or if we pause right on the ramparts of conquest in half-heartedness and ease, then we pass our opportunity to make this America's greatest spiritual renaissance.

Someone has said that on the plains of hesitation leach the bones of countless millions who on the dawn of victory sat down to rest, and resting, died.

Our opportunity is the opportunity to dedicate ourselves regardless of the personal cost to the principles we know to be right for the Lord that we know to be God.

Three years ago President Eisenhower stood at his inauguration, his finger resting on those sacred words from the scripture that speak to us freshly today with sure promise but with strong demand, "If My people who are called by My name will humble themselves and pray and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven and forgive their sins and heal their land."

Some years ago someone said of the Polish nation that two forces strive for control of Poland, communism and Christianity, that whichever one becomes a flame of fire will capture Poland. And communism had its flame of fire and Christianity had no flame. The passion, the dedication, the sacrifice, and the consecration of these who are dedicated to atheistic materialism calls us afresh to say that we must commit ourselves in a devotion that is fresh and new and complete to Jesus Christ and his righteousness.

The statement of one of our great religious movements is, "It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness." It is not enough that we are no longer candle blowers; it is essential that within our lives individually and collectively we light a flame, that we strike that match of the flame of faith in our own hearts by individual repentance from sin and commitment to Jesus Christ.

We dedicate ourselves to a premise of the word of God, that only Jesus Christ can transform human nature. We consecrate ourselves. We dedicate ourselves afresh today to Him who is our hope for personal peace and for the peace of our world, and somehow as we light that flame of faith the torch of liberty will burn more brightly in this land than it has ever burned before.

Our great heritage will be rekindled again for our generation, even more brightly than before. "Long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light. Protect us by Thy might, great God our King."

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Butt.

I just wish to state that for the next 2 or 3 days this conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership is going to hear messages by clergymen and laymen from all over the country and the world.

We are going to close with a prayer by the executive secretary of the international council, Mr. Abraham Vereide.

Mr. VEREIDE. O God, our Father, we thank Thee for this hour together. We humbly thank Thee for our President, his Cabinet, our Congress, the courts, and the officials of the departments and agencies of this Government. We present them now to Thee, O God of infinite mercy, justice, and truth. Grant unto them the spirit of wisdom and power for every hour.

We thank Thee for these representatives of the International Council for Christian Leadership with their many groups throughout this land and other countries.

We thank Thee for this country, a haven of refuge, a place of opportunity for people from every land.

God grant that we may increasingly learn how to live together according to Thy plan in mutuality and concord. For the nations of the earth and leadership everywhere, especially those assembled before Thee, we pray.

Forgive, O God, our sins, and save us, for Jesus' sake. Cleanse us from headiness and pretense, pride, and all unreality, and so invade us by Thy spirit that we may in true dedication and implicit faith and love be an inspiration to our people and a blessing to mankind and an honor to Thy holy name. To this, O merciful Father, we now dedicate ourselves to Thee. By Thy grace may we arise to every difficulty and go forward courageously in Thy victory.

(This was followed by the Lord's Prayer in unison.)

The Arrogance of Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a part of the continuing discussion of Mr. Dulles' controversial article in Life magazine, a thoughtful and provocative editorial appears in the New Republic for January 23, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARROGANCE OF MR. DULLES

At long last the Eisenhower administration has officially conceded that on 3 occasions during the last 3 years it has as a matter of deliberate policy brought the United States and the world to the verge of nuclear war. "Of course we were brought to the verge of war," Secretary Dulles is quoted as saying in words that he acknowledges are his own: "The ability to get to the verge without getting into war is the necessary art." In defense of his policy of avoiding war by threatening war, Mr. Dulles adds: "On the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa, we walked to the brink of war and looked it in the face."

These phrases are published in the January 11 issue of Life in an article which the editors first described as "an exclusive interview" with Secretary Dulles. The material is presented for political reasons, for the author, James Shepley notes, "Dulles' direction of United States foreign affairs is under attack these days as the presidential year gets underway." The information, in Life's opinion, "bulwarks the substantial case to be made for Dulles." Mr. Dulles seems to share this opinion. Most Americans may disagree.

The news that Dulles advocated and Eisenhower authorized the bombardment with nuclear weapons of nations with whom we were at peace is startling to voters led by Mr. Dulles' Republican associates to identify wars exclusively with Democratic administrations.

In some alarm, Republican politicians as belligerent as Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND are insisting that the dispute aroused by the Life article is a sham battle over words, "a tempest in a teapot" according according to Vice President NIXON. But this argument is not reassuring. Mr. Dulles has set forth frankly the spirit which has governed the conduct of the United States overseas under Eisenhower, and which still governs today. There are frantic boasts in the Life article, unfounded claims and distortions of history calculated to increase Mr. Dulles' domestic prestige while overseas the friendly governments, well aware of the truth, are weakened and deeply offended. These distortions wil be brought to light if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sets the record straight by publishing Mr. Dulles' own past testimony, given in executive session. Why, for example, should Mr. Dulles claim today that the Indochina settlement is a diplomatic triumph for his diplomacy, when at the time he described it to the Senate as a tragic advance for world communism? And how can he insist that his threats of atomic bombardment transmitted to Peking by the unwitting Mr. Nehru brought the Chinese Communists to heel within 2 weeks when Nehru himself maintains that he never passed the Dulles threats along?

But past concerns are secondary in importance. For the brilliant victories which Mr. Dulles claims to have won by threatening war are far from secured. On the Chinese coastal islands, if not in the two other areas of conflict, Mr. Dulles may, within 3 months, lead the United States back to the verge of war—and beyond the verge when the Chinese Communists decline to be deterred by his threats of atomic bombardment.

For this reason it is necessary to treat the Life article in terms of the policy that stands until it is repudiated by President Eisenhower. The first characteristic of this policy, in our opinion, is that it is formulated and carried out by Mr. Dulles in a personal, almost autocratic way. Thus the title of Life's article is in itself revealing. It is: Three Times at the Brink of War: How Dulles Gambled and Won. This title, so appalling in its implications, is amply justified by the article itself which Mr. Dulles or

his chosen representative read in advance of publication and approved.

It was Dulles, according to Life, who radically revised the containment policy of the Truman administration; Dulles who altered drastically the basic concept of the job of Secretary of State. It was Dulles, who, loyal to his new concept, conceived of the idea of employing the threat of war as a deterrent, although the fervor of his righteous wrath can hardly be imagined, were the Russians to use the same tactics. It was Dulles who three times proposed walking to the brink; Dulles who drafted the resolution which Congress obediently adopted, giving President Eisenhower a free hand to go to war against 500 million Chinese. These feats, according to Life, amount of the greatest display of personal diplomacy since the great days of the Franklin-Adams-Jefferson triumvirate in the Europe of the 1780's.

It may be that even Life magazine cannot insure that in future generations the name of John Foster Dulles will take its place beside those of Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson. But, in this, Life is right: Dulles in his gambles has wielded personal power that those modest men would have trembled in approaching. Life fails only to identify the new and terrifying ingredient in Mr. Dulles' personal power—his ability, subject only to the veto of Mr. Eisenhower, to order human destruction by means of atomic bombs.

It was Eisenhower according to the Life interview who decided on the tactical use of atomic arms in Korea if the Communists tried to continue keeping the U. N. command and the United States bogged down in stalemate. It was Dulles who characteristically put this decision to the service of his personal diplomacy.

Again Life tells us, when colonial France seemed close to ruin in Indochina, it was Dulles in a new display of personal diplomacy who sent bombers armed with atomic weapons to the South China Sea in a classic show of force. Thus, Life informs us, instead of negotiating from the extreme and undisguised weakness of the French position, Mendés-France and Eden found themselves able to bargain from Dulles' strength.

Once again, Life tells us, "Dulles faced war" in 1954 and 1955 when Communist China attempted to regain the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Again we are left to conclude it was Dulles' personal diplomacy in brandishing atomic weapons that caused the Chinese Communists to desist. These claims, in the opinion of many informed men, are utterly unfounded. More important, however, is the fact that without doubt Dulles himself believes them and seems certain to employ the same methods again, in further displays of personal atomic diplomacy—that is, unless he is checked.

Among the nations of the world the United States alone has employed atomic power in the indiscriminate destruction of human life. We acted thus twice in wartime against a powerful and undefeated foe. Justified as our action seemed at the time, it has been one of the strongest of influences in swinging millions of people overseas away from the United States in spite of our pretensions of morality. Mr. Dulles, a leading Christian layman, apparently finds nothing wrong in employing atomic weapons in behalf of objectives that are neither vital to our existence nor well supported by our allies, nor sustained by the United Nations, nor firmly grounded in international law. He finds nothing wrong in arrogating to himself the power to use these weapons in the display of personal diplomacy. For that, most certainly, is what he has done, and promises to do again.

Our allies, the Life interview confirms, were informed only at the last minute of Mr. Dulles' plan to threaten atomic bombardment of Viet-Minh; on Korea and Formosa Life fails to indicate that they were consulted at all. Congress, in a similar matter, was not told of Mr. Dulles' secret intentions and, if Life's newest version of the Dulles years is accurate, was misinformed.

On the matter of the Chinese coastal islands Congress and the Nation were kept wholly in the dark as to whether a Chinese attack upon Quemoy and Matsu would or would not be interpreted as an attack upon Formosa, thereby involving the United States in a war with China. Now Mr. Dulles acknowledges as accurate Life's statement that he never doubted that Eisenhower would have regarded an attack on Quemoy and the Matsus as an attack on Formosa. In other words we are now to praise Mr. Dulles and the President because they concealed from the Nation their intention to use the power that Congress so rashly granted them to enlarge a minor effort by China to recover its own territories, into a probable world war.

The power to involve the world in war is the most fearsome power that any man may hold. Mr. Dulles may claim it for himself: the world will not easily acquiesce. Because the penalties of error are so enormous the American people have in the past raised formidable barriers against involving us in war. In turn the alliances of other nations with the United States have been predicated on the knowledge that under our system of government it has not been possible for one man to gamble as Mr. Dulles now boasts he has gambled. So far, certainly, the precarious peace has been preserved. But if Mr. Dulles had lost, and world war, fought with nuclear weapons had followed, would Americans or their allies have concluded that they had been accorded the choice that is the right of free men?

"You have to take chances for peace," Life quotes Mr. Dulles as affirming. That goes without saying. The task of diplomacy, above all in a time of nuclear weapons, is to take no chances that are not necessary and, when they are necessary, to make certain that they are evaluated and accepted by the American people and their allies. But Mr. Dulles apparently has an addiction to gambling; and a predilection for close-to-the-chest poker. The corrected draft of the Life article that was first distributed to the press records that when the Secretary journeyed to India to induce Nehru to relay Dulles' threat of atomic bombardment to Peking he went "under the cover of the first good will visit of the new United States Secretary of State." The point is deliberately obscured in the published article, but the point remains.

If there is an open way and an undercover way of attaining the same objective, Dulles' whole instinct directs him to the second course. Concealment, maneuver, even deception are all ingredients of what Mr. Dulles calls the necessary art. It is the art of Machiavelli, and for all his lifelong training and his legal skill Mr. Dulles forgets one thing—that Machiavelli died in chains.

No man, we repeat, should assume the power that Mr. Dulles boasts of employing in his gambles, least of all one who prefers the devious to the direct. An alert and active President is the one sure check upon his errors: Mr. Eisenhower is no such check today, nor is he likely to be again. Despite the untold damage it has done the United States abroad, the Life article serves a purpose if it alerts this Nation to the danger that has commanded scarely a glance until now. Adlai Stevenson was harsh but essentially accurate in declaring that Dulles has been playing Russian roulette with the lives of every one of us. How many more times will we hear the trigger click?

Tribute to Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a great Virginian, a great American, and a great humanitarian, was honored today when a representative of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission placed a wreath on the tomb of the late President Wilson in the National Cathedral. This act was performed, most appropriately, by another distinguished Virginian, who, like the late President, is a native of Staunton, and who is serving as chairman of the executive committee of the celebration commission.

Maj. Gen. E. Walton Opie has added to a courageous and distinguished record of military service an outstanding performance as editor and manager of the two Staunton daily newspapers, and as a leader in civic enterprises. He is an editorial writer whose analyses of current problems I have followed with deep respect and admiration.

At the cathedral exercises today he compressed into a few words the ideals and achievements of Woodrow Wilson which are significant for our day and generation. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have General Opie's remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following is a tribute to Woodrow Wilson at services in the National Cathedral commemorating the anniversary of his birth, by Maj. Gen. E. Walton Opie (retired), upon placing wreath on the Wilson Tomb, February 3, 1956. General Opie is chairman of the United States Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission:

"It is with humbleness that we enter today the radiant light of the tomb where rests one of the noblest leaders of mankind. The spirit which once dwelt in the mortal shell enshrined in this sacred edifice lives on to inspire new generations.

"A new birth has been given to Woodrow Wilson's aspirations for peace, world order, and brotherhood. The time will come when his full vision, the march toward which was slowed only by the blindness and fears of others, becomes a reality. Right and justice will yet rule the world, and wars will be no more.

"Such were the goals of Wilson. He climbed toward them with steps which never faltered, though at last the body proved unequal to the demands of the spirit.

"We know that this man drew his inspiration from God, of whom he learned at his mother's knee and whose will and ways his reverend father taught him. He lived close to God throughout his days, and found in him the faith, the courage, and the wisdom which won him place among the world's immortals.

"As we observe the centennial of Woodrow Wilson's birth, and today the anniversary of his passing, it is well to think of how thoroughly he prepared himself for the tasks destiny set him. It is well to recall his unfailing adherence to principles, though compromising when need be as to methods.

We should ponder, too, his love for mankind, his selflessness, and the achievements which flowed from these attributes—laws which blessed this country with new freedom and better government; the successful prosecution of what was then the most all-embracing war in history; the crystallization of all people's longing for freedom, self-government, and peace; the launching of the "parliament of man," which, until Wilson, was but the figment of imagination.

"Yes, we stand in a brilliant light today in what some would call the shadows of a tomb. Millions of Americans will become better acquainted this centennial year with the greatness and nobility that were Wilson's. Thus they will be better Christian citizens—some of them leaders strong in the spirit of this son of Virginia.

"St. Paul said: 'Death is swallowed up in victory.' Those words were never truer than they are of Woodrow Wilson, whose victory is of both the world and the spirit."

The Al Sarena Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two editorials and a letter which recently were published in certain Oregon newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Capital Journal of January 27, 1956]

WHY SARENA PATENT WAS ISSUED

If there is anyone around Doug McKay's hometown who still takes seriously the attempt to make him appear dishonest in the southern Oregon Sarena mining claim case we hope he reads the résumé of a statement by Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, to a congressional subcommittee on the front page of yesterday's Capital Journal.

Davis said the case went through routine channels in the Department as do thousands of others in such an enormous agency and that McKay did not know about it until after the decision had been made. Davis took full responsibility for the decision.

Davis pointed out that the law, passed back in the 1870's, provides that a patent must be issued upon application to one who has proved to be a valid discoverer of minerals, upon which he has staked a claim and has done $500 worth of work. The Sarena claims date back to 1897 and far more than that amount of work has been done on them.

The abuse is in the law. When it was originally passed timber was not considered a factor because it had little value. Nobody took out patents then because of the timber. When the timber became valuable—it became very valuable about 1940—the law should have been changed. The New Deal-Fair Deal administrations controlled the Government for many years after that. Their attention repeatedly called to the loophole that permitted valuable timber to be lost to the Government. But the mining interests objected and nothing was done. The real blame rests on Congress, not upon officials who are bound by the laws Congress passes.

The Eisenhower administration has closed this loophole, but the change in the law could not be made retroactive. There are probably a number of other Sarena cases if anyone wants to go through the records, for where loopholes are left someone is sure to crawl through them.

[From the Portland Sunday Oregonian of January 29, 1956]

AL SARENA SHOWDOWN

When the Department of Interior finally got around to making its case in defense of shotgun accusations of give-away in the Al Sarena mining-timber case, the controversy was narrowed to this single question:

Was there, or was there not, sufficient mineralization of the 15 disputed claims to justify the issuing of patents to the applicants, the McDonald family?

And this is a question, of course, which cannot be answered unless the case is reopened and new assays taken in which all parties to the controversy may impose full confidence. Even then, the disputants might not agree. What constitutes sufficient mineralization to authorize prudent investment in mining will always be a matter of varied opinion.

The testimony before the Senate committee of Clarence A. Davis, former Solicitor and now Under Secretary of Interior, was that he alone made the decision to grant the patents, and that the mining law as it then existed was complied with. It was that law, and not the patents themselves, to which the Oregonian objected when Al Sarena first became news. The law subsequently has been changed to give the Government the opportunity to harvest valuable timber on mining claims not needed for construction in the mining.

The weak point in the entire case is the fact that the patents were granted on the basis of assays made by a firm selected by the patent applicants and accepted by the Bureau of Mines, without other substantiating assays. As for political pressure, both Republican and Democrat Members of Congress are on record as urging the Department of Interior to clear up a case which had been pending under the Truman administration for 5 years.

Certain Democrats have made a vigorous effort to convert the Al Sarena case into a scandal reflecting against Secretary McKay and the Eisenhower administration. This has gone to the point of planting a story in the receptive Drew Pearson column of Presidential intervention which the White House denounces as a "scurrilous falsehood."

But the essential fact is that if the claims showed enough mineral promise the Government had no other choice than to issue patents under the law. If there is still controversy, it can only be ended by taking new samples and getting new assays.

[From the Portland Oregonian of January 28, 1956]

AL SARENA TESTIMONY

To the EDITOR:

The Oregonian contained a New York Times report on the Al Sarena inquiry which requires clarification in the interest of accuracy.

First, the story indicated the committee held "many more hours" of hearings in Oregon on Al Sarena. That is false. The issue was raised in Portland just before the committee decamped and there was no opportunity for rebuttal testimony. Witnesses who desired to testify were advised they could do so in Washington, D. C.

Second, the report indicated that GOP strategy is confined largely to shouting that the probe is politically inspired. A reading of the committee testimony and the statements made by Republican members of the committee would prove the allegation false.

At the Portland hearing, Congressman HOFFMAN entered into the record a series of six articles and an editorial on the Al Sarena question published in the nationally respected Eugene Register-Guard. The articles showed that the Department of Interior under Secretary McKay had acted in accordance with laws enacted by Congress. The editorial summed up the six articles and disproved the irresponsible charges raised by certain political partisans.

When the hearing reopened in Washington, Congressman HOFFMAN reviewed the charges and quoted facts and figures to disprove them. Most Oregon papers received copies of the three-page, single-spaced statement of the Congressman.

The overwhelming bulk of his statement dealt with the factual aspects of the question; only a small portion contained any reference to the poltical aspect.

Republicans should not be blamed if the press reports give more space to the charges than the rebuttal offered by GOP members of the committee. To settle the issue, the committee should hear testimony from the owners of Al Sarena (most of whom are Democrats), former Interior Secretary Chapman, Senator KEFAUVER (who interceded for the applicants) and the Democrat leader who offered to handle the Al Sarena application for a $10,000 fee.

WENDELL WYATT,
Chairman, Republican State Central Committee of Oregon.

The Midwest and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part II of an article entitled "A Time for Praise," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., part II being entitled "The Midwest and West."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIME FOR PRAISE

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

PART II. THE MIDWEST AND WEST

1. First Baptist Church, Tucson, and Dr. Richard Sidney Beal

This great congregation at Tucson, Ariz., was organized on April 7, 1881, under the direction of Dr. Uriah Gregory. The original deacons were called trustees, and were Dr. Gregory, C. M. K. Paulison, Ben Goodrich, Ed S. Dodge, and Charles D. Poston (known as the father of Arizona). The charter members were Dr. Gregory, Mrs. Alice L. Gregory, Edwin S. Dodge, Lelia Dodge, Alice Samuel, and Briggs Goodrich. The name of the church has never changed.

The pastors have been Dr. Uriah Gregory (1881–88), M. M. Hitchcock (1888), C. A. Buchanan (1890), H. M. Bell (1895–97), H. P. Aulick (1897–98), J. B. Thomas (1899–1903), D. Carl Williams (1903–08), E. H. Hicks (1909), Thomas C. James (1909), J. P. Burroughs (1909–12), R. L. Sproles (1912–16), Dr. J. H. Clifford (1916–17), and Dr. R. S. Beal since February 24, 1918. During the years 1890 to 1895, there was no paster, but Rochester Ford, a St. Louis lawyer, maintained services. Reverend Hicks and Reverend James died in office, and Reverend Williams is the only living former pastor, and he resides in San Francisco, Calif.

When Dr. Beal arrived at the First Baptist Church, it was very small; now it has 3,361 members. There were more than 200 converts last year, with 99 baptisms. The current budget is $168,339.55. There are 11 paid employees. During Dr. Beal's tenure 184 youth entered the ministry and mission field. The buildings have been built under his leadership, and the property is valued at $1,500,000.

During his pastorate, the church has established 19 missions. Eleven of these have become separate and independent churches, and the 12th is in the process of taking this step. The church has published 10 volumes of the pastor's sermons under the general heading of Rivers in the Desert. Each volume contains 52 sermons, and they have had worldwide circulation. Dr. Beal has also written many articles that have appeared in Christian publications here and abroad.

No Christian would doubt that Dr. Beal is listed in Who's Who in America. He has an outstanding family too. Not only does he have a wonderful Missouri wife, but he has the following children who are all godly: Dr. R. E. Beal, Jr., professor of theology in the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colo., who is also an authority in the field of entomology; Mrs. Robert B. Thieme, Jr., wife of Reverend Thieme, pastor, Barachah Bible Church, Houston, Tex.; Dr. Charles B. Beal, a Harvard-trained physician who, with his wife, are missionaries to the Ivory Coast of French West Africa, under the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society; Rev. David P. Beal, who was educated at Wheaton College and Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, pastor, First Baptist Church, Nogales, Ariz.; and Mrs. Ridgely O. Ryan, whose husband is Lieutenant Colonal Ryan, a Baptist preacher who plans to enter the Baptist ministry when he is released from the Air Force. He is not a chaplain, but he preaches each Sunday. All of the children are sound in the faith and have never given their parents one anxious moment.

The church has a fine church staff, missionaries, and evangelists. One of the deacons, Frank Dawson, gives Dr. Beal a new Dodge each year. The University Baptist Student Center is owned and supported by the church.

Thank you Lord for Dr. Richard S. Beal and the First Baptist Church of Tucson.

2. Beth Eden Baptist Church and Dr. Sam Bradford

This congregation was organized as the Homer Avenue Baptist Church and dedicated on December 8, 1892. It was composed of 27 charter memebrs. It was actually organized on January 13, 1893. It was admitted into the Rocky Mountain Association during November 1893. The name was later changed to the Beth-Eden Centenary Baptist Church.

The pastors have been: Charles H. Walker, Arthur De V. Carpenter, John L. Beyl, J. W. Cabeen, William S. Callaway, Adrian D. Berry, W. A. Daniel, Francis W. Starring, E. B. Hart, and Sam Bradford since December 1936.

Dr. Bradford was born on February 14, 1903, in a log cabin deep in the Ozark Mountains of Missouri. When he was 1 month old, his mother dedicated him to the gospel ministry. He was ordained on October 30, 1930. He professed Christ when he was 11, and was baptized into the membership of the Pinecreek Baptist Church. His call to the ministry came in 1922, but he resisted God for 8 years. His first pastorate was at Casa Granda, Ariz. Later he was called to Douglas, Ariz.

The new church budget is $105,890. The last report (1954–55) for a single year gave the following: 93 baptisms, 90 other gains, 1,794 membership, 766 average Sunday school attendance, and $24,011.29 for missions. The church is a member of the Conservative Baptist Association of Colorado.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. Sam Bradford and the Beth Eden Baptist Church of Denver, Colo.

3. Bales Baptist Church and Dr. Alvin George Hause

This Kansas City, Mo., congregation was organized on April 5, 1891, under the name of Bales Chapel. The following 25 people were charter members: Samuel E. Sandys, Charles W. Wright, Mrs. Susan Wright, Mrs. N. A. White, Miss Mina White, John H. Tinker, Mrs. J. H. Tinker, Miss Lizzie Tinker, Thomas B. Dale, Miss Mollie Given, Rufus Elliott, Frank M. Sutton, A. P. Johnson, Mrs. Eliza Jones, Mrs. M. J. Perry, R. E. Perry, A. D. Perry, Mrs. A. D. Perry, Miss Laura Perry, Mrs. Margaret Perry, Charles R. Huntington, Mrs. Laura Elliott, Miss May Elliott, Miss Nana Elliott, and Bryant Elliott.

The original deacons were: A. D. Perry, L. A. Howard, Joseph Elliott, George Zimmerman, and Samuel E. Sandys.

The pastors have been: William J. Williamson (1891–1901), Fred D. Hale (1901–02), Edwin B. Pratt (1903–04), H. H. Hulton (1904–05), Horace W. Cole (1907–15), Dr. W. T. Richardson (1915–16), O. P. Bishop (1917–23), Dr. D. L. Gross (1924), Dr. John W. Bradbury (1925–28), C. C. Cunningham (1929–32), and Dr. A. G. Hause since 1933. The name of the church was changed to the present title in 1909.

The present membership is 1,125, which is very selective. A person to remain as a member must remain active, hence no deadwood. There were 189 additions last year, with 76 baptized.

There are at the present time 60 deacons. The city is divided into 48 districts with a deacon over each district, contacting the members of their group every 3 months. The total church budget is $89,000, with one-half of this amount going to missions and benevolences. There are 6 full-time and 2 part-time employees.

Reverend Hause is one of the greatest ministers in Missouri and the Southern Baptist Convention. He is extremely sound in doctrine. His son, Dr. David Hause, has made a name for himself as his father's assistant, as pastor of the Maywood Baptist Church, and now as a leading minister in Oklahoma.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. A. G. Hause and Bales Baptist Church.

4. Trinity Methodist Church and Dr. Robert P. (Fighting Bob) Shuler

This Los Angeles, Calif., congregation was organized in 1869, by the Reverend Abram Adams. The first building was erected in 1875, while Rev. A. M. Campbell was pastor. The church was moved to a new building in 1884, while Rev. W. B. Stradley was pastor. Rev. A. C. Bane, as pastor, led in another move. While Rev. R. P. Howell was pastor, in 1912, the old building was removed and a new one built. The present building was purchased in 1919, while Dr. C. C. Selecman was pastor. Dr. R. P. Shuler became pastor in 1920 and remained until 1953. He retired then, because of a law of the church as to age.

There are about 1,800 members. The church budget is about $104,000. There are 10 employees, exclusive of the quartet. Four others receive small monthly amounts.

Dr. Shuler was born in Grayson County, Va. (Blue Ridge Mountains), August 4, 1880. He was educated at Emory and Henry (A. B. and D. D.), Asbury College (D. D.), and John Brown University (LL. D.). He married Nelle Reeves, of Johnson City, Tenn., on October 4, 1905. Their children are William Reeves, Dorothy, Robert Pierce, Jack Cornett, Nelle, Richard Clifton (deceased), Edward Hooper, and Phil Ross. Dr. Jack Shuler has greatly appealed to the writer as an evangelist.

Dr. Bob Shuler was ordained as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1904. He has been successively a pastor at Pocahontas, Norton, and Cumberland Gap, Va.; Elizabethtown and LaFollette, Tenn.; Grandview, Temple, Austin, and Paris, Tex.; and Los Angeles, Calif. At his final church, he was pastor of the largest Methodist Church west of the Mississippi River.

Dr. Shuler has been a successful author of articles and books. He was editor of Bob Shuler's Magazine, from March 1922 to June 1933, and he is now editor of the Methodist Challenge in Los Angeles.

Thank you, Lord, for Dr. Bob Shuler, Dr. Jack Shuler, and Trinity Methodist Church.

Thank you, Lord, for other Midwestern and Western religious leaders, among whom are Dr. and Mrs. Charles E. Fuller; the late Dr. W. B. Riley, of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, and founder of Northwestern Schools (now Northwestern College); Dr. Billy Graham, once president of Northwestern Schools and now a world evangelist; Dr. T. W. Medearis; Dr. Earl Harding; Dr. Richard V. Clearwaters; Dr. M. R. DeHaan; Dr. Merv Rosell; Dr. Louis T. Talbot; Dr. William P. Whitemore; and Dr. Cedric Peterson.

United States Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the present-day endeavor to inform the American people of facts bearing upon the subject of our merchant marine, it is refreshing to note that such a well-informed authority as President Francis T. Greene, of the American Merchant Marine Institute, has just stated his views in an article in the current issue of Marine News. Among other pertinent observations expressed in the article is a forthright explanation of the Butler-Tollefson Act, which I had the privilege of sponsoring in the 83d Congress. In order that this presentation of views might be available to the general public, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING, 1955–56

(By Francis T. Greene, president, American Merchant Marine Institute)

During 1955 the American merchant marine took the most concrete and ambitious steps since the war to insure its future vitality and efficiency—steps tending especially to replacing and upgrading present fleets, and to reinstating the coastwise and intercoastal trades. These steps raised some of the brightest hopes the industry has seen in recent years, but few of them had progressed beyond the status of plans and projects by the year's end.

Conversely, it was a year during which tonnage and trade figures continued to decline, though somewhat more slowly; when shipbuilding, though it had managed to claw off the rocks on which it was nearly wrecked, stayed much too close in for comfort; and when all marine activities under the United States flag continued to be haunted by old difficulties and new dangers.

At least one of the latter threatened its very survival, and still does at this writing.

Statistically, the privately owned merchant marine continued to shrink, though less rapidly than in 1954. As against the 101 oceangoing ships of 1,010,000 deadweight tons lost to the fleet in that 12-month period, the first 10 months of 1955 witnessed a net removal, for all causes, of only 48 vessels of 559,000 deadweight tons—leaving 1,087 ships of 13,695,779 deadweight tons on November 1. In contrast to the previous year's attrition, which consisted chiefly of dry-cargo and cargo-passenger ships, this year's was composed mainly of tankers, a category in which we had 34 fewer hulls on November 1 than on January 1. This decline was, however, partly illusory. Ten of the tankers involved were not real losses, since they were turned over to the Maritime Administration under trade-in-and-build agreements, whereby the owners are to build modern ships and receive allowances from the Government toward construction costs. Apart from these, 36 ships of all types were transferred or sold foreign, 6 scrapped, 6 forfeited to the Government, and 2 otherwise removed.

Of 12 ships added to the private fleet during the same period, 9 were *Mariner*-type freighters. These went into major fleet-improvement programs for 3 West Coast companies: Pacific Far East Lines, which took 3 from new construction; American President Lines, which purchased 4 from the Government and converted them for its round-the-world cargo service; and the Oceanic Steamship Company, which bought 2 for conversion to passenger liners for service to Australia. Two supertankers and one small oil carrier, all newly launched, completed the additions.

Besides the Oceanic conversions, due to be completed in 1956, a substantial number of passenger liner-building projects took tentative or final shape. Most definite of these were the 2 included in Moore-McCormack Lines' very extensive ship-replacement agreement with the Maritime Administration. Destined to replace the veteran "good neighbor ships" *Argentina* and *Brazil* on the run to the South American east coast, these 18,000-ton sisterships were under construction by the end of the year. Almost as well along were two 15,000-ton ships planned by the Grace Line to replace their *Santa Paula* and *Santa Rosa*. Early orders are also expected for 4 passenger-cargo ships which stand at the head of APL's fleet replacement plans. At least 4 other additions may be made to the passenger section of the Merchant Marine from Government sources in 1956. Congress has authorized the sale of the P2-type *LaGuardia* to the Hawaiian Steamship Co. and of the prewar Pacific liner *Monterey* to Matson, both to augment service to Hawaii. Arnold Bernstein, successful prewar Atlantic operator, has undertaken to purchase and convert a Mariner, if his pending subsidy application is granted. And APL, late in the year, applied for permission to charter the MSTS transport *General Daniel I. Sultan*, to supplement the trans-Pacific service of her sisterships *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson*.

This good news in the passenger field comes none too soon. The shockingly low state, quantitatively, of the American-flag liner fleet—40 active and 5 inactive ships at the start of 1955, as against 151 in September 1939—worsened steadily as the year advanced. By scrapping, or transferring to foreign flags, vessels which although overage were still capable of giving good service, we cut the active passenger fleet to 39, and no inactive vessels in the fleet, making a loss of 6 ships. In this process, the last vestiges of our large prewar fleet of deepwater costal liners were liquidated.

Throughout the year the issue of MSTS competition with privately owned American shipping occupied the attention of official agencies and commercial groups. The basic questions were as to the military validity of Defense Department determinations of nucleus fleet requirements, the economic consequences of having a large number of merchant-type vessels handling passengers and freight which in any previous peacetime period would necessarily have been commercially transported, and the political sense of maintaining this Government-owned fleet while at the same time financial aid to private shipping was deemed necessary and vessels owned by another arm of the Government, the Maritime Administration, were forbidden by law to compete with the private fleet.

Early in the year, the Hoover Commission task force dealing with Government transportation agencies sounded a keynote when it reported that the United States in effect had two competing merchant marines, and could not afford to do so. It recommended that the nucleus fleet be held at a realistic minimum and that maximum use of private facilities be made for Government transportation business.

Following this cue, committees of both Houses of Congress gave renewed attention to the problem. Some MSTS vessels were placed in inactive status and it was hoped that the goals set by the Hoover Commission would soon be achieved. However, in October, the situation was such as to evoke criticism from two national organizations actively concerned with shipping problems, the Propeller Club of the United States, and the American Legion.

Answering these criticisms, an MSTS spokesman asserted that its operations had been curtailed to the point where the naval agency was no longer a competitor of private shipping but its best customer. As supporting evidence, he gave current strength figures on the MSTS fleet, which showed that it had in active use 16 dry-cargo freighters, 33 tankers, and 47 transports, besides 91 specialized vessels of various types. In most categories these totals did bear a small ratio to commercial ships of comparable type. However, the enumeration called attention to two striking facts. One was the very large number of passenger-type vessels being operated by this governmental agency at a time when the privately owned American passenger fleet was at its lowest numerical level in history. The other was that, almost a year and a half after Congress enacted the MSTS tanker law, with the aim of providing a substantial amount of privately owned tonnage for long-term charter to the Government, no significant progress had been made toward effectuating this legislation. Yet, the 15 large, speedy tankers which it envisaged could probably, if built, have taken the place of well over half of the present MSTS-owned tankers.

But the foremost problems for the American shipping industry have arisen in connection with the Butler-Tollefson, or 50–50, Act (Public Law 664). This legislation has been persistently attacked in those foreign countries which have substantial merchant marines in competition with ours. Shrewdly and plausibly, the attackers have couched their arguments in such terms as to appeal to the one segment of the American electorate which, if convinced, would be most influential in securing the law's modification or repeal. That is, of course, the farm segment, and the theme of the propaganda addressed to it has been that the 50–50 law clashes with another measure in which it has a special interest, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480).

In brief, the provisions of these acts follow: Public Law 664 amended the Merchant Marine Act to include the 50–50 rule in permanent maritime legislation. It requires at least half the cargo resulting from government-financed transactions — purchases, gifts, foreign economic assistance—to be carried in privately-owned American-flag ships, if they are available at reasonable rates. Its sole purpose is to assure that a reasonable part of our taxpayer-backed cargoes help support our merchant fleet. Since 1948 such cargoes have constituted almost half of the exports carried in United States-flag dry-cargo ships. Yet, of all our overseas exports, commercial as well as governmental, the percentage carried in American bottoms dropped from 71 in 1946 to 23 in 1954. This happened even though the governmental exports were subject to the 50–50 rule.

In Public Law 480, Congress embodied a method which it had found especially successful, in the earlier Mutual Security Acts, for coping with the post-Korean accumulations of surplus farm commodities This was the sale of surplus stocks for foreign currencies. The 50–50 provision has been applied to these disposal shipments, as it was to those under the Mutual Security Acts.

Foreign and domestic critics often acquiesce in the cargo-sharing principle as applied to aid but object to it as applied to the transactions under Public Law 480, which they call commercial. Actually, it is hard to see why these are not foreign aid transactions quite as much as the almost identical dealings under the Mutual Security Acts. Whatever aid of the commercial they possess arises from the ill-advised legislative use of the word "sales," the employment of commercial trade channels, and the acceptance by our Government of foreign currencies.

The elements of commercial sale are in fact entirely lacking. No profit is involved. Sales are governmentally negotiated and prices are deliberately set to avoid disturbing market levels. Acceptance of nonconvertible local currencies is only one of a number of inducements which no commercial seller would or could offer. Most of the "sales" involve losses, borne by the taxpayer. And it is our Government's standing policy to distribute foreign aid through commercial trade channels.

The most significant fact, however, is that the United States does not retain the bulk of the foreign-currency payments. About 65 percent of them are being given or loaned back to buyer countries, or otherwise applied in the interest of foreign beneficiaries. Except for a percentage difference, this is exactly how previous assistance programs have been conducted.

Americans—especially inland Americans—are being told that foreign countries are so set against 50–50 that they will retaliate by refusing commodity agreements under Public Law 480, thereby defeating the purpose of the latter statute. To date, Denmark's is the only clear instance of this, and there is some doubt as to her candor in laying the refusal to 50–50. Last year she purchased under mutual security (which, remember, is also subject to 50–50) $4 million-worth of agricultural surplus. Since this matched her full requirements of American grain for the 2 previous years, it may have cost her no particular hardship to reject an additional agreement. In the same connection, it may be noted that, of 9 European countries which formally protested Public Law 664 while it was before Congress, all but one concluded agreements under mutual security between July 1, 1953, and June 30, 1955, to a total value of $314 million.

The facts that, during the first third of the statutory life of Public Law 480, two-thirds of its initial allocation of $700 million was covered by disposal agreements with 17 countries, and that Congress, on the strength of that showing, has since raised the ceiling to $1.5 billion, are persuasive evidence that

foreign opposition to 50–50 has not materially impeded the program to date.

Apart from the dread of boycott, some farm quarters have feared that 50–50 may limit disposals by raising transportation costs to foreign purchasers. This is impossible. Public Law 580 requires buyers to pay ocean freights in their own currency, at current freight rates prevailing in the world market. The United States makes up the difference, if any, between such rates and those actually paid.

It is, however, not generally understood outside shipping circles that in a majority of cases no difference will exist. The rates charged by both American and foreign-flag berth lines (which carry the bulk, by value, of all agricultural shipments) are identical in virtually every case. Only in the realm of tramp shipping does a significant rate differential exist, and it is not nearly as wide as the gap between American and foreign trampship operating costs. Only on tramp shipments, therefore, does our Government normally have to make up any difference in rates, and the record to date shows that these payments run well below 1 cent to the dollar of program costs.

This tiny percentage is, in practice, the only expense to anyone, buyer or seller, farmer or taxpayer-at-large, which is entailed by applying the 50–50 rule to Public Law 480 transactions. This is in startling contrast to the 15 to 20 percent of total expenditures which go to those other segments of the American economy with which the Government deals in administering any agricultural program; bankers, packers, brokers, domestic transportation, and others. In contrast to all these, American-flag shipping is the only industry in which our costly high living standards collide directly with foreign competition. Yet there have been numerous public statements in 1955 (and more are to be expected when Congress reconvenes in 1956) which would deny this perilously exposed first line of our commerce even its fraction of 1 percent.

In the same breath it has been, and will be, argued that defense needs are the only real justification for governmental aid to the merchant marine in any form. The policy statement of the Merchant Marine Act, reiterated in every major piece of maritime legislation since 1936, refutes this. Military emergencies are a leading factor in shaping our country's shipping policy, of course; but there are commercial emergencies as well, and it is not less important that they be prevented from tying off our foreign-trade arteries. We were not at war in 1914; but, because Europe was, we found ourselves without the foreign shipping on which we then placed a 91 percent dependence. In 1926, the general strike in Great Britain suddenly immobilized many of the ships on which we had again come to rely. In both cases, goods in transit were stalled, cargoes spoiled, markets were lost, and freight rates skyrocketed.

Not until Korea were 20th-century Americans able to meet a transport crisis with enough ships. Ocean shipping-space requirements were abruptly multiplied to cope with vastly increased shipments of agricultural and bulk commodities. Freight rates began to boom as suicidally as in the First World War. But cargo ships were broken out of the reserve fleet, to be operated by private companies. They moved the cargo, and freight rates were held at reasonable levels. The Foreign Operations Administration estimated that in 1952 about $245 million was saved in freight on Government-financed shipments.

As 1955 drew to an end, it was clear that the often-won legislative battle over 50–50 would have to be fought again in the new congressional session. Yet American agriculture was by no means unanimously in agreement with its purported spokesmen in Washington who were sponsoring legislation to dilute or destroy 50–50. Both the National Grange and the Mississippi Valley Association have spoken out emphatically for the merchant marine and the existing legislative forms of assistance, specifically including Public Law 664. Numerous other national groups—industrial, commercial, veteran, and military—have taken parallel stands.

It is no function of this article to forecast the action Congress will take on the bill to alter the Butler-Tollefson Act. The foregoing summary of American shipping in 1955, however, suggests what the consequences of such alteration are likely to be. It also indicates the principal reasons why Congress has always so far found it in the national interest to support the merchant marine, both by subsidies and by statutory apportionment of Government-financed cargoes. Subsidies by themselves are not sufficient. They cannot take the place of cargo, the fleet must have work to do. The 50–50 law is the most practical means Congress has yet found to achieve this object. Its repeal or serious abridgment would be a disaster for our shipping, admittedly; but not for our shipping alone. Because of the damage it would do to one of the chief arms of our defense, and the precarious basis on which it would place our export-import flow, it would be, in the long run, no less a misfortune for the American farmer, the American manufacturer, and indeed the whole American economy.

Federal Power and Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, those of us from the west coast—and those far-sighted southern and eastern leaders who have noted the ever-increasing volume and value of our gross national product—have long pointed out the value and wisdom of Congress' decision to lend money to build low-cost power and reclamation projects in the Western Untied States.

California floods and an evermore pressing need for more electricity in the Pacific Northwest are constant reminders that this program of development has proceeded neither as fast nor as well as was possible.

Many entries in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD testify to the soundness of the loan program. One is the statement by Commissioner Dexheimer that the dollars loaned to the Pacific Northwest are being repaid and that that loan repayment is more than $65 million ahead of schedule to this point.

Where many have been crying that a power shortage is imminent, a newspaper editorial in the Columbia Basin News, of Pasco, Wash., Tuesday, January 24, 1956, points out emphatically that the power shortage is not around the corner—it is upon us now. I would like unanimous consent to have the editorial of that date entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER SHORTAGE?—IT'S HERE

The Bonneville Power Administration, in its annual advance program, indulges in that pleasant fiction—that a power shortage is just around the corner.

"At present nearly 3 million kilowatts are under construction by the Federal Government for the United States Columbia River power system," BPA's advance program points out, "including McNary, The Dalles, Chief Joseph, Ice Harbor, and smaller plants, and almost 1 million kilowatts are under construction or have been scheduled by other utilities in the Northwest Power Pool area.

"Yet even these substantial additions will not be enough to avoid a power shortage in the 1960's * * * unless additional new starts are made soon."

We had better get on the ball, BPA seems to be saying, or there isn't going to be enough power to go around.

Apparently Dr. William Pearl, BPA Administrator, defines power shortage differently than we do. To us, a power shortage would seem to exist when there is more demand for power than there is power generated.

And, by this definition, the power shortage is not something that will happen in the 1960's—it already has happened. It is here and now.

The multiplicity of schemes for importing power from Canada prove this. So do blunt assertions of spokesmen for the light metals industries, who say they can't expand because they can't get power with which to do so.

Perhaps Dr. Pearl has a different definition. Presumably, he refers to the day when those industries already in the Pacific Northwest will have to curtail their operations because power won't be available with which to operate.

This point of view, we submit, is not proper to the Bonneville Power Administration. BPA is charged with delivering power produced by Federal generating units in the Pacific Northwest. When BPA has customers who can't get all the power they want, it has a power shortage.

Several pages farther on in the advance program, BPA says this:

"Our historical analysis shows that in the past decade the Pacific Northwest has barely kept pace with the minimum power requirements of its expanding economy. Under the impetus of the administration's partnership policy, local utilities—both publicly and privately owned—are planning to develop additional supplies to meet a high level of load growth."

Here we have a somewhat different picture. Dr. Pearl and his associates seem to be saying that we have almost had a power shortage, but not quite.

Perhaps, if the advance program were 160 pages long instead of only 60, BPA would have got around eventually to admitting what BPA people will tell you in private—that a shortage of cheap hydroelectric power has crippled industrial expansion of the Pacific Northwest.

Each year for the past 10 we have had warnings that something had better be done fast about developing new generation. Always the bugaboo has been a power shortage, right around the corner.

For most of those 10 years much, but not nearly enough, was done to build new generation plants. In the past 3 years very little has been done. And the power shortage, as result, is not something that will happen if we don't hurry.

It is something already upon us.

Needed now is not quick action to avoid a dread situation—but action quicker than quick, to alleviate as much as possible as quickly as possible a situation which already exists.

Objectivity in the Editor's Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Objectivity in the Editor's Chair," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBJECTIVITY IN THE EDITOR'S CHAIR

A procession of suckers who got trimmed of $10,800 by a confidence man named Paul H. Hughes, who represented himself as a renegade operative from Senator McCARTHY's former investigating committee, and persuaded these gulls that he could blacken McCARTHY's reputation, has been parading to the witness stand in New York.

Among those who have given a delightful display of their own credulity are Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action; Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald; and other professional McCARTHY haters.

If the Pulitzer committee awards a booby prize for journalism, we suggest that Mr. Friendly is the inevitable choice. This genius of the news desk commissioned a series of articles based on Hughes' fabricated "disclosures" without ever investigating the credibility or good faith of his informant. By a lucky fluke, the Post and Times Herald was saved by the bell from its editor's folly when Hughes was exposed as a phony.

On the witness stand, Friendly freely admitted that, even before his initial meeting with Hughes, he was prepared to believe that Senator McCARTHY was a rascal, a scoundrel, and possibly a criminal. He conceded, by inference, that he was so predisposed as to be unwilling to believe Senator McCARTHY even if he swore on a stack of Bibles.

Now, Friendly, as managing editor, supervises the treatment of news in the news columns of the Washington Post and Times Herald. He is not supposed to write editorials, deal in comment or opinion, or color the facts. Yet he admits that he has an a priori disposition to approach any news involving Senator McCARTHY with a jaundiced and hostile attitude.

Some of the holier brethren of the press are fond of trumpeting their self-righteousness from their editorial pulpits in season and out. For example, the Louisville Courier-Journal, which has the same liberal coloration as the Post and Times Herald, set out some little time ago to distort one of our editorials in order to validate its preconceived prejudice that "the Tribune management's editorial opinions * * * constantly seep into the news columns.

M. Stanton Evans, of the weekly National Review, analyzing the Courier-Journal's attempted deception, said that the most charitable interpretation is that the Courier-Journal has someone writing editorials who can't read. This is always a possibility, we suppose.

But, it seems to us, if the Courier-Journal really wants to go out and document its charge that there are men on newspapers who would set themselves up as censors of political news on the basis of their personal predilections, it need not seek any further than its own friends, Mr. Friendly and the Washington Post and Times-Herald. For here is an editor who frankly states under oath that, at any time and in any circumstance, he is prepared to treat any news referring to a United States Senator on the assumption that the Senator is a rascal, a scoundrel, probably a criminal, and someone not to be believed under oath.

Award to Miss Verna Hornbeck for Essay in the 1955 Soil Conservation Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the winning essay in the 1955 soil conservation essay contest in Kentucky. The winner in that contest, Miss Verna Hornbeck, of Jackson, Ky., is a 12-year old student in the eighth grade in the Jackson City school. Her essay was judged best from among the 22,941 papers submitted from 116 Kentucky soil conservation districts, and is, I think, a fine presentation of her understanding of the benefits to be derived by her community from the soil conservation program.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FOREST CONSERVATION CAN BENEFIT MY COMMUNITY

My home is in Jackson, Ky., in Breathitt County. Our county is in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains. The Hazard coalfield comes into the eastern part of the county. Two large railroad mines and several small truck mines employ many men. Ten or more sawmills operate part time. There are no factories in the county. Most of the people farm and work in the woods for a living. Farm income is low because this area is very hilly and good cropland is scarce. Most of the farmers get their cash income from raising livestock and tobacco. Many of our farmers work part time in other cities and States. Forest conservation can help bring into our county industries which use wood.

The early settlers had very large farms. They didn't clear any more land than they needed because tools were scarce and expensive. They didn't take good care of their fields, partly because they didn't know how and because they believed that they could clear new fields as they were needed.

The population grew. The large farms were divided among children. Soil erosion became common because the heavy rains would wash the good topsoil from the steep fields. Some of the topsoil would settle in the stream channels and cause them to overflow more easily. Sometimes the streams would overflow into the fields in the bottoms. The swift water would wash away the fertile topsoil and leave sand and gravel.

Before the railroad was built through the county, not much timber was cut. There were not very many forest fires and they didn't do much damage to the big trees. The floods were not as big as now and didn't do as much damage.

The railroad brought sawmills into the county. Most of the big trees were cut. There were more fires and they did much more damage because they had more fuel to burn in the tops of trees on the ground. The fires burned all of the leaves on the ground and the humus and the fertility out of the soil. The heavy rains, which followed the fires, washed the unprotected soil from the hillsides down into the streams. The floods got larger and did more damage. The trees which were left had poorer soil in which to grow and couldn't grow as fast.

Conditions are better now. We have had a countywide fire control system for about 5 years. Our soil conservationist and county agent help people to take better care of their farms and grow better crops. The forester helps them with their woods and to learn about forest conservation.

Forest conservation is the wise use of forest lands to conserve and use the soil, water, and timber resources for the greatest good of all of the people. It means that forest lands must be properly managed to grow good timber. The trees must be harvested when they are ready in order to keep the forests thrifty and healthy.

Good forests help to prevent erosion on forest lands. They have enough trees of all sizes to use all of the growing space. The treetops shade the ground and keep it cool. The fallen leaves protect the soil from beating rains. They decay and make spongy fertile soil which makes the trees grow faster. The spongy soil soaks up most of the rain and keeps it from running off into the streams quickly. The undecayed leaves form a blanket to keep the water from evaporating from the soil. Also, the tree roots help prevent erosion by holding the soil in place.

Only a small part of heavy rains runs off the surface of the ground into the streams. The rest soaks into the ground and seeps out later at springs. This helps to keep the streams from flooding. The rain falls in the leaves and they keep the water from moving rapidly on top of the ground. When water moves slowly it can't pick up and carry silt, sand, and gravel into the streams. There is less silting of stream channels and ponds.

Forests catch and hold water for our use. Part of the water which soaks down into the good forest soils follows the layers of rock to where they come out on the hillsides. This makes springs. The water is always clear and pure. Springs keep the streams flowing steadily during dry spells. This is the water we depend on between rains for our use on our farms and in our homes.

I am convinced that forest conservation can benefit my community by helping to protect it from floods and by furnishing a steady supply of clean water. It can help to prevent soil erosion. Good forests furnish more food and shelter for game animals and more different kinds of fish can live in the clear streams. More people could hunt, fish, and picnic near their homes. They would be healthier and happier. The forests would grow better timber faster. The timber owners could cut and sell more timber to increase their incomes. A steady supply of good timber would make it worthwhile for a wood-using industry to operate here. New industries would furnish more work for more people. Then it would be possible to have better homes, schools, and churches. Our community would be a better place in which to live.

References:

1. Yearbook of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, 1949, pages 26–30; 114–120, 173–176.

2. Management of Forests in an Eastern Kentucky Area, W. A. Duerr and R. O. Gustafson, bulletin 518, 1948, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Kentucky.

3. Trees Can Cut Your Taxes, Town Journal, November 1955, pages 34–35.

4. Several leaflets and bulletins of related material from the United States Department of Agriculture and other sources.

The Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Facts About Fulbright Natural Gas Bill," written by Bob Siegrist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT FULBRIGHT NATURAL GAS BILL
(By Bob Siegrist)

The United States Senate next week will vote on the Fulbright bill which would, in a measure, free natural-gas production from Federal controls. Wisconsin's officials have pretty well crystallized their positions. Senator MCCARTHY favors the bill. Senator WILEY opposes, as do Governor Kohler, Attorney General Thomson, Mayor Zeidler, and others.

Last year, the House of Representatives passed a companion measure, the Harris bill, with Wisconsin's Congressmen VAN PELT and WITHROW voting with the majority. Our purpose here is not to argue the merits at this late date. However the Senate vote may go, and it will cut across party lines, we believe a few fundamental facts should not be overlooked:

The natural gas industry has three divisions: Producers, who obtain the fuel at the wells and who operate mainly in six Southern and Southwestern States; interstate pipelines, which transport natural gas to consumer markets, the bulk of which are situated in 33 large importing States, like Wisconsin; and, finally, there are the local gas companies.

Since pipelines and local gas companies, by essential nature, operate as monopolies, they are subject to governmental regulation. The local companies, like Milwaukee Gas Light, are regulated by State laws as public utilities. The Federal Government has no jurisdiction in this field.

To further protect the public, however, Congress passed the Natural Gas Act in 1933, giving the Federal Power Commission authority over pipeline companies engaged in interstate commerce. It is important to note that this act specifically exempted producers at the well from Federal regulation.

In June 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled, via split decision, that producers were also subject to Federal control if any part of their production was sold across State lines. In sum, the Court held that a law passed by Congress contained something which Congress apparently had not put into that law.

That's way the Harris-Fulbright bills were introduced in the Congress—to rescind that ruling. Now, with the Harris bill having passed the House, its Fullbright companion is endeavoring to do the same thing in the Senate.

The basic issue, obscured by the political huff and puff, is that legislative powers under the Federal Constitution belong solely to Congress and may not be usurped by either the executive or judicial branch.

Obviously, if the Federal Government has power to regulate the production of natural gas, then, as Senator BRIDGES warns, "We must also extend Government control to the production of coal, lead, zinc, copper, and all other mining." Fulbright bill opponents claim natural gas production is a monopoly from which the public must be protected by Federal intervention.

It is true that 197 companies produce 90 percent of the natural gas supply. Of these 197 companies competing with each other, however, none controls 5 percent of the total production.

Moreover, in this highly competitive industry there are actually 8,000 producers operating 71,000 gas wells in 28 States. That is hardly a monopoly.

There are some 25 million residential natural gas consumers, mostly in the large cities, like Milwaukee. The millions who read Hearst newspapers are among them. Naturally, we are on their side; always have been and always will be.

Currently, the average Milwaukee area consumer who cooks and heats his home with natural gas, pays approximately $1.10 per 1,000 cubic feet, exclusive of his service charge.

Of this approximate $1.10, Milwaukee Gas Light gets 77 cents, and the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. gets 23 cents, leaving 10 cents for the producer. The 77 cents received by the gas company must go toward the overall operation, including plant, labor and taxes. That 77 cents still does not permit Milwaukee Gas Light to realize the 6 percent return on its investment permitted under Wisconsin law.

The Fulbright bill's opponents claim Federal regulation, as decreed by the Supreme Court, will increase the market supply of natural gas and reduce consumer prices. Market statistics indicate exactly the opposite effects, because expanding potential markets demand expanding supplies.

Actually, the interstate supply is diminishing, since Federal regulation at the wellheads has prompted many independent producers to sell their product only within their own States to avoid Federal control. Likewise, the bringing in of new wells is declining because control discourages risk. The real, long-range result of Federal control, then, must be a future market shortage and high consumer prices.

Is the regulation of natural-gas production another stride down the road to socialism?

Ninety-fifth Birthday Anniversary of the State of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on January 29 Kansas celebrated its 95th birthday anniversary.

Kansas is a State that is rich in history, and its entrance into the Union was exemplified by its motto, Ad Astra per Aspera—to the Stars Through Difficulty.

Those of us who are privileged to enjoy the rich heritage with which we were endowed by those who pioneered this great State have much to be thankful for. We of this generation must preserve this great heritage for future generations.

A very fine poem was written for the 95th birthday of our State by Frank Madson, Jr., a photographer for the Wichita Beacon, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A KANSAS DAY POEM FOR 95TH BIRTHDAY
(By Frank Madson, Jr.)

What is Kansas?
That's a tough question, until you ask,
What is a Kansan?
Answer that one and the first is easy.
For history is but the story of people,
And the people of Kansas
Have made exciting history.
They have made Kansas great.

What is Kansas?
It is more than just another State
More than just a big rectangle of earth
Four hundred miles long
Two hundred miles across
With an area over eighty two thousand square miles.
More than just statistics
Kansas is a state of mind
A psychological outlook
A philosophy of living
Based on the traditions and dreams of her pioneers.
Who crossed mountains, rivers, and prairies
To reach her spacious plains
And founded their homesteads in her tough sod.
The first emigrants were from New England
"Bleeding Kansas" meant just that in those 1850 days and later
Later the "brother's war" came the veterans.
Both the blue and the grey
Took homesteads in Kansas.

What is Kansas?
Maybe it's beyond analysis or definition.
You might say of a Kansan
"He's the gamest sport in the world."
The Kansas farmer bets his corn will make
Despite drought, deluge or damnation
And if the corn loses
He banks on the kaffir, the rye, or the sorghum.
A Kansan is something of a gambler.

What is Kansas?
Kansas is a kind of barometer of the Nation.
Bill White, the Emporia editor used to say:
When anything is going to happen in the country it happens first in Kansas.
Abolition, prohibition, populism, the Bull Moose movement, the exit of the roller towel, the appearance of the bank guarantee, the blue sky law,
These all first popped up in Kansas.

What is Kansas?
Kansas was and is people.
All manner of people—
John Brown, Jim Lane, Charles Robinson, John J. Ingalls, who called Kansas the navel of the Nation;
Sockless Jerry Simpson, Boston Corbett, Carrie Nation, Arthur Capper, John Brinkley, Charley Curtis, Mary Elizabeth Lease, who advised Kansans to raise more hell and less corn.
Ed Howe, the sage of potato hill, Damon Runyon, Osa and Martin Johnson, Clyde Cessna, who gave Kansas wings, William Allen White of Emporia, the small town editor who became great by staying in the small town and writing with such wit and wisdom rulers and presidents sought his opinions.
And Ike Eisenhower of Abilene who captured the hearts of his countrymen as no man had since Washington.

What is Kansas?
Above all the people—
The people who came in the beginning and stuck thru thick and thin when the going was really tough, for better or worse, for richer or poorer.
And the newcomers who have followed in their footsteps who have taken up the torch of vision and ideals of liberty entrusted to them by their forebears and carried it onward and upward "to the stars thru difficulties."

The Public Power Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the February 4 issue of the Saturday Evening Post magazine. It is entitled "Who Says the People Want Public Power?" I believe this editorial is worthy of examination on the part of all Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO SAYS THE PEOPLE WANT PUBLIC POWER?

One issue which the Democrats had relied on for 1956 took a turn for the worse last November when Stevens County, Wash., voted by about 7 to 3 to keep a private-enterprise power company in business rather than see it sold out to the competing public-utility district. It has long been suspected that the public-ownership lobby and its journalistic allies had less popular support than they pretended to believe, and the victory of the Washington Water Power Co., in an area which was supposed to be overwhelmingly in favor of public power, confirms that suspicion. Furthermore, the Stevens Co. result ought to convince President Eisenhower and his Cabinet that the administration's effort to retreat from socialism has plenty of mass support.

Electric power is one of very few items in the cost-of-living index which have remained steady, and in some places even declined, in an area of explosive inflation. Nevertheless, the private-power industry has been the target of continuous virulent assault. Why? Couldn't the answer be that the power business is more easily socialized than most other types of industry? That, at any rate, is the view of Kinsey M. Robinson, president of Washington Water Power. Mr. Robinson also believes that "the American people anywhere will vote in favor of free enterprise if they are given the opportunity to do so."

Unfortunately they seldom have this opportunity. Although public power has doubtless provided healthy competition in some areas for the private industry, the issue is usually fogged with irrelevancies and alleged scandals designed to divert attention from the central issue—socialism or free enterprise. The current smoke screen is the Dixon-Yates issue. This is presented as some sort of blot on the escutcheon of the Eisenhower administration, but it is really only an elaborate and complicated façade to conceal the expansionist ambitions of TVA and public power everywhere.

The chatter in the newspaper columns and from TVA Senators over the part played by Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., in the negotiations, or the alleged failure of the Atomic Energy Commission to tell President Eisenhower what was up, is strictly for confusion. Mr. Wenzell's assignment—without fee, incidentaly—was mainly to assist the parties in determining a reasonable interest rate on the money needed to construct the new plant. There was some bungling on the public-relations side. But the real crime in the Dixon-Yates deal was that it threatened to curtail the effort to socialize electric power in the United States.

The Dixon-Yates contract was for the construction of a steam plant contiguous to the TVA domain, thereby making it even less likely than it is now that Congress would appropriate money for new TVA steam plants. President Eisenhower rightly pointed out in 1953 that, if the National Government must undertake to provide the TVA area with all the power it needs, "generated by any means whatever," then it has a similar responsibility "with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States." Although most people think of TVA as based on waterpower, the fact is that more than 60 percent of TVA electric energy is produced by steam plants. Its future expansion depends on the building of more steam plants. A privately operated steam plant at the edge of the TVA empire was not to be tolerated.

Therefore, the Dixon-Yates contract had to be killed, and a hundred smears poured upon men whose offense was an enthusiasm for the Eisenhower administration's effort to check the gallop toward socialism. Unfortunately, there is no simple method like that employed in Stevens County, Wash., to determine the views of the whole population on this issue, but the Washington experience ought at least to have a reassuring effect upon defenders of private enterprise in the electric-power field. The public-power bloc will do its best to make Dixon-Yates look like a synthetic Teapot Dome, but that is a tough assignment. Few appear to be listening.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard Rutter which appeared in the financial section of the New York Times on Sunday, January 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO INFLATION, BUT PRICES ARE HIGHER—INDEXES REGISTER STABILITY ONLY BY VIRTUE OF SLUMP IN FARM PRODUCTS—INDUSTRIAL GOODS RISE—OVERALL BALANCE THUS HIDES AN INTERNAL IMBALANCE THAT MAY CAUSE TROUBLE

(By Richard Rutter)

"This may not be inflation we're having, but it's a pretty good facsimile."

That view was expressed the other day by a leading economist. His remark was in direct challenge to a key passage in the President's Economic Report, submitted to Congress on Tuesday. That message stressed that the record boom had been accomplished without the accompanying specter of inflation.

But had it?

Almost daily for the past few months news columns have carried reports of significant price increases. These have occurred mainly in basic industrial commodities, but some consumer items have been affected. Consider this sampling of price increases so far this month:

United States Steel raised charges for extras, or special handling charges, applying to carbon plates, sheets, and strip. The adjustment amounted to a 3- to 5-percent price increase.

The American Viscose Corp., the Nation's largest rayon producer, increased prices of high-tenacity yarns by 3 to 5 cents a pound. The material is used for tire cords. Three days earlier American Enka Corp. had posted similar rises.

Zinc was raised half a cent a pound to 13½ cents, quoted at East St. Louis. The increase followed two recent half-cent increases for lead, the companion metal.

Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) raised heating and diesel fuels 0.3 cent a gallon. Esso Standard Oil Co. marked up marine diesel fuel by 13 cents a barrel, with upward adjustments in other grades.

Prices of Douglas fir lumber jumped $5 to $6 a thousand board-feet.

Price rises of 2 cents a pound were put into effect by major producers of titanium dioxide.

Dow Chemical Co. added 1.5 cents a pound to the price of magnesium alloy.

BUYERS VERSUS INDEXES

Few executives are more on top of the price picture than the members of the National Association of Purchasing Agents. Buying of materials is their daily concern. Each month the trade group quizzes its members on the latest economic trend. And each month since September 1954 the purchasing agents have reported higher prices.

How does this jibe with the Government's price indexes, which indicate the cost line has remained stable?

To put it bluntly, these statistics are—not intentionally—misleading. They depict only the surface picture.

Most familiar to the average person is the consumer price index, compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is usually regarded as the cost-of-living barometer. In the past 18 months this key figure has actually declined from 115.2 in July 1954 to 114.7 in December 1955 (1947–49 equals 100). Food, of course, is a major part of the family budget; it constitutes almost 30 percent of the budget used in the consumer price index.

It will come as no new tidings to learn that the average retail prices of farm products have declined some 10 percent in the last 18 months. Every other major item in the cost-of-living yardstick—apparel, housing, gas and electricity, medical care, transportation, services, and the like—has risen substantially. So the apparent stability in the cost of living has been due entirely to a decline in food costs.

The businessman, however, is far more concerned with the wholesale price index. This also is compiled by the Labor Department and it keeps tabs on the host of materials on which industry depends.

What has happened to this important barometer over the last 18 months? The answer, again: apparent stability. Between July 1954 and December 1955 the wholesale price index has moved up just barely, from 110.4 to 111.3 (with 1947–49 equaling 100).

But here, too, the drop in farm prices has kept the overall index in line. Wholesale farm prices dipped some 13 percent during this period. Meanwhile, metals, rubber, lumber, and other products far removed from the agricultural have gone up steadily and in some cases spectacularly in the past year and a half.

A breakdown of the wholesale price index tells the behind-the-scenes story.

Since July 1954 basic industrial materials have gone up in price as follows:

	Percent rise
Nonferrous metals	25.9
Rubber and products	19.7
Metals and products	13.2
Iron and steel	11.6
Lumber	9.4
Construction equipment	8.7
Petroleum and products	6.8
Gas	5.1
Paper	5.1
Coal	4.3

Another way to measure the price rise of basic materials is to compare the quotations in the spot or cash markets. Comparing

mid-July 1954 with mid-January 1956 this is the gap:

	July 1954	January 1956
Iron, No. 2 grade, at Philadelphia (a ton)	$60.16	$62.66
Steel billets, Pittsburgh (a ton)	64.00	68.50
Steel scrap, No. 1 heavy at Pittsburgh (a gross ton)	32.00	57.00
Copper, electric domestic (a pound)	.30	.43
Aluminum, ingots (a pound)	.21½	.24½
Lead (a pound)	.14	.16
Zinc, East St. Louis (a pound)	.11	.13½
Tin (a pound)	.96¾	1.02⅞
Rubber, No. 1 smoked sheets (a pound)	.23⅞	.40
Gasoline (a gallon)	.15	.16

What does it all add up to? A major price movement—upward. If not actual inflation (how high is up?), this shapes up as an alarming forerunner. It is a symptom—if not a tipoff—that as of now 1956 is an economic question mark. Strong forces are in effect that may well spell serious trouble.

Stassen's Reports to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Paul Harvey.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL HARVEY SAYS: STASSEN'S REPORTS TO IKE WERE ENCOURAGING AND WERE MISLEADING

It was Harold Stassen who was most certain the Russians meant well.

As long ago as the spring of 1954 and as recently as the autumn of 1955 he was assuring President Eisenhower that they would accept his "open-skies inspection" and "exchange of military blueprints" proposals as a prelude for disarmament.

Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dulles were pulling the President in opposite directions at the time of Mr. Eisenhower's dramatic proposal at Geneva.

President Eisenhower chose Harold Stassen's optimism to John Dulles' realism.

Nobody can know to what extent the disillusionment and disappointment which followed contributed to the September heart attack.

The Soviet rebuff which followed that first Geneva meeting was felt very keenly by the President.

Mr. Stassen was so sure that the Soviets since Stalin, had changed for the better, his reports to the President on his contacts with the Soviets at the U. N. were all highly encouraging and misleading.

White House confidence in the counsel of Mr. Stassen has since been considerably curtailed.

The political debt, if such there was resulting from Mr. Stassen's withdrawal gesture in favor of Mr. Eisenhower at the 1952 convention has been repaid with interest.

At the Camp David Security Council meetings immediately following the President's return from the hospital, Mr. Stassen was conspiciously silent.

In the several official deliberations since, at Key West and in Washington, when Mr. Eisenhower was phrasing his messages to the new Congress, Mr. Stassen was not consulted at all.

On October 23, 1955 (between the summit conference at Geneva and the subsequent disillusioning one), Mr. Stassen made a speech in New York. He reiterated that he was convinced Russia would accept the Eisenhower plan for exchanging military buleprints and inspecting installations from the air.

The President's disarmament advisor said that talks on reducing arms were then being conducted on an optimistic note. He said, "All delegates recognize that disarmament can no longer be treated as an idle dream or a springboard for propaganda."

Subsequent events in the U. N. and at Geneva were a diametric contradiction to his prognostication.

Thus it is that Mr. Stassen with these public declarations has furnished ammunition to those who would thwart his perennial personal political ambitions for the White House.

And through confidential counsel of a similar nature, Mr. Stassen has similarly discredited himself with its present occupant.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of the Independence of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the 38th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine was observed on January 22, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made on this occasion which was sent to me by Mr. O. E. Miles, president, United Ukranian Organizations of Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This indomitable will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan State from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak State from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles Heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible man-made famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will continues to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA) against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

The Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present to you a very excellent speech by an able Chief of Staff, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, of the Air Force. The address delivered to a conference of the Air Force Association in Washington was well received and presents in a billiant manner a complete discussion of the question of noise abatement in this jet age.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BEFORE THE JET AGE CONFERENCE OF THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1956

Mr. Toastmaster, President Gill Robb Wilson, General Doolittle, and distinguished guests, your conference topic—the jet age—is very broad. This is good, for it puts few if any limits on your speakers and discussions. Flying itself is limitless—and so should be any discussion about flying.

Unlimited as this discussion is, it is already apparent that this conference will focus itself on 2 or 3 central issues. I thought I would have a pretty clear field when I was asked to talk about operational problems of the future. Then I learned of Gill Robb Wilson's topics and the comprehensive report General Partridge gave you this morning. Between them, they stole all my thunder.

All I can say about the future is that the difficulties General Partridge described are going to get worse.

To put it another way—many of you are familiar with the inscription on the National Archives Building here in Washington.

It says, "The past is prologue."

According to one Washington taxidriver, this means, "You ain't seen nothing yet."

So if we think we face problems now, let me say that "We ain't seen nothing yet."

And to introduce the first problem facing us, I might add that, "We ain't heard nothing yet."

This business of noise has been mentioned in just about every speech so far today. This afternoon you will hold a noise abatement forum. I would guess that you will hear this subject discussed at least three more times tomorrow.

All of the concern has generated from a relatively few number of complaints. Do you realize that of 6,000 airports in the United States, only about 250, or about 4

percent, are Air Force bases? If we add the airfields of the other services, we can say that 5 or 6 percent of all our airfields are military bases. Many of these bases do not have jet operations, and only a handful support supersonic operation.

The trouble we have had is nothing, compared to the trouble we could have, because aviation is tending toward more noise, not less. Long ago we foresaw this problem. We started noise studies, and noise-abatement programs. Yet the complaints already received indicate the future magnitude of the problem.

Theoretically, we could move Air Force bases away from cities. Actually, we are trying to do this, but it will never be a complete remedy. We cannot even get enough base money to properly prepare existing bases to accommodate our modern, high performance aircraft. You can imagine how much it would cost to build all new bases away from population centers.

As General Partridge mentioned, our criteria for future bases requires them to be located at least 15 miles from the local community.

But this does very little good. Wherever you plunk down a multi-million-dollar air base with a several million dollar payroll, local construction and service contracts, and local civilian employment, you will be surrounded by a rapidly growing community, practically before you even get an airplane off the ground. An air base is a big business. It makes the nearby cities bigger and it automatically generates communities where none existed before.

There are unlimited examples of this. Tinker, for instance, was originally several miles from Oklahoma City. Now Midwest City, a suburb of Oklahoma City, practically surrounds Tinker Field.

An example closer to home is Andrews. When it was built during World War II, it was comparatively isolated. Now Washington and its suburbs have grown completely out to Andrews.

Even if it were possible to build isolated bases and keep them isolated there would have to be two big exceptions.

Part of our air defense is necessarily based to protect population centers. To provide maximum range, 360° protection to a metropolitan area, the interceptors must be based very close to that city. Any other policy would be like putting the city fire department out in the country.

The second exception is our Reserve and National Guard bases. We could not expect effective Reserve participation, if our Reservists had to use most of their limited time just trying to get to their bases. The major proportion of our Reservists and Air National Guardsmen live in or near populous areas. It is common sense that their bases be located nearby.

I might add that we are under constant presure to give these Reserve components first-line equipment. We want them to have first-line equipment, because they would be of little use if they did not have it. But as we give these units first-line equipment, the noise of their operation gets louder.

Nevertheless, let me assure everyone that insofar as it is financially possible and tactically sound, we will continue to try to get our bases away from population centers.

There are other measures we can and are taking which offer better immediate and local help. Here are some of them.

You know the technical developments now underway. Several of these are projects initiated by industry. For ground runups there have been developed a whole gamut of Rube Goldberg devices to reduce the sound level.

Our research and development command and our aircraft industries are spending lots of time and money to develop silencers or mufflers for jet engines. Unfortunately, many of the gadgets developed so far, degrade performance. These are unacceptable since our margin of security depends on ever-increasing performance of combat aircraft. In flight, we have adopted time-consuming fuel-wasting, and tactically inefficient traffic patterns both for take-offs and landings.

Community relations efforts to explain and keep the people informed really pay off. They do not reduce noise, but they at least make the reason for noise a little more understandable.

Our commanders, for instance, have had much success with what we call preconditioning communities. Before a combat wing moves into a new area, we explain to the local people what to expect and why our air operations are necessary.

The way these communities have reacted and accepted the minor inconveniences of better defense is a tribute to the understanding of the American people.

All of our present difficulties have been generated by the noise of jet engines of 4 to 8 thousand pounds thrust. The noise of these comparatively small engines have already become a nuisance in some localities.

Now, let's look at the future.

Questions like these face all of us:

What will the effect be of jet noise from engines of 12, 16, 20, 25 thousand pounds of thrust?

What will be the effect of hundreds of jet airlines operating in and out of population centers?

What will be the effect when increasing numbers of light planes become jets?

As civil airplanes become jet propelled, military aviation will no longer receive sole blame for jet noise. But that is no consolation, even to us. This noise problem will become one the whole Nation will face, and I think you civil operators will find your choices of action even more limited than we are finding them in the Air Force.

For one thing, airliners will find it more difficult to play with traffic patterns. Air Force planes, even bombers, can and do execute sharp turns, steep pull-ups, and so on, to avoid flying over communities near bases. I do not know what would happen if you put a load of paying customers through even a mild 2-G turn, but I'll bet the outcry would drown out the jet noise.

Also, airliners operate on tight cost margins. You will not want to fly large, time-consuming, money-consuming traffic patterns.

Even more important, your business is carrying people and cargo. You can't find many customers in isolated areas. Your business takes you, and your noise to the cities. For passenger convenience, the closer you are to the city, the better.

So what is the solution?

As I said before, this is becoming a national problem. Military and civil aviation must work together to do everything possible consistent with security and progress.

We should expend every effort to reduce disturbance to communities by routing, flying techniques, and mechanical silencers.

But I am afraid that these solutions will not be enough.

The big job is to get our Nation to recognize this as a largely unavoidable consequence of progress. Gill Robb Wilson pointed out that every technological advance has had undesirable side effects—and opponents of those side effects always try to stop our progress. Their efforts to halt progress always succeed in slowing it down, but they have never succeeded in stopping progress.

Noise is just something we are going to have to live with. The American people will eventually understand this. We must do all we can to speed this understanding.

In 50 years we have learned to live with the stench, noise, expense, death, and destruction of the automobile. I doubt that noise will cause the destruction in a hundred years that the automobile does in one.

While there is a frightening death toll on the highways, there is not a one of us who does not value the automobile. We may not like its byproducts, but we have learned to live with them.

I foresee the same acceptance of the undesirable side effects of flying. It is conceivable that the airplane will affect our way of life just as has the automobile. Homes may be designed soundproof—bombproof. Communities may grow away from centers of air activity.

Now, as far as the Air Force is concerned, let us look a little further into the future. We are getting into the field of short take-off and landing planes. We are developing Zero launchers to get aircraft airborne, and mats and barriers for landing. We are getting boundary layer control and reverse thrust. The vertical take-off aircraft is coming. All of these will alleviate the noise problem because they will get us up and down faster, and make it easier to stay away from communities. Like all new developments, they will probably bring on new problems we haven't even imagined yet.

Looking even further into the future—we are getting more and more into the missile business. Eventually, a great proportion of our defense and offense will be in place, poised—ready to fire—missiles. Let me add parenthetically, that this won't happen until missiles are as dependable and efficient as pilots. This time is coming but it's not here yet. Now these missiles won't make a bit of noise until we need them—and at that time we'll have other things to worry about.

To sum up my remarks on noise—it's a growing problem. It will be handled partially by our noise suppressing measures. The end answer is acceptance. We must not only precondition communities, we must precondition the Nation.

I wish our jet noise were our only problem. To me the echoes of Communist H-bomb tests obliterate the noise that comes from our building a defense against them.

So far the public has objected to noise primarily because it is a nuisance, not a hazard. I believe we will be able to keep it from being considered hazardous.

Other jet-age problems will be the result of public concern over danger. There are several of these. Problem areas include air-traffic control, congestion at and near airports, and heavy landing and take-off traffic over populated areas with the increased potential for tragic accidents.

Most of these are problems shared by civil and military aviation. One, however, is peculiar to military aviation. I speak of the weapons carried in aircraft.

It is only commonsense that whatever weapons our Air Force uses must be readily available. Instant readiness means survival.

The Air Force has been in the nuclear-bomb business for over 10 years now and you may be sure that full attention has been given to every detail of design and methods of handling required to eliminate the possibility of an accidental nuclear detonation of the weapon, either in the aircraft or on the ground. You may readily appreciate that an aircraft crew would be hesitant to fly a vehicle unless the hazard to them of an accidental detonation was essentially nonexistent. With this built-in safety, the worse condition to be expected would be the hazard associated with conventional high explosive weapons. These safety features have been, and will continue to be, tested realistically, to assure that the chance of an accidential nuclear detonation is so remote as to be incalculable.

Even though our weapons have an extremely high degree of built-in safety, our handling of any kind of weapon is super-

cautious. Machineguns, for instance, are not charged until the aircraft is in an area where they can be safely fired.

External rocket connections are not hooked up until the aircraft is in take-off position—pointed away from all populated areas. It is standard procedure for aircraft carrying any kind of ordnance, even small-practice bombs, to fly many miles out of their way to give a wide berth to all towns or villages.

The point is that handling and carrying ordnance, from bullets to A-bombs, is potentially less dangerous than many other operations. It is not, and will not be, a major problem to conduct these actions in safety.

The last topic I wish to include in my discussion of future operations is the nuclear-powered aircraft. I want to allay any fears there may be about hazards in operating this type plane. A nuclear engine will be merely a new form of propulsive power. Our sister service, the Navy, has been operating a nuclear powerplant in its submarine, the *Nautilus*, with safety and dependability. The controls built into a nuclear engine will make it no more dangerous than any other engine.

By no means let anyone be confused. Nuclear weapons and nuclear airplanes are not synonymous.

Actually, our hopes for peace and progress rest to a large extent on this big difference between a nuclear bomb and a nuclear reactor. The bomb could in many ways darken the world. The reactor could eventually light the world.

The nuclear-powered aircraft will not be solely an instrument of war. It would be developed even if the threat of war were buried forever. It is a step of progress that is as inevitable as the nuclear powerplants that generate electricity, or nuclear-powered ships.

There will, of course, be new problems associated with the operation of nuclear powerplants. A great deal of our research in developing nuclear powerplants is devoted to finding out what these problems will be.

You have read of the airborne nuclear reactor now being tested in an Air Force B–36 based in Texas. These are the first flights of an actually operating reactor. The reactor presently provides no propulsive power. It is running simply so we can test its effects upon the components of aircraft in flight.

This is one of the means by which we are determining the potential problems of nuclear flight in order to be able to whip them before they ever become real problems.

These flights will also enable us to design safety procedures for nuclear flights.

Actually, there are many ways in which nuclear flight could be much safer and even less hazardous than conventional flight. Theoretically, nuclear engines can be the most dependable engines ever made. Engine failure in flight, and during takeoff or landing should be almost nonexistent.

Even a greater safety advantage is the nuclear plane's boundless range and flying time. These days, bad weather combines with definite limitations on aircraft range and endurance, to become a major cause of accidents. Imagine the day when a pilot can have an unlimited choice of alternate airfields, or an unlimited time to circle and wait for the weather to improve.

These same qualities will help to solve another problem that is being discussed in this conference. That is air-traffic control. Everyone agrees that the high speed and high-fuel consumption of jet airplanes is completely incompatible with our present air-traffic control system. Planes with unlimited range and endurance will certainly be welcome in any system of control, and will never be a problem.

I will close this by reminding all of us that our main problem overshadows all the difficulties I have discussed here today. Our biggest problem of the future will be the same as it is now. That is, to keep American airpower able to do its job. Solving the difficulties we are discussing here will certainly enable us to do our job better.

I think the Air Force Association is to be congratulated for its foresightedness in organizing conferences like this. These meetings of civil and military aviation leaders will certainly point the way to keeping our airpower superior.

It has been a pleasure for me to be here today. Thank you for asking me.

Hungry Horse Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, more than 3 years after it was dedicated, and long after it has proved itself, Hungry Horse Dam in northwestern Montana is still under attack by those who would turn back the clock 50 years.

I offer in evidence the following editorial, entitled "Down With Hungry Horse Dam," from the January 27, 1956, issue of the Hungry Horse News, published at Columbia Falls, Mont., near this multipurpose project.

The author of the editorial, and defender of Hungry Horse, is Mel Ruder, an editor who knows his subject. In May of 1954, I called the attention of my colleagues to another editorial by Mr. Ruder. In that one, he told a tale of two rivers in the Northwest. One, the Kootenai, was uncontrolled and flooding, destroying property in Libby and threatening the city of Bonners Ferry, Idaho. The other was the Flathead, under control because Hungry Horse was holding back the one-third of the river's flow which comes from the stream's south fork.

Mr. Ruder's most recent editorial follows:

DOWN WITH HUNGRY HORSE DAM

During first years of the Hungry Horse News our editorial dander used to rise as we refuted charges against the Hungry Horse project. We're not of great consequence, but we'd rise to the occasion.

Hungry Horse Dam seemed to spell out its own success, and we've practically forgotten that the project was bitterly opposed at its start.

Our good friend, Homer Murphy, publisher of the Flathead Courier at Polson, doesn't quite let us forget it. He had an article in his Chit Chat column January 12 in the old Hungry Horse "unfeasible" style, which Dan Whetstone reprinted in the January 19 Cut Bank Pioneer Press, one of Montana's best newspapers. Neither publisher has had an ounce of regard for Hungry Horse Dam through the years, but we thought the completed project and coming of the aluminum plant might have impressed them sufficiently to cause a change of opinion.

First of all we'd like to present Homer Murphy's ideas on Hungry Horse, and then our long answer. Pictures would tell our story better.

From Flathead Courier, Polson, January 12:

"A large headline last week announced that Hungry Horse Dam cost about $7 million less than estimates. That is a good story, but why not tell the other side. The costs of hydroelectric plants are based on installed capacity, or potential. Hungry Horse cost more per kilowatt than any other dam of comparable size or output. The four generators at the plant total 285,000 kilowatts. The project allegedly cost $101 million. The majority of the generators are not running on a firm power basis since the south fork does not have an outflow large enough to supply them full time. The American people have come to expect Government projects to cost more than private, but why not add the tax loss into the cost of Government-owned and operated plants. That would give the construction cost plus the tax loss, which each year increases the cost. Fewer generators would be as efficient at Hungry Horse, but to cover up the first mistake of four units, promoters are now thumping the tub for a dam on the middle fork of the Flathead, and a diversion tunnel from there to the Hungry Horse reservoir to keep it full so the generators can be run a little more often. Lake County would profit from a taxpaying dam or two built below the Kerr plant. Not just a few would profit from this type of enterprise, but the entire population."

Hungry Horse News view:

Our thought is that Hungry Horse has done an excellent selling job for itself. The big structure at the time it started was to cost $108,800,000, and the total cost figure now is down to $101,500,000.

In addition that seemingly little river piled its floodwaters behind Hungry Horse and the reservoir has been full to overflowing through the summer and fall months.

Then came the new Anaconda Aluminum Co. plant with its 500 jobs created by snow stored, a dam and generating plant, extension of the Bonneville Power Administration grid, American and a bit of French technocracy, plus capital, labor, and all good things, American.

Hungry Horse stores snow waters that in former years surged down rivers to the sea unused in May and June. Now this water is released in December, January, February and into the spring. Kerr Dam at Polson assured of a more even runoff pattern to provide added months of water for its turbines, installed a second and third generator. Water that made these new installations practical comes from Hungry Horse.

In fact we wonder if Cabinet Gorge and even the new Noxon Rapids Dam downstream would have been built without Hungry Horse first coming in to hold back upstream waters that formerly flowed unused to the sea. Upstream storage is an essential factor, and is assisting the whole region's economy, a fine thing.

We recall that Cabinet Gorge's whole reservoir holds that amount of water which Hungry Horse releases in a week of full power production.

Hungry Horse with its 285,000 kilowatt generator capacity by itself is not a practical project anymore than are Cabinet Gorge or Noxon Rapids by themselves. Hungry Horse costs in terms of benefits do not balance for the one dam itself. But take Hungry Horse and its downstream benefits—that was the principal reason for the project—and there is a beautiful economic picture.

We have one chart that shows: "Increase in Columbia River system prime power due to Hungry Horse—563,000 kilowatts." These figures are outdated, present benefits are more.

Now we are talking again about the proposed Middle Fork diversion, which incidentally seems to lack support in the Flathead.

Today there is not a single extra kilowatt or electricity in the Flathead for more industry. The Middle Fork diversion through a dam and tunnel would take unused flood waters into Hungry Horse Reservoir to be used

for power generation here, and for that matter also boost the water to turn turbines and generators at Kerr Dam, Cabinet Gorge, Noxon and Grand Coulee. Our downstream neighbors, it would seem, would favor such development.

Polson's situation, however, seems something like that of Redding, Calif., with Shasta Dam. At Shasta and Redding we found local residents pointing out that they were lighted, but that Shasta power was exported to turn the wheels of industry in the San Francisco Bay area.

Kerr Dam is a sizable factor to well-lighted Lake County and Polson school district tax base, and important to major industry especially in Butte and Anaconda.

People tend to take developments for granted. Fortunately Hungry Horse legislation provided safeguards so that power output would be reserved for Montana and a favorable rate brought job-providing industry right here near the dam. Montana and the Flathead has no reason for regrets.

Bastiality of Red China Communists Now Fully Exposed—Red China Must Not Be Admitted to United Nations—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the fourth article in the series appearing daily in the Washington Daily News on the inhuman treatment suffered by Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw and his wife at the hands of the Chinese Communists.

The article follows at this point:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 2, 1956]

"THE BIBLE OFFERED SPIRITUAL STRENGTH THROUGH PRISON ORDEAL"

(Fourth of a series)

(By John Troan)

PITTSBURGH, February 2.—As a physician, Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw deal with drugs. But he'll tell you the Bible is very good medicine, too. For 264 days—the time he spent in a Communist prison in Kukong, China—it was the Bible, more than anything else, which gave him the spiritual strength to stand up to the Red torture.

Failing to extract a phony confession after several marathon talkfests, the Commies switched to the silent treatment.

They stuck him in a cell, all by himself, never asked him questions, never gave him answers.

"Have you ever tried to do nothing, day after day?" Dr. Bradshaw asks. "Believe me, it's awfully hard."

"You start thinking: 'Why? Why am I here? Why did they do this? How long will it last?'

"It's not good for you.

"Fortunately, I had memorized a lot of verses of Scripture. I would say them over and over to keep other things off my mind, and the Scriptures comforted me."

Dr. Bradshaw turned up at the Kukong prison May 1, 1951. This was almost 2 months after he and his wife had been seized at his Presbyterian mission in Linhsien, 250 miles above Canton.

"BUMPED OFF"

On that day he was told that he was to be "bumped off."

Under the inspiration and direction of Communist hotheads, students at the Linhsien school, which the Reds had taken over, were to storm the nearby hospital, where Dr. Bradshaw was imprisoned, and murder him.

"But," said Dr. Bradshaw, "the Almighty had other ideas."

The day before Dr. Bradshaw, his wife, and two other American prisoners were put on a bus, then shifted to a train at a railroad point named Pingshek.

It was on the train that the doctor first realized Mrs. Bradshaw, with whom he hadn't been permitted to talk since their arrest, had suffered a mental breakdown.

"But even she knew the Communists were lying when they finally told us on the train that we were being taken to Canton to be released," said Dr. Bradshaw.

"She said to one of the guards: 'You're lying. We're being taken to another point for further punishment.'"

ORDERED OFF TRAIN

Canton is an overnight train ride from Pingshek. Yet just 4 hours after they had switched from the bus, the train stopped and they were ordered off.

"This was Kukong," he says. "This was a real jail." Surprisingly, Dr. Bradshaw found the treatment at Kukong fairly decent.

"Our food was better," he said. "There was meat occasionally, pork or beef. Sometimes fish, eggs. And a little better vegetables."

The Communists, however, managed to get their pound of flesh. Dr. Bradshaw discovered this diet improvement was being subsidized by the mission funds the Reds had impounded when he was seized.

"They said they were taking care of the money for us," the doctor said with a laugh.

He had about 7 million in Chinese currency when the Commies jailed him, about $350 in American money.

Though the money helped buy better food for the American prisoners, "we still got only two meals a day, never any lunch," Dr. Bradshaw adds.

MENTAL TORTURE

The torture at Kukong was mental. A silent cell. Faceless guards. A vacuum of information.

Of course, the doctor and his wife were separated again, as soon as they were taken off the train at Kukong. And the doctor could never find out how she was coming along. But—

Sometimes the guards would slip up and I would get to see her at a distance while we were both out for exercise walking on a basketball court.

This assured the doctor his wife still could walk. But he was concerned about her mental condition. He wondered whether she had snapped back. Of course he couldn't tell, from a distance, and the Communists refused to tell him.

"Not once in the 264 days I was there was I questioned," the doctor says.

Nor did he see the other Americans the Communists had imprisoned.

SAME WASHBASIN

"But all of us used the same enamel washbasin. When I was finished, they'd take the washbasin to the others. Each day, they'd have to bring it back and shuttle it around.

"As long as I knew somebody else was using the washbasin, I knew somebody else was still alive, too."

Then, after nearly 9 months at Kukong, Dr. Bradshaw was put on another train. Mrs. Bradshaw also was placed aboard.

"I could tell her physical condition was fairly good because she was able to walk unaided," said the doctor. "But otherwise things were about the same as before."

Two other Americans seized by the Reds also were on the train—Miss Sarah Perkins, of Georgia, a nurse, and Miss Dorothy Middleton, of Cicero, Ill., a missionary teacher who had been working among the Chinese hill people about 8 miles from Dr. Bradshaw's mission, under auspices of a small Protestant sect in the Midwest.

"They let us talk on the way down to Canton," the doctor says, "but we didn't talk much. It was a night trip and most of the time we just dozed. Of course, we didn't say much in English because some of the Chinese probably knew English."

Did he think of a possible escape?

"No," says Dr. Bradshaw, "there was never any thought of any escape. There wouldn't have been a ghost of a chance."

Los Angeles Port Tonnage Soars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks the following report on the great progress that has been made in the development and expansion of Los Angeles Harbor.

This great harbor is unique among the great harbors of world commerce because it is a manmade harbor built and dredged out of the mud flats on Los Angeles County's shoreline years ago.

LOS ANGELES PORT TONNAGE SOARS—LOS ANGELES PORT PACES SOUTHLAND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH 4,361,852 TONS OF DRY CARGO SHIPPED IN 1 YEAR

Los Angeles Harbor's spectacular rise in world commerce is keeping pace with Los Angeles' industrial development and building activity. For the second consecutive year, dry cargo, the real barometer of business in any port, has reflected the booming southland changeover from agriculture to industry.

Dry-cargo shipments and receipts handled across the nearly 120 improved docks of this $150 million man made harbor were greater by 489,787 tons than during the previous 12-month period. They showed an impressive increase of over 13 percent for the year, and were one of the highest since 1855, when the first cargo records were noted in the infant port.

Total dry-cargo shipments of 4,361,852 tons flowed across the 6 million square feet of wharves in Los Angeles Harbor last year, compared to 3,692,065 tons in 1953–54.

While shipments of general cargo, fresh fish, and softwood lumber showed heavy increases, bulk oil movement throught the port dipped sharply, dropping to 20,637,985 tons, compared to 22,821,933 tons for the previous 12 months. Bunker fuel taken by ships visiting the port also showed a decline to 3,166,161 tons from 3,735,969 tons.

Ship arrivals at Los Angeles Harbor terminals were down 479, or a decrease of 15 percent, 4,228 craft utilizing port facilities, compared to 4,707 ships the year previously.

So while over-all tonnage totals for Los Angeles Harbor revealed a decline for the fiscal year, mostly in bulk oil movement, higher revenue-producing cargoes kept the port's financial balance sheet on a fairly even keel with a total gross income for 1955 of $5,593,320, only $87,864 less than last year.

Major change in Los Angeles Harbor's oil shipping picture came about as a result of

general world conditions. Development of economic recovery plants in Europe created demands for oil which resulted in diversion of crude oils formerly coming here from foreign ports. The same factor also resulted in heavy oil shipments from east coast ports to Europe which in turn rebounded to create a practically new market for local fuel oil shipments, which amounted to nearly 11,000,000 barrels during the later part of the year while only 378,000 barrels were shipped to Atlantic domestic markets a year ago.

Development of new shipping facilities and refineries at Annacortes and at Ferndale on the Pacific Coast is expected to cut into Los Angeles' oil shipments during the coming year, with those facilities capable of handling some 26,000 barrels per day formerly handled through the local harbor.

United States Department of Commerce figures reveal that although the value of exports arriving at Los Angeles in the first 8 months of 1955 was approximately the same as for the same period in 1954, imports showed a spectacular $34,156,157 (19 percent) increase, amounting to $211,066,732 for the 8-month period this year, compared to $176,-910,575 for the same period last year.

PORT REFLECTS INDUSTRY BOOM

Coastwise trade through Los Angeles Harbor showed lumber movements totaling 775,-153 tons compared to 608,140 tons a year previous; petroleum movement dropping to 11,310,417 tons compared to 13,241,114 tons, and general cargo increasing to 395,733 compared to 54 commodities from 28 nations the preceding year. Value of the 2,021 tons received in the zone was $1,106,882 while shipments totaled 2,535 tons valued at $1,301,113. These figures compared to receipts of 5,191 tons valued at $3,691,502 and shipments of 7,731 tons valued at $5,051,234, handled through the zone the previous year. Total income of the zone last year was $32,185 with expenses of $123,767 for a total net loss of $91,581 compared to a net loss of $77,906 during the previous year. Total loss sustained by the harbor department in operation of the zone since its inception is $445,608.

Suspension of the Foreign Trade Zone and operation of the area as a bonded and domestic warehouse would serve and retain nearly all business carried on at the zone and steps have been taken to effectuate the suspension and closing of the zone.

Future development of the West's largest and most modern port under a cooperative program with approxmiately 50 steamship companies and agents who hold preferential assignments to berths has aided the overall $30 million post-World-War-II construction program. Harmonious shifts of operation have increased in efficiency. First step in the port's huge building program was completion of the $6 million American President Lines terminal facilities at berths 153–155 and a second great step was the harbor department's construction of a $10 million terminal for Matson Line operations at berths 195–198.

Arrangements were made during the year for the berthing of Japanese flagships of the rapidly growing Mitsui Line at berth 145.

A shift of the Luckenbach Steamship Line operations, largest intercoastal carrier in the port, to berths 229 and 230–A in addition to berths 228–D and 228–E, with the latter two widened to provide 40,000 square feet of additional dockside transit shed space, is typical of harmonious changes effected in the interests of efficient port operations.

While petroleum products still lead in cargo categories in Los Angeles Harbor, agricultural products have always been a substantial part of the export cargo. Los Angeles is a natural outlet for southern California citrus and thousands of boxes of oranges, lemons, and grapefruit flow through the port annually, some ships taking as many as 280,000 crates of citrus on a single voyage. Nearly 70 percent of California's huge cotton crop is handled through the West's great gateway to world markets.

Lumber movements, which reached peak proportions in the 1920's and were sharply curtailed after World War II, have increased to rival all-time high marks. While lumber schooners of the old type have virtually disappeared, highly specialized package-type lumber carriers and barges have grown in number and handle more lumber faster and more efficiently. A total of 828,666 tons of lumber moved into the harbor last year compared to 657,747 tons in 1953–54.

Cargo volume in intercoastal traffic has declined steadily. From a prewar fleet of some 150 vessels, the intercoastal traffic dropped to 65 in 1948 and to less than 40 today. Reported plans of American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., according to press dispatches, are for a $115 million fleet of roll-on, roll-off, 13,170-ton cargo liners capable of carrying 570 truck trailers each. This might rejuvenate the lagging intercoastal shipping trade. Advices from Washington indicate that a second intercoastal carrier is also interested in this type of operation.

Most spectacular change in commerce has been the booming in export trade exclusive of petroleum products. This export traffic has shown an increase of more than 800 percent during the past 30 years and during recent months growth ratio of exports in the general cargo category has increased above the rate of population gain and industrial development in southern California, both of which are far above the national average.

Phenomenal increase in export of manufactured articles coupled with an equally surprising gain in imports of raw and semi-raw materials has resulted in a balance between imports and exports in comparison to prewar periods when imports represented two-thirds of the foreign trade through the port.

Goods bearing the "Made in California" label now go all over the world, returning profits to all the southland.

Our primary objective is to provide accommodations for ships to enable vessels from all over the world to transport passengers and goods, effectively, speedily, and economically. Los Angeles Harbor is moving to meet these needs and constantly striving to become a better port.

Development of new underground storage tanks for the handling of latex, liquid rubber, is an outstanding example of Los Angeles Harbor's program to keep in step with Southland development. Demands for liquid rubber in furniture, bedding, and automobile manufacture in the Southland led to the installation last fiscal year of 14 huge underground tanks capable of holding the equivalent of 1,500,000 pounds of dry rubber.

It is a new facility to meet a new demand of industry. That is the way Los Angeles Harbor grows and serves the needs of the southland.

Bestiality of Red China Communists Now Fully Exposed—Red China Must Not Be Admitted to United Nations—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including the fifth and final article in the series by Mr. John Troan, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which have been appearing in the Washington Daily News. Mr. Troan prepared these articles after personal interviews with Dr. Bradshaw.

There is no reason for the cruel and inhuman treatment the Bradshaws suffered at the hands of the Chinese Communists and their story illustrates well the moral reasons why Red China must not be admitted to the United Nations.

The fifth and final article follows at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 3, 1956]

"THERE WERE TWO ARMED GUARDS AT MY SIDE DURING LONG TRIAL"

(Last of a series)

(By John Troan)

PITTSBURGH, February 3.—After Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw had served 4 years, 7 months, and 24 days in 3 Chinese Communist prisons, the Reds finally told him they'd give him a trial.

"I was informed of the charges at the same time—October 26, 1955," said the Pittsburgh medical missionary.

"There was a long list of charges—operating a clandestine radio, taking pictures, interfering with anti-American propaganda. Stuff like that.

"All summed up, it meant espionage."

Since they had seized Dr. Bradshaw and his wife, Wilda, at their Presbyterian mission in Linhsien, 250 miles above Canton, on March 2, 1951, this was the first time the commies had spelled out their charges.

During these 4 years and 7 months, this gentle aging couple had served 10½ months at a makeshift prison in Linhsien, then more time in a real jail in Kukong and now were in separate confinement at Prison No. 1 in Canton.

SEPARATED AGAIN

The Bradshaws had arrived at the Canton jail January 20, 1952. There they were separated again. "I didn't see Mrs. Bradshaw again until last December 8, when the Communists asked me to talk to her to see if I could get her to eat something because they thought she would die," said Dr. Bradshaw.

By this time, Mrs. Bradshaw was in a severe mental depression, and she could no longer even walk.

"I have no way of knowing, right now, what she went through," said Dr. Bradshaw.

The doctor himself was placed in a cell "with just boards on the floor." His bed was on this floor—"a heavy quilt for a mattress, plus two blankets and a mosquito netting."

No matches and no cigarettes.

CELLMATES

Unlike Kukong, where he was in solitary confinement, Dr. Bradshaw had cellmates at Canton. Anywhere from 1 to 3 other prisoners shared the small cubicle with him.

"They were all Chinese prisoners," said the doctor. "Some apparently were legitimate military prisoners. Some were political prisoners, some criminals."

Dr. Bradshaw is convinced now that two of the many cellmates he had were commie plants, placed there to "draw me out," to get him to say something which the Reds could distort against him.

Fourteen times at the Canton prison, Dr. Bradshaw was questioned by the Reds. They kept trying to get him to sign a confession that he was a spy for the United States and Wall Street.

In the midst of these inquisitions, Dr. Bradshaw relates, the prison was flooded with Chinese newspapers claiming that American fliers captured in Korea had confessed to germ warfare.

Immediately, the doctor's Chinese cellmates began venting their wrath.

"They called me everything under the sun. You'd think I had personally carried out the alleged bug-bombing," he said.

PAPERS

On February 24, 1953, the doctor recalls, the commie quiz masters came loaded with papers.

"They had me read them all in Chinese. They translated the papers into English, too, so I was forced to read them again in English.

"They told of one American flier confessing to germ warfare, saying Wall Street forced him to drop the bombs. Obviously they wanted some such confession from me."

Two days later the Reds returned to question him about a short-wave radio set which a former member of Dr. Bradshaw's mission—the Rev. M. Halstead Gates, of Minnesota—had brought to Linhsien in 1949, before the commies were even there.

Dr. Bradshaw told the Reds it was common knowledge in the village that Mr. Gates was a "ham" enthusiast. He went on to say that Mr. Gates never did set up his equipment because he returned to the United States in April 1949, taking all his equipment with him.

HANDCUFFS

But the Reds insisted Dr. Bradshaw sign a phony confession that he owned "broadcasting stuff." When the doctor stood his ground, they handcuffed him.

"They kept the handcuffs on for 48 hours," Dr. Bradshaw says. "That did it. From then on, the Communists didn't have to plant anyone in my cell to draw me into conversation on anything.

"I made no bones about how I felt. I told them I hadn't been arrested; I had been kidnaped. When they asked what I meant, I proceeded to give them a good American definition of kidnaping."

There were no more inquisitions. But Dr. Bradshaw began to get concerned about his health.

"My weight dropped from 175 to 132—officially," he said, but I had to cut two extra notches in my belt after that so I don't know how low I went.

"I tried to keep the belt for a souvenir but the Communists wouldn't let me."

BREAKDOWN

Last May Dr. Bradshaw suffered "a physical breakdown, from the last stages of malnutrition." He could feel it coming on 2 or 3 days before and "I forced myself to eat the rice they'd bring me. But I couldn't keep anything down, not even water."

After he collapsed, said Dr. Bradshaw, "Communist doctors came in and started giving me injections—probably vitamins.

"I also started getting 3 meals a day and better food. And on July 26 I began receiving Red Cross packages.

"I got 14 in all before I was released. But, you know, those Communists stole the cigarets in the parcels.

By October 26, when the Reds finally advised Dr. Bradshaw he would receive a trial, he was back on his feet.

"I asked to have the British consul represent me at my trial," said Dr. Bradshaw, "but this was refused. Instead, on October 28, the Reds sent some man over to pose as a friend and be my lawyer.

"I imagine they wanted to sound me out, but I just told him I'd defend myself. Two hours later, the party was on.

"There was a prosecutor with his staff, a judge with 2 assistants—and 2 armed guards at my sides.

"I spoke for a half hour. I told them it was all a pack of lies. I dared them to prove their accusations in a legitimate court. I called them all bandits.

"They interrupted me only once. Told me not to be disrespectful of the court.

"Then they handed down their decision. They said I was guilty of being a counter-revolutionist and sentenced me to 5 years in prison, dating from the day of my arrest."

This meant the doctor would have to stay in jail until March 2, 1956.

But last December 16, after the commies had broadcast to the world they were releasing "an American criminal" named Mrs. Wilda Bradshaw and after he had already read of it in the Red newspapers in his own cell, the Communists told the doctor his wife was being released.

Two days later, they told him he was going to be freed. But Dr. Bradshaw didn't believe it until he crossed over into Hong Kong with his wife December 20.

Today they're both recuperating at Pittsburgh's Presbyterian Hospital. The doctor has added more than 10 pounds and looks surprisingly well after his 5-year ordeal.

Mrs. Bradshaw? "She's coming along as well as you can expect," says the doctor. "She recognizes all of our friends and is making satisfactory progress. But it's a slow road and a long road back, you know."

Nationalism in a Collectivist World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 22, 1956, it was my privilege to appear on the Georgetown University Forum of the Air, including a telecast which was carried over the Dumont network. The subject of the forum was Nationalism in a Collectivist World. The other participants in this forum were the Honorable PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Member of Congress from California, and the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, former Congressman from Wisconsin, and now a White House consultant on global problems of the cold war.

The subject selected for forum discussion, in a very special way, crystallizes the struggle of the cold war which now grips the entire world. I believe Members of Congress who did not hear or see this program, will find it of interest, particularly the manner in which state collectivism and colonialism are brought into focus as identical evils and oppressors of the spirit of mankind.

Under leave previously obtained, I include the transcript of the Georgetown University Forum Nationalism in a Collectivist World:

Mr. WARREN. "Nationalism in a Collectivist World," is the topic for the 479th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown University Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's capital.

Today's discussion will be Nationalism in a Collectivist World. The participants are the Hon. Michael A. Feighan, Member of Congress from Ohio; the Hon. Patrick J. Hillings, Member of Congress from California; Charles J. Kersten, formerly Congressman from Wisconsin, now White House consultant.

The spirit of nationalism is one of the major forces of the 20th century. It is the spirit of peoples and nations seeking and fighting for natural opportunity to determine themselves free. In its enlightened form it means love of God and country, patriotism, national independence, and sovereignty.

Secretary of State Dulles gave fitting expression to this spirit recently when he declared, "We do not believe that nations and peoples who want to be independent should be forced into unwelcome dominance by others merely to produce monolithic power."

Our panel today comprises three members of the former Select House Committee on Communist Aggression; Congressman FEIGHAN is a well-known authority on the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R.; Congressman HILLINGS visited the collectivist world last summer and has studied closely the problem of Red imperialism and colonialism; Mr. Kersten is world renowned for his fight in behalf of all enslaved and captive nations in the Russian Communist empire.

Congressman FEIGHAN, to open today's discussion, would you give us perhaps a more complete definition of nationalism?

Mr. FEIGHAN. You gave a good definition, but I think it is important that we make certain what we mean and what we do not mean by nationalism. Nationalism has been equated with imperialism and superracism and supranationalism. As an example, nazism and fascism were often called nationalism. But they really are misguided internationalist terms. As an example, the concept of the Rising Sun of Japan was not nationalism. It also was misguided internationalism.

The term "nationalism" is derived from and related to the term "nation." Nation is best defined as a people having a common and distinctive heritage, culture, tradition, folk lore, and language which is supported by geographical continuity. The Declaration of Independence sets forth very clearly the principle of nationalism. Historians will agree that nationalism in World War I brought about the breakup of the Czarist Russian Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Ottoman empire.

Nationalism, as you say, is patriotism such as we have in the United States. It is pride in our national independence and our national sovereignty. We have a right to these, as do all other nations have the same right. It was after World War I that there was a rebirth and birth of nations because of that nationalistic spirit.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman HILLINGS, do you note from your trip overseas a fear of nationalism?

Mr. HILLINGS Well, Mr. Warren, at the outset let me say that I agree with the definition which you have advanced, and also that which has been advanced by my distinguished colleague and good friend, Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio.

Yes, on my trip to the Soviet Union and five of the satellite nations this summer and fall, I found that seems to be the one major aspect with which the Russians are terribly frightened and concerned, that plus the military strength of the West. But I found that in the satellite nations you could see constant attempts by the Soviet masters to destroy the nationalistic spirit which exists, for instance, in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the other countries that are there.

In Warsaw, which was a city which suffered something like 85 percent or more destruction in World War II, you find the rebuilding is being done along Moscow lines, every effort being made to erase the Warsaw which was typical of the time in the old days of the Polish Republic, and the other eras of Polish history. Everywhere you go in the satellite countries today you see constant evidence of the fact that those areas

are being rebuilt and reconstructed along Soviet lines, every effort being made to destroy the basic nationalistic fervor which exists in those captive nations.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you. Congressman Kersten, would you agree with what we have said up to this point on nationalism?

Mr. KERSTEN. Yes, I certainly would. I was glad to hear Congressman FEIGHAN distinguish between true nationalism and the abuses that nations have through history accomplished by extending their national efforts beyond their own nation and to try to subdue other nations.

I was very glad to hear the example of that described by Congressman HILLINGS in his recent trip, the way Moscow has extended its influence over into Warsaw, a distinct and different nation. You have the two examples right there.

I certainly agree with this concept, that the force of nationalism, the natural aspirations of human beings living in one area, it is a kind of family concept, where everybody has the same custom and tradition. It is a distinctive thing located to that area, and they have the natural right to self determine themselves, people that have the same culture, the same tradition, the same language. This is what we are talking about, and what this means to the world, what its destruction means to the world, and what its maintenance means to our security.

Mr. WARREN. Our topic for discussion, of course, is Nationalism in a Collectivist World. Would you say that collectivism is just the opposite of nationalism?

Mr. KERSTEN. Mr. Warren, I believe it definitely is. Collectivism is a mowing down of all the natural, human forces and traditions that each nation has, and makes for a common absence of all of these national characteristics. I think it is one of the most terrible forces that has been unloosed in modern times, this destructive force, the destruction of the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman FEIGHAN, I have heard nationalism described as an 18th century development. Isn't it older than that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The historians usually refer to the 19th century as the century of nationalism. We Americans should be mindful of the fact that nationalism was really born with the birth of our Nation.

Mr. KERSTEN. Nationalism is really an outgrowth of colonialism and colonial exploitation.

Mr. HILLINGS. Where the people rose up against the colonial masters and established their individual countries, and which led to the basic ground of nationalism, as characterized in the American Revolution.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Congressman HILLINGS, you had the firsthand knowledge of not only the Soviet Union, but you went down to Guatemala a little over a year ago, and you saw some firsthand efforts of the attempted extension of foreign influence right here in the American Hemisphere, of the destruction of a nation down there; is that correct?

Mr. HILLINGS. That is right. I happened to be in Guatemala just before the revolution took place which threw out the Communists. Then I went back a few months after the new anti-Communist government had taken over. There was firsthand evidence of how the Communists had tried to impose their will on a little nation in the Western Hemisphere and completely destroy its nationalistic feeling and its heritage.

I am convinced that there, one of the first nations, incidentally, that has succeeded in overthrowing the Communists, that in that little country it was the desire for nationalism, and the right to govern themselves, and at least have the type of government that they basically wanted, and their belief in their background and their history and their traditions which caused the overwhelming majority of the people to have the courage to rise up against the imposition of a foreign ideology.

I believe, frankly, that this spirit of nationalism may in the final analysis be the greatest hope the free world has to eventually overthrow the cloak of Communist slavery which has now enveloped some 800 million people in the world.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman FEIGHAN, what is the situation, to bring us up to date now, in southeast Asia?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I was there last fall, and that situation is another example of nationalism being rampant. Many people are confused by the Russians, who try to make believe that they are responsible for the nationalistic spirit in southeast Asia.

As an example, I will take Ho Chi Minh, who is the Red Communist agent in North Vietnam, but the Russians try to set him up as a patriot. He is not. Unfortunately, the nations in southeast Asia were under colonial rule by the Europeans, but now that they see the opportunity for national independence and self-determination, that is what they are fighting for, and that is what we in this country should support. Our whole foreign policy has been the support of independence for nations. I believe that we should do everything in our power to let the entire world know that we are opposed to colonialism or imperialism in any form.

The Congress by unanimous vote passed the McCormack resolution, which sets forth our policy as being absolutely opposed to colonialism or imperialism in any form. I think we should tell the world exactly that we stand against colonialism and we will support the efforts of all nations to regain or gain their national independence and self-government.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Kersten, you are well known, as I said earlier, in your fight for the enslaved and captive nations in the Russian Communist empire. How are you carrying forth this fight now?

Mr. KERSTEN. Mr. Warren, I have been a consultant at the White House for the past 6 months. Of course, I wouldn't want to talk about any of my activities specifically, publicly, but I can say from the basis of the experience that I had as a Member of Congress, and the investigation of the House Committee on Communist Aggression, that one of the things that I think we are all interested in is to understand what is going on behind the Iron Curtain insofar as these nations are concerned.

The reports that we turned out in our committee showed the takeover of these nations and the processes of destruction that have been going on with regard to all of them. I think one of the things that we as Americans must be concerned about is what is going to be the end result of the destruction of these nations, if the Communists are permitted to communize nearly a billion people. If these nations are destroyed, if that happens, we will be bequeathing to our children the most terrible problem, probably the most terrible war that mankind has ever experienced. The prospect of a communized Marxist world facing a future generation of Americans, generations of Marxists, without any idea of God, that is, believers in atheism, such as they are teaching their children there now, devoid of any national characteristics, devoid of such things as the ordinary relationship in a family.

I have here in my hand, for example, Mr. Warren, a textbook that is being used in the Soviet Union today. This textbook contains a story glorifying the young man who gladly sent his father to the gallows. This is typical of the destruction of something that arises out of the concept of nations, the love of one's own family. If they are able to communize the Soviet orbit and destroy these human values that are planted in and rooted in the national idea, then God help our children.

Mr. WARREN. Is this an example of the exhibits that you discovered during your official report to Congress?

Mr. KERSTEN. Yes, it is, Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN. You have numerous examples of this?

Mr. KERSTEN. We have numerous examples of this, and numerous examples of what happens to this kind of philosophy. To me, there are two symbols to the world devoid of any national characteristics: The one symbol is a cadavar, with wrists wired behind the back, and a bullet in the back of the head; and the other symbol is this young man raised to the emanated, who would turn his parents over to the executioner. That is what is being built behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman HILLINGS, would it be possible to encourage nationalism within the Iron Curtain without being accused of fomenting or fostering war?

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Warren, in direct answer to that question, I say "Yes," it is possible.

Now, there are people in this country and in the countries of our friends abroad who have a basic misunderstanding of the international Communist conspiracy. There are people who say, "Well, the Communist Party is a political party," and they fail to recognize that the Communist Party in all the various countries of the free world today is an international conspiracy directed and controlled by the men in the Kremlin. It is not an independent political party. It is not a nationalist party, say, in regard to the Communist Party in France, or in the other countries. It is a Russian-directed international conspiracy.

So, when some of our friends say now we must not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, by sending in our broadcasts and getting literature and material in, or sending delegations, because if we do that, we are in a sense adopting Communist tactics, I think they are being terribly unrealistic. This is a war. Fortunately, it is not being fought at the present time with bullets. We hope that day will not come. But certainly it is a war that is going on for the control of the minds of men.

I believe that we must use every means at our disposal, short of war, in an effort to try to get the word to these captive nations and to the other peoples of the Soviet Union.

Let me say this in regard to that general question, and also in commenting on my good friend, CHARLIE KERSTEN'S statement, with which I agree, I believe there is hope. I am convinced that the spirit of nationalism is still strong, and burning behind the Iron Curtain. It is true that every effort is being made to atheize the people and do everything else to destroy their belief in nationalism, and their belief in the principles of human freedom, which we cherish. But that hope is still there despite all the Communists have done.

I believe there are ways and means by which we can capitalize on it, things we can do to keep the spirit burning behind the curtain. We will talk more about that, I am sure, before this program is concluded.

Mr. FEIGHAN. On that, I would like to say that what we should do is to have as our basic point in our foreign policy the eradication of colonialism from the face of the earth. We will succeed because 90 percent of the people of the world are in favor of eradicating colonialism. The only people who are opposed to it are a handful of tyrants of the Russian Communist stripe.

If we are to prevent war, we have to eliminate the collectivist strength which gives them an opportunity and the strength to wage war. The surest way to break up that collectivist strength to prevent war is to crusade for the national independence of the many nations enslaved. In addition, we should take action, political action, diplomatic moves, and proper use of our economic

strength. In that way we can eradicate colonialism, and this colonialistic strength is the only strength that would enable the Russian Communists to engage in a war.

So, as I say, by encouraging nationalism, and standing against the colonial tactics of the Russian Communists, is the only way to prevent war.

Mr. WARREN. You would make this the strongest spoke in our wheel of foreign policy?

Mr. FEIGHAN. One of the very strongest, and it will be one of the most effective in any effort to prevent world war III.

Mr. KERSTEN. I would like to comment on the statements of Congressman HILLINGS and Congressman FEIGHAN. I certainly agree with them that this idea that appealing to the basic, or appealing in behalf of the basic human rights of the people behind the Iron Curtain, the idea that that would provoke war simply fails to recognize the situation as it is. Actually, it is one of the best ways to deter war, because in order for the Communists to launch a war against the rest of the world, they have to have basic support among the people behind the Iron Curtain. They can't send their forces out behind the Iron Curtain in any great numbers with the threats of uprisings at home, with the threat of having their lines of communication cut.

If we were to let the Communists, if we were to give them time and a free hand to beat down all resistance in the next 10 or 15 or 20 years, then that would be the best way, that would be the most terrible path for us to follow, that would be the greatest provocation to war.

Actually, a deterrent to war is to encourage the basic human rights, to appeal on their behalf and do everything we can to restore true human values behind the Iron Curtain.

I think in that regard, referring to what Congressman FEIGHAN said, one of the best things we can do is to have our delegation in the United Nations bring up the basic charge against the Soviet Union of Red colonialism. There is plenty of ammunition and facts in which the war might be conducted, ideologically, in the U. N. against the Soviet Union, and to arouse world opinion against the Soviet Union as being the greatest colonizer in all history.

Mr. HILLINGS. I was going to agree to this extent, too, to add that I think there is a great deal that the United Nations could be doing which is not being done at the present time to take the stand that you mentioned. I think a lot of us in the United Nations have been a little fearful to take a stronger stand against Red colonialism might result in some further internal dissension within the U. N.

Let me add to that what would probably be considered a dangerous statement, and I make it advisedly, having seen a little bit of what life is like in the other side of this Iron Curtain area: I am convinced that we have consistently overestimated Russian strength, both militarily, economically and psychologically. I believe we have tended to believe that the Russians are actually more powerful and stronger than they are. It is dangerous to make a statement like that, because if we should dare to underestimate them we could find ourselves in trouble. Of course, the real problem is to try to estimate them exactly. I believe that we are closer to that situation today than perhaps we have been for some time. We have had the courage to stand up to them time after time in recent months. For example, by standing up to them strongly we have succeeded in bringing back another part of the world to freedom, and that is Austria, and now the Red Army of the Soviet Union has been pushed back beyond the borders of Austria, which is a great gain, and a fact and event which undoubtedly has given great hope and encouragement to peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I am convinced on the basis of what I saw in my recent trip into the Soviet world that we are stronger than we think we are, and the Russians are not as strong as we have been inclined to think in these various categories that I mentioned. If we can continue to follow the principles of courage and stand up to them time after time, I think the Russians are going to find it far more difficult to convince the peoples behind the Iron Curtain that they should bow in obeisance and give in as the constant pressure of the Soviet continues.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I believe you are so right on that, Mr. Hillings. I think we must recognize from the reports of the Kersten Committee of over 335 witnesses and documentary testimony, we have to recognize the biggest enemy of Russian communism is the upswing of nationalism in all the non-Russian nations throughout their entire empire.

You take the Ukraine, for example, which is the largest nation in Europe outside of Germany. They celebrated their 38th anniversary of their independence, which they gained in 1918, but unfortunately lost within 3 years because of the aggression and occupation takeover by the Russian Communists. But in addition to that, you have the resistance in Georgia, Armenia, Turkistan, the Baltic States, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. I think the most dynamic force of nationalism seeks to bust up this U. S. S. R. These people are striving for their independence. It is a real rip tide. That is the real ally of the United States. So long as that upsurge of nationalism is in existence, the U. S. S. R. will not be in any position to start a war. And eventually we will have a breakup of the empire and an opportunity for peaceful existence among peaceful nations in the world.

Mr. KERSTEN. A very good example to prove Congressman FEIGHAN's point is the news story that appeared in the paper yesterday. In the small nation of Lithuania, one of the Baltic States, and there the Russians, the Communists have sought in the last 10 or more years to wipe out that nation. They have deported hundreds of thousands from the Baltic nations. They have moved in Russians. They have repressed religion completely, and destroyed, attempted to destroy all basic human rights. And yet the resistance there is still causing the Communists a great deal of trouble. I think it is all bound up in the concept expressed by President Eisenhower at Philadelphia last August, when he said that our way of life recognizes man as made in the image of God, and behind the Iron Curtain they want to plant in the hearts of their youth the idea of atheism. That is the basic issue and it is an issue on which we have taken a stand.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman HILLINGS, what does this mean to our listeners? What can they do about it?

Mr. HILLINGS. First of all, I believe that every listener who is interested in government, and that should include every American, who is listening to us at the present time, should recognize that we must have men in public office who are in a position to do something about this problem, who recognize that we must not abandon the peoples of the satellite countries and even the peoples of Russia itself.

We must do everything we can to encourage our Government and our leaders to increase the contact between the West and the East. To take the necessary steps to let the people there know they must not abandon their hopes, that we are still thinking about them and working for the day when they will be able to be free again and have their own nationalistic government.

Mr. WARREN. Are we getting through now?

Mr. HILLINGS. Unfortunately, our Voice of America is jammed in all the major cities of Russia and the satellite countries. It is practically impossible to get an American newspaper or magazine anywhere. But I hope that many of our listeners, Mr. Warren, will go to the Soviet Union, as Mr. FEIGHAN has done in the past and I did recently, not because they are going to have a nice trip like they would if they went to my State of California, but because they will have a chance to come in contact with individual Russians, and the more the Russians see us and hear us, the more the people in the satellite countries hear us and see us, will help.

Let me add one final point on my part, and I don't want to inject controversy into this discussion from a political standpoint, but I believe a recent article in Life magazine by Secretary of State Dulles, because he took a courageous stand in the situation facing us today, that article if it could be widely distributed around the Iron Curtain areas could be of great help.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman FEIGHAN, what would you say we could do about this program?

Mr. FEIGHAN. First, I think we must take an unequivocal stand against colonialism. We must identify the colonial power, which is Russian communism, and call them what they really are, and not to use any abstractions in doing so.

I think we should use every media of expression that is available and all scientific advancements to let the world know that we are opposed to colonialism, and we are willing to assist these nations in their fight for national independence.

The President requested an expanded United States information program. I think we should get behind that and expose all the lies of the Kremlin, and in addition use political, diplomatic and economic action along with that to implement our work in behalf of nationalism for all nations.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I am sorry but our time is up for further discussion of today's program, Nationalism in a Collectivist World. Our thanks to you, Congressman Michael A. Feighan, Congressman Patrick J. Hillings, Mr. Charles J. Kersten.

Next week you will hear discussed, American Military Policy: 1956. Our panel at that time will consist of Dr. Eugene H. Bacon, instructor in American history, Georgetown University, coauthor of the book, American Military Policy; Dr. Henry Kissinger, professor of international relations, Harvard University; Dr. James D. Atkinson, associate professor of government, Georgetown University.

This program has been presented in the interest of public education by Georgetown University. Your moderator: Matthew Warren.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

St. Elizabeths: Pace Setter for Mental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PURTELL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD selected excerpts from an article entitled "St. Elizabeths: Pace Setter for Mental Hospitals," which was published in the January 1956 issue of Harper's Magazine. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this interesting and informative article about St. Elizabeths, which is starting its second century as an outstanding Federal institution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS: PACE SETTER FOR MENTAL HOSPITALS

(By Natalie Davis Spingarn)

As a taxpayer, you own and support one of the world's best centers for treating mental illness—a pioneer for the last 100 years.

Since more than half of this country's hospital patients—upward of 700,000 people—are mentally ill, one might expect the mental hospital to enjoy as much public confidence as the special centers for cancer or heart disease. As everybody knows, this is far from the case. People frequently choose suicide rather than commitment—especially to any of the almost 98 percent of the hospitals which are publicly run. The average citizen regards "asylums" with horror and shrinks from the idea of sending a member of his family to one, even on doctor's orders.

Some of the dread may be justified; the "shame of the States" has surely received its share of publicity. But far too little attention has been paid to the other side of the picture.

There is, for instance, St. Elizabeths, the Federal Government's huge mental hospital in the District of Columbia. It is not typical of the Nation's mental institutions; on its 100th anniversary last year, the head of the World Health Organization's mental health section described it as one of the three hospitals in the world which have consistely practiced humanistic psychiatry. But as a pace setter in its field, it offers a glowing example of how a mental hospital can be run.

It is even more interesting because it cares for residents of the District of Columbia—which, incidentally, has one of the highest mental hospitalization rates in the country; about 879 per 100,000 as compared to New York's 586. These rates are always highest in densely populated areas where erratic behavior is not easily tolerated. And in any national capital there are also many uprooted people who have neither family nor State to be responsible for them if they are taken ill. Among St. Elizabeths' patients are employees of the Government; such Federal wards as certain veterans, Indians, and prisoners judged unfit to stand trial; and those individuals—dubbed "White House cases" by the hospital staff—who come to Washington with intricate plans for saving the Republic from plots and conspiracies, who take potshots at Congressmen, or who harry the Patent Office for recognition of their genius. These often show up at the hospital in short order; Capital police and Secret Service men have learned to recognize the glassy eye and the heroic stance.

THE WALLED CITY

St. Elizabeths consists, somewhat unexpectedly, of clusters of old red brick buildings, loosely Victorian in architecture, set high on a promontory where the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers come together. Even on the hottest of the Capital's infamous summer days, breezes blow over its carefully tended grounds, lightly touching the 200 species of trees and shrubs, the elegant flower borders, and, in accordance with therapeutic practices that have prevailed as long as the recognition of insanity, the minds of the patients with healing peace.

One can enter casually through any of the three gates in the high brick walls that enclose the grounds, usually with only a nod to the uniformed guards on duty. Inside, one finds patients with ground privileges and employees—the two groups are almost indistinguishable—going about their business on the trim sidewalks. At first only the bunches of keys at the waists of doctors, nurses, and attendants, the tight screening on the porches, the grillwork at almost every window, and the occasional shouts from behind some of them, identify the visitor's whereabouts. St. Elizabeths' wide lawns, hilltop setting, and spectacular view of the Capital's major landmarks have led many people to compare it to a campus. This it is not.

It is, in fact, a 364-acre walled city whose citizens are some 7,500 patients and 2,500 staff members, including 1,700 professionally trained psychiatrics, psychologists, psychiatric aids, nurses, social workers, occupational therapists, vocational rehabilitation counselors, chaplains, and recreational workers. On its $13 million annual budget the hospital supports its own police and fire departments, a 400-acre farm in nearby Maryland, a shoe factory, laundry, bakery, and private railroad. Since it is a Federal institution, its superintendent is responsible to both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the 535 Members of Congress whose sympathetic interest it is his duty to maintain. He must therefore be able to traverse political hazards with agility, and without being labeled a politician.

These are not qualifications that a psychiatrist is always called upon to offer. According to one member of the profession, there are only a handful in the country who could run St. Elizabeths. The man who has been running it with signal success for 18 years now is a gracious, highly articulate, nonneurotic doctor from Massachusetts named Winfred Overholser. Nothing about him suggests the popular conception of a psychiatrist. Beardless, with thick gray hair, merry hazel eyes behind glasses, and a New England twang in his speech, he could easily pass for a Senator or the head of a large corporation. Merely the sight of his tall, portly, self-assured figure striding slowly across the grounds inspires confidence. * * *

No vital decision—from the use of a new drug to the drafting of a warm letter to new patients, the consideration of whether a fantasy like "Harvey" would be disturbing for the patients, or the handling of a habeas corpus writ—is made without Dr. Overholser's consent. And because he believes that St. Elizabeths should play a major role in the general battle against mental illness and in educating the public, he is (unlike many psychiatrists) always available to the press and almost always willing to comment on the intricacies of human behavior.

THE PIONEERS

This history of St. Elizabeths parallels the great developments in psychiatric treatment over the past 100 years; and in many cases the hospital itself was the instigator of progress. In a corner of Dr. Overholser's study stands the small mahogany schoolhouse desk on which, in 1855, Dorothea Lynde Dix drafted an act of Congress beginning:

"The title of the institution shall be the Government Hospital for the Insane and its objects shall be the most humane care and enlightened curative treatment of the insane of the Army and Navy of the United States and the District of Columbia."

In 1855 there was little to do for madness except to make the patients' surroundings as pleasant as possible. So, from its earliest days, St. Elizabeths has put strong emphasis on flowers, trees, shady walks, and on keeping its patients occupied with music, dancing, and various kinds of recreation. The first superintendent, Dr. Charles H. Nichols, believed in using as little restraint as possible—muffs and mittens existed at the hospital but were seldom used—and in choosing his staff with care.

(Today Dr. Overholser tells new employees, "If you can't take any kind of abuse from a patient, you shouldn't work here. If a patient can't act crazy in this hospital, where can he make a comeback?")

Dr. W. W. Godding, who became superintendent in 1877, started a school of nursing, an innovation in an insane asylum, and employed the first full-time pathologist in any mental hospital in the United States, Dr. I. W. Blackburn, a pioneer in neuropathology. The third superintendent, Dr. A. B. Richardson, died after only 4 years' incumbency, to be succeeded by Dr. William Alanson White, who played an intimate part in the development of modern psychiatry.

So important was Dr. White's contribution that the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, sponsor of the Washington School of Psychiatry, which stresses the interpersonal aspects of this branch of medicine, was established in the Capital during his own lifetime, thanks largely to the efforts of a gifted, idiosyncratic disciple of his who came to St. Elizabeths as a young Veterans' Bureau doctor after World War I, Harry Stack Sullivan.

When the theories of Sigmund Freud, translated into English in 1908, met with resistance, to put it mildly, it was Dr. White who brilliantly defended them at a meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association, now the American Psychiatric Association. And under his direction, St. Elizabeths became one of the first public mental hospitals to have a clinical psychiatrist on its staff who devoted his full time to psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy.

Dr. White set up one of the first psychological testing laboratories in the United States at St. Elizabeths, began an extended occupational-therapy program, developed the school of nursing, and established the first medical and surgical department in an American mental hospital. (It is still the only one in a public mental hospital which the American Medical Association recognizes for the training of interns in general medicine.) In this department, for the first time in the Western Hemisphere, malaria was given therapeutically to a patient with general paresis.

Himself an innovator, Dr. White encouraged his staff to do original research and publish their findings, and helped to start scientific journals to give them a forum. From St. Elizabeths grew what some experts consider the two most valuable textbooks on psychiatry in the English language: White's Outlines of Psychiatry and Dr. Arthur P. Noyes' Modern Clinical Psychiatry.

"Is Ezra Pound still there?" is the inevitable question whenever the name of the hospital is mentioned. The poet, accused of treason in Italy during World War II, was committed as a Federal prisoner after a psychiatric panel, which included Dr. Overholser, judged him unfit to stand trial. Last year, when Ernest Hemingway complained to a Time reporter that Pound should be free to go and write poems, Dr. Overholser was annoyed.

"Many of Pound's literary friends have visited him at St. Elizabeths," he observed. "T. S. Eliot and H. L. Mencken have been here, but never Hemingway. I know Hemingway is an eminent literary man, but I've never heard he was a prominent psychiatrist. Maybe if he visited Pound he wouldn't be so quick to pontificate."

Pound lives quietly at St. Elizabeths, visited daily by his wife but refusing to see many other would-be visitors, having little use for the staff, and not participating in the hospital's intellectual life. He is, of course, free to write poetry.

By a curious twist of fate Pound is spending his postwar days close to a brain he is alleged to have greatly admired. In a bottle of formaldehyde in the superintendent's locked safe is a small gray portion of the brain which once was part of Benito Mussolini. It was obtained by Dr. Overholser through the Army for study, but post mortem changes made satisfactory examination impossible. So it rests in its bottle.

FINDING THE BEST TREATMENTS

Both admission and dismissal rates are high at St. Elizabeths: during any given period the number of patients dismissed is approximately 65 percent of the number admitted. But, since there are many patients who have been hospitalized for long periods, including one who has lived 70 of her 99 years at the hospital ("a triumph for preventive medicine," says Dr. Overholser, "a failure for psychiatry"), staff members disclaim enthusiastic news stories giving the impression that they can pass miracles overnight. Wonderful as the advances in public health and medicine over the past two decades have been, they have also brought St. Elizabeths, in common with all mental hospitals, its most pressing current problem: what to do about elderly patients with the degenerative disorders of old age.

About 40 percent of the women and 30 percent of the men admitted to St. Elizabeths each year now are 60 or over, and a new 500-bed geriatric building, provided with all the latest equipment, has been built to house them. It can house them, but it cannot cure most of them. Yet to cure and restore to normal life is the primary job of the modern mental hospital. Many of St. Elizabeths' staff, like hospital administrators elsewhere, are beginning to feel that some special provision—like the British "halfway houses" which combine the functions of a hospital and a nursing home—must be made for these elderly people whom modern medicine has kept alive but cannot keep in touch with reality. Then the psychiatric hospitals can get on faster with the business of curing.

Throughout its hundred years, the St. Elizabeths approach to this business has been an eclectic one. It has always been willing to try new or to revive discarded treatments, if they seemed to be worth investigating.

It has had great success with psychodrama, spontaneous dramatizations by patients of life situations. Last spring, as part of the centennial celebration, the patients prepared and presented "Cry of Humanity," a pageant about Dorothea Lynde Dix and her crusade for more enlightened treatment of the insane. Later, audiences throughout the country saw the play on the first dramatized television program in which mental patients ever appeared, unashamed, without the overprinted masks the public has come to expect in photographs of them.

PSYCHIATRY AND RELIGION

The wide respect in the profession for treatment methods at St. Elizabeths has made the hospital a training ground for students in all medical and allied professions. The American Medical Association has approved it for residency training in psychiatry and surgery, as well as for rotating internships; and it offers qualified field training to clinical psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists, practical and affiliate student nurses, and chaplains. As a result, it is one of the few mental hospitals that can be highly selective about its staff of trainees; it is usually flooded with applications.

The chaplains' branch, organized in 1946, is the newest weapon in St. Elizabeths therapeutic arsenal. The kinship between psychiatry and religion, now popularized by numerous "peace of mind" books, is comparatively new. For years many psychiatrists felt, with Freud, that the future of religion might be little more than an illusion. Dr. Overholser, who was once moderater of the American Unitarian Association, the highest position a layman can hold in that church, has always felt otherwise.

Today 2 full-time Protestant ministers, 1 full-time and 1 part-time Roman Catholic priests, and a rabbi (who serves only part time because St. Elizabeths has only 250 Jewish patients) conduct an active religious program, including the training of theological students and ministers.

In its 100 years of operation, St. Elizabeths has had only 5 superintendents. What State governor does not sigh for an institution with the same record? (St. Elizabeths' staff get plenty of other offers. In 1 week last year, the hospital's assistant superintendent, Dr. Addison Duval, was approached about the mental health commissionerships of 3 separate States. He preferred to remain where he was.)

It is not merely that St. Elizabeths pays good salaries by civil-service standards, either. The superintendent, for example, gets better than $14,000 a year plus some maintenance benefits, but even this is far less than its physicians could net in private practice. There is something more about the hospital that appeals to first-rate men—partly its tradition, equipment, and enlightened policy, partly the extraordinary efficiency with which it is run.

Although he makes it his business to know everything that is going on in the hospital, Dr. Overholser has delegated responsibility so that he is freed of a great load of administrative detail. His assistant, Dr. Duval, an administrative expert who has spent his whole professional lifetime at St. Elizabeths, performs all the management jobs done on a ship by the executive officer. First assistant physician, Dr. Jay L. Hoffman—a soft-spoken, contemplative man who a recent visitor described as the psychiatrist he'd most like to be analyzed by—is in charge of the actual therapeutic treatment. The executive assistant, M. Keller Madden, supervises the business management. This leaves Dr. Overholser time to make the hospital's policy and to handle its all-important relations with the outside world.

Overholser is willing to go to any honorable length for St. Elizabeths. Consequently both his staff and his patients tend to think that he can accomplish anything, whether it is raising money for a psychodrama project, or a research study of suicide, or the enactment of a special bill to permit a foreign-born doctor to stay in the United States.

"I don't know whether it's due to Dr. O. or not," says a young resident in surgery, "but this is a wonderful hospital. You feel it as soon as you arrive. The reason is simple: it will help you in any possible way to cure your patient."

A patient who has been in four other mental hospitals agrees. Now he is well on his way to recovery. When he was admitted to Howard Hall, the walled maximum-security building for the criminally insane, he expected cells, rifles, side arms, perhaps clubs and blackjacks. Instead he was escorted to his ward by a fellow patient, introduced around, and given a tour of the building. He saw patients working in a shop (one of them taking a correspondence course to learn how to be a radio mechanic), editing a newspaper, playing softball and badminton, even pitching horseshoes; he heard a patient orchestra practicing; he was told that there was patient self-government in Howard Hall, and almost no attempts at escape.

"This hospital," he says, "offers a patient every opportunity for recovery, if he can—or will—take advantage of it."

Bulganin's Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there is virtual unanimity of opinion in our Nation today that the latest proposals by Russian Premier Bulganin to establish peace and security in the world are more crude and transparent maneuvers to achieve aggressive designs by another route. While there is no controversy here that this is Russia's purpose, the Bulganin proposals play cruelly on the hopes and aspirations of some other peoples who yearn for a quick solution to the present international tensions so that the world may enjoy the blessings of peace. But for the millions of peoples who have lost their national independence and now live under the iron boot of Red domination, the single hope for liberation lies in the opposition which is expressed in the policies of free nations.

The following editorial from the Zanesville (Ohio) Signal for February 2, 1956, presents the reasons why it would be morally unconscionable to condone past Russian aggression to achieve only more false promises for future good behavior:

BULGANIN'S PROPOSAL

The United States cannot now or ever be a party to any plan of world settlement which calls for dividing the globe into Communist and non-Communist spheres of influence. Our moral position before the world demands that at all times we speak and act for freedom.

That is perhaps the chief reason why President Eisenhower could do not other than reject Russian Premier Bulganin's offer of a treaty of friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Bulganin's proposal, set forth in his letter to the President, is basically a program for gaining American acceptance of Russian conquests to date. We would be asked, in effect, to enter upon a new era of "Soviet-American friendship" in which we would do nothing at all to disturb Russian rule over millions of enslaved peoples.

It is one thing to recognize as we do, the existence of a military stalemate in the world today. It is quite another to extend formal recognition, to condone, Soviet conquests in Europe during and after World War II.

The only hope the enslaved have is America's moral support, its dedication to the cause of their freedom. To abandon them would be unthinkable, even though it is thoroughly plain we cannot now do anything concrete about restoring their liberty. Furthermore, we have no assurance whatsoever that a treaty of friendship with Russia would be worth a ruble. Russia's path is strewn with broken treaties of this sort. They are maintained only so long as they are thought convenient and useful to the Kremlin.

In this specific instance, too, it seems fair to conclude the Russian leaders imagined their offer might drive a wedge between us and Britain on the occasion of the Eisenhower-Eden conversations. The attempt was crude, and Britain already has pronounced it futile. The British understand no less than we that a stroke of the Soviet pen will not bring peace, will not wipe away the many problems in the world's trouble spots.

As Mr. Eisenhower observed in his written reply to Bulganin, America is ready now as always to negotiate sincerely for world peace.

But to us the spirit of Geneva, if it has had any meaning, does not signify simply the discarding of belligerent posture in return for a mutually approved carving up of the world. It means active, sincere effort to solve the critical problems that are true peril to peace.

Russia has so far shown no effort of that kind. Its price for friendship, indeed for peace, is the West's endorsement of all the evil it has wrought.

Even in the world of nuclear force, free men need not thus court the friendship of tyrants. We need not yield to their smiling blackmail. By keeping strong and united we can block their resort to violence, halt further conquest, and one day lift the yoke from the conquered.

Size of the Co-Ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

SIZE OF THE CO-OPS

The rising volume of business done by cooperatives in the Midsouth is little more than a shadow of the size this method of business has attained elsewhere, we learn from new Department of Agriculture statistics.

Businessmen of this region, because of this rise, are interested in the bill of Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS (Democrat, Tennessee), to alter taxation of the co-ops, but their interest is mild compared to what it would be if the co-ops had attained full size here.

These figures are restricted to farmer co-ops. Their business is sale of such things as cotton and milk and purchase of such things as feed, fertilizer, and seed. In 1954 the farmer co-ops did a business of $166 million in Mississippi, $92 million in Arkansas, and $66 million in Tennessee.

The 3-State total is $325 million. But the farmer co-ops of Illinois alone did twice that much business—$652 million. And it was in second place to California, where the cooperative method was used for $793 million of business.

For all we know every business in Illinois and California that calls itself a cooperative is a legitimate organization of profit-sharing farmers, with little to fear from the DAVIS attempt to end unfair tax advantages claimed by some other organizations using the co-op name. We simply call attention to the amount of business done by co-ops in regions where they are more popular than in the tri-States.

Address by Former President Truman at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Boston, Mass., February 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an address made in Boston, Mass., February 4, 1956, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner, by former President Harry S Truman.

In his address President Truman paid a glowing and deserved tribute to our distinguished majority leader. Those who know JOHN MCCORMACK and who have served with him in the Congress of the United States recognize the important part he has played in the history of this era. From the beginning of his service in the House of Representatives through the days of the great depression, during our country's struggle against the infamous Hitler and the menace of world communism, JOHN MCCORMACK has always stood and fought for a firm policy for our country in world affairs. He recognized that strength on our part is the medium through which our foreign policies would lead us to victory against foreign ideologies. His speeches in the House of Representatives through the last 20 years have been the best evidence of his wisdom and foresight. He has been remarkably consistent, and remarkably right.

The people of Massachusetts are deeply indebted to President Truman for the warm tribute he has paid to this distinguished son of Massachusetts.

President Truman's address follows:

Whenever I come to Boston, you treat me so well I just don't know what to say.

If I were 10 years younger, it might give me some foolish notions about running for political office.

However, there is an old lady called "Anno Domini" who has a way of catching up with us, and she has been catching up with me. There are a number of men younger and more vigorous than I—and smarter, too—who are well qualified to lead our party to victory next November. And that is exactly what is going to happen.

The Presidency of the United States is the greatest office in the history of the world—and one of the most strenuous. No one knows better than I do the burdens of that office.

There is a lot of talk today about lightening the President's load. I know something about that subject, and I know that no matter how many reorganization plans are adopted, and no matter how much you tinker with the mechanics of government, the load is not much changed.

This is because the President's burden lies in the inescapable responsibility of making great decisions. If the Republicans, with all their schemes for lightening the President's load, are really trying to dissolve his responsibility for making decisions, then they are proposing a fundamental change in the way our Government operates.

They would be proposing to make the President a mere presiding magistrate, which would leave the country weak and leaderless, as it was in the years of drift from 1781 to 1789 before the Constitution was adopted and from 1845 to 1861 before the Civil War.

I hope this will not happen. I sincerely hope the power and integrity of the Presidential office will be preserved.

And, of course, I derive great comfort from the prospect that the Presidential office will soon be occupied again by a Democrat.

I have been greatly heartened by the last 3 years. To my mind, they show that the Republican victory in 1952 was a fluke and that the country is really Democratic and is returning to its basic political faith.

Not only did the Democrats regain control of the Congress in 1954—they have also been enjoying an unprecedented series of successes in local and State elections and special congressional elections as well.

The latest one was last week, when a Democrat was elected in Pennsylvania to fill a congressional vacancy—and by a majority of more than 3 to 1.

SAYS DEMOCRATS DRIFT BACK TO FOLD

That is only a sample of what has been going on across the country. Nine new governors, dozens of mayors, hundreds of State legislators, and city and county officials by the score, have all been added to the Democratic rolls.

There is a Democratic surge from the grassroots upward.

There must be a reason for this—and there is a very good reason. It is the simple and historical fact that the Democratic Party is the party of all the people and the Republican Party is the party of special privilege.

This is what we have been saying all the time—but during 20 years of national Democratic administrations—and constant attack and misrepresentation by the Republicans—many people were taken in by Republican propaganda and lost sight of this fundamental difference between the two parties.

Many of the people who voted Republican in 1952 are now ready to return to the fold. The Republican Party by its actions during these last 3 years has been making converts for the Democrats faster than we ever could.

Now, what do we mean when we say the Democratic Party is the party of all the people and the Republican Party is the party of the special interests?

First, as to the Democratic Party. We mean that it includes men and women from all groups in our population, and that men and women from all of these groups have an

important voice in forming Democratic policies.

The result is a balanced program, a program that is fair to all the people and that takes the interest of everyone into account.

DEMOCRATS FAVOR BUSINESS—BIG, SMALL

I must confess that we pay special attention to the problems and the needs of the less fortunate. If that is a sin—let those who will make the most of it. Someone has to speak up for the underprivileged and the minority groups, as well as the great body of working men and women. These are the people who can't afford to keep high-salaried lobbyists and advertising agents in Washington. As I used to say—the President ought to be the lobbyist for 150 million people.

The Democratic Party has nothing against business—large or small. Indeed, we know that the prosperity of business is essential to the prosperity of all.

But we strongly believe that business should take its place at the table along with everyone else, and should not be allowed to run the whole show for its own selfish benefit.

The Republicans, on the other hand, are the party of big business. Their party is controlled by big business and is run primarily to serve the interests of big business. They believe that if big business is making big profits it will carry the rest of the country along with it.

This is what we call the trickle-down theory of economics, in contrast with the Democratic belief that prosperity must have a broad base in consumer purchasing power spread among all the people.

We have seen many evidences of this big business philosophy in the Eisenhower administration. It began with the appointment of a Cabinet of millionaires—men representing the big business interests of the country.

These men, with their big business backgrounds, laid down the policies for the Eisenhower administration.

It is not surprising that their first act was a lopsided tax cut—a $7 billion tax cut they put across in 1953.

HAILS M'CORMACK AS FIGHTER FOR PEOPLE

And where did the benefits of that tax cut go? Not to the average, run-of-the-mill taxpayer. Oh, no.

Corporations and people with incomes over $5,000 a year got 91 percent of the cut, and all the millions of taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year got only 9 percent of the cut.

This is a classic case where the big business administration was looking after its own and taking care of its campaign contributors.

Big business—the big corporations—have had special consideration from this administration in the award of Government contracts and in other dealings with the Government.

Your own Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK has been looking into this matter of special favors to big business, and I am sure you are going to hear more from him on the subject.

JOHN MCCORMACK is one of the finest men and one of the best Congressmen I have ever known. His brilliant service as Democratic leader in the House of Representatives has not only been of great value to the country, it was also a great personal help to me when I was President—and one for which I shall be forever grateful.

You can be sure that whenever the people need a friend to fight their battles in Congress, JOHN MCCORMACK is there on the job. And he can cite chapter and verse for you on the way big business runs the Republican Party.

They are even running the Department of Agriculture for the benefit of business instead of the benefit of the farmer.

BLAMES FARM PLIGHT ON REPUBLICAN PLANS

Some months ago, Secretary Benson started a program for buying pork, claiming that it would help the price of hogs, which was distressingly low. But he did not buy from the farmers, he bought from the processors.

And what have the results been?

The price of pork kept right on going down, but the profits of the processors zoomed upward. I have heard it said the processors' profits during this period have actually doubled.

The latest Government reports show that the farmer is now getting only 38 cents of the consumers' food dollar, the lowest figure since the 1930's. At the end of 1955, farmers' share of the retail price of a pound of pork was 30 percent less than it was at the beginning of the year.

The rest of the money is going to processors and middlemen.

Shortly before I left the White House, I directed the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of this whole subject, and to find out why there was such a great spread between the prices farmers got for food and the prices consumers pay for it.

But before the study could be made, the Republican 83d Congress came along and passed a law to prevent it. They didn't want the people to find out the truth.

Last year, the situation had become so much worse, and there was such a hue and cry about it, that Secretary Benson had a so-called study made in the Department of Agriculture.

And do you know the answer he came up with? He put the blame on the working man.

He said that most of the increase in the spread had been taken up by wage increases, and that processors' profits had increased very little, if at all. You can believe that if you want to, but I am very skeptical about it.

The Eisenhower administration has placed too many men from the processing industries—from big business—in the top jobs of the Agriculture Department for me to have much confidence in their objectivity and impartiality about such matters.

ATTACKS MRS. HOBBY'S ROLE IN ADMINISTRATION

The influence of big business in the Eisenhower administration has also held back the wheels of progress in the fields of health, welfare, and education.

The Republicans at first put Mrs. Hobby at the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But she was apparently more interested in the balance sheet than she was in helping people in trouble and distress.

She opposed lowering the age at which women can retire under Social Security. She opposed disability insurance. She opposed Federal aid to education. And the mess she made of handling the antipolio vaccine program has never been equaled.

The administration arranged a very touching scene for her exit, but you will never make me believe that they were not extremely happy to see her go—as they had good reason to be.

This year, the administration is taking a somewhat more humane position in its recommendations to Congress on these matters. It may be because they have a new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—or it may be that this is just the kind of deathbed repentance that comes to them in an election year. And I might say that when they contemplate this election, I think it is appropriate for them to think in terms of deathbed repentance.

There are some other places wher the Republicans in Washington are showing some signs of repentance—and I welcome it—if there's anything to it.

They say now they are in favor of government insurance against floods. I recommended that in a special message to Congress several years ago. But they paid no attention then. They had to wait until after the terrible floods that did so much damage last year. I hope they have learned their lesson at last and will really do something about this instead of just giving lip service.

DEPRESSIONS ARE BORN ON THE FARM BUT—

I also hope they will do something to control and prevent these floods up here in New England. Your rivers here could be developed for flood control and power generation just like the Tennessee Valley.

But the private power companies have been against it—and the Republicans have danced to the tune played by the power companies.

The moral of this story is that if you want something done to control these terrible floods in New England and to provide cheaper power for New England industry, you had better vote for a Democratic President and a Democratic national administration.

In short, my friends, big business domination of the Eisenhower administration has resulted in injury to the welfare of the country.

Special favors have been given, necessary jobs have been left undone, social progress has been held back. The Republicans hope to be able to cover all this by talking about prosperity. Well, I rejoice in prosperity, but the Republican party didn't invent it or begin it.

The country was in a very prosperous condition when they took office—and they haven't managed to ruin it yet. But their policies have created many weak spots in the economy.

Small business concerns have been having a tough time and failures have increased. While the net profits after taxes for big business have gone up 46 percent, the net profits after taxes for small business have gone down 66 percent.

There are still large pockets of unemployment. The farmers have suffered a terrible loss in income, and the depressing effects of this are fanning out now further and further through the economy.

Remember this: Depressions are born on the farm, but when they grow up, everybody suffers.

We need a national administration that will make sure that all groups and regions share fairly in our prosperity, because that is the only way to make sure that prosperity will continue.

ATTACKS CUTRATE DEFENSE POLICIES

Poor as the Republican record is on these important matters here at home, I am much more deeply concerned about what the Eisenhower administration has been doing to our national defense and our foreign policy.

As I pointed out in New York Thursday night, they have really made a mockery of bipartisanship in foreign policy. They have put politics first and the national interests second.

The result has been to dismay our friends, comfort the enemies, weaken the position of the free world, and drive other nations closer to the Communist bloc.

In the face of the growing military strength of the Communist nations, the Eisenhower administration has actually been cutting down on the size of our Armed Forces.

They have been putting economy ahead of national security.

A few voices have been raised against this. I made a speech myself last September in which I pointed out—as one who had learned from hard experience—that we had to keep up our defenses against the Communists at all costs.

I pointed out then that the Eisenhower administration was playing politics with national defense. Nobody paid much attention to me, of course. They said he's just a retired politician himself. But now some-

one who is not a politician has come to confirm my statements.

This is Gen. Matthew Ridgway, a professional soldier of the highest type. In his experience as Chief of Staff of the Army, he found out that the Eisenhower administration was taking a political approach to matters of the most vital national importance.

He has said so, right out in public, and I suppose the Republican press will revile him and persecute him for it, but he has been doing his patriotic duty. Our ground forces are too small and inadequately prepared to perform the great missions imposed upon them.

This points up, as few things could, the overriding importance of a Democratic victory in the presidential election next fall. It is important for domestic reasons, yes.

We all want a Government that gives the little fellow an even break—and the economic welfare of our country cannot be made secure unless we have it.

But it is even more important to have a Government that will restore integrity to the conduct of our foreign affairs—and will build up our defenses more strongly against the Communist threat.

My friends, for the sake of our preservation as a free and independent nation, we must have an administration that puts national security ahead of partisan politics.

And that means we must elect a Democratic President next November.

Decision in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Thursday, February 2, 1956:

DECISION IN HISTORY

"I could devoutly wish that there were some method by which the American people could, under the circumstances, point out the path of true duty. But it appears that this is a question that first I alone must answer." (President Eisenhower, January 20, 1956.)

No. This is not so. In some way the people must speak. For this decision on a second term is too personal, too crucial, too weighted with historic impact, to be taken solely in the lonely eminence of the Presidency. A humble man, a man loath to assume even the suggestion of indispensability, cannot by himself completely measure his duty.

This is an issue that calls for the advice and consent of the Nation.

The problem is a calculation of risk. It is simply this: whether a man who recognized the physical erosion of the Presidency even before his illness, who acknowledges his health can never be fully restored, who senses the necessity for zip and zest in the discharge of his responsibilities, who appreciates the unsettlement from unexpected changes of government—whether such a man remains essential to the Nation because of overriding capacities, tested experience, and the trust and confidence of this and other countries.

The physical Dwight Eisenhower must be weighed against the Eisenhower of those complex imponderables that fit him especially for the job.

The people can have no voice in the appraisal of the first factor, the President's physical condition. That is for him and his physicians to determine.

But of the latter only the people can finally judge. It is not given to any man to measure his own place in the scheme of things.

If the people could be made articulate at this moment, they would present a far more imposing list of qualifications than the President himself would, in native modesty, draw up. And these must be half the essence of the decision.

What are they?

1. The Presidency is a responsibility demanding an on-the-job training without parallel in any other position in which men are ever called to serve. There is no substitute for the actual burden of the office.

Mr. Eisenhower has completed his apprenticeship. He has the comprehension of the requirements of the post, his faculties are habituated to its demands, he has the "feel" of it. This is a priceless virtue we would lose if another man took over in January.

2. Mr. Eisenhower has laid the groundwork for a steady and consistent foreign policy, now becoming so well recognized that he could answer the recent letter of Premier Bulganin with a simple but devastating restatement of the American position. Without appeasement, he has still impressed the world with this country's peaceful intentions.

Another President might or might not carry these projects on. There is a continuing bipartisan foreign policy. But the interruption of a change in the White House, with its attendant uncertainties, the difficulties of making new contacts with chiefs of other states, would inevitably work against our interest at this perilously delicate stage of our foreign relations.

It was perhaps no accident that the deepening of the cold war came at the time the President was stricken, and that the Kremlin again made conciliatory talk when the President took up his full duties.

3. Mr. Eisenhower has made for the country an economic climate of confidence that has meant, for the first time in this century, a period of rising personal income without rising prices. What this confidence means was shown by the stock-market decline at the time of his illness.

There is little doubt that a change in administration, no matter who took over, would mean a temporary break. It is true that we will have to face it in 1960 if we do not face it now, but there should be no unnecessary interruption.

4. The President's faculty for bringing quarreling elements together has brought the country nearer a coherent unity than it has had in many years. This is not to overlook the serious divisive forces still present—there are many; but no other man in the United States stands as clearly as the respected mediator of all factions. The oneness of the country today is peculiarly his. We are enjoying an era of good feeling rarely matched in history.

Another might serve that cause as well. But can we be sure?

5. The President's moderate policies, themselves unifying, also seem to meet the deep, social urgencies of the Nation at this time. We could not be sure of a successor able to match that quality.

6. There is the danger that always exists in a campaign between two new candidates that the issues will be obscured and perverted. If Mr. Eisenhower runs, his record will be the unequivocal issue on one side. If another runs as the Republican candidate the new personality will inevitably introduce new and less precise factors.

7. Last, and of ultimate importance, is the great "X," the unknown quantity who would be the next President if Mr. Eisenhower did not run. There are those in the field today who would carry on the philosophy of government we have had in the last 3 years. But there are others, no less likely of election, who would bring back the very policies and practices which stirred General Eisenhower to lay down his command and enter politics. The fight might be lost before it was fully won.

Such are the compelling reasons that weigh against some uncertain degree of physical disability or risk.

If Dr. White and his consultants find on February 10 that the President has stood the pace of the past few weeks with mended heart, then there should be a heavy balance on the side of a second term.

It is the President's decision, but not in solitude. The people who stand in deep respect at his shoulder, say:

"If you can, we want you."

Fairbanks, Morse Imperiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., we have a new industry of which we are quite proud. It is Fairbanks, Morse & Co., a name known in nearly every American household, a name seen on products of high standard.

I own no stock in this corporation, which has been soundly financed, and which through good products and good management has built up assets and some surpluses.

Sharing the concern of our community, I have read, that like so many other concerns, of which we all have common knowledge, Fairbanks, Morse & Co. is being "blitzed" by outsiders seeking control, and access to the distributable—but needed—surplus.

Therefore, I was sorry to read of the raid on this fine concern as disclosed in the excerpts from an article which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 5, 1956, by Leslie Gould, financial editor, which follows, and which gives much of the firm's background:

SILBERSTEIN GROUP BUYING FAIRBANKS, MORSE STOCK

(By Leslie Gould)

A group headed by Leopold D. Silberstein of the Penn-Texas Corp. is buying stock in the $100 million Fairbanks, Morse & Co., indicating a proxy fight for the March 28 annual meeting.

This was learned exclusively today.

The group is understood to have acquired in Street or brokers' names around 15 percent of the outstanding shares.

The operation is similar to the unsuccessful move more than a year ago in Montgomery, Ward & Co. by Louis E. Wolfson, who, like Silberstein, has made a business of grabbing control of old-line business concerns.

Fairbanks, Morse is one of the oldest and best known industrial enterprises in the country, dating back to 1830.

MAKES DIESEL ENGINES

The company is one of the leading manufacturers of industrial equipment, including diesel locomotives, electric motors and generators, diesel stationary and marine engines, pumps, farm and household pumping equipment, light plants and a number of consumer items and scales. The shares, traded on the New York Stock Exchange, ranged in the last year between $24.12½ and $41.50. They are currently selling around their high.

The domestic operations are nationwide, with plants at Beloit, Wis., East Moline and Freeport, Ill., Kansas City, Kan., St. Louis, Pomona, Calif., St. Johnsbury, Vt., Stuttgart, Ark., and Three Rivers, Mich. It has a Mexican plant and the Canadian subsidiary has a plant at Kingston, Ont.

Except for 3 years in the depth of the depression, the company has an unbroken dividend record dating back to 1900. The earnings record is favorable, with sales well in excess of $100 million.

BOOK VALUE INCREASED

The book value for the shares has gone from $24.21 in 1944 to currently around $46.

The management is headed by the third and fourth generation. The grandfather of the present chairman and general manager. Robert H. Morse, bought out in 1865 the interests of the E. and T. Fairbanks, who had founded the business in 1830. Robert H. Morse, Jr., is president.

The Morse family owns around 30 percent of the voting stock, which will complicate efforts at a takeover by a business raiding group. In Montgomery Ward, the management held only a relatively small percentage of the shares.

BUILT UP EMPIRE

Like Wolfson, Silberstein in 8 years has built up a small industrial and mining empire, centered around the old Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corp., the name of which has since been changed to Penn-Texas.

He is 51, coming here in 1947, after fleeing first Germany and then Holland from Hitler. He went from Holland to England and from there to Australia and China, where he was interned during the war for several years. He had been in the investment business in Berlin and Amsterdam.

He obtained control of Pennsylvania Coal in a market coup and has used it as the vehicle for his expansion into other companies, most of it done on borrowed money or through an exchange of stock.

ACTIVITIES VARIED

Some of the companies he has taken over include Industrial Brownhoist of Bay City, Mich., Quick-Way Truck Shovel, Crescent Co., maker of insulated wire, Niles-Bimment-Pond, leading New England toolmaker; Colt's Manufacturing Co.; Bayway Terminal Corp., of New Jersey; Liberty Products Corp., Long Island aircraft parts company; Elyria Foundry, of Ohio; and Hallicrafters Co., Chicago radio and electronics firm.

The company also controls three freighters, a uranium-mining company, Penn-Uranium, and three small oil companies, Pennco Oil, Tex-Penn Oil & Gas and P-T Corp.

* * * * *

Silberstein has headed Penn-Texas since 1951, and the stock which had a range that year of $12.12½ to $15.50 is currently quoted around $18.50. He is chairman and president.

More on Fairbanks, Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in a previous extension, I referred to a drive to acquire control of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.

A subsequent article, appearing January 9, 1956, in the New York Journal-American, shows the need for some changes in the laws relating to Securities Exchange Commission, not only as it relates to Fairbanks, Morse & Co., but other successful concerns as well. This article also by Leslie Gould, the Journal-American Financial Editor, follows:

SEC'S FULL DISCLOSURE—GREAT HELP AFTER DEAL IS DONE

(By Leslie Gould)

This Fairbanks, Morse & Co. situation—where somebody has accumulated 15 percent of the stock with the idea of moving in on the management of this fine, old-line company—shows the weakness in the SEC's purported full disclosure policy.

There just isn't such disclosure until after the fact in the case of one of these raids. There is no disclosure as to the individual or individuals attempting the take over.

Under the law there is supposed to be disclosure of any shareowner holding 10 percent or more of a company's stock. It should apply in these takeover attempts, whether one or more individuals are involved, for they act as one.

The somebody in the Fairbanks, Morse stock buying is either Leopold D. Silberstein, head of Penn-Texas or individuals close to him and his operations. Silberstein is one of the more aggressive operators in the field of business takeovers, having brought into his Penn-Texas a long list of companies, including such enterprises as Niles-Bement-Pond, Industrial Brownhoist, Colt's Patent Firearms, Hallicrafters, and Quick-Way Truck Shovel.

Silberstein, denies he or Penn-Texas has acquired any Fairbanks, Morse stock, but he admits a block of 10 to 15 percent has been offered to Penn-Texas for investment. Also, he admits the stock may wind up there.

REQUIRE PROMPT REPORTING

If the SEC were really on the job and sincere in this full disclosure business, it would require prompt public reporting by any individual or group acquiring 10 percent or more of a company's shares.

The dodge now is to have the purchases made in a number of names, some of which are no more than nominees or dummies. The facilities of the stock exchange and its member firms are so used. In fact, some of the exchang firms allow customers men or partners to work up such deals in stock exchange listed companies.

It makes no difference how many individuals are involved when, they act in concert the effect is the same as one buyer. There should be disclosure, and promptly, not a month or 40 days late.

SEC WAS NO HELP

Only through aggressive newspaper reporting are these operations and the individuals involved revealed. This column first broke the news that Louis E. Wolfson, the Floridian, was buying into Montgomery Ward with the object of grabbing control of the management. He was unsuccessful, but through no fault of the SEC—for the staff and the commissioners—some of them, anyway—were far from impartial.

The same in Follansbee Steel, if the SEC had had its way, that little steel mill would have been dismantled and around 1,000 workers made jobless.

President Benjamin Harrison and Our Country's Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Indiana has produced many leaders in the national scene. One of these was Gen. Benjamin Harrison, the 23d President of the United States.

An interesting article on President Harrison's contributions to patriotism by Rev. Harry J. Sievers, S. J., presently of Georgetown University, was published in 1953 by the Fort Wayne and Allen County Public Library, which is in my district.

A foreword, prepared by the staff of the library, accompanies the article. Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the full texts:

PRESIDENT BENJAMIN HARRISON AND OUR COUNTRY'S FLAG

(By Harry J. Sievers, S. J.)

FOREWORD

(The following article reveals a warm and patriotic aspect of the character of our Hoosier President, who was known to some of his contemporaries as a cold, forbidding figure.

(Born and educated in Ohio, Benjamin Harrison moved to Indianapolis with his bride in 1854 and began the practice of law. His active interest in politics soon brought him recognition as a respected member of the Republican Party. He assumed the duties and responsibilities of the Presidency in 1889, but his high moral standards prevented his attaining wide popularity. His contribution to American patriotism is visible in every school in the Nation.

(Reprinted with the permission of the editors of the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine, the article first appeared in November 1952. Now professor of history at West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Ind., the author first became interested in Harrison while studying for his doctorate at Georgetown University. The recent publication of the first volume of his definitive biography, Benjamin Harrison: Hoosier Warrior, is the result of many years of research. Volume 2, now in preparation, will narrate Harrison's career as President and public servant.)

When Gen. Benjamin Harrison, 23d President of the United States (1889–93), retired from office, he was, as he wrote to a colleague, "very thoroughly worn out with the care of my public life and the sorrows of my personal life."

Still smitten by the death of his wife, Carrie Scott Harrison, the weary ex-President drew some consolation by confiding to a friend: "I did try to make the administration thoroughly American and hope that something was done to develop an increased love of the flag at home and an increased respect for it abroad."

Three generations later our country knows that his hope was not in vain. Old Glory flying daily from atop our public institutions and our schools, bears testimony to the gallant spirit who first requested that the flag should take its place with the Bible in every American home and public institution. It was, perhaps, only natural that a patriotic instinct should have inspired Benjamin Harrison to make a request so typically American.

Descendant of an important family that had always played a significant role in the making of America, President Harrison was ever conscious of the fact that he should live up to the great traditions that had been established. His great-grandfather, also a Benjamin Harrison, came from a long line of Virginia burgesses, and his fame was secure when he signed the Declaration of Independence. His grandfather, William Henry Harrison, hero of Tippecanoe, left his mark on America, though his term as ninth President was short-lived. This Benjamin, however, was wise enough to realize that ancestry itself did not make the man, and he

claimed no credit on that score. He struck out on his own and rapidly grew large with the knowledge of America's past and the bright promise of its future.

Successfully he compiled a record of steady achievement. As a young lawyer he became one of the leaders of the Indiana bar through untiring industry, unusual intellectual ability, and a constant adherence to the best legal traditions of his State. In the Union Army, with no previous military experience, he displayed an aptitude for leadership that won for him a brigadier general's commission. It was during the torrid battles of the Civil War that he first showed a personal magnetism that made men follow him without question and that transformed his regiment into one of the best disciplined units in the armies of the West.

Preceding this progress was an earlier record of academic excellence. At Miami University Harrison had revealed intellectual gifts far above the average, and his assiduous study of law while residing in Cincinnati provided him with the background for a legal career. He married early and was particularly fortunate in winning Carrie L. Scott, a wife who fulfilled all the requirements of an ideal helpmate. Together they rose to prominence in the land they loved.

From a briefless barrister in 1854, Harrison grew rapidly. Perhaps the most singular thing about him was his capacity for improvement. In 1889 he entered the White House. As "America's March King," John Philip Sousa, has remarked, "few intellectual giants have graced the presidency, but Ben Harrison was one of them."

Carrie Harrison grew also, but she never left behind the charm and grace cultivated in her coed days at Oxford, Ohio. In 1889, as wife, mother, and housekeeper, she assumed most graciously her responsibilities as first lady of the land. In this position also she became the seventh charter member in the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution and was unanimously elected first president general.

Benjamin Harrison, as Centennial President, and Caroline Harrison, as first lady, made their tremendous but as yet little-known contribution to American patriotism. Together they planted the flag of the United States in the hearts of their countrymen. First by Presidential order, Old Glory waved high above the executive departments and over the White House; then by suggestion and appeal, our country's banner was lifted over every public school and educational institution throughout the land.

The story behind the inauguration of this patriotic custom is as compelling as it is interesting. It authenticity is as certain as the flags that wave today. It is the story which began with an impromptu address by President Harrison on April 30, 1889, the Nations 100th birthday.

Thoroughly imbued with the spiritual significiance of the occasion, Harrison by a brief address won the hearts of his hearers. This centennial celebration of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States began actually on April 29, 1889, in New York, and the attending demonstration was both grand and magnificent. The events of the day were as far as possible similar to those witnessed 100 years before when Washington came from Elizabethport to New York to take the oath of allegiance on the Constitution and assume the responsibilities of Chief Executive.

President Benjamin Harrison reenacted Washington's role in every way. He came from Elizabethport to New York, as did Washington, was rowed to the foot of Wall Street by representatives of the Marine Society which performed the same service for Washington, was welcomed to the city as was Washington, and participated in ballroom festivities the same as Washington did.

Nine years after this momentous celebration of April 30, 1889, in response to a letter from Jessie Benton Frémont, wife of John Charles Frémont, first Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1856, ex-President Harrison revealed the inside story "of the lifting of the flag over the schoolhouse." "Perhaps," Harrison wrote to Mrs. Frémont, "you would be interested to know how I came to connect the flag and the schoolhouse?"

Then followed the ex-President's own version:

"During the celebration of the Centennial of Washington's inauguration at New York I was landed from a Government vessel at the Battery and rode up Broadway to Madison Square. All the store signs and all the show windows were covered with the flag. There was not a suggestion of commerce upon the whole route. The thought occurred to me what should be done with these flags when the parade is over; and at the banquet at the Metropolitan Opera House I made the suggestion that they should be taken to the schoolhouses.

"I think the children should be taught and we should all remember that the flag is not simply a war sign but an emblem of government."

As the former President wrote those lines, he had before him the well-merited tribute of Mrs. Fremont: "Perhaps you do not realize how great a part in patriotism you had in ordering our flag to go up on all public schools. The daily impression on young receptive minds makes this a precious habit—the Nation's daily prayer—and you are seeing some of the results. Long after they are grown—and we have passed away, your thoughts will continue its silent teachings."

Mrs. Fremont, then living through the Spanish-American War, could write to Harrison: "It (the flag) gladdens me every time I see it against the sky—

"Many an eye has danced to see
"That meteor in the sky.

"And it has many meanings already to these young people. They put it half-mast for the *Maine* and ran it up high for Dewey. But it is theirs—in ill or good fortune to be lifted or waved in happy triumph—always their own, belonging to their early days of glad enthusiasm. One sometimes doubts himself. No doubt can cloud this beautiful act of yours."

On that momentous occasion of his address to the centennial crowd in New York neither doubt nor hesitation crossed Harrison's mind. To other speakers he left the pleasant task of reviewing the wonderful physical expansion. For himself, in keeping with his deeply religious nature, he chose to speak on the moral import of the moment. To the toast, "The United States of America," came his easy, spontaneous reply.

Substituting "Our country" for the longer title, he passed over in silence the material welfare of 42 States and 7 Territories, a growing population, and an amazing record of expansion. Rather, this President, who began each day of his life on his knees, addressed himself immediately to those lofty sentiments and moral principles which for him concretized the life of Washington and the lives of every patriotic son of Washington.

"It is," began Harrision, "a spiritual thought that is in our minds. I have great pleasure in believing that love of country has been intensified in many hearts here, not only to you who might be called, and some of whom have been called to witness your love for the flag upon battlefields by sea and land, and in these homes among these fair women who look down upon us tonight, and chiidren who mingled their biting cries with the hoarse acclaims of men as we moved along your streets today."

An editorial write for the Independent, a New York newspaper, captured Harrison's deep joy at the fact that during 3 days of celebration "the insignia of trade had been covered with the stars and stripes; that great thoroughfare of trade had been closed to business, because something higher than business was in our hearts; and that the flag had been carried into the very heart of Wall Street." To Harrison this was a signal that "the love of country had been intensified" and that "patriotism was blown into a holier flame in many hearts."

With his eye turned to an everlasting tomorrow, Harrison reiterated his wish—a wish that has long since become a national custom.

"The bunting with which you have covered your walls, these patriotic inscriptions, must go down and the wagework and trade be resumed here.

"May I not ask you to carry those inscriptions that now hang on the walls into your homes, into the schools of your city, into all your great institutions where children attend, and teach them that the eyes of the young and old may look upon the flag as one of the familiar objects of every American."

In his plea to make the flag a familiar adornment of the American home, Harrison asked: "Have we not learned that not stocks or bonds or stately houses or lands or the produce of the mill is our country? It is the spiritual thought that is in our minds. It is the flag and what it stands for."

"And what does it stand for?" The President assured his audience that it stands for "its glorious history; its firesides and homes; the high thoughts that are in the heart, born of the inspiration which comes by the story of the fathers, the martyrs to liberty; the graveyards into which our careful country has gathered the unconscious dust of those who have died; the virtues not of war only but still more of peace."

Then Harrison concluded his impromptu remarks by recounting the lofty aspirations of patriotism symbolized by the Stars and Stripes, namely, "to elevate the morals of our people; to hold up the law as that sacred thing which, like the ark of God of old, might not be touched by irreverent hands; to frown upon every attempt to displace its supremacy; to unite our people in all that makes home pure and honorable; as well as to give our energies in the direction of our material advancement—these services we may render, and out of this great demonstration do we not all feel like reconsecrating ourselves to the love and service of our country?"

The memories of the New York celebration had not grown cold before President Harrison gave another public demonstration of his deep devotion to the flag. In Baltimore on September 9, 1889, there was a wonderful parade held in connection with the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the bombardment of Fort McHenry and the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner. In the company of two Cabinet members Harrison was escorted from Washington to Baltimore. Having arrived at the reviewing platform, the President stood on his feet for 4 solid hours. It was a demonstration of endurance dictated by the love of the flag and the flag-covered floats which passed the stand incessantly. He gave proof through the day that his heart had been in every word of his memorable address at New York.

From April 14 to May 15, 1891, President Harrison made a famous trip through the South and West. By train he journeyed from Washington through the South, thence west to the coast, thence north to Seattle, and thence back through the Prairie States, the Middle West, and so to Washington again, visiting en route States just admitted to the Union and Territories soon to be admitted, speaking everywhere to large enthusiastic crowds, and seeing everywhere evidence of the enormous growth and expansion of the United States. Rapidity of travel illustrated strikingly how much America had changed; but even more gratifying to Harrison was the undeniable fact that from coast to coast

America had become one Nation united under the flag of the Union. He rose to the occasion as his patriotism, wisdom, and truly remarkable abilities were clearly revealed in an unprecedented series of speeches—142 in all, most of them impromptu, and no two alike—which he delivered to all sorts of crowds and on all sorts of occasions during his month's journey.

Highlighting almost every address, lengthy or brief, was his appeal for unlimited devotion to the flag. To the people of Tennessee he could say: "I am glad that by the common consent of all our people, without any regard to past differences, we have once and forever struck hands upon the proposition that from the Lakes to the Gulf, from the St. Lawrence to the Bay of California, there shall be 1 flag and 1 Constitution. [Great cheering.] * * * I rejoice to see in the hands of the children here that banner of glory which is the symbol of our greatness and the promise of our security * * * the story that it brings to us from the time of its adoption as our national emblem is one in which we may all find instruction and inspiration. It is the flag of the free." This message was repeated in different words throughout Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

To Californians he was no less direct and forceful when speaking about the American influence. "The American sentiment and feeling were never more controlling than now; and I do not use this term in the narrow sense of native American, but to embrace all loyal citizens, whether nativeborn or adopted, who have the love of the flag in their hearts." To the people of San Francisco he was candid: "You, in California, full of pride and satisfaction with the greatness of your State, will always set above it the greater glory and the greater citizenship which our flag symbolizes."

At Grant's Pass, Medford, Oreg., General Harrison spoke most cordially to comrades and veterans of the Civil War. "I am glad to see that the old flag you took to the field and brought home in honor is still held in honor among you. It is a beautiful emblem of a great Government. We ought to teach our children to love it and regard it as a sacred thing, a thing for which men have died and for which men will die. * * * It is this flag that represents us on the sea and in foreign countries; it is under this flag that our navies sail and our armies march. * * *"

During the twilight of Harrison's administration his crusade for our country's flag met with success. In Boston, Francis Bellamy, an editor of the Youth's Companion, wrote the original pledge of allegiance: "I pledge allegiance to my flag and for the Republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." That draft was written in August, 1892. Soon the pledge was changed to read "the Flag of the United States," with the subsequent addition of "of America." Harrison rejoiced to note that it was first repeated at exercises in connection with the celebration of Columbus Day, 1892.

That same October, Mrs. Harrison died in the White House, and a few months later the President retired to private life, reechoing the motto of his tenure in the White House: "I did try to make the administration thoroughly American and hope that something was done to develop an increased love of the flag at home and increased respect for it abroad." Could he help but rejoice today? As one authority on the flag has phrased it: "* * * perhaps the greatest evidence of the solemn significance of the flag to the rank and file of America is found in the very simplicity of the oath of allegiance that is repeated daily by millions assembled in schools, conventions, luncheon gatherings, in short, wherever true Americans congregate."

If it is true that "a thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself," how great must be the pride of every true American today. When we see our flag today, we instinctively see it as Washington and Harrison saw it—a symbol of liberty and freedom to all who live beneath it. Therefore to Washington and to Harrison, his centennial successor, this Nation owes unending gratitude for the love and the patriotism, symbolized by our flag, that burn in free American hearts today. Harrison raised the flag over the sschoolhouse, but he also planted it in the schoolboy's heart.

Walk His Ways Under the Guidance of the Gospel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I wish to make a statement concerning a special issue on Christianity published December 26, 1955, by Life magazine.

As we all know, Christianity is the bulwark of this Nation. Indeed, this Nation was first settled by persons who voluntarily relinquished traditional home ties at great personal sacrifice that they might have freedom of worship. The Founding Fathers of our Government recognized this spirit of religious freedom and while formulating the basic law of our land, the Constitution, included a measure to safeguard forever this precious right.

Much has been said and written in recent months about the rebirth of Christianity and the religious renaissance. I believe religion has always been a vital part of our communal existence and that it is no more so now than at other times in the past. However, it pleases me greatly that the various media of communication is giving such worldwide attention to Christianity in this era of international tension. The special issue of Life magazine, to which I have referred, is an excellent example of the public service interests to which the majority of the Nation's press organizations are dedicated. I commend them for their attitude.

Among Life magazine's beautifully illustrated articles on religion was one entitled, "A Cloistered Life of Devotion," photographed by Gordon Parks. This article told the modern, yet age-old, story of daily devotion at St. Benedict's Abbey in Atchison, Kans.

The text which accompanied the many illustrations is as follows:

WALK HIS WAYS UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF THE GOSPEL

Living in the shadow of a rotting Roman Empire, his religion but a few centuries old, St. Benedict turned his thoughts to how a Christian might best "do battle for Christ the Lord" and "walk His ways under the guidance of the Gospel." His conclusions set down in the holy rule prescribed a life devoted to prayer, study, and labor which has characterized the Benedictine order for 14 centuries. In America, Benedictines followed the frontier, establishing monasteries like St. Benedict's Abbey in Atchison, Kans., that have made the American Benedictine congregation to which it belongs the second largest in the world.

Monks enter St. Benedict's as novices. * * * Instructed by priests, they become clerics and are prepared for perpetual vows. Seven times a day the monks meet for prayer, following the scriptures quoted by St. Benedict: "Seven times a day I have given praise to Thee." After the last prayers the silence of meditation descends on the monastery until the following morning.

But although devotion is primary, the abbey is also a self-supporting part of the community. The 172 monks cultivate the land. They staff a college and school and act as the local weather observers, doing their duty in humility and leading their lives in the quiet belief that "the eye hath not seen * * * what things God hath prepared for them that love Him."

As even the untrained observer can well understand, it is not easy to portray in proper perspective such a significant story as this article in Life magazine. Yet, with only a dozen pictures and a short text, life at St. Benedict's Abbey was accurately and vividly depicted. Testimonial to this is a letter from the abbot of St. Benedict's Abbey, Cuthbert McDonald, to the editors of Life magazine. His letter, which appeared in the January 16 issue of the magazine, read as follows:

ST. BENEDICT'S ABBEY,
Atchison, Kans.

SIRS: These are quiet days around St. Benedict's Abbey now that we are all famous monks (a cloistered life of devotion). Everyone seems to have his head buried in a copy of Life. We were well pleased. You hit a deeply spiritual note, and the characteristic Benedictine motifs come out clearly.

CUTHBERT MCDONALD, O. S. B.

Brink of War: Mr. Dulles Refuses To Eat Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Superior Evening Telegram of January 27, 1956, by Jim Dan Hill, Ph. D., president, Wisconsin State College, Superior, Wis.:

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD—BRINK OF WAR: MR. DULLES REFUSES TO EAT WORDS

The pot and pother about the Dulles interview (brink of war) in Life magazine is of no significance except for two things.

It serves as a reminder to all of us that 1956 is a presidential election year. The overall impact of the political uproad on our allies is not too good.

Those who allege our Secretary of State was talking when he should have been listening are not on firm ground. Should he refuse frank and forthright discussions with

the press, the scream would be "secret diplomacy." In the end that would create far more uncertainty and distrust than have the bring-of-war remarks.

Now that we are in an election year, it is not likely he or any other Cabinet officer will be able to say very much without inviting an adverse analysis by someone.

Nor does the high level Republican officialdom merit any special sympathy. They are being paid in the same coin they used in denouncing the Truman foreign policies.

The Korean fighting was Harry Truman's war when the Republicans were the critics, it will be recalled.

The Democrats are probably making a mistake in creating such a furore over the mere words "brink of war."

They are reminding millions of Americans with reasonably sound memories that Korean policies under Truman and Acheson did not constitute merely a brink of war; it was war.

The teapot tempest started when Mr. Dulles gave a Mr. James Shepley, of Life magazine staff, a rather self-congratulatory interview on the fine art of diplomacy as practiced by the State Department under his leadership for the past 3 years.

The art was a pokerlike skill of so thoroughly convincing the other fellow America would shoot if the final card had to be drawn to stay in the game that the other fellow throws in his hand rather than play it to the final showdown.

There were three instances in which these brink of war techniques had given America diplomatic success. Mr. Shepley reported:

(a) In June 1953, when Syngman Rhee released his 27,000 North Korean prisoners and it was feared the Reds would break off the truce talks, Dulles had intimated America's next play would be bombs beyonds the Yalu and atomic weapons on the battlefield.

(b) Similar toughness had paid dividends for the West in general and France in particular in settling the Indochina mess in the spring of 1954.

(c) And finally the fleet in the Formosa Strait and Chinese uncertainty as to our policies saved the situation there last summer.

Mr. Shepley quoted Mr. Dulles on all these.

Mr. Dulles seemed surprised that other reporters considered the Life story sensational, or unusual. He said he had not yet read it.

When he had the chance he did not repudiate his remarks to Mr. Shepley, though Mr. Luce, boss of the Time-Life magazine group, offered some semiretractive remarks.

The facts seem to be that Life's Mr. Shepley oversimplified some highly complex, diplomatic situations—something that Mr. Luce's slick magazines do too often for complete accuracy.

It is the secret of their art in getting and holding reader interest. And in this they are just as artful as Mr. Dulles ever dreamed of being.

No harm is done on this side of the two oceans, but how about elsewhere?

England and France, of course, are apprehensive and do not accept the implication that any success in diplomacy is because of 1, 2, or 3 Americans—not even Mr. Eisenhower, not to mention Dulles.

They will get over this. They always do. We have learned to discount the vaporings of their politicians when they are approaching an election season. Our allies should learn as much about us.

All in all, this has proved to be the most noise-producing interview any Secretary of State has given since Dean Acheson called in the press and gratuitously announced he was not turning his back on Alger Hiss. This was immediately after the second trial in which Hiss was convicted.

Thus, if Mr. Dulles was broadcasting when he should have been receiving, he is by no means the first offender in that office.

The Keeping of a Great Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on Sunday January 29, 1956, one of Minnesota's outstanding ministers, the Reverend Dr. Arnold Lowe, minister of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Minneapolis, spoke on the subject The Keeping of a Great Tradition. I might also add that this distinguished Minnesotan was recently named "national church preacher" by the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

I ask unanimous consent that the sermon may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KEEPING OF A GREAT TRADITION

(Sermon of Dr. Arnold H. Lowe, minister, Westminster Church, Minneapolis, Minn., as the national church preacher, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., January 29, 1956)

Text: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught." (II Thessalonians 2: 15.)

The Gospel of Christ is endlessly implicated in all our relationships, from the most casual domestic situation to the deepest loyalty which leads a man to offer his life for his country. This matter has simple beginnings and magnificent consequences.

It begins with the simple intimation that a man is not the master of his fate and ends with the magnificent recognition that God is the key to history—not a nation living under an angry symbol of hammer and sickle; not a fearful weapon of destruction. The key to history is still God. This matter begins with a simple realization that God lends the touch of beauty to everything that has grace and color and ends with the magnificent conviction that the pyramiding stratas in the earth, the seeming depthlessness of the universe, the almost mystical relationship between time and space and matter, or even the deep hinterland of the human mind reveal the majesty of God, so that we are led to say: "I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well." It begins with the simple observation that any man can love the soil which gave him birth and ends with the magnificent persuasion that only consecrated minds and hearts can keep the great tradition of a nation.

Now it is with us and our country as it was with us and those in whose shadows we walked when we were young. There are three things my father left me: a good name, a regard for intellectual integrity, and a thirst for truth. There are three things my mother left me: a love of books, a compassion for men, and a simple faith in God. These are good things to keep, but through the years I have learned that nothing can keep them but a consecrated devotion.

There is a spiritual kinship between a man and his country. The same blood runs in their veins. There are three things our forefathers left us: a Nation under God, a holy concern for the well-being of men, and a people morally strong. It will not be for historians of another day to say how well we will have kept the tradition. It is for us to know now how well we keep it. Like all wealth, a great tradition can be wasted. Men whose conscience is barren, whose minds are idle with vain ambitions, whose purpose is consumed in material satisfactions will not keep that tradition. No; the tradition has to fall into better hands than that. Only men and women whose hearts flame with the fire of God will keep it; only those who experience a divine urgency in their souls. A man's public service is an act of consecration, as it was when Isaiah said: "Here am I; send me"; as it was when Albert Schweitzer turned from his organ to a life of physical and spiritual surrender. For some reason a halo has been placed upon the preacher's head. This is unwarranted generosity. You who stand in the arena of public service must feel yourselves compelled by God, no less than those who stand in the pulpits of their churches. God calls his spokesmen from many ranks—statesmen and scientists, teachers, and workers, and here and there preachers, who must become prophets.

A nation under God—what a tradition that is. It involves much: Our way of life, our social and political morals, the wise use of our freedom, our common decencies. Those who came first to the eastern shores of our country did not seek gold at the end of their rainbow. They sought better things than that. The sought a drama of spiritual adventure. They sought a new way of life. They found the will to carve out of the forest a nation under God. To this purpose men held fast through the long years. There were storms; there was revolution; there was war of brother against brother; there was frustration and agony. But there was always this purpose—a nation under God. There was one frontier and then another. were storms; there was revolution; there was The wilderness yielded to the pride and the venturesomeness of men and women. It was still a nation under God. Rivers became highways; prairies became fertile fields; mountains became thoroughfares; hamlets became cities; security turned into plenty. It was still a nation under God.

In this day when people, are windblown by confusion, things of yesterday are fading into the background. Powerful influences are playing upon us. We stand challenged by a host of problems. At times we see darkening shadows of danger. A new world is emerging. But we are still a nation under God. It will take consecrated men and women to keep this tradition. If ever this dream grows dim and the great tradition is lost in the sands of indifference, we had better recall the words of Tennyson:

"O young Mariner,
Down to the haven,
Call your companions,
Launch your vessel
And crowd your canvas,
And, ere it vanishes
Over the margin,
After it, follow it,
Follow the Gleam."

Then we need to say with the Apostle Paul, "Hold the tradition which ye have been taught."

There is then this holy concern for the well-being of every man and every woman. What a tradition that is. It is woven into the texture of our souls. We did not create it. It was the deep concern of our Lord. He put it plainly: "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which is lost." Whatever Christ said—or, better still, whatever Christ did—He said and did because of His deep concern for the well-being of men. If He spoke of love and forgiveness, if He spoke of justice and mercy, if He suffered indignities at the hands of friend and enemy, it was because He was concerned for men. If He died on a cross, it was because He was concerned for men. Here a searching question reaches to the farthest corner of our minds. Why do men die before their time? In this

congregation there must be many who know the answer. They die for strange things—for freedom, for dignity of being, for self-respect, for God and country. It is the imponderables men die for. Not far from this city is the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. I knew him well. I saw him die many times. Why did he die? Why did Socrates die before his time? Not because of his concern for things that could be bought and sold. Why did Jesus die before his time? Not because of His concern for things that could be traded in the market place.

There are times when we talk as though the great social virtues—justice and equality and fair play—were ends in themselves. They are not. Justice is not a straitjacket. If it were, we might someday stand in judgment and look in vain for mercy. Equality is not a test scale. If it were, we might someday be weighed in the balance and found wanting. Fair play is not a gratuity. If it were, we might someday ask out of the deep of our need and receive no more than we deserve. Justice and equality and fair play are instruments of mercy. They hold the power of social healing. They belong to the great tradition, and it will take consecrated men and women to keep it. If this tradition grows dim, it will be because we have lost Christ and do no longer say:

"If Jesus Christ is a god—
And the only God—I swear
I will follow him through heaven and hell,
The earth, the sea, and the air!"

—Richard Watson Gilder, The Song of a Heathen.

So we come to the end of the way and to the last great tradition: a people morally strong. We have permitted cynics to lead us into a barren land and let their siren voices tell us that there are neither moral nor spiritual finalities in our human scheme. But morality is not a human prerogative which we may accept or reject. Morality is not a philosophical conclusion with which we may agree or disagree. Morality is not respectability. It is spiritual cement, which in one instance holds a family together and in another instance, as in our day, makes a nation so strong that it keeps the world from falling apart.

Shall not a minister be the moral conscience of his church? Shall not the church be the moral conscience of a nation? Shall not a Christian nation be the moral conscience of the world? From the far yesterdays, screened by the centuries that have gone, come these words: "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." These are haunting words, are they not? But there are other times when these words are like hammer blows and we cannot escape them. Some of us know. Some of us have tried. When we do, our souls condemn us; leadership falls from our hands like a broken sword; and there is no peace in us.

Strength and goodness have been the secret of America's greatness. Many years ago de Tocqueville came to this country, hoping to find the source of America's greatness and genius. Upon his return to his native shores he wrote: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers; and it was not there. I sought for the geratness and genius of America in her fertile fields and boundless forests; and it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her rich mines and vast world commerce; and it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution; and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because America is good—and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

These words are almost frightening. They should be written over the portals of every public building and every school and church. They should be enshrined in every American heart. We will continue to be great if we allow ourselves to be compelled by God. Yes, the Gospel of Christ is endlessly implicated in our relationships, from the most casual domestic situation to that strange love of country which tears at our hearts and asks for our full surrender. This is the great tradition, and only consecrated men and women will keep it.

One does not close such thoughts with exhortations. There are no words at the end which have the sound of trumpets. One can close only with a prayer. Fifty years ago I came to this country. This is my country. May it always be God's country.

It will be if we keep the great tradition.

Eighty-third Annual Meeting of the American Public Health Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the American Public Health Association held its 83d annual meeting in Kansas City, Mo., beginning on Monday, November 14, 1955.

There were several thousand delegates and visitors attending this annual meeting and a very interesting program was arranged. One part of the program was a symposium at which representatives from industry, labor, government, and education discussed on a panel, "Where Are We Going in Public Health?"

It was my privilge to speak on this panel as a representative of government, together with Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of the Jones & Laughlin Co., in Pittsburgh, Pa., for industry, Mr. Leonard Woodcock, vice president of the International UAW–CIO, of Detroit, for labor, and Dr. Fillmore Sanford, executive director of the American Psychological Association for Education.

As it was my privilege to speak for Government on that occasion, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement I made placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, ASSOCIATION SYMPOSIUM, AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, KANSAS CITY, MO., NOVEMBER 14, 1955

Mr. Chairman and officers, members and friends of the American Public Health Association, I am honored to be here and to participate in the Association Symposium, "Where Are We Going in Public Health?"

I believe the answer to that question will depend upon how well the people are informed on health matters—how active the various levels of government—namely, national, State, and local—become in meeting public health problems.

The Good Book says, "Where there is no vision, people perish," and we have been blessed in this Nation, in the field of public health, by having men and women with vision. It takes more than vision to build and carry out a great public health program. It takes faith and courage on the part of our citizens.

I realize there are more improvements required than just improvements in our medicine and surgery for a great public health program, but I believe we all recognize that great advancement has been made in these fields.

Some of the things which we now take for granted are priceless commodities that kings, emperors, and presidents could not obtain.

Would Abraham Lincoln and his wife, Mary, have quibbled about the price of a small quantity of antibiotics as they maintained their futile vigil at the bedside of their dying son?

Would Calvin Coolidge have preferred the wealth of the Indies or a few dozen sulphur tablets when septicemia was draining away the strength of his boy?

What of the untold thousands of parents who suffered mental anguish while their children were stricken with diphtheria, pneumonia, tetanus, influenza, smallpox, and other diseases which are almost unknown to American parents today.

Not being a medical man, I realize that I am treading on dangerous ground, but I do feel that there is some reason to believe that we are on the threshold of eliminating polio as one of the plagues of mankind. I am also confident that we are tightening the noose around the neck of cancer. Before many generations these words will be in the limbo of the past.

As we consider the field of public health, I know those of us in Government must give consideration to such programs as education, social security, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile delinquency, mental health, general health, hospital reconstruction, and training programs for doctors and nurses.

In the 83d Congress, which session began in January of 1953, Congress approved much legislation dealing with the various problems I have just mentioned:

1. Social security legislation was extended to cover an additional 10 million more Americans.

2. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954 will increase the level of rehabilitated persons from 60,000 to 200,000 per year.

3. Established a new Juvenile Delinquency Service Division in the Children's Bureau to offer professional consultation to States and communities and to search for improved methods of dealing with juvenile delinquency.

4. Changed existing laws to provide for Federal funds to supplement State and local resources for the building of chronic-disease hospitals, nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, thus recognizing medical problems of older Americans, the group most susceptible to chronic illness.

These major legislative measures enacted by the 83d Congress are bringing many benefits to the American people.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, which began in January 1955, consideration was given to the omnibus health bill sent to Congress by President Eisenhower at the beginning of the session.

In this session, Congress responded to the President's request for legislation in only one of the measures proposed in the omnibus bill—that of mental health.

In this field, Congress did forward to the President a measure which he approved, Public Law 182, which authorized an appropriation of $250,000 for the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1956, and $500,000 for each of the next 2 years for grants by the Surgeon General for one or more Government agencies for a basic study and evaluation of our mental health problems.

Among the programs which failed of consideration during the 1st session of the 84th Congress were:

1. The establishment of a self-sustaining health reinsurance service to increase the number of Americans protected by health insurance and to increase the scope of protection they enjoy.

2. Provision of Federal insurance of mortgage loans for the construction of private hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and related health facilities.

3. Expansion of practical nurse training under existing State vocational education programs.

4. The authority for the Public Health Service to provide traineeships for the graduate training of nurses and professional public health personnel in Public Health Service facilities or educational institutions.

5. Consolidation of the existing Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the promotion of general health services and the control of venereal disease, tuberculosis, cancer, and heart diseases.

It is my sincere hope that the second session of the 84th Congress will give favorable consideration to the proposal submitted by the President.

Every person who has worked in the field of government has a few achievements in which he quietly takes pride. As I now look back on my 4 years as Governor of the State of Kansas, it is health legislation that gives me some of my greatest satisfaction.

This kind invitation to visit with you affords me an opportunity to boast a bit of accomplishments in the field of health in Kansas, during my administration. Sincerely, I am glad to have been a part of health projects that so many persons worked on. I am glad these projects came into being while I was Governor. I am glad to report on them to you because now, some six or more years later, an obvious and apparent success is proof that our judgment was right and that there still is much work to be done.

The projects that immediately come to my mind are: Our mental-health program—our project to attain medical care in rural areas—and our project for handicapped children.

These are major undertakings and the cost of each was such that many persons wondered whether we could ever reap reasonable returns on our investment.

I believe our present story will supply the answer to that question:

I. MENTAL HEALTH

May I give you a brief account of what I recollect on the mental-health story in Kansas?

Our mental hospitals were what State-operated institutions for the insane all over the United States have been—relatively humane houses of incarceration to protect society from the patient and the patient from himself. Whatever else we said about these places was unrealistic and simply not true to the facts.

Actually, we didn't know what was happening until some surveys were made. From these surveys, the public learned the truth. They then became sufficiently aroused to act.

Now I do not need to tell you what our surveys revealed because the problem was the same everywhere—buildings were run down and overcrowded and were fire hazards and health hazards. Patients were all but forgotten—a commitment was almost tantamount to a life sentence and no one seemed to do anything about it.

We have the well-known Menninger Foundation in Kansas and we called in the doctors from this outstanding foundation and solicited their counsel and advice.

We called in doctors from all over the State, especially the Mental Health Committee of the Kansas Medical Society and we talked with leaders in every field—farmers, bankers, lawyers, churchmen, and yes, we talked with housewives, many of them.

Gradually we learned that the people wanted to do something to correct this situation and the professional people told us how we might do this.

I know there is much still left to be done—let there be no mistake about that—but let me show you what has been accomplished through the cooperation of the people of Kansas.

We immediately repaired and refurnished buildings. They are not new but they are safer today than they were and inside they are more attractive.

The long hard benches have been replaced with bright colored chrome chairs. There are rugs on the floors—curtains hanging in the windows—books for the patients to read.

There is organized entertainment and vocational therapy. The patients have begun to live instead of sitting out an endless existence. They talk—they laugh—and have an interest in things around them.

How this happened is far too long to recount here, but this is what has happened—Kansas has 3 mental hospitals, of which the 1 at Topeka was designated as a training center.

At this institution, there are 11 separate training programs such as adjunctive therapy, where people are trained in recreation, music and occupational work. There is a training program in psychology and social service—a training program for ministers who have an interest in such work.

Kansas schools of nursing now send their students here for their psychiatric experience. There are classes for lay volunteers who wish to help with the mentally ill. The University of Kansas School of Medicine sends each senior student to one of our mental hospitals for 6 weeks' training.

And there are others, but perhaps the most significant is the residency training program in psychiatry. Out of a 5-year residency, the physician who is specializing in psychiatry will spend 3 years at the Topeka State Hospital. I am told there are about 50 such physicians at this hospital now.

Such programs are gradually supplying us with trained personnel in our State hospitals, and of course we are training people for hospitals in other States too. But, in Kansas, the acute shortage of professional personnel may be over.

In comparing the Kansas situation of 1947 with that in 1955, here is what we find:

In 1947, there were 13 physicians in all our mental hospitals.

Today, there are 77, in addition to the 50 residents mentioned earlier.

We had no social workers in 1947, and now have 23.

Then, there were 9 registered nurses, now there are 56.

We had no trained psychiatric aides in 1947, today we have 609.

There were no dietitians in 1947; today there are 8.

The ratio of patients to employees has changed from 9 in 1947 to 2.2 at the close of last year. Expensive? Yes; this program is expensive in dollars and cents.

In 1947 it cost us 76 cents a day to keep a patient in a mental hospital. But in 1955, it cost us $5, and this cost will go still higher.

But look what our money is buying. We are sending people home cured and they are taking their place as constructive members of society again.

In spite of increased commitments, our average daily hospital census is actually declining. In 1948, we were proud to have released 400 persons. Last year, I am informed, almost 1,500 were dismissed as cured. And today the great majority are cured.

Worth the money? Honestly, I cannot think of any program adopted by our State that I could be more proud of, and this is only the beginning.

The future will be infinitely more dramatic. Where is there greater drama than in the restoration of a mind to useful service again? Where is there greater drama than in the reunion of a family?

That is why we are proud of this program, why I am pleased to have been a part of it, and why I am happy to have this opportunity to discuss it with you today.

II. DOCTORS FOR RURAL AREAS

The second major health effort was an effort to supply doctors to all parts of our State. It also is an expensive program but a successful one and one I wish I had time to discuss in detail.

After World War II, we were all concerned over the physician shortage and we all blamed the war for this situation.

In Kansas, we made a little survey and found that the war had very little effect on this crisis because we had been losing doctors constantly during the last 50 years and in addition to that, doctors were moving out of the country to the cities. So the entire State was losing doctors and rural Kansas was losing doctors twice as fast as the cities.

Dr. Franklin Murphy, now chancellor of the University of Kansas, came up with a formula that might cure this problem. It is in three parts which, as I remember, went a little like this:

1. We cannot expect other States to educate our young men and women in medicine. We must do this ourselves, if we expect them to come to Kansas to practice.

2. We must bring graduate medicine to the profession so they will not feel isolated.

3. Communities must understand that a doctor, to practice in a rural area, needs access to a hospital.

There was a great deal of effort spent in getting this project before the people but it was successful to a remarkable degree.

I had the pleasure of signing into law an appropriation bill of $3,862,560 to the medical school in 1949. It was most remarkable because, out of a house of 125 members, only 2 voted against this and they did so, not in protest to the plan, but because they wanted to draw the money from a different fund.

In other words, support of this venture was almost unanimous and, for our State, this $4 million was more than had been spent for the school in the past 20 years together.

Here is what it did: It increased the number of students per class from 80 to 125, at the present time. This makes it possible for 40 additional Kansas young men and women each year to enter medicine.

Now, as they finish their education, they are returning to Kansas to practice.

Part 2 of the program is strictly a professional venture—that of supplying graduate education. But I understand that our own school now ranks first in the United States in the volume of graduate education offered, so that problem has been solved and the hometown doctor can keep up with new developments without traveling long distances for such instruction.

Part 3 consists of preparing the community to receive its doctor. This involved many things and sometimes the construction of a hospital. In 1947, a division of hospital facilities was begun by the State board of health to administer the hospital licensing act passed by the legislature.

In the same year, we arranged to obtain access to Hill-Burton money and passed what I believe to be a very workable and elastic hospital district law. I wish I might go into detail because I find this a fascinating story, but time will not permit.

The conclusion is that the school of medicine was expanded—more students graduated and they began to locate in Kansas, in small towns too because they had built hospiptals or clinics. We have built or enlarged about 70 Kansas hospitals since the program went into effect. Today there are doctors practicing there, fine doctors doing an excellent job for Kansas.

Today, we have at least 1 doctor in each of our 105 counties and, in many small

towns where 1 doctor timidly set up to practice a few years ago, he had to get a partner. So now there are 2.

That is the story of the rural health program—a job we have done without subsidies or bonuses or contracts. If we could put the formula into one sentence, it would be that we tried to obtain doctors by making them want to practice and to live in our smaller towns.

I am proud also to have had a part in this venture because it is proving itself of value to the people of this State.

And now, I would like to just mention briefly one other Kansas project which I believe is of great importance both to parents and their children:

The Kansas Legislature of 1949, through House bill 440, created, within the State Department of Education, a division of special education. By this enactment, the State department of education could authorize certain schools to participate in a special education program for handicapped children.

That law has since been implemented and Kansas now has a program for children with speech deficiencies, supervised by well-trained and qualified speech teachers.

These children were not mentally retarded; they simply had a speech deficiency and needed special training and attention.

In addition to this law, the Institute of Logopedics of Wichita, Kans., is authorized to establish branch speech centers in certain qualified schools of the State.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have reported on these projects because it is my sincere belief that, if our people are to have the right kind of health programs and health protection, we must continue to conquer "medical isolation." We need to put additional emphasis on medical research and to carry on a progressive program in the field of public health education.

The Get-Us-All Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an address which was handed to me by Mr. Art Ziegler, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Ziegler is a high-school boy who has been very active in American patriotism organizations in his area for the past several years. The address appeared in the April issue of Facts Forum in 1955, and I believe it worthy of a place in the RECORD.

The address follows:

THE GET-US-ALL ADDRESS

One score and twenty years ago our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are fair game. Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculations, testing whether this taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure.

We are met on form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who here spend their lives that they may spend our money. It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot evade, we cannot cheat, we cannot underestimate the tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here have gone far beyond our poor power to add and subtract.

Our creditors will little note, nor long remember, what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here.

It is not for us, the taxpayers, to question the tax which the Government has thus far so nobly spent. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that this tax on the people, by the Congress, for the Government, shall not cause solvency to perish.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman at ADA Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 3, in New York City, I had the honor of addressing the ADA Roosevelt Day dinner, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks made at that time be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT ADA'S ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER, FEBRUARY 3, 1956, NEW YORK CITY

The sincere praise of good friends is music to the ear. I am afraid I have heard more tonight than is either justified or is good for any man. The presence and the words of my friend, Governor Averell Harriman, and of my beloved colleagues from the Senate, and of the array of other eminent and distinguished persons who have gathered here tonight, do me much more honor than I deserve.

But although I believe I am too old to have my head turned by praise, I am still quite young enough to enjoy and appreciate it.

Thank you for the honor of this occasion.

This tribute should, in fact, be directed to the memory of the man in whose name tonight's dinner is being held. And, in a certain sense, it has been. For I consider myself something of an apostle of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and of all the great causes and principles which have come to be identified with him, and which history calls the New Deal.

I was not only his friend for 30 years, but in New York State I tried to be what he called me while I was his lieutenant governor—his good right arm. He often said that I did his worrying for him. And although I differed with him on some occasions, publicly as well as privately, I did my best during his lifetime, as I have since his death, to carry on the fight for the kind of government * * * the kind of society here at home and the kind of world order Franklin Roosevelt conceived and worked so greatly to achieve.

I am proud indeed to be along with HUBERT HUMPHREY, national co-chairman of these Roosevelt Day dinners across the country.

I am proud, too, to be a national vice chairman of the ADA. My pride is enhanced, rather than dimmed, by the attacks which have been and continue to be made against ADA.

In this election year we can look for those attacks to be intensified. They constitute, in fact, ADA's merit badge of achievement, a reflection of the effective role ADA has played in our public life.

Of course, ADA does not pretend to have a copyright on liberalism, nor does it insist on the use of its trademark on all liberalism or on all liberals.

But the ADA is concerned over the quality of the product that is offered under the name of liberalism.

Thus President Eisenhower was recently called a New Dealer because of his State of the Union Message. Shades of Alice in Wonderland. And to top it off, this so-called New Deal message won the immediate praise and support of such liberals as Senators BRIDGES, BRICKER, and BUTLER.

As a matter of fact, this is nothing to be really surprised at. This is simply a recurrent political phenomenon known as leap year liberalism. Every fourth year, in the same year that a maid can propose to a man, and when candidates for public office propose to the voters, so-called liberalism bursts out all over.

It should be reassuring, but it is disturbing, too. It is reassuring that liberalism is so popular, but it is disturbing to think that some voters may be taken in by the leap-year liberals.

The trouble arises from a lack of general understanding of what liberalism really is. To begin with, liberalism is much more than the sum of those specific programs and policies which have, at one time or another, been advocated by liberals.

Once upon a time liberals fought for public utility rate regulation, for the Sherman Antitrust Act, and for the Clayton Antitrust Act. Well, these eventually were adopted and today no one, but no one, directly repudiates them. Not even Senator BRIDGES. Does that make Senator BRIDGES a liberal?

The New Deal ushered in regulation of the stock market and the commodity market; it outlawed utility holding companies; it established bank deposit insurance, and social security. Does that make liberals of everybody who today accepts these programs—which is practically everybody?

President Eisenhower has indicated his acceptance of the principle of minimum-wage legislation, of Federal aid for school construction, of Federal aid for voluntary health-insurance plans, and of public housing, for example. Remember, I said "the principle."

Does that make President Eisenhower a true liberal, and make the Republican Party into a liberal party?

I am not ready to concede that. If liberals are willing to accept these, and these alone, as passwords of liberalism, then we have certainly lowered our standards, and liberalism has lost the meaning I always thought it had.

As I undestand it, liberalism is, above all, a spirit of action, a method of approach to problems, and a devotion to certain basic tenets of faith in freedom and in individual dignity.

And of these three characteristics, the last is the most important.

Liberals believe not only in the Bill of Rights, but in the right of individuals to exercise those rights, free from intimidation, coercion, or punishment.

Liberals believe not only in the right to be right, but even more importantly, in the right to be wrong.

Liberals believe not only in the words "equal opportunity" and "nondiscrimination," but believe that these words must be implemented by action: they believe that the denial of equality of opportunity, or the practice of discrimination on the basis of

race, creed, color, or national origin is not only absolutely wrong, but absolutely intolerable.

Liberals believe in the ceaseless reexamination of all doctrine and orthodoxy.

Liberals believe in the encouragement of the strong, but not at the expense of the weak.

Liberals believe in the widest and most equitable distribution of the benefits of prosperity. We are opposed to the trickle-down theory of economics.

Liberals do not believe that the sole business of Government is business. We believe that business of Government is the welfare of all sectors of the Nation.

Liberals believe in international cooperation and brotherhood; in the possibility of peace, security, prosperity and justice for all nations and all peoples.

Liberals believe that we are our brother's keeper.

Liberals believe that each human life and each human soul, whether in America or elsewhere, is important.

Liberals are opposed to communism and totalitarianism in any form, under any name.

I have listed 11 criteria of liberalism as I understand it. I have undoubtedly omitted some important ones.

I do not expect that every liberal will agree with my definitions. We do not expect every liberal to fit into a rigid category in order to be a liberal. But he must have the liberal spirit and the liberal faith.

The liberal spirit is an adventurous spirit—a spirit of bold experiment and courageous attack on problems. It is a spirit which strives for the practical but does not automatically reject the ideal.

It is a spirit of pressing forward toward new horizons, attempting not only to resolve the problems of today but to anticipate the problems of tomorrow.

The liberal sprit puts the accent on youth—on the youth who are the inheritors of our successes and our failures.

Do you remember—some of you are surely old enough to remember—the early days of the New Deal? Do you remember the Civilian Conservation Corps? The WPA? And the National Youth Administration?

High among the priorities of the New Deal were the programs designed to meet the problems of our young men and women.

Among other reasons, that is why the New Deal appealed so deeply to the young and why there was a trend, which has not yet been reversed, for first voters to become Democrats.

Where is the emphasis on youth today? Where is that bold forward-seeking spirit that characterized our Government in the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt?

Where is the ferment of ideas which led to some of the greatest advances our country had ever made—from the brink of economic disaster and despair to the highest levels of economic and scientific achievement the world has ever known?

The spirit of the New Deal is not to be found in the ranks of this administration.

There were some wild and woolly minded young men in Government in those days. But collectively they had a spirit which infected the land—a spirit of reform and recovery, of reconstruction and of construction. This spirit lighted new fires of sacrifice, dedication, and patriotic endeavor which brought America from depression into recovery, and then on to victory in World War II.

Today, in place of that spirit we have the stodgy, stifling atmosphere of caution and restraint—a spirit of search—not for solutions, but for slogans; an emphasis not on pioneering but on merchandising.

This is the spirit of 1956—the spirt of this administration, the spirit of this time.

I do not mean to indicate that all we need to do to renew and rekindle the spirit of the New Deal is to elect a Democratic President. It is not quite as simple as that. There are deep ailments afflicting the national soul today.

But I do mean that as we liberals go into this election year, our sights must be set high because we have fallen back and have far to go.

November is still 10 months away, but it is also very soon. Let us consider well what we are going to say to the people in the months ahead.

The people are wiser than some people think. Neither the violence nor the extravagance of unsupported assertions will convince them. They may be temporarily swayed, but they will not be held by trick or maneuver. nI the long run, they will see through hypocrisy.

Their support can be won by honesty, sincerity, vision, courage, and a sense of responsibility. It can be won by talking sense.

In appealing to voters we must speak in the language of the times and address ourselves to the problems of the hour. But we dare not try to anticipate too much the passing public mood and tailor our program and principles to it.

Such a presentation will ring false and come out untrue.

The people will know.

The chief task of liberals in the year ahead is to help frame the issues.

They must help to insure that the people will have a clear choice between clearly alternative sets of principles and programs.

Of all the issues there is one which, in 1956, serves better than any other as a touchstone of liberalism. I mean the issue of civil rights.

I have spoken too often on this subject—and this is too sophisticated an audience—for me to be required to spell out what I mean.

If a candidate is to qualify as a liberal candidate he must show a deep understanding and firm resolve on this issue. He may not duck or dodge it.

There is no halfway house on the road to equal human rights for all our citizens.

It is the duty of government to see that none of our citizens is treated less equally than others. When there is a threat to the very authority of government, as there is today, it is time that the struggle is joined and pressed to its inevitable conclusion.

I know that this issue cuts across party lines. I have heard the wish expressed that the civil-rights issue be taken out of politics. That wish is academic. And those who wish it are reflecting an inadequate understanding of the inner workings of democracy.

In this election, the people are going to vote on the civil-rights issue. It is their only opportunity to express themselves effectively. It is the only way they can give their mandate.

I have no doubt of what this mandate will be.

I have faith in the people's wisdom. I have faith in the basic truths of liberalism. And if all of us—each one of us here—and those thousands and hundreds of thousands like us throughout the country—if we truly have faith, we cannot truly fail.

Economic Idiocy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Hunterdon County Democrat, Flemington, N. J., dated January 12, 1956, which is quoted, as follows:

ECONOMIC IDIOCY

At a time when the administration is advocating a soil bank to take land out of production and the taxpayers are buying and storing surplus crops at a staggering cost, one would think that advocates of irrigation projects would be keeping mum. But that is not the case.

The Nation has 21 million acres of rich, idle farmland in the Midwest, South, and Southeast available for crop production when more food and fiber are needed. But Congress is being asked to approve the upper Colorado River project to irrigate 523,000 acres of arid mountain land at a cost of $4 billion in added taxes. Conservative estimates show that it will cost $5,000 an acre to bring water to this land and grade it so that it can be properly irrigated and brought into production.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, says "the whole thing is nothing short of economic idiocy." It so happens that the crazier the schemes are the more apt they are to be adopted by our economic planners. A letter to your New Jersey Senators and Congressmen may help to head this one off.

Inside the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inside the Republican Party," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report on February 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(By David Lawrence)

Lately there have been rumblings about disaffection inside the Republican Party among conservatives and antiradical groups. The dissenters argue that the Eisenhower administration has accepted too much of the New Deal doctrine, has blocked the adoption of the Bricker amendment, or has not been vigorous enough on the issue of subversion and anticommunism in this country.

Differences of opinion on particular issues also confront the Democratic Party.

An interesting example of how a leading Republican conservative handles the dilemma was given by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, at one of the "Salute to Eisenhower" dinners on January 20. He said:

"Just 3 short years ago we were embroiled in a bloody, stalemated war in Korea. Today, the ship of state sails on calm, though still treacherous, waters of peace. In just 3 short years, a Republican administration unraveled a tightly regimented economy. Today, we have a dynamic, free, and competitive economy—an economy which is providing us with the greatest material blessings in the history of man. We live in an era of uneasy peace and unparalleled prosperity.

"Only extreme partisans and demagogs will maintain that this peace and prosperity is not due, at least in part, to the leadership of the man who occupies the most powerful elective office on earth * * *.

"In choosing not to emphasize President Eisenhower's legislative program on this occasion, I do not mean to impugn its general excellence. The fact is, however, that the legislative program outlined in the state of the Union message is the work of an army of presidential aids. We should not expect our President to be fully conversant with all the details of his legislative recommendations. That knowledge could be acquired only by a criminal sacrifice of Presidential time—the time which he devotes to life and death issues of foreign and national defense policy. President Eisenhower rightly refuses to regard the Congress as a mere rubber stamp. Accordingly, he should not be blamed for Congress shortcomings nor given paramount credit for Congress achievements.

"As an example of the President's courageous leadership, I cite the foreign policy of this Republican administration. A President of less courage might have declared South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam beyond the defense perimeter of the United States. History proves, however, that firmness and courage in foreign policy are more likely to maintain peace than attitudes of vacillation or appeasement. President Eisenhower has had the courage to take risks. Partisan critics profess to be horrified by the fact that America has been pushed several times in recent years to the brink of war. They are, however, notoriously silent about alternative methods to stem Communist aggression. We do know this. During the administrations of each of the last three Democratic Presidents, America stood on the brink of war and each time plunged over the precipice. President Eisenhower has not permitted that to happen.

"As an example of patriotic leadership, consider the President's forceful actions against subversive influences. If there is a softness toward communism in the top echelons of government, no combination of congressional investigating committees can uproot it from the executive branch. President Eisenhower has not airily disregarded pertinent FBI reports. He has not promoted any Harry Dexter Whites. He has not decried undeniable evidence of Communists in government as 'red herring.'

"President Eisenhower's leadership has inspired not only America but the entire non-Communist world. Our network of mutual security alliances was never stronger. The President, almost single handedly, showed the world how the atom could be consecrated to man's life instead of being the instrument of his destruction. Yes, even the Communist dictators have been inspired by the President. They have been inspired by the healthy fear that any overt act of aggression is apt to bring swift and deadly retaliation.

"In the area of economic policy the conservative quality of the President's leadership has produced enormous benefits. One example of this conservatism was the President's reluctance to accept standby price and wage control authority which some Members of Congress were anxious to give him. No President in recent times has spurned a proposed grant of power. * * *

"President Eisenhower's leadership has been conciliatory in tone. No longer do we have a President who, for political gain, pits class against class, workers against management, and rich against poor. One result of this conciliatory leadership has been the generally harmonious relationship between the White House and Capitol Hill. Another result of this conciliatory approach has been the President's success in advancing equality of opportunity for all Americans without stepping beyond the limits of his constitutional authority * * *.

"We salute him tonight and hope to salute him on five more anniversaries of his inaugural."

More Than a News Photo Is at Stake Under Public Law 566—Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., under date of February 1, 1956, protesting to the provision of Public Law 566 which prohibits the taking of pictures in Federal public buildings.

The editorial is as follows:

MORE THAN A NEWS PHOTO IS AT STAKE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 566—FREEDOM

It is somewhat astounding to learn that, in this land of the coveted free press, a newspaper photographer must look up the custodian of the Federal building and get special permission if his newspaper wants a picture of taxpayers waiting in line to pay their income taxes.

What makes it even more astounding—beyond the interference with freedom of the press—is that those people in line are there to pay the salary of the building custodian and all the expenses that go with the upkeep and services of that Federal building.

In short, the Federal building is a public building and all the Government employees working in that building are supposed to be servants of the people.

And yet, under Public Law 566, just because he has camera in hand, a newspaper photographer is not free to enter the Federal building for purposes of making a picture, notwithstanding the fact that he is part of the taxpaying public and also is supposed to be protected by the constitutional guarantee of a free press.

This law, enacted by Congress in 1948, says that "taking of photographs for commercial or publication purposes within property is prohibited unless prior permission is obtained."

Frederick D. Ehle, General Services custodian for Federal buildings and grounds in West Virginia, takes this to mean that special permission must be obtained from him before a newspaper photographer may make a picture—any picture—on Federal property.

Under the law and Mr. Ehle's interpretation, we presume the same procedure would have to be followed before any news picture could be made in the post office to illustrate the Christmas rush or any other unusual activity.

By the same strict interpretation, we must also presume that a saboteur who wanted to make a picture of a top-drawer secret in the Federal building would not be restricted by Public Law 566, because it refers to photographs "for commercial or publication purposes."

We have no particular quarrel with Mr. Ehle, even though it does seem to be going a little far in requiring special permission for a newspaper to photograph a line of people waiting to pay their income taxes.

Our quarrel is with Public Law 566 which, to our mind, is an abridgment of the Constitutional provision on freedom of the press and which says, in effect, that the public's business is none of the public's business.

Mr. Ehle has a job to do * * * just as a newspaper photographer has a job to do when he is sent on a picture assignment involving the Federal building. Unfortunately, if Mr. Ehle is ill or out to lunch, the newspaper photographer apparently is without the means of getting Government approval to do his job.

The big thing involved here is a principle. If a newspaper photographer is thwarted in his efforts to get a picture of a line of taxpayers, that will not be greatly missed nor long remembered.

But Public Law 566 provides the means of keeping secret the public's business * * * of denying the people their constitutional right to know what is going on in their Government.

This is the basis of government by secrecy, and that is the first stepping stone to totalitrianism—distatorship. It happened in Germany, in Russia, in Argentina—everywhere that freedom has been snuffed out, the first step has been suppression of the press.

Once that has been done, Government officials can make their plans and build their power under the protection of secrecy * * * and the people learn about it only when they awaken to find themselves powerless in the bonds of suppression.

In the name of freedom, Public Law 566 should be repealed.

The Use of Atomic Energy for Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1954, carried a report I offered for the record on the subject of the Use of Atomic Energy for Electric Power. In the nearly 2 years which have followed a great amount of change has occurred, and it might be apropriate for me to review in summary form the progress which has been made. Although all the data I am presenting has been drawn from public sources, the information is scattered, and developments are coming so fast that accounts of even a few weeks back are already out of date. This report covers what had been announced by December 31, 1955. I wish to acknowledge the very capable assistance of Charles S. Sheldon, II, Ph. D. of the Library of Congress staff in preparing it.

My concern is with reactors whose primary purpose is the generation of power. There are many parallel programs which impinge upon this field, and they affect each other because the advances in one reactor program influence the design and costs of other programs. Because these several programs are so interrelated, I want to talk about all of them.

Only a small part of our total expenditures for atomic energy has gone into the development of power reactors. This was because of the overriding need for weapons development in the race for survival. But power development can be delayed no longer, and in each of the last several years, expenditures for power

research and development have been stepped up.

Our specific projects which have been made public are easiest to comprehend if presented in tabular form. Table I shows this information, and my discussion of the several parts of this program is built around this table.

My report of 2 years ago described the four study groups which explored various power reactor concepts in a series of design studies. These groups were: First, Commonwealth Edison Co.-Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois; second, Dow Chemical Co.-Detroit Edison Co.; third, Monsanto Chemical Co.-Union Electric Co.; and, fourth, Pacific Gas & Electric Co.-Bechtel Corp. These initial studies have long since been completed and many of their results have been used in the concrete projects now underway.

CIVILIAN-REACTORS PROGRAM

A greatly expanded number of study groups are undertaking a wide range of projects associated with power generation. By June 30, 1955, there were 25 groups under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission: First, American Machine and Foundry Co.; second, Atomic Power Development Associates, headed by Detroit Edison Co. and consisting additionally of 25 utilities and 8 engineering, construction, and manufacturing firms; third, the Babcock and Wilcox Co.; fourth, Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton and the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad; fifth, Bendix Aviation Corp.; sixth, Bethlehem Steel Co.; seventh, Combustion Engineering, Inc.; eighth, Consumer Public Power District of Nebraska; ninth, Ford Motor Co.; tenth, Foster-Wheeler Corp.-Pioneer Service and Engineering Co.-Diamond Alkali, and 6 associated companies; eleventh, General Dynamics Corp.; twelfth, General Electric Co.; thirteenth, Kaiser Engineers Division of Henry J. Kaiser Co.; fourteenth, Monsanto Chemical Co.; fifteenth, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; sixteenth, Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry-Dock Co.; seventeenth, Nuclear Power Group, consisting of 5 companies; eighteenth, Pacific Northwest Power Group, consisting of 4 companies; nineteenth, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.; twentieth, Puget Sound Utilities Council; twenty-first, Rocky Mountain Nuclear Power Study Group, consisting of 9 companies; twenty-second, Seminole Electric Cooperative Association; twenty-third, Tennessee Valley Authority; twenty-fourth, the Vitro Corporation of America; twenty-fifth, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

TABLE I.—*Civilian power reactor program*

Reactor concept name	Location	Scheduled completion date	Moderator	Coolant	Fuel	Heat output (kilowatts)	Electrical output (kilowatts)	Total cost (millions)[1]	Cost per kilowatt[1]	Cost per kilowatt-hour (mills)[1]	Constructor	Operator
(a) Earlier experiments:												
Boiling water	Borax I, Arco, Idaho	1953	Water	Water	Nat and Hi enrich U						Argonne	Argonne.
Do	Borax II, Arco, Idaho	1954	do	do	Nat and Hi enrich U		3,700				do	Do.
Do	Borax III, Arco, Idaho	1955	do	do	Nat and Hi enrich U	15,000	2,400				do	Do.
Fast breeder	EBR-1, Arco, Idaho	1951	None	Na-K	U-235 in blanket U-238	1,400	170	3			do	Do.
Homogeneous, aqueous	HRE-1, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	1952	Water	D_2O	Hi enrich UO_2SO_4	1,000	140	10			Oak Ridge	Oak Ridge.
(b) 5-year program:												
Pressurized water	PWR, Shippingport, Pa.	1957	do	Water	Sli enrich U	264,000	60-100,000	85	630	8-20	Westinghouse	Duquesne Light Co.
Boiling water	EBWR, Lemont, Ill.	1956	do	do	Nat and Hi enrich U	20,000	5,000	17			Allis-Chalmers	Argonne.
Fast breeder	EBR-2, Arco, Idaho	1958	None	Sodium	U-Pu alloy	62,500	15,000	40			Argonne	Do.
Homogeneous, aqueous	HRE-2, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	1956	D_2O	D_2O	Hi enrich UO_2SO_4	10,000	300	47			Oak Ridge	Oak Ridge.
Do	HTR, Oak Ridge, Tenn.	1959	D_2O	D_2O	Same, plus thorium	65,000	16,000				do	Do.
Sodium graphite	SRE, Santa Susana, Calif.	1956	Graphite	Sodium	Sli enrich U	20,000	7,500	13			North American	North American.
(c) Later and proposed additions to 5-year program:												
	LASLR, Los Alamos, N. Mex.						5-10,000				Los Alamos	Los Alamos.
Liquid metal	LMFR				U-Bi hi enrich and Th_3Bi_5 blanket.		10-20,000				Babcock & Wilcox	Brookhaven.
Organic moderated	OMRE, Arco, Idaho		Dowtherm A or E.				20-40,000				North American	North American.
(d) Power demonstration reactor program:												
Fast breeder	Monroe, Mich.	1958-59	None	Sodium	Hi enrich U and blanket	300,000	100,000	54	540		[Not named yet]	Detroit Edison.
Boiling water, dual cycle	Dresden, Ill.	1960	Water	Water	Sli enrich U	682,000	180,000	45+	250		General Electric	Commonwealth Edison.
Sodium graphite	Columbus, Nebr.	1958-59	Graphite	Sodium	Sli enrich U	250,000	76,000	20-25	320	7-11	North American	Consumer Public Power.
Pressurized water	Rowe, Mass.	1958	Water	Water	Sli enrich U	500,000	134,000	25-30	230	8-10	Monsanto-Fluor Corp.	Yankee Atomic Electric.
Homogeneous, aqueous	(Allentown, Pa)	1962	D_2O	D_2O	UO_2SO_4, Th-D_2O blanket		150,000	20-25			Westinghouse	Pennsylvania Power & Light.
Boiling water, closed cycle	Elk River, Minn.	1959	Water	Water	Sli enrich U (and oil)		[2] 22,000	6.5	273	8	American Machine & Foundry.	Rural Co-op Power Association.
(e) Other applications:												
Pressurized water	Buchanan, N. Y.	1959-60	do	do	Sli enrich U or Th (and oil)	500,000	[3] 236,000	55	233	7-9	Babcock & Wilcox	Consolidated Edison.
Fast breeder	(Philadelphia, Pa)							54			[Foster Wheeler?]	Philadelphia Electric.

[1] Not an accurate indicator for ultimate commercial production costs due to involvement of experimental and research items and other noncommercial factors.

[2] 17,600 nuclear.

[3] 140,000 nuclear.

The several laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission have built experimental reactors for power generation. They have discovered that by altering reactor design, among the hundreds of variations open to them, they could maximize radioactivity for research purposes, or conversion of U238 into plutonium, or heat generation. All three processes simultaneously are present, and like the difficult cost accounting problems associated with a multipurpose hydroelectric dam, power costs depend a little on whether the primary interest is to breed plutonium for military purposes, or to generate heat for power.

My report of 2 years ago summarized the principal types of power reactors which were then known to the public. All of these types and more are now represented in working piles included in table I. Very small experimental reactors need highly enriched uranium in order to sustain a chain reaction. The larger models can go critical with only slightly enrished uranium. Many of the projects include some conversion of U–238 into Pu–239 or of Th–232 into U–233. This is the "stretcher-outer" type I referred to in my previous report, that allows some conversion of nonfissile material to economize in the use of the very expensive U–235 or its equivalents in plutonium and U–233. The greatest economies probably will be associated with breeder reactors which will produce more fissile material than they consume, but it will take longer to develop the experimental reactors of this type into large plants.

The first operational power reactors of significance are the military types used in submarines. The STR pressurized water reactor has to use very expensive, highly enriched uranium in order to be made small enough to mount in the submarine *Nautilus*. The SIR, which uses liquid sodium instead of water as a coolant, was the first to supply as a byproduct this year commercial power from the prototype at West Milton, N. Y.

The STR reactor which had to be developed under high priorities for naval purposes, supplied much useful data which could be used for the development of civilian powerplants. So, too, did the design study undertaken for the CVR project for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, which was canceled. Both of these were pressurized water reactors, one of the simpler designs, although not especially economic. It was adopted as the type for the first full-scale power project, the one which will serve the Duquesne Light Co. in the Pittsburgh area. Although it is not expected to supply cheap power, it seemed to offer the best prospects for gaining experience quickly in the operation of a large plant.

To avoid the complications of working with high pressures, the boiling water reactor, which is basically of the same type as the pressured water design, was tested in three successive small reactors at Arco, Idaho. It was Borax III, which for a short time supplied 2,000 kilowatts to the nearby town of Arco in 1955. These studies have led to the construction of an intermediate-sized boiling-water reactor at Lemont, Ill., for the Argonne Laboratories. Earlier experiments with a fast-breeder reactor have led to the planning of an intermediate-sized reactor of this type at Arco, but it is still over 2 years away from completion.

Reactors which are designed primarily for breeding plutonium rather than power have to be shut down frequently to change the fuel elements which contain the partially converted U238. In power generation, the purpose is to have as near continuous power production as possible with fuel elements which can remain in the reactor for extended periods. One solution to this problem is to depart from the heterogenous reactors which are best known, and to use homogeneous reactor fuel instead. This type uses highly enriched uranyl sulphate in a solution of heavy water. As it passes through the reactor vessel, the chain reaction is possible, but as the solution is piped to carry away the heat, it is not concentrated in sufficient quantity to react. A heat exchanger picks up the heat for the turbine. These experiments are continuing with scaled-up intermediate models, and in time may also breed some thorium into U233. There is no necessity to shut down the pile to replenish fuel, for byproducts can be separated from the continuously flowing liquid mixture, and new fuel added. This in the future may offer great economies. The highly corrosive nature of uranyl sulphate makes it difficult to handle, however.

Also difficult to handle is liquid sodium, which is a much more efficient heat transfer agent than water. Probably some of the experience gained from the SIR naval reactor will be useful to the sodium-graphite reactor being completed by North American Aviation as a part of the 5-year program of power reactors.

Although the Los Alamos Laboratory reactor has other uses, it is making contributions to the civil program and is now classed as part of the 5-year program. There are other new reactor suggestions which have also been commended for inclusion in the program. One is the use of a homogenous reactor which instead of being aqueous uses liquid metal. This promises potentially considerable savings in its greater efficiency but also involves difficult engineering design problems. It would circulate highly enriched uranium and bismuth with a blanket system of Th_2Bi_5. Another recent proposal is for an organic moderated reactor which would use Dowtherm A or E for the moderator.

Growing realization that foreign countries cannot afford large plants, even though they are the only ones that yet offer much prospect of early economy in operation, and the interest of some smaller utilities in sharing in atomic developments have led to the proposal for a new program for three sizes of small reactors. These plans probably will draw upon the experience which is being acquired in the Army package power-reactor program.

As a result of the earlier study group investigations of reactors and the amendment of the Atomic Energy Act, a power demonstration reactor program has been launched. This goes beyond the joint AEC-Westinghouse-Duquesne Light Co. plant under construction at Shippingport. It includes a number of central power station plans. The program has some limits to it. The purpose is to extend some Atomic Energy Commission aid to selected projects which will test each of the principal reactor types showing promise of generating reasonably competitive power. There is no substitute for the kind of experience to be gained from such actual operations. The Atomic Development Associates have proposed a very advanced fast-breeder reactor to supply power to the Detroit Edison Co. Some 21 companies will share in the development. The nuclear power group headed by Commonwealth Edison, and joined by seven utilities and the Bechtel Corp., plan a boiling-water reactor for the Chicago area. General Electric is to supply a dual-cycle type which offers marked economies over earlier test models. After first being rejected, now a revised plan of the Nebraska Consumer Public Power District is to receive power from a sodium-graphite reactor. In New England, the Yankee atomic electric group of 12 utilities wants to build a pressurized-water reactor on the Pittsburgh model, but as of this date there is still some question whether it meets the needs of the demonstration program. A late proposal of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. of Allentown would call for the construction of an advanced homogeneous aqueous reactor which might be eligible under the AEC's demonstration program. The smallest of the later proposals is for a boiling-water, closed-cycle reactor for Elk River, Minn. It would differ from the other reactors listed by using conventional oil fuel in a superheater unit to boost the temperature of the steam for greater efficiency in the turbine. Only 17,600 kilowatts of the total 22,000 kilowatts of electricity generated would be attributable to the nuclear part of the plant.

Outside the demonstration program is a major plant projected by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, to be built on the Hudson at Indian Point. It would not require partial financing by the AEC. It also is a pressurized-water type, using conventional fuel to superheat the steam. Of its total power output of 236,000 kilowatts of electricity, 140,000 would be of nuclear origin. Another independent project which has not reached concrete form yet is a proposal for a fast-breeder reactor to serve the Philadelphia Electric Co. and some eight other utilities sharing in the development. Finally, the Rocky Mountain nuclear power study group looks forward eventually to a 60,000-kilowatt plant delivering power at a cost of from 7 to 7.5 mills. Nine companies are supporting this project.

FUSION REACTORS

This brings up to date the status of the civilian power reactor program, so far as announcements have been made. Other power reactor programs are those of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. It would be a mistake, too, to ignore nuclear-power developments in other countries. For many of them, power costs are so high or fuel is so scarce that nuclear power has a much greater immediate business significance than is true at the present moment in the United States.

Finally, there is some speculation about the future, including use of fusion power, which is required to round out this report.

Dr. Bhabha, of India, at the Geneva meeting insisted that there was every prospect that within 20 years the secret of controlled fusion would be unlocked, and the world would have at its disposal unlimited power supplies. The United States somewhat reluctantly admitted

that it has been studying the problem for some years, but will not estimate when success will be attained if ever. Our country started project Matterhorn at Princeton, N. J. This initial work has been followed by project Sherwood with five of our best laboratories at work on the problem. In addition to the work at Princeton, study is underway at Livermore, Calif., Los Alamos, N. Mex., Oak Ridge, Tenn., and at New York University. There has been no public disclosure of a method to contain the high temperatures required to sustain a fusion reaction. In its semireport issued a few days ago, expressed belief there is a long road ahead before controlled fusion will become a reality.

ARMY REACTORS PROGRAM

Under actual construction is the APPR–1, the Army package power reactor, No. 1. It is designed to have its components air-transportable for later assembly at advanced bases where conventional fuel might be difficult to obtain in sufficient quantity or at reasonable cost. ALCO Products, with the assistance of Stone & Webster, is building it at Fort Belvoir, Va., with a scheduled completion date of 1957. It is of the pressurized water type, using water for both moderator and coolant, and enriched uranium for fuel. Its capacity is 1,825 kilowatts of electricity. The cost is about $2 million.

Some 10 other firms are making design studies under contract to the Army for more advanced reactors, and from among these will come later construction projects. These firms are: General Electric, Babcock & Wilcox, Westinghouse Airbrake, Fluor Corp., Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Glenn Martin, Sanderson & Porter, Argonne National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Army Engineer Research and Development Laboratories.

NAVAL REACTORS PROGRAM

Two prototype reactors for submarines have been put into operation, and two atomic-powered submarines launched to far. The SS571 *Nautilus* has already gone to sea. The SS575 *Seawolf* is nearing completion. The SS578 *Skate* is building at Groton, Conn., and the SS579 *Swordfish* is building at Portsmouth, N. H. Two similar ships are to be constructed at Mare Island and at Portsmouth. These latter 4 ships are smaller than the first 2 already launched. They may have the improved hull shape now under test with the conventionally powered U. S. S. *Albacore*. Also authorized for construction at Groton is a new very high speed submarine, and another exceptionally large submarine which will be of the radar picket type. It will be equipped with two reactors. A preliminary design contract for a much smaller submarine reactor has been let to Combustion Engineering.

The AEC has identified the following submarine reactors so far: The submarine thermal reactor, STR, was built as mark I at Arco, Idaho, as a prototype for the *Nautilus*. It was completed in 1953, was of the pressurized water type using water as moderator and coolant and highly enriched uranium as fuel. It could deliver 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. Westinghouse was responsible for its construction. Now it is being converted to other uses. The STR mark II was the unit actually installed in the *Nautilus* at Groton, and completed in 1955. The submarine intermediate reactor, STR mark A was built at West Milton, N. Y., by the General Electric Co. as a prototype for the *Seawolf*. Completed in 1955, it is graphite moderated and sodium cooled. It also produces 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. The SIR mark B of course is installed in the *Sea Wolf* which was launched in 1955. The AEC has also identified the SAR, submarine advanced reactor, being built with a mark A prototype at West Milton by Geneeral Electric and a mark B to go into an unspecified submarine. It is water moderated and cooled. Westinghouse has a contract for two SFR, submarine fleet reactors. Another reactor is the SRS, submarine reactor small. This is the one being built by Combustion Engineering.

The program of surface ship reactors was initiated with the CVR, intended for installation in an aircraft carrier. This was a Westinghouse project carried on with the assistance of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. It was of the pressurized water type. When it was canceled, the study results were used in the PWR reactor under construction at Shippingport, Pa. Work has now been renewed by Westinghouse with the LSR, large ship reactor, of which a prototype is to be built at Arco. It is also of the pressurized water type, using water as moderator and coolant, and slightly enriched uranium for fuel. Corresponding ship designs to use this reactor are under study both at Newport News Shipbuilding and at the Bethlehem Quincy yards.

The Navy has discussed the possible construction of a new 85,000-ton atomic-powered carrier which might contain as many as eight reactors. But no budget request has been made yet for funds to cover its construction. The new budget contains instead a request for funds to construct an atomic-powered antiaircraft cruiser which would launch guided missiles.

The Navy also is interested in building atomic-powered seaplanes. In this effort, it is working with the Air Force. Airframe design contracts have been awarded to Martin and Convair. The powerplant is to be developed by Allison Division of General Motors designing the turbine and Nuclear Development Corp. the reactor. It already is sharing in the development contracts awarded to General Electric and Curtiss-Wright, through the Air Force. AiResearch of Garrett has a contract to develop certain auxiliary systems.

MERCHANT SHIP REACTORS PROGRAM

Serious work on this project will depend upon actions taken by the present session of Congress. The President's original proposal for an atomic-powered demonstration ship was not approved, nor was the alternate proposal for a commercially competitive cargo vessel. The United States Lines has talked of building a replacement for their liner, the *America*, which would be nuclear powered. Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. plans to build under contract for the AEC a merchant ship test reactor at Arco, Idaho.

AIRCRAFT REACTORS PROGRAM

Although it is not possible to state when a successful nuclear-powered plane will take to the air, a major effort is underway to make this possible. The former Manhattan District assigned the exploratory contract to Fairchild Aircraft under the initials NEPA, even before the present AEC was created. Those studies have been concluded. The present Commission has a number of contracts outstanding which are concerned with the many phases of the problem. Airborne reactor projects have been assigned to General Electric, Pratt & Whitney, Curtiss Wright, and Carbide & Carbon Chemicals. Airframe contracts have been assigned to Convair, Boeing, and Lockheed. It is thought by unofficial sources that General Electric will probably be paired with Convair, Pratt & Whitney with Boeing, and Curtiss-Wright with Lockheed.

A testing facility is under construction at Arco, while other development facilities are being prepared at Oak Ridge, Evendale, Ohio, Middletown, Conn., Fort Worth, and Sandusky, Ohio. The Sandusky research reactor will cost $4.5 million. A B–36 with conventional power has been the first to carry aloft a working reactor, to test problems of shielding and placement. A large seaplane may be the first to fly under actual nuclear power.

Since preparation of this report the Atomic Energy Commission has announced the testing of a nuclear aircraft engine prototype at its Arco, Idaho, installations.

FOREIGN NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENTS

The Geneva meetings resulted in the unveiling of atomic projects in several parts of the world. Although most of the participating countries are only able to contemplate research reactors, there were also a number or nuclear power projects described.

PROGRAM OF THE BRITISH ATOMIC ENERGY AUTHORITY

The AEA has extensive facilities active in many lines of research necessary to both weapons and civilian use. In the field of power production, it has two major enterprises. Calder Hall in Cumberland uses a very simple design to produce both power and plutonium for the weapons program. Dounreay in the far north of Scotland is an experimental fast breeder reactor to pave the way to much advanced designs for use a decade hence.

Calder Hall will be in operation by 1956, probably the first plant of such size anywhere in the world. It is a thermal reactor, carbon dioxide cooled and graphite moderated. Using natural or slightly enriched uranium, it will produce plutonium, and as a byproduct, some fifty to sixty thousand kilowatts of electric energy from its two reactors. The plant will cost between $42 and $56 million. This is a cost of about $560 per kilowatt capacity or 7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

To expand production of plutonium further, and to supply more electricity as well, the AEA will build two more

Calder Hall type primitive reactors at Calder Hall and four more of the same type at Chapel Cross.

The Dounreay plant will use U–235 or Pu to convert natural uranium into Pu. This fast breeder will be ready in 1957 or 1958. It will be graphite moderated and liquid sodium cooled. The Zephyr research breeder already has produced at a rate of 2 for 1.

PROGRAM OF THE BRITISH CENTRAL ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY

Looking forward to 1975, the expectation is that 40 percent of electrical needs will be met by nuclear fuel-generated electricity. To this end, a program of 12 large plants has been established, with 16 reactors involved. All of these will be patterned after the Calder Hall installations, but with progressive improvements. The first 2 will have 2 reactors each and generate between 100,000 and 200,000 kilowatts. These will be carbon dioxide cooled and graphite moderated. The total cost of each plant will run between $84 million and $98 million. These plants will be completed in 1960 and 1961.

The next 2 plants also with 2 reactors each will be similar in design and capacity but may be slightly more expensive. They will be complete in 1963.

Then will come four plants to be completed in 1963 and 1964. Each will have only a single reactor, and similarly be carbon dioxide cooled and graphite moderated.

The final stage of this program is four more single-reactor plans, probably with liquid cooling. They will be in service by 1965. All told, the last 8 reactors will produce over 1 million kilowatts and cost about $350 million to build.

The entire program therefore will produce between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 kilowatts at a cost of $560 million for plans, $112 million for fuel, $84 million for ancillary equipment, and $84 million to $112 million for prototype development, or a total investment of $840 million.

BRITISH PROPULSION PLANS

For 5 years, the Royal Navy has been sponsoring the construction of a nuclear submarine. The results have not been made public. The British Shipbuilding Research Association is exploring the application of such propulsion to merchant ships.

SOVIET PROGRAMS

The Russians claim to have been the first to deliver usable commercial electric power as a byproduct from a reactor. In 1954, they say they put into operation a demonstration power plant of only 5,000-kilowatt capacity about 50 miles outside of Moscow. It is of elementary design, using pressurized water as a coolant and graphite as a moderator. They claim that at some undesignated point, by 1956, a new full-scale station of 100,000 kilowatts will be completed. Other plants are projected, but their numbers and locations have not been revealed.

The Russians also have described a planned merchant ship of the icebreaker category to have a nuclear power plant of 200,000-kilowatt capacity. This may be its steam-generating capacity rather than net electrical output. The vessel is to be able to shoot out jets of steam to carve a way through ice. It will have a speed of over 24 knots and be 512 feet long.

Russian papers also have carried a suggested design for an atomic-engined plane with a needle-like fuselage which would put the crew compartment as far away as possible from the reactor near the rear of the plane.

What may be the truth and fact with regard to these Soviet assertions is not subject to verification.

THE FRENCH PROGRAM

Starting with Zoe at Chatillon in 1948, additional research reactors have been built. Zoe is heavy water moderated and turns out only 150 kilowatts of heat. The second reactor was built at Saclay. It is gas cooled and heavy water moderated. It turns out 2,000 kilowatts of heat, and uses natural uranium for fuel. Also building at Saclay is a reactor known as EL–3.

Electricité de France has two power producing reactors planned for Marcoule in the Rhone Valley. G–1 will be completed in 1956, and produce 5,000 kilowatts of electricity. This air-cooled reactor will produce 40,000 kilowatts of heat. In 1957 and 1958 will come the first unit of reactor G–2. It will produce between 100,000 and 150,000 kilowatts of heat, and 25,000 kilowatts of electricity. It will be fueled with natural uranium, graphite moderated and carbon dioxide cooled. A second unit of similar capacity will be added in 1958–59, and a third unit of 50,000 to 60,000 kilowatts electrical capacity will be completed in 1960. Thereafter, every 4 years,, the French expect to double the electrical output from nuclear sources. The cost of G–1 and G–2 will be about $86 million.

The French also are working on a submarine nuclear propulsion unit.

CANADIAN REACTORS

Following the experimental work with heavy water moderated research reactors at Chalk River, the first power reactor is to be built at Des Joaquims, Ontario, about 20 miles away. This is called the NPD—Nuclear Power Demonstrator. It will produce 20,000 kilowatts for Hydro-Electric Power of Ontario. It will be built by General Electric of Canada. To be ready in 1959, it will cost $11 million. Moderated with heavy water it will use natural uranium for fuel, slightly enriched with plutonium. The Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd., is supporting the development.

BELGIUM

Westinghouse is to supply a power reactor to be ready by April, 1958, in time for the opening of the Brussels World Fair. A Belgian syndicate of 20 companies called the Syndicate d'Etude de l'Energie Nucleaire is cooperating in the venture. The plant is to produce 11,500 kilowatts of electricity. It will be of the pressurized water type, will cost between $5 and $5.5 million, or between $400–$500 per kilowatt of capacity. It will be fueled with slightly enriched uranium. United States cooperation with Belgium is especially critical because of our use of the Belgian Congo uranium output. The Belgians also are planning to construct a nuclear powerplant with an electrical output of 100,000 kilowatts.

ITALY

Westinghouse also has made tentative arrangements to sell a pressurized water reactor of 10,000 kilowatts capacity to the Fiat Company of Turin. It will operate with enriched uranium.

Another Italian group, the Societa Edison, centered in Milan, is seeking a reactor plant of 100,000 kilowatt electrical output capacity, but have not let the contract yet. They plan to spend from $22 million to $25 million for it.

NORWAY

Norway and the Netherlands have operated jointly the JENER—Joint Establishment for Nuclear Energy Research—which operates a pile at Kjeller, Norway. Proceeding from this experimental work, Norway is designing a merchant ship atomic reactor which they hope to complete in 1957. Norway also plans to build an atomic electric powerplant.

NETHERLANDS

Following from research carried on with Norway, the Dutch plan to build a power reactor in their own country.

SWEDEN

Sweden plans a power reactor, first of test size, then later of 100,000 kilowatt electrical output.

WEST GERMANY

West Germany plans a power reactor.

LATIN AMERICA

The American and Foreign Power Co. is in the market for three different reactor designs of about 10,000 kilowatts each, and costing between $15 million and $20 million each, for installation in countries where it operates conventional powerplants. It is thought that these may be built in Brazil, Cuba, and Mexico.

SOVIET AID

Just as the United States has an extensive program of experimental reactor agreements with other countries, the Russians claim they are offering similar aid to satellites and neutralist countries. They have promised powerplants to Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Egypt, and Red China. The plant in China is announced to produce 6,500 kilowatts of electric power.

Reliability of Soviet announcements and stated intentions in the nuclear field must, of course, be regarded with the same caution as in other fields.

SPECULATION ON THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

There is every indication that existing knowledge of nuclear principles with some engineering development will yield electric power competitive in price with most conventional sources. Almost certainly there will be new discoveries which will reduce costs even below these levels, but there is nothing to indicate yet that power will become so cheap in the future as to revolutionize life. This is because even if fuel is free, as is already true of a hydroelectric plant, there will always be capital costs for the construction of the plant. What is true, however, is that nuclear fuel promises to rescue us from the danger of exhaustion of chemical fuels of reasonable cost, and to bring

cheaper power to places where chemical fuels are now high in cost. Further, its availability casts serious doubts on the advisability of investing taxpayers' dollars in hydroelectric projects, such as the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado storage project, which must sell power at relatively high rates for the next 100 years to return capital investments.

A better basis for estimating nuclear power costs has been provided by the revelations this last summer at Geneva of United States selling prices for materials associated with nuclear energy. Enriched uranium is now priced at $88 a pound, and pure U–235 at $11,000 a pound. Deuterium is priced at $140 a pound and heavy water at $28 a pound. The price of heavy water is now only about one-third what had been charged by the Norwegian supplier.

It was also made clear in the discussions at Geneva that the plentiful element, thorium, may become the principal atomic fuel of the world. It converts in a breeder reactor into U–233 which is fissile. Granite rock was revealed to be a practical source of both uranium and thorium, opening the door to even larger supplies of fuel for the future.

At least two new applications of nuclear power are under development, according to recent announcements. One is to use the heat of nuclear reactions to carry out coal gas synthesis at lower cost. Another is to operate a nuclear reactor with nitrogen gas as the coolant. Instead of powering a turbine coupled with an electric generator, the gas turbine would power the propeller shaft of a merchant ship. This design approach, under consideration in the United States, would use either graphite or beryllium as a moderator.

Although one can always wish for greater speed, sufficient progress has occurred in the 2 years since my last report to make the assertion that the outlook is very hopeful and that there is every expectation that the next 2 years will see many additional developments.

Resolution Calling for the Withdrawal of Our Membership From the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas Dixon, national commander of the United American Veterans, has presented the following resolution of that organization, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF OUR MEMBERSHIP FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the principal purpose of the United Nations was to bring about world peace; and

Whereas the United Nations has been in existence for the past 10 years; and

Whereas during this time it has been unable to bring about the principal object of its purpose, world peace; and

Whereas, as matters stand today, the United Nations is being used by the communistic countries as a steppingstone to world communism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United American Veterans go on record as petitioning the Committee on Foreign Affairs to render a report on H. R. 3296, as to permit this bill to reach the floor of the House for action by that august body. This bill was introduced in Congress by USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, and deserves the immediate attention of Congress.

THOMAS DIXON,
National Commander.
FRANCIS F. LEBRUN,
National Adjutant.

There Are No Frontier Barriers for Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 of this year our Nation will celebrate the 180th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Throughout its long history extending over 180 years of independence, the United States has been a beacon of freedom to colonial and dependent peoples yearning to attain their national independence. Our Declaration of Independence struck a notable spark which ignited a determination for freedom among the oppressed and subjugated peoples the world over when it declared:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Patrick Henry's stirring words, "Give me liberty or give me death" expressed the yearnings not only of the American Colonies, but also of those under colonial rule on other continents as well. From Paris, Benjamin Franklin wrote during the War of Independence as follows:

Hence it is common observation here that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own.

Likewise, the continuing influence of American opposition to colonialism and tyranny was envisaged by Thomas Jefferson in 1790. He said:

It is indeed an animating thought that, while we are securing the rights of ourselves and our prosperity, we are pointing out the way to struggling nations who wish, like us, to emerge from their tyrannies also. Heaven help their struggle, and lead them, as it has done us, triumphantly through them.

As our country grew in power, prestige, and population, the opposition of the American people to colonialism was reflected in our state policy. In his message to Congress in 1823, President James Monroe enunciated a new doctrine:

The American continents—

He warned in his message—

are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.

The effects of this doctrine in helping to bring greater freedom, independence, and a realization of national aspirations of the Latin American peoples is now a matter of history. We are proud of our role in that great struggle for human liberty by our Latin American neighbors.

During the 19th century, colonial rule was severely tightened upon the continent of Africa. In Asia, the peoples of India, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya, Indonesia, Indochina, and the Philippines were all subject to alien control. In China there was a race among the colonial powers to fasten and extend their spheres of influence. When the total dismemberment of China appeared imminent in 1899, it was the United States which consistently remained firm in seeking to preserve China's territorial integrity. At that time our Secretary of State, John Hay, enunciated the so-called open-door policy—a policy of equal opportunity which, while it did not stop the expansion of foreign influence in China, it discouraged outright annexation of territory.

The consistency of United States policy in opposing the spread of colonialism in China has since become traditional throughout the past half century. Suffice it to recall that in 1932, even while the League of Nations was still debating the issue, the late Secretary of State Stimson proclaimed American nonrecognition of the Japanese conquest of Manchuria.

During World War II, a war in which the might of this Nation saved vast areas in all parts of the world from becoming colonies of Nazi Germany and Japanese imperialism, President Franklin D. Roosevelt minced no words in urging independence for the subjugated peoples in colonial areas. His opposition to the return of French rule to Indochina was outspoken. The same was true of our attitude toward the continued rule of the Netherlands in Indonesia. As for United States policy regarding independence for India, Burma, and Ceylon, it is recalled that at one point during the war our diplomatic representative in India was so outspoken on the question of freedom for that country that the British Government requested his recall.

When the United Nations Charter was being formulated and subsequently adopted at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, the United States supported the establishment of a trusteeship system which provided for international scrutiny of the administration of certain dependent areas in various parts of the world. At the war's end, we supported the independence of Korea. Independence was also restored to Ethiopia. The Arab States in the Middle East were granted their independence. Later, the new state of Israel was created and our

country was among the very first to extend its recognition.

The list of newly independent nations does not end there. True to the promise which had been given by our country, the Philippines were granted full independence on July 4, 1946, nearly 10 years ago. This was followed by the British grant of independence to India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon in 1947. In contrast with our peaceful transfer of power in the Philippines and also in the former British dependencies in Asia, Indonesian independence was won in 1949 amid bitterness and hostilities.

In Indochina, after 8 years of costly warfare in human lives and resources, the independence of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had been achieved. Among the last remaining colonial areas in Asia, Malaya and Singapore have each held elections during the past year and have thus taken a long step on the path toward self-government. In Africa, Libya gained its independence, while Tunisia and Morocco have been granted a large measure of self-government by France. In very recent days Sudan has cast off its British-Egyptian yoke and has joined the growing list of independent nations on that continent.

With certain exceptions, it may well be said that western European colonialism has been swept from the continent of Asia. It is now being seriously challenged in Africa. Parts of that sprawling continent are now in boiling ferment, while other areas are showing unmistakable signs of political stirrings. Judging by past experiences, it would seem that the western nations in that area of the world are facing the overwhelming trends of historical evolution—the trends toward freedom and national independence.

In its essence, the issue of colonialism is simply a question of the inherent right of peoples to exist in freedom from external domination and control. On this question, I am happy that the history of our country over these past 180 years has been a flaming testimonial of the opposition of the American people to the evils of colonialism. Only the blind can fail to see that testimonial. Only those who are themselves seeking to foist upon the world a new brand of colonialism and tyranny will not admit it, for it is in their selfish interests to try to label us as defenders of colonialism.

Nearly a year ago, on April 11, 1955, the President of the United States restated this heritage of the American people. He said:

> By tradition and conviction, our Nation is committed to the independence and self-determination of all peoples. This determination, rooted in our own revolt against colonial status, is exemplified by our encouragement of Cuba and the Philippines to assume full freedom and control of their own destiny as independent nations. Throughout our history, and especially in the postwar years, the American people have made substantial personal sacrifices so that other peoples may enjoy internal stability and hope for the future.

Yet now, as many of these former colonial and subjugated peoples are struggling with the trials and tribulations of their newly found independence, the freedom of these new states is being threatened by a militant communism. For the United States to stand aloof and permit Communist imperialism to trample upon the liberties of these free nations would hardly be consonant with our traditional opposition to colonial domination, including the Communist brand of colonialism. We Americans want the newly born states to remain free and to enjoy the fruits of their hard-won freedom. We have given them economic aid and we have extended them a helping hand out of the deep store of technical skill and knowledge which our people possess. We want to continue to share these blessings with them, so that they can stride confidently into the future as free nations.

Ironically enough, our motives are sometimes misconstrued by the very people whom we are trying to help. At times, these nations have the delusion or suspicion that through our aid we are endeavoring to impose upon them some new form of colonial control. The Communists, of course, strive mightily to nourish this delusion and to spread it far and wide, in order to divide the free nations and to entrap in their clutches the weak and the naive. They strive to cover up their own despotism and the lack of fundamental standards of freedom, decency and human dignity within the confines of the Communist empire.

In the December 13, 1955 issue of Look magazine, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who recently toured the Soviet Union, has an article entitled Soviet Colonialism—Product of Terror. The opening paragraph reads as follows:

> The Soviets denounce colonialism and pose as champions of the underdog. Yet, within its own borders, the U. S. S. R. today has a brand of colonialism similar to the kind the French practice in Morocco and more evil than anything England ever promoted.

Justice Douglas then adds the following:

> I speak of Central Asia, where I spent a month last summer. In this part of the Soviet Union, political control is concentrated in the hands of Russians; there are segregated schools, special courts for the trial of Russians, discrimination against the native people, a ruthless suppression of all nationalist sentiments, and a quick liquidation of all those who dare breathe a word about liberty.

Mr. Speaker, such is the type of colonialism practiced by the Communists. It is no different in Eastern Europe than it is in Central Asia. Nevertheless, during their recent tour of India and Burma, the Soviet leaders Khrushchev and Bulganin continually stressed how much the Kremlin hates colonialism. Upon his return to Moscow Mr. Khrushchev attacked the bourgeois nations of the West as representing an imperialistic pact that is a disgrace to modern man, and he emphasized: "We shall keep repeating this point as long as colonialism exists."

We wish he would do so, but we also wish he would tell the truth. In such event, he will be repeating himself a great deal, because Communist colonialism has chalked up a long and black record which is truly a disgrace to modern man. Will Mr. Khrushchev be sure to include the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the Ukraine, who are suffering in Europe because of the colonialism of communism. He should also not overlook the peoples of Outer Mongolia, Tibet, North Korea, and North Vietnam, who are suffering in Asia because of the colonialism of communism.

And when Mr. Khrushchev speaks about India's and Burma's colonial status in the past, he must not forget to tell the truth here, too, namely—that it was "imperialists" like the British who gave them a free choice and enabled them to attain their independence. But this would be expecting too much from one who perverts modern history, who approaches it in a cynical manner, and seeks to interpret it in an upside-down version to suit communism's ends.

The fact of the matter is that, if Mr. Khrushchev would be honest and truthful with himself and with the world at large, he would stop shedding crocodile tears over the colonialism of the past and would try to convince his colleagues in the Kremlin to make an end to the colonialism of the present. I mean the brand of Soviet colonialism in Europe and Asia which is infinitely worse than that ever practiced by any Western power.

I cannot believe that the peoples of Asia, in their desire to maintain their freedom and independence, will voluntarily suppress this desire and allow themselves to be swallowed up by Communist colonialism. The untold millions of people in Asia, who a short while ago existed in faceless anonymity, are on the march to attain political and economic independence. It is incumbent upon us, the people of America, to bring to the people of Asia a clear picture of the advantages and the disadvantages of a free and democratic society such as we have in this country, as against the despotic and ruthless society of the Communist world. There is no doubt in my mind as to their choice, if given the true facts.

In a discussion of Asian policy, the London Times recently stated as follows:

> The West will fail to understand Asia if it thinks Asia's attitude to communism can be equated with its own. However much it has traduced its first ideals, communism proclaims itself the liberator of the common man from want and indignity. There are many common men in Asia suffering from both. It proclaims the brotherhood of man and that is echoed most warmly in Asia. It proclaims equality which Asia assiduously demands. Its message is all-embracing.

Mr. Speaker, before it is too late, we must bring to the people of Asia the truth that real liberation, that genuine brotherhood of man, and equality of peoples and nations will not be acquired by linking their future with communism. Communism is dangling false hopes and promises before their eyes. We must help open their eyes to the fact that once they get behind the iron curtain they can forget about freedom and brotherhood and equality and all the other things for which they are aspiring.

I stated above that there is distrust and suspicion of United States motives in that part of the world. The thought is widely shared by many people in Asia that the actions of the United States are compromising its traditions. In certain instances, it is felt, our country has placed strategy before liberty, and military policy before the advance of democracy. In short, they believe that, where a military ally of ours stands to be embrarrassed, we fail to act in support of the dependent and the oppressed.

To these people we should say: If you will judge our actions from a more realistic and long-range point of view, free from emotional or partisan approach, then you will find that in the vast majority of instances our actions have been determined on the basis of the general welfare of mankind as a whole, and of its future survival as a free civilization.

Perhaps what is needed at this time is a careful reorientation of our policy in Asia. That reorientation should also include a restatement or reassurance to all the peoples of Asia and Africa regarding the true American conviction on colonialism. I feel that the situation calls for dramatic and forceful evidence from the American people and their representatives in Congress that we are loyal to our heritage and to the doctrine of freedom for all.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am today introducing a resolution reaffirming our traditional policy of opposition to colonialism as a basic tenet of American foreign policy. The resolution declares "there are no frontier barriers for free men" and maintains that United States policy "will continue to be the expansion of freedom throughout the world." The resolution also extends the greetings of this Congress and the American people to the subjugated people suffering from Communist colonialism in Europe and Africa and expresses the firm hope that they will soon be liberated from Communist domination and be "able to resume their existence as independent nations, developing their national cultures in peace and freedom."

Let us establish this firmly as one of the foundations of American foreign policy today. Let us unmistakably prove to the nations of the world that the United States disclaims any colonial prerogatives or designs. We always have been and always will be opposed to the subjugation of any nation, and we shall at all times be prepared to help subjugated nations attain their independence.

Let us emphatically establish this as our foreign policy for 1956. The American people stand for the expression of freedom throughout the world. In order to achieve this, we must plant the seed of hope among peoples everywhere. While the policy of Soviet Russia is to expand the Iron Curtain and to engulf as many nations as possible behind its bars, we must be determined to break it wide open wherever it now exists. We do not recognize, and never will recognize, that there are frontier barriers for freemen.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Bible has served humanity as a great source of inspiration in times of stress because of the eternal truths which it expounds. In similar fashion, our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and the Bill of Rights are a source of genuine inspiration to the people of the United States and of the whole world because of the fundamental principles of freedom and human dignity which they expound. It is, therefore, imperative for us to reaffirm strongly and clearly that, since colonialism is against the principles enunciated in these basic documents on which our Nation is founded, hence we cannot tolerate it anywhere in the world.

Such is the meaning and purpose of my resolution. I call upon all of my colleagues to support it. I also urge the committee to which the resolution is being referred to give it early consideration. We cannot afford to lose any more precious time.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution —

Concurrent resolution reaffirming the United States' policy of opposition to colonialism, restating the United States' policy of expanding freedom throughout the world, and sending greetings to those suffering under the colonialism of the Communists

Whereas it is now evident that it is the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to expand and extend the Iron Curtain to engulf other free nations; and

Whereas the United States, has, throughout its history, opposed the subjugation of any nation, through colonialism, imperialism, or any other form of tyranny; and

Whereas the United States is at all times prepared to help subjugated nations attain their national aspirations and their freedoms; and

Whereas the United States at this time reaffirms its traditional policy of opposition to colonialism, imperialism, and similar forms of tyranny which is, and always has been a basic tenet of the foreign policy of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in pursuance of this policy, the Congress and the people of the United States declare that there are no frontier barriers for free men and declare that the foreign policy of the United States for 1956 will continue to be the expansion of freedom throughout the world, and send greetings to the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the Ukraine, who are suffering in Europe because of the colonialism of communism, and to the peoples of North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, and Tibet who are suffering in Asia because of the colonialism of communism, and express the firm hope that these peoples will soon regain their freedom from domination by the Communists and will be able to resume their existence as independent nations, developing their national cultures in peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am also inserting into the RECORD a very timely article which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on January 3, 1956. The article is written by Edward Crankshaw and deals with the subject I discussed above. It reads:

RUSSIA'S RECORD AS A COLONIAL POWER

(By Edward Crankshaw)

LONDON.—It was all too easy for Mr. Khrushchev in Indian and Burma to represent the Soviet Union as the champion of anticolonialism. But it has nothing to do with the truth. Russia is also one of the great colonial powers; and, unlike Britain or France, Russia has never given up an inch of the territory she has taken from small nations.

The conquest of Siberia proceeded almost unnoticed by the outside world; the Russians, over the centuries, moved slowly east until they got to the Pacific. But it was a conquest nonetheless, involving innumerable small wars and the subjugation and reduction of innumerable Asiatic tribes and nationalities.

It was an operation not unlike the American conquest of the Red Indians, but it took longer, and what remained of the tribes of Siberia, the Yakuts, the Bashkirs, the Tartars and the rest, has now been absorbed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The grandfathers of the present-day inhabitants of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenia, Khirgizia, to say nothing of the Georgians and the Azerbaidjans, and Armenians of tho Caucasus, did not submit themselves to Moscow of their own free will. They fought hard and bitterly and over many years against the organized armies of the Tsars.

When the Revolution came the process in many cases had to be repeated. With the collapse of central authority, there was an empirewide move toward separatism. This included not only the Asiatic nationalities, but also the Ukranians and the peoples of the little Baltic nationalities. Of all these, only the last managed to preserve their separate identities—until they were reoccupied once more by the Russians in 1940.

For the rest there was no hope at all, though the proud and high-spirited Georgians gave the Russians a grueling time before they finally surrendered to their great compatriot Stalin.

Even today separatism is far from dead: it constantly smolders and intermittently flares up all round the perimeter of the great Muscovite empire, and is kept under control only by the efficiency and ruthlessness of General Serov's security police.

Mr. Khrushchev does not call this rebelliousness a national liberation movement: he calls it bourgeois nationalism, and it is the supreme crime against the Soviet state. For Stalin laid it down explicitly that the idea of self-determination among nations was always right when the ruling power belonged to the bourgeois world and always wrong and counterrevolutionary when the ruling power was Russia. And so it goes on.

This is not an argument against colonialism as such. Colonialism has clearly had its place in the history of world development.

Colonialism, with all its evils, has raised up and educated backward peoples to the point at which they feel able to turn successfully against their conquerors the very weapons from newspapers to guns which those conquerors taught them to use. Everywhere, that is to say, except in the great Russian empire where, sealed off from the outside world, the colonial nations cannot make their voices heard.

Dreadful things have happened throughout the length and breadth of the Soviet empire, and dreadful things are still happening. So it can truly be said that Mr. Khrushchev is interested only in national liberation movements and anticolonialism when these are directed against the Western powers and are calculated to weaken their economy and undermine their authority and strategic position.

The peoples of Indonesia, of Africa, are encouraged to raise their voices and fight the imperial authority. The peoples of Uzbekistan and Georgia may not cry out and, if they move against the imperial authority, are immediately struck down.

Nobody would deny that Russia has brought benefits to her colonies. The re-

ward of total obedience is a gradual raising of the standard of living and increasing absorption in the Soviet way of life—which means the Russian way of life.

But the peoples are still subject absolutely to the central authority.

The Russians take the line: Resist us and we shall annihilate you; do exactly as we tell you, however different it is from what you want to do, and we shall share with you everything we have. It may not be what you want, but it will be good for you. There may not be much to share now, so that you have to give more than you receive; but one day, if you do what we tell you, we shall all be rich together.

This is a point of view. But it is not the point of view of the hundreds of thousands of martyrs who struggled for so long, who in lesser numbers still struggle, against Russion domination. And Mr. Khrushchev knows it.

The Status of Forces Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily News, of February 1, 1956:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—We wish all good luck to Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican of New York—because he'll need it—in his effort to persuade Congress to end the fantastic arrangement by which every American in our Armed Forces, ordered to serve in a foreign country by United States military command, loses his rights as an American citizen once he is picked up by foreign police and tried by foreign courts.

It makes no difference whether the arrest on foreign soil is on suspicion, or whether the charge be minor or major—a traffic violation or a murder—the fact remains that for the first time in the history of the Republic an American in uniform is no longer subject to trial and discipline by his commanding officer. Instead he is surrendered to the far-different criminal jurisdiction and punishments of Japan, France, North Africa, and some of the distant lands we're protecting, where petty larceny is punished by the amputation of the offending, thieving hand.

Members of our armed personnel are now serving time in the prisons of Japan, Germany, France, etc., after convictions by foreign courts under circumstances which denied them the rights of American citizens. All this started when Harry Truman's Secretary of State Dean Acheson worked out the so-called "status of forces" agreement and on June 16, 1952, Truman sent it up to Capitol Hill as a "Presidential agreement."

It was, in fact, a treaty—and a bad one—and should have been help up until it received a two-thirds approval of the Senate. It never would have become law had the proposed Bricker amendment been on the books to curb the assumed Presidential authority which burgeoned when Franklin D. Roosevelt loftily took over treatymaking power on his own.

Since that time, scores of members of the overseas Armed Forces have been tried and convicted by foreign countries. They have complained that they have been deprived of their constitutional rights by such trials and convictions and efforts have been made to get a Supreme Court decision on the issue. Legal efforts, backed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, regarding some French convictions of American GIs, have stalled in the appellate divisions here when efforts to serve habeas corpus writs on the Defense and State Department leaders ran into legal obstacles.

DEMANDS CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES

More recently, counsel retained by American soldiers convicted by Japanese courts have intervened in Federal court proceedings here in Washington. These are still pending. As Representative BECKER declared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "If we are going to draft the Americans, send them overseas to die, then the least we can do is to give them their constitutional guarantees."

Representative HARRISON WILLIAMS (Democrat, of New Jersey) came to the defense of the White house "right" to make these personal "agreements" with foreign governments.

This White House "status of forces" personal agreement tagged onto the NATO setup is in head-on collision with the basic law laid down by the great Chief Justice John Marshall (1755–1835) incidentally himself a soldier. It also collides with traditional procedure in such cases, including World Wars I and II, until July 12, 1953, when the "agreement" got an OK from the Senators then on the floor.

Until that date an American in uniform guilty of misbehavior or crime on foreign soil was promptly turned over to his commanding officer for trial and punishment and never, under any circumstances, handed over to foreigners. We Americans followed the same rules here. If allied personnel got drunk or disorderly in Times Square they were taken into custody by New York police and promptly turned over to their foreign superiors. Which is as it should be. But that isn't true of Americans today. Yet Chief Justice Marshall clearly put it into the law of the land:

"Service in the Armed Forces of the Republic of the United States shall not abrogate or nullify the constitutional rights of an American citizen."

GI'S FEEL THE UNITED STATES HAS LET THEM DOWN

Representative BECKER, who in 1950 codified and rewrote the military laws for New York State, takes a dim view of the Defense Department defense, which runs along the line: "After all, in general, these men found guilty got off with lighter sentences from foreign courts than they would have received from an American court-martial."

BECKER, in Britain last summer, interviewed GI's imprisoned in such famous jails as Wormwood Scrubs Prison, Maidstone Prison, etc. He reports that the Americans he interviewed "almost to a man" feel their Government has "let them down" by failing to insist on their constitutional guaranties in trials abroad. They are entitled to counsel, under the treaty, but only to advise; not to represent them, he said.

One disadvantage to the GI convicted in Britain is that when he appeals, he runs the risk of having his sentence increased—a risk not incurred under American justice.

One Becker example: an American GI was arrested for drunken driving in England and fined 150 English pounds (approximately $400). Although he had not had an accident or injured anyone, while a United Kingdom citizen was fined 10 pounds ($28) the same day for the same sort of offense.

"I don't see why we can't put our forces in those countries without whittling away some of our constitutional protection," he said. "After all, it's for mutual defense; theirs as well as ours."

A Revolution in Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 4, and was entitled "The Marvelous *Nautilus*." The editorial asserts that the world's first atomic-powered submarine represents "a new dimension in naval tactics and strategy," and says that it has "expedited a military revolution."

This tremendous achievement reflects the highest possible credit upon our Navy, our scientists, and all others who pioneered in this development; and to them should go our deepest thanks.

On the other hand, this event should point up the sober and alarming fact that the Soviet Union is working at feverish speed and with all available resources in this and related fields. Already, the Russian submarine fleet is the largest in the world, and their production of military aircraft outstrips our own. Further, they are believed to have a guided missile of much greater range than ours, and to have tested a hydrogen bomb high in the air which indicates great strides in this field.

Let me again urge with all the strength at my command that our leaders reject at once and for all times the fatal temptation to put dollars above defense, or to place a balanced budget above national security in a world which is fraught with peril to every nation in the free world.

The editorial is as follows:

THE MARVELOUS "NAUTILUS"

Just a year ago at this time, the U. S. S. *Nautilus*—the world's first atomic-powered submarine—made history with its initial test run. And since then, according to a Navy report on its performance to date, it has proved itself many times over as a seapower instrument full of revolutionary significance.

It is no exaggeration to say this. Never before has the world seen anything quite like the *Nautilus*. Never before has there been a submarine so fast or so deadly—and so marvelously equipped to carry out undersea offensive and defensive missions over vast distances without having to surface for air. What it represents, in itself, is a sort of new dimension in naval tactics and strategy.

To appreciate this, we have only to bear in mind a few of the facts that the Navy has cited in reporting on what the *Nautilus* has achieved in its first year of operation. It has traveled, all told, more than 26,000 nautical miles without refueling. On one cruise it has sailed nonstop for 8 days and 14 hours. On another cruise, totally submerged, it has moved at an average speed of 16 knots on a 1,300-mile mission. And on yet another cruise, it has stayed beneath the surface of the sea, without once rising for a breath of fresh air, for 3 days, 17 hours, and 14 minutes.

Moreover, as the Navy's report proudly declares, there are other statistics about the *Nautilus*—statistics bearing upon such things as its true maximum speed on the surface and submerged—that are far more impressive, but they cannot be revealed for security

reasons. What we can be sure of, however, is that they all add up to an unprecedented and extremely potent new factor in American seapower. Small wonder that the President's budget message for fiscal 1957 calls for still more atomic submarines, and for an experimental nuclear-powered cruiser, and for action to make a reality of atom-propelled aircraft carriers and giant bombers. In proving itself, the Nautilus has expedited a military revolution.

Another Old Soldier Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, we have recently read, and in the future will hear, much about some remarks made by an "old soldier." He, however, is not the only one who can write.

Robert L. Thompson, who started his military career in combat in World War I, and served in World War II, accumulating as a citizen soldier, a National Guardsman, over 17 years of active military service, recently came back from Japan, and started a newspaper, the Moran (Kans.) Sentinel.

After reading the first installment of the Ridgway articles, Colonel Thompson, who has a high regard for General Ridgway as a soldier, took pen in hand last week and in his editorial columns wrote, speaking from personal observation and experience:

MILITARY WASTE

In the first of a series of articles appearing in a national magazine, former Chief of Staff Matthew B. Ridgway is critical of the defense policy of the Eisenhower administration. According to Ridgway we are not spending enough money on national defense. It is the same old tune all generals sing, especialy after they retire on a fat pension.

It is true, as Ridgway says, that we do not have adequate defense, but it is not the fault of the administration. It is the fault of the Army, the Air Force and the Navy.

Since War II ended more than half of the Federal budget has gone to these three services, yet our defenses are pitifully weak. It is due entirely to unexampled and criminal waste in the armed services.

For 10 years the Congress has appropriated adequate sums for defense but most of it has been wasted by protean and credulous dullards who, while enjoying the dolce far niente of the Pentagon, have never learned anything except how to squander money.

Today, as always, officers and enlisted men are being transported from one post to another throughout the world for no good reason. Today, Major Jones, now serving in Korea, will receive orders transferring him to Fort Riley. Tomorrow at Fort Riley, Captain Ward will receive orders transferring him to Germany. In 6 months he will probably have his feet on a desk in the Pentagon. All of this insane shuffling of personnel goes on month after month, and no one knows how may millions it is costing the taxpayers.

What is needed is not more cash for the armed services but men in the Pentagon endowed with some capacity for adult ratiocination in matters pertaining to business administration.

A Petition for a Solvent America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a petition of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council and an editorial on this petition which appeared in the Oklahoma City Times. The response to the action by the council was overwhelmingly sympathetic and strikingly gratifying, with nationwide response from all segments of the American scene.

A PETITION FOR A SOLVENT AMERICA

Whereas the Federal debt has risen to such proportions that the annual interest charge now constitutes the second largest item in the Federal budget,

Whereas the Federal budget remains out of balance even though the national income is now at an alltime high.

Whereas a continuation of deficit financing by the Federal Government necessitates further increases in the Federal debt,

Whereas continuing increases in the Federal debt will further depreciate the value of our American dollar,

Whereas the financial chaos which will result from a continuation of this policy may well destroy our present form of government and our individual liberty,

Whereas Members of Congress, seeking reelection in 1956, will be subjected to terrific pressure to both reduce taxes and increase spending: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That members of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, assembled at their ninth annual meeting, place themselves on record petitioning Congress:

1. To take such action as may be necessary to place our Federal Government on a pay-as-you-go basis except in times of extreme emergiencies.

2. To forego any reduction in taxes until such time as the budget is balanced and a start made toward orderly reduction of the present burdensome debt.

3. To approve no new or increased spending programs unless plans for financing such new or increased programs within the framework of a balanced budget be included as a part of the authorization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this petition be mailed to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Budget Director, all Members of Congress, the national chairman of both major political parties, and presented to the proper committees of Congress at the appropriate time; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this petition be mailed to the presiding officers of State and national organizations, and that such organizations, their members, and all citizens be invited to join in this effort to protect the solvency of our Nation.

[From the Oklahoma City Times of November 29, 1955]

OKLAHOMA'S CRUSADE FOR SOLVENT AMERICA

About a month ago the Times commented upon a petition originated by the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, approved unanimously by that organization. Since that action a significant thing has happened.

The petition was printed in a newspaper of national circulation, and signed petitions have been piling into the OPEC office at a great rate, with 44 States represented, including 5,000 Oklahoma names in 1 week.

The petition, in brief, calls on Congress to put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, forego tax reductions until the budget is balanced and a start is made on reducing the public debt, and disapprove all new spending proposals which cannot be financed within the framework of a balanced budget. The document is significant for a number of reasons—for instance:

1. It constitutes a blueprint for sound fiscal administration on the part of the Federal Government.

2. It indicates that a substantial number of citizens are willing to forsake temporary—and that word should be emphasized—individual benefits for the welfare of their country.

3. It now shows signs of snowballing into a national movement of monumental proportions which can become a major factor in saving the citizens of this country from the disastrous effects of runaway inflation.

4. It provides all citizens an opportunity to register their protest against unsound and dangerous Government policies and practices supported and advocated by demagogs in both parties.

Every widow—in fact, every person living on a fixed income in this country—should be listed among the signers of this petition. Every life-insurance policyholder, every man or woman who owns a Government bond should add their names to the list.

These people, striving to provide for themselves rather than become wards of the Government in their declining years, have been robbed of $158 billion in purchasing ability in the last 15 years by inflation—generated to a great extent by Government policies.

Petitions are worth not a dime a dozen unless they are vigorously followed up by an individual action and support. If there is a strenuous followup, Oklahoma will get the credit for starting one of the most momentous movements in the history of our Nation.

Something To Bank On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Peru (Ind.) Tribune:

[From the Peru (Ind.) Tribune of February 1, 1955]

SOMETHING TO BANK ON

During war and its aftermath, the Government gave American farmers incentive to expand their output to meet the extraordinary needs of this country and its allies. Now it must supply fresh incentives to get them to reduce production in the face of monumental surpluses.

For too long the high, rigid price support law encouraged farmers to produce too much. Foreign markets fell off but the crops kept piling up—in Government warehouses.

At length, under President Eisenhower, a shift was made toward more flexible supports designed to minimize the lure and put prices more in line with true market conditions. But the switch was so long in coming that by then the Nation's surpluses had become well nigh unmanageable.

Meantime the farm price decline that set in even before the Eisenhower regime has continued apace. Total net income from farm products has slipped substantially. This has hurt family-sized farms more than large commercial establishments. It has

left many ordinary farmers outside the sweep of America's newest wave of prosperity.

The President's new farm proposals represent a broader and more drastic attack upon the farmer's dilemma. They seem to emphasize not so much immediate relief as a long-range approach which might conceivably get farmers out of their predicament for an indefinite time. In this respect they show political nerve in an election year, when the clamor is for quick solutions.

In addition to offering a multitude of devices for directly reducing present surpluses—research into new market uses, removal of barriers to sales abroad, etc.—the President asks Congress to enact what is being called the soil-bank program.

Under this plan farmers would be compensated for taking out of production either fertile lands or marginal soil or both. Payment could be taken in cash or feed stocks now in Government hands.

In this case of productive soils, farmers would be asked to cut their crop acreage voluntarily below existing allotments, in return for payment.

They would also be used with the same incentives, to put their marginal lands back into forest or grassland. This soil presumably would be removed indefinitely from the crop-producing category.

These soil bank measures, together with the frontal assault on current surpluses, would be expected within fair time to make deep inroads into our mountainous reserves.

No one can properly say how effective this approach would be. But at least it is an approach that goes beyond the sterile thinking which says that high, rigid price supports and only they can get American farmers out of their low spot.

At the minimum the soil bank plan constitutes a start down newly inventive lines. At best it may contain the core of a real solution.

Federal Funds for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch of Tuesday, January 31, 1956:

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR CANCER RESEARCH

The proposal of President Eisenhower that Congress provide more money for medical research into the preventions and cures of the great human killers—especially cancer and heart disease—makes extremely good sense.

He requested an appropriation of $126.5 million to penetrate "the dark mysteries" of cancer and other diseases.

Although Mr. Eisenhower treated the proposed program as new, we interpret his remarks to mean that he urges a vastly stepped-up program.

Congress has usually been responsive to requests for cancer research funds. The current appropriation of $21.7 million is $2 million higher than the fiscal 1954 appropriation. In addition, the American Cancer Society last year raised more than $24 million through private solicitation, of which about one-third went directly into research.

A stepped-up program is needed for cancer research. Now the Nation's second most potent killer—behind heart disease—cancer is draining countless wasted millions of dollars off the gross national product, to say nothing of causing shocking suffering throughout the land.

The money being poured into research by the American Cancer Society and the Federal Government has not been sufficient to maintain an adequate research program on a continuing and integrated basis.

For one thing, cancer research has a staggering overhead because it involves the use of expensive electronic equipment, atomic energy devices and fuels and the time and energies of hundreds of highly skilled doctors, technicians, and scientists. Some elements of this research cannot be put together on a modest basis; by the nature of steps needed to go through experimentation, these elements must be huge or nothing.

For another thing, research of this magnitude cannot be programed on a 1-year basis. The human beings involved need to have something more tangible for their own futures than year-by-year contracts. Many of them, of course, are on permanent tenure, but there is a high degree of insecurity in research which a greatly expanded program will soften.

On the matter of principle, Federal aid should not be used to help people who are not inclined to help themselves. But in this case, with the American Cancer Society straining to raise every dime it can and falling far short of a goal—that of all-out research—Federal participation on a major basis is justified.

High Stakes Over China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, January 31, 1956:

HIGH STAKES OVER CHINA

"If we stand together, there is almost anything we can do together. If we fall apart, or if we are driven apart, then there is no danger which may not befall the free world."

So spoke British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd on his arrival with Prime Minister Eden for talks at the White House. Mr. Lloyd's remark offers much for Americans and British to think about. It could be an epitaph for the free world, or it could be the foreward to a glorious and peaceful and secure future.

None of the difficult subjects to be discussed at the White House threatens to drive America and Britain apart more than the long-standing disagreement over Red China. Nothing could torpedo the American-British alliance more quickly than a British vote to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Such a move would provoke a wave of resentment and anti-British feeling in this country unparalleled in years. It would open a major campaign to get the United States to quit the U. N. It would either wreck the U. N. or convert it into a rubber-stamp organization for the Communists. It would be the coup de grace for an already weak Western alliance.

Sir Anthony is too much of a practical politician not to see the dangers of such a move in an American election year. But we hope he will find time while here to sound out American sentiment. If he does, we believe he is too much of a practical diplomatist not to see the disaster that would be caused by British support of Red China's membership in the U. N.—this year or any year in the foreseeable future.

Britain recognizes Red China; the United States does not. Britain believes Red China should be admitted to the U. N. But because of American opposition, Britain has refrained from openly pressing the issue. It has adhered to an unwritten understanding not to provoke the question—that is, an agreement to disagree.

Pressure for admission of Red China to U. N. will be greater next year, however. Many new members admitted last fall favor it, and India's pressure on Britain to abandon the United States will increase.

That would be a bonanza for the Communist world—a diplomatic and political triumph for the Reds comparable to the Communist seizures of power in Russia and China. It would legitimize the bandit regime in Peking, already branded an aggressor by U. N., and elevate it to a legal and moral position of equality with the great powers.

It would defeat the main objective of American and free-world policies—to contain communism from further expansion and prestige.

Whatever will be the ultimate place of Red China in the world, this certainly is not the time to pass out honors to a regime that has transgressed not only the laws of nations but the laws of humanity.

Sir Anthony could do no greater service for American-British unity or for the free world's cause against despotism than to stand firmly with the United States in opposing the pressures to honor Red China with admission to U. N. and to dishonor Nationalist China with ouster.

It is no longer enough to stand passively on the sidelines. Britain must stand together with the United States against Red China's bid to shoot its way into the United Nations. Otherwise, both Britain and the United States may hang separately from a Red gibbet.

Bill To Provide Federal Program of Insurance and Reinsurance Against Flood Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed in the House a bill of insurprovide for a Federal program of insurance and reinsurance against flood loss in this country.

This measure is similar to that filed in the Senate today by Senators LEHMAN, of New York, and KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

The bill encourages private insurance company participation in the program. The Commissioner of the Federal Flood Insurance Administration, the new constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would be required to give Congress his opinion every fifth year on the feasibility of private insurance companies taking over the program completely.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that thousands of property owners in the

Northeast and on the west coast suffered millions of dollars in damage due to the 1955 floods. Citizens must have the opportunity of being protected against such future disasters. In the past, however, private insurance companies just could not risk flood insurance offerings and still hope to remain solvent.

Under this bill we are offering protection to real and personal property owned privately or by State and local governments, but no State participation is required. The bill sets a per policy limit of $10,000 face value on real and personal property for one to four family residences and $100,000 face value for other real and personal property in a single location.

This should encourage private insurance companies to issue policies covering risks above these limits, with the aid of Federal reinsurance.

Conservationists End Colorado River Project Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, and I recently notified leading conservation organizations that Echo Park Dam would not be a part of the upper Colorado River storage project—that an alternate site had been adopted. Echo Park Dam has been deleted by agreement of Representatives and Senators in the upper basin States, and an amendment is being proposed to the project act to insure the integrity of the national park system.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I am submitting herewith a letter I have received from the Council of Conservationists, 568 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.:

JANUARY 23, 1956.

Hon. W. A. DAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: Congressmen from the upper Colorado Basin States and prospective Senate conferees have guaranteed the Nation's conservationists that the Echo Park Dam will not be reinserted into the upper Colorado bill when it comes up for action in this session of Congress, and the administration has also reversed its former stand on this matter and has agreed to drop the Echo Park proposal.

Furthermore, we have now been assured that the following two provisos will be added, in their appropriate places, to H. R. 3383 when it reaches the floor of the House and that Senator ANDERSON and other prospective Senate conferees will support the inclusion of these two provisos:

1. *Provided further,* That as part of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

2. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument.

In view of these agreements we no longer oppose this bill. In fact, we also wish to commend the proponents of the project for the addition of these provisos, which we are glad to support as of great positive value to the cause of conservation, for they are a reaffirmation of the national park principle at a time when the National Park System, in the minds of many, is in serious danger.

We who have led the fight against the Echo Park Dam are accordingly pleased to be able to take our present position.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT,
Trustee for Conservation.
IRA N. GABRIELSON,
Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources.
HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Council of Conservationists.

Salute to the Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News of February 1, 1956:

SALUTE TO THE BOY SCOUTS

We salute the Boy Scouts of America on its 46th birthday, to be observed during Boy Scout Week, beginning Monday.

Scouting is a program for all boys everywhere. It is successful in the widest rural areas and in the most congested cities because it possesses an inherent appeal for the healthy, vigorous, normal American youth and also offers fields of achievement for the handincapped.

It has often been said that a boy can always find something to do. It is when he finds something to do that does not measure up to reasonable standards that he may get in trouble. Scouting offers a steadying hand that often tips the scales away from delinquency.

Scouting has three program parts to meet the needs of boys of different age levels.

Over 1 million families, together with their 8-to-10-year-old sons, participate in Cub Scouting, said to be America's largest and most dynamic parent-and-boy program. Today there are 1,430,000 Cub Scouts in 36,000 Cub packs.

Boy Scouting provides for boys from 11 to 13 an outdoor program that helps them grow in character and citizenship. Today 1,160,000 Boy Scouts are active in 54,000 troops.

Exploring serves the boy of 14 and over with a rich program filled with high adventure and opportunities to practice good citizenship. Today 440,000 Explorers are members of 14,000 Explorer units or Boy Scout troops.

Many hands join to bring scouting to these 3,030,000 boys and young men. In addition to the 1,070,000 adult volunteers who provide the leadership for them there are 68,000 sponsoring institutions that actually operate the 104,000 scouting units. This roll of institutions sponsoring Scout units really represents democracy in action. They represent the religious, civic, educational, and veterans' organizations of the Nation.

Appropriate indeed it is to say: "Happy Birthday, Boy Scouts!"

Congress To Use the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, the House of Representatives authorized the House Office Building Commission, in collaboration with the Architect of the Capitol, to enter upon a very substantial program for not only the construction of a new office building for House Members, but also for enlarging and modernizing Capitol Hill, generally.

In connection with this sizable undertaking, there are the problems of heating, electricity, and air-conditioning, all of which are the natural by-product of atomic energy.

Since I have been somewhat instrumental in encouraging greater application of the possible uses of atomic energy, it occurred to me that perhaps here was an opportunity to show not only the Congress, but the Nation and the entire world just how helpful and practical the atom could be. Accordingly, I made a suggestion to the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. George Stewart, that he discuss the matter with knowledgeable persons in the Atomic Energy Commission as well as the staff of the joint committee.

When it became evident that the initial consideration showed that the idea might be feasible, I then wrote to the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, more formally, urging that the matter be thoroughly considered and canvassed.

During the intervening months, the matter has been rather thoroughly explored and the point has been reached where all persons, who had given any thought to it, are confident that the idea is not only feasible and practicable, but that it can be done economically as well.

In order to be more certain of its feasibility and practicability, it seems highly desirable that a detailed study and survey be made by competent persons in the field of atomic energy. Accordingly, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, junior Senator from New Mexico and chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have introduced companion measures in the Senate and House today authorizing the appropriation of $200,000 for the necessary survey to be done under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter addressed to Speaker RAYBURN last year and the press release issued today by the Architect of the Capitol:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As senior member of the Joint Planning Committee you are aware that present plans for expansion of Capitol

Hill buildings, together with new construction under way of contemplated and certain planned classified activities, will require approximately 25,000 kilowatts of heat to provide space heating in winter and electricity for air-conditioning in summer. These planned modifications and new construction are needed not only to meet the pressing office and committee space problems, but also to provide suitable and safe locations for Capitol Hill personnel in the event of enemy attack.

In thinking about these matters, it occurred to me that the Congress should consider the installation of an atomic power reactor to provide the needed heat and electric generating capacity. The atomic power reactor appealed to me from several vantage points:

1. It would provide a source of heat and electricity for the Capitol area independent of any disruptions that might occur to Metropolitan utility systems. It could be buried beneath the present powerplant. The sort of shielding necessary for the reactor itself would also give it protection for everything but a direct hit with a very large bomb.

2. Its economics of operation, I am told, may well prove to be more attractive by the time it is operating than any other independent source of energy. For such an independent source of energy the only alternative in this area is a diesel plant, which requires underground fuel storage, and whose fuel is relatively high cost in Washington.

3. The size of the reactor needed to do the job—about 25,000 kilowatts of heat energy—is of very widespread interest for use by rural electric cooperatives, in small metropolitan areas and in many foreign countries. Yet, to date, no substantial effort on a plant of this size has been undertaken by Government or industry. A need for such a plant by the Congress would serve to speed the day when such users would be able to benefit from atomic power.

4. The location of an atomic-power plant at the Capitol, undertaken at the initiative of the Congress, would serve as a dramatic demonstration of the practicability of atomic power and the feasibility of locating atomic-powerplants in cities. It would also be a fine example of leadership by the Congress in an area of untold national significance. Similarly, it would have great international impact.

5. Additionally, it would provide an early opportunity for the tens of thousands of American citizens who come to Washington and who have supported the development of atomic energy with their taxes to see a practical application of atomic power.

These considerations led me to explore further the idea of installing a 25,000-kilowatt atomic reactor on Capitol Hill. Discussions were held with the Architect of the Capitol, scientists of the Atomic Energy Commission, and members of the staff of the joint committee. Far from regarding the idea as impractical, these discussions show it to be quite worthy and workable. A preliminary study of such a reactor system for Capitol Hill is being undertaken by the Atomic Energy Commission, in consultation with the Architect of the Capitol. In my opinion, the study will bear out the preliminary estimates.

I recommend this project to you, and urge its most serious consideration by the Joint Planning Committee.

Very sincerely,

STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress.

[Press release issued by the Architect of the Capitol, February 6, 1956]

A bill was introduced in the Senate, today, by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and in the House of Representatives by W. STERLING COLE, of New York, both members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, authorizing the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of that committee, to make surveys and studies and prepare recommendations and reports, including preliminary plans and estimates of cost, for providing and utilizing atomic energy for lighting, heating, power, and air-conditioning refrigeration for the Capitol Building and Grounds; Senate and House Office Buildings; Capitol Power Plant; Supreme Court Building; Congressional Library Buildings; Botanic Garden; Legislative Garage; Government Printing Office; Washington City Post Office; and the Folger Shakespeare Library (all of which are connected with the Capitol Power Plant, which produces air-conditioning refrigeration and steam for heating and other purposes, and from 1910 to 1951 also generated electrical energy for light and power); the additional Senate Office Building now under construction; the additional House Office Building and related improvements authorized by Congress last year and now in the planning stage; the Extension of the Capitol and related improvements also authorized by Congress last year and now under study; and for any new construction and improvements which can be reasonably anticipated and for which lighting, heating, power, or air-conditioning refrigeration services may reasonably be expected to be supplied from the same source as the Capitol group of buildings.

Under the provisions of the proposed legislation, the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is authorized to engage such professional engineering services as may be necessary for making the surveys, studies, recommendations, and reports authorized.

The proposed legislation also provides that the surveys, studies, recommendations, and reports shall develop full information concerning the feasibility of providing and utilizing atomic energy for the purposes proposed, and shall also develop full information concerning the safe, practical, adequate, and appropriate means and facilities for accomplishing such purposes.

The proposed legislation further provides that, upon completion of the surveys, studies, recommendations, and reports, the joint committee shall submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report thereon, together with such recommendations as the committee may deem advisable.

Greatest Engineering Blunder in Our History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, gigantic Glen Canyon Dam, $421 million main unit of the proposed upper Colorado River project, could become the greatest engineering blunder in our history, because water for the project might pour into two enormous subterranean sievelike basins, instead of flowing through the dam to make hydroelectric power.

Alongside of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir are two underground basins of almost unbelievable size. Once the 700-foot-high dam was built across the Colorado River, the flow of water could back up and pour into these immense sieves.

One of these great subbasements of the earth is known as the Kaiparowits Basin. It would hold at least 250 million acre-feet of water. The other is the Henry Mountains Basin, and it would hold 100 million acre-feet of river water. An acre-foot of water is enough water to cover one acre of ground a foot deep.

That is 350 million acre-feet of water, or at least 26 years' flow of the whole Colorado River at this point.

If adequate power cannot be produced by the dam to pay its cost, it hardly seems reasonable to build it and force this great new loss on the taxpayers of the Nation.

Scientific data in my hands make it doubtful that Glen Canyon Reservoir could be filled in our lifetime, and doubtful as well that adequate power could be produced by the dam. I am appending at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of a memorandum to me by geologist Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., on this subject.

This matter demands an exhaustive investigation by independent geologists and engineers who have no personal interest in the project, as do those employed by the Bureau of Reclamation whose employment depends on authorization of more projects by Congress.

The Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains Basins can hold enough water to cover the District of Columbia to a depth of 8,000 feet.

That is enough water to serve the people of New York City for 98,000 days, or 268 years.

Here, based on sound geological reports, we have the frightening spectacle of the whole Colorado River flowing for years into gigantic underground sponges.

The great dam that is proposed here could well stand as a towering monument to engineering folly and a memorial to the wanton waste of all these millions. It could become history's most colossal white elephant.

These endless cellars are immediately adjacent to the reservoir site and plunge as far as 2,000 feet in depth. There are miles and miles of rock of great porosity through which the river water would flow away, to be forever lost to use in the cavernous depths of the earth.

This rock is marked by enormous cracks and fissures which I have observed myself as late as last December. Water backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam could have free flowing passage into them and into the great basin through them. Undoubtedly many of these cracks and fissures occurred during the gigantic geologic earth movements that created these tremendous downwarps.

Such a loss would be a major tragedy. In addition to the great money loss to all taxpayers, the entire economy of most of the West would be irreparably damaged. This in turn would affect the welfare of the entire Nation.

Last December, in the company of Geologists Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., and Peter H. Gardett, I made an examination of the Glen Canyon Dam and Res-

ervoir area in northern Arizona and southern Utah. The country contains no roads, and the trip was made by helicopter. Samples of Navaho sandstone and Chinle shale rocks were brought out from the reservoir site.

A portion of Dr. Hoots' memorandum states as follows:

The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure.

I wish to emphasize that the Bureau of Reclamation has reported favorably on the proposed upper Colorado River project and its chief unit, Glen Canyon Dam, without adequate information as to the practicability of the project, without proper engineering studies, and without determining the immensity of water losses that would occur.

In House Document No. 364 of the 83d Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation's explanation of the project, a startling admission is made as to water losses of an unexplained nature in the San Juan Basin. The reservoir's waters would extend 71 miles up the San Juan River which is crossed by the Henry Mountains downwarp. At page 180 the following is stated:

Unexplained losses of water have been reported also in the San Juan River Basin. The proposed study in the vicinity of the Navaho Reservoir is for the purpose of evaluating this loss, and determining the quantities that are lost by evaporation and transpiration.

In connection with these structural basins, House Document No. 364 adds on pages 180–181:

There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

I most emphatically agree with Dr. Hoots and other eminent geologists and engineers that the Glen Canyon reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. This is evident from statements made by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

Orderly consideration of his project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

On last Monday I told this body of the existence of large outcrops of Chinle shale in the proposed reservoir area that could be undermined by its waters, causing collapse of overlying massive rock formations and disaster to the power potential of the Glen Canyon power project and thus the entire financial structure of the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

If the reservoir will never hold water, concerning which there is considerable doubt from what I have said today, the Chinle of course, will not have opportunity to disintegrate and fill the reservoir with its own residue and the overlying rocks.

In either eventuality, or with a combination of them, the net effect would still be to make the Glen Canyon project a complete failure.

Thus it would be folly to proceed to consideration of this legislation without a complete and thorough geological study of this area and the final and absolute determination of the questions I have raised.

My studies have been attacked and will be attacked by proponents of the project whose local interests are understandable. But these local interests should be subordinated to the general welfare of the Nation, its taxpayers, and its fiscal integrity.

If I am wrong in this geological analysis, if the respected and distinguished geologists who agree with me is wrong, then let the facts be collected through studies that are yet to be made. But let not this Congress embark upon a program which learned and distinguished opinion warns may be one of tremendous folly and disastrous financial consequence. I reiterate, no further legislative steps should be taken with regard to this project until full, complete and thorough geologic studies and analyses have been made of the Glen Canyon Reservoir site.

I say this despite the fact that under date of February 2 the Department of the Interior finally wrote an answer to my inquiries dated January 3 with respect to these basins and other geologic questions regarding the Glen Canyon site. It is interesting to note that this February 2 letter did not reach my office until February 4, whereas another February 2 letter from the Department to me appeared on that date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD proceedings of the other body.

In 1950 when House Document No. 364 was prepared Interior geologists concluded:

Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is a great depth below the plateaus.

In 1956, now that the geologic feasibility of the plan is under scrutiny and the Bureau of Reclamation is hot to perpetuate its massive bureaucracy by having Congress authorize new projects, any new projects, they say, through the Department's letter:

All evidences from existing oil and water wells and observation of springs and seeps within the basin show a normal tributary water table with no significant volume of unsaturated strata.

Comparing the two quotations one wonders indeed how such contrary conclusions can be reached if in truth and in fact the Bureau of Reclamation is producing unbiased and uncolored scientific opinion rather than self-serving statements toward its goal of self-preservation at the taxpayers expense.

It also should be a matter for those interested in evaluating these conflicting Bureau opinions to know that the so-called water wells on which the Bureau is placing substantial reliance for its 1956 opinion are little more than scratches on the surface which could be expected under any conditions to yield some recently captured rainfall. This is the footnote in the Bureau's letter describing two wells on the northeast side of the Kaiparowits Basin on which the Bureau's learned 1956 opinion is based:

Utah State Engineer Application No. 8288 located T.40S, R5E. (unsurveyed) Depth-water 5' yield 2g/PM–Utah; State Engineer Application No. 8289 located T.41S., R5E. Unsurveyed. Water in standstone at 5' yield 2g/PM.

I submit that 2 scratches on the surface, only 5 feet deep, yielding the meagre amount of 2 gallons of water per minute can hardly substantiate the Bureau's conclusion. Turn on the tap in any kitchen sink and you will get out a lot more than 2 gallons of water in a minute.

I repeat once again, no further legislative steps should be taken with regard to this project until full, complete, and thorough geologic studies and analyses have been made of the Glen Canyon Reservoir site, preferably by geologists other than those in the employ of the Bureau of Reclamation.

So that there may be no question or doubt with resepct to the Hoots' memorandum, I am setting it forth in its entirety, except for the illustrations which cannot be reproduced in this RECORD:

MEMORANDUM ON GEOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED GLEN CANYON DAM SITE AND RESERVOIR AREA IN NORTHERN ARIZONA AND SOUTHEASTERN UTAH

(By Harold W. Hoots)

The writer was requested by Hon. CRAIG HOSMER to undertake a geological investigation of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site at Mile 15 on the Colorado River in northern Arizona, and the proposed reservoir area located principally in southeastern Utah and extending 186 river miles up the Colorado River from Mile 15, and 71 miles up the San Juan River.

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this investigation was threefold, namely:

1. To inspect in the field critical geological aspects of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir area, and to collect rock samples considered essential to this investigation;

2. To review:

(a) existing conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the proposed dam site; and

(b) published geological data pertinent to the proposed dam site and reservoir area, for the purpose of appraising the adequacy of geological investigations that preceded the recommendation of this construction project; and

3. To ascertain from tests by qualified engineering laboratories certain critical physical properties of rocks exposed at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and in the reservoir area.

PROCEDURE

Fieldwork

The geological investigation and collection of rock samples in the field was done by Harold W. Hoots and Peter H. Gardett, consulting geologists, December 12–14, 1955. Transportation by helicopter made it possible not only to inspect the geology of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and reservoir area from the air, but also to land at strategic localities for the examination of rock outcrops and the collection of rock samples along both the Colorado River and the San Juan River.

Several hundred pounds of rock samples were collected, flown out by helicopter, and shipped for laboratory determination of certain physical properties of the Navaho sandstone and the Chinle shale. Samples of water from the Colorado River and the San Juan River also were collected for use in conducting laboratory tests on rock samples under conditions that would approach actual field conditions within the proposed reservoir area.

Photographs were taken to illustrate the erosional characteristics of rock formations critical to the proposed reservoir area, and to emphasize the difficulty and tremendous expense involved in constructing a dam that would adequately protect Rainbow Bridge from destruction by the proposed reservoir.

Laboratory tests of rock samples

The more important of the laboratory tests were directed toward:

1. Determination of the permeability and porosity of the Navaho sandstone which forms the walls of the canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

These tests were made with water from the Colorado and San Juan Rivers, and were designed to duplicate, insofar as possible, conditions that would exist within the proposed reservoir. Their purpose was to determine:

(a) the ability of this Navaho sandstone to absorb water from the reservoir;

(b) the capacity of the pore-spaces within a unit volume of this sandstone;

(c) The total quantity of reservoir water that could be lost by leakage through the sandstone walls of the proposed reservoir, and thence by natural gravity drainage into the large structural basins known to extend from the Colorado River for many miles to the north;

(d) The magnitude of the leakage that might occur around the abutments of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam at mile 14; and

(e) Whether Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be protected from flooding by a dam built in this sandstone.

2. Determination of the physical characteristics of the Chinle shale which outcrops, and would be covered by water, along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir area.

The purpose of these tests was to determine the ability of the Chinle shale to maintain its position and physical strengthen when saturated with water, and, under these conditions, to support the load of several hundred feet of overlying cliff-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstone, and to thus prevent the ultimate loss of much of the calculated capacity of the proposed reservoir.

Office studies and preparation of this memorandum

Critical review of available information bearing directly on investigations of, and recommendations made for, the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir was essential to this investigation and the preparation of this memorandum. Particular attention has been devoted to:

1. Published and mimeographed reports by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey on the geology and ground water of the area containing the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir area;

2. To the adequacy of the investigations made by the Bureau of Reclamation of the physical character of the Navaho sandstone at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site, and to the extent that the Chinle shale in the reservoir area will increase sedimentation and reduce the storage capacity and usefulness of the reservoir; and

3. The problems and expense involved in the construction of a dam designed to protect the Rainbow Bridge, and the uncertainty that such a dam would actually provide this protection.

FINDINGS

The Navaho sandstone

The canyon of the Colorado River at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site and along most of the 186 river miles of the proposed reservoir is composed entirely of Navaho sandstone. This sandstone, as it occurs in this region, is described by Dr. Herbert E. Gregory and Dr. Raymond C. Moore[1] as follows:

"The Navaho sandstone is essentially an aggregate of white, crystal-clear quartz grains, loosely held together with cement. In general the cement is weak. Even where iron oxide forms the bond it is not easy to obtain a well-trimmed hand specimen, and much of the rock exposed at the surface is so friable that it crushes under the foot, and a single blow of the hammer may reduce a block of sandstone to a mass of dust. Blasting this rock with powder presents special difficulties."

J. W. Harshbarger, C. A. Repenning, and J. T. Callahan[2] of the United States Geological Survey, make the following statement regarding the Navaho standstone:

"One striking feature of this sandstone is its great permeability and capacity to absorb, immediately, a substantial portion of the light precipitation. Evidence of this rapid absorption is the extremely small amount of runoff from the area of outcrop. Undoubtedly, the Navaho sandstone transmits water more freely than any other water bearer in the region."

Laboratory tests of porosity and permeability

Samples of Navaho sandstone collected from the lower part of the canyon wall at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon dam were determined to have a porosity varying from 24.3 to 25.5 percent, and an average porosity of 25 percent. One acre-foot of this sandstone thus has sufficient porosity to contain one-fourth of 1 acre-foot of water.

The permeabilities of these samples of Navaho sandstone to air were found to be uniformly high, to vary from 4,920 to 5,180 millidarcys, and to average 5,060 millidarcys. Their permeabilities to Colorado River water under normal vertical hydrostatic gradient for 100 hours averaged, at the end of this 100 hour period, 1,330 millidarcys. Permeabilities of this magnitude permit comparatively rapid movement of water into and through the Navaho sandstone.

Significance of established porosity and permeability: The Navaho sandstone clearly is sufficiently porous and permeable to contain large quantities of water, and to permit movement of this water from the proposed reservoir into and through the sandstone walls to areas of lower hydrostatic pressure. Several such areas of lower pressure adjoin the proposed reservoir and are tabulated below.

1. The sandstone walls of the canyon adjacent to the proposed dam and the lower end of the proposed reservoir: Average permeability of this sandstone indicates that in excess of 15 million gallons of water may leak around the abutments of the proposed dam every day.

2. The Kaiparowits downwarp or structural basin: This geologic feature, one of the major structural basins of this region, extends from the lower part of the proposed reservoir northwestward for 70 miles. (See accompanying map of A. A. Baker, of United States Geological Survey.) It is a magnificent natural basin for containing water in volume many times that calculated for the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Access of water to this basin from the proposed reservoir is provided by porous and permeable Navaho sandstone walls along 50 river miles of the proposed reservoir immediately above the proposed dam. This basin covers over 1,700 square miles and has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 250 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir is full. Since this capacity is about 10 times that calculated for storage in the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir, it is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

3. The Henry Mountains Basin: This geologic feature crosses the Colorado River about 45 river miles above the mouth of the San Juan River. It is similar to the Kaiparowits Basin in its geologic character and ability to drain water from the proposed reservoir. It has ready access to the reservoir through permeable Navaho sandstone walls along many river miles of the proposed reservoir, and it has the capacity, within the Navaho sandstone alone, to hold an estimated 100 million acre-feet of water when the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir is full. It is essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and is thus free to drain water from the proposed reservoir.

4. The Rainbow Bridge National Monument: This area, it is proposed, is to be protected from flooding by a dam built in the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone, but regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subject to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir through the Navaho sandstone.

The Chinle shale

The Chinle shale is exposed along the canyon walls of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers for an aggregate distance of about 50 river miles within the proposed reservoir area. Its importance to the proposed reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks.

The Chinle shale is a fine-textured bentonitic type rock that varies in color from gray to blue, red, and purple. When exposed to the elements it has little resistance to erosion, and when brought in contact with water it expands and rapidly disintegrates to a shapeless mass of mud.

If brought in continuous contact with water from the proposed reservoir this Chinle shale, which now is partially protected in canyon walls above the river level, would immediately disintegrate and flow down slope into the reservoir. More importantly, it would undermine and cause collapse of all overlying cliff-forming rocks in extensive areas bordering the proposed reservoir. All of the broken debris resulting from this collapse would move down slope and would partially or completely fill the proposed res-

[1] The Kaiparowits Region, U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 164, pp. 65 and 66, 1931.

[2] The Navaho Country, Arizona-Utah-New Mexico, included in the Physical and Economic Foundation of Natural Resources, p. 121, by Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, U. S. Congress, 1952.

ervoir in these extensive areas of Chinle outcrop.

Field and laboratory investigations of the character, distribution, thickness, and geological relations of the Chinle shale strongly indicate that this formation, if brought in contact with water in the proposed reservoir, would contribute materially to rapid diminution of the capacity and usefulness of the reservoir for water storage.

The Chinle shale is not thin. According to H. D. Miser[2] this formation has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River. Its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the nearby Colorado River appears to be similar.

LACK OF ADEQUATE INFORMATION

It is essential that the expenditure of money required for the proposed Glen Canyon Dam project be supported and justified by adequate data, and expert appraisal and interpretation of these data. Published statements by the United States Geological Survey emphasize the fact that a vast quantity of data essential to a technical evaluation of the soundness of this project has not been obtained.

The following quotations of statements by the United States Geological Survey are taken from pages 178–182 of House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, entitled "Colorado Storage Project."

Page 178, second paragraph:

"Although much information on water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin already has been collected, available records fall far short of presenting the complete understanding of water resources which will be needed for purposes of the storage plan outlined in this report, and for full utilization of the waters allocated to the respective States under the terms of the upper Colorado River Basin compact. Detailed geologic maps and data for the upper Colorado River Basin are inadequate, and in large areas they are entirely lacking. The topographic mapping essential for inventory of both water resources and mineral resources is likewise far from adequate. Only 11 percent of the basin is adequately mapped, and mapping is in progress in an additional 2 percent of the area."

Special Erosion and Sedimentation Studies (p. 179, first and second paragraphs):

"The Colorado River has always been outstanding in sediment transportation, and has been cited as a horrible example of land erosion and soil wastage by may writers. The sedimet has been a vexing problem in the preparation of the storage project. * * *

"Far more research is needed before reliable predictions can be made as to sedimentation in the future, and before evaluation can be made of proposed preventive measures. * * * A complete analysis of the problem will involve study also of meteorological aspects, as well as soils and vegetative cover—that is, coordination of effort among the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, and agencies of the Department of Agriculture."

Special Water-Loss Studies (p. 179, last paragraph):

"In the case of Glen Canyon, it has been estimated that evaporation losses would average about 63 inches annually, of which 54 inches would be chargeable to the basin. These estimates are based on very meager data as to evaporation from free water surfaces, and transfers of data from remote areas in the case of natural losses from the stream. Detailed investigations have not been made of evaporation from streams in the basin under varying conditions of turbulence, or of evapo-transpiration from riparian vegetation or from flood plains bordering the streams."

[2] The San Juan Canyon, U. S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 538, fig. 2, p. 34, 1924.

Glen Canyon Reservoir and vicinity, Arizona and Utah (p. 180, last paragraph, and p. 181, first and second paragraphs):

"Topographic mapping of more than 2,600 square miles has a high priority for the Glen Canyon project. Geologic mapping of a slightly smaller area along the Colorado and San Juan Rivers is proposed. The rocks cropping out in the reservoir area are predominantly sandstones, as shown by geologic reconnaissance. It is known that structural basins lie northwest of the reservoir site under the Kaiparowitz Plateau and also under the Henry Mountains. Groundwater studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

"Several wells drilled in the region for oil indicate that the regional water table is at great depth below the plateaus. In the Mexican Hat field along the San Juan River, small quantities of oil were encountered in a synclinal structure, an exceptional occurrence which has been explained as due to the lack of ground water in the area. Ground-water studies are proposed for the purpose of determining the position of the regional water table. There is also the question whether the Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains structural basins contain significant amounts of unsaturated strata in positions where they might draw water from the Glen Canyon Reservoir. * * *

"The Glen Canyon Reservoir will extend upstream into Cataract Canyon, where gypsum and salt of the Paradox formation crop out near river level in several places. The possible effect of these rocks upon the quality of water in the reservoir should be investigated."

Classification of Federal Lands for Water Development (p. 182, first paragraph):

"The Geological Survey is responsible for classification of Federal lands as to their water-storage and waterpower values. These values are dependent in part upon the upper basin's ability to furnish water to the lower basin as required by compact, and dependent therefore upon the Colorado River storage project. Many of the streams in the basin are not adequately mapped, and geological investigations of possible dam sites must precede any classification as to their waterpower or water-storage value."

CONCLUSIONS

The Glen Canyon Reservoir project has been proposed and recommended without benefit of a vast amount of information essential to a determination of the practicability and future success of this project. It is evident from the above-quoted statements by the United States Geological Survey that much of this essential information is not available.

Orderly consideration of this project should come only after the Geological Survey has had an opportunity to complete the topographic and geologic mapping of the entire proposed reservoir area, investigate underground water conditions, soil and erosion hazards, and appraise and make available to all concerned the results of these studies.

Of particular importance is the determination of:

1. The magnitude and rapidity of water loss that can be expected from the proposed reservoir into the large Kaiparowitz and Henry Mountains basins;

2. The extent to which the disintegration of water-soaked Chinle shale and other similar formations will reduce the capacity and usefulness of the proposed reservoir; and

3. How the dam suggested for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument can be built in the impassable terrain surrounding this area, and how any dam, regardless of its construction, can protect this national monument from flooding.

HAROLD W. HOOTS,
Consulting Geologist.

Food Merchandising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the annual banquet of the Marathon County Retail Food Dealers Association, at Wausau, Wis., on February 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES INTENSIFIED EVOLUTION OF FOOD MERCHANDISING—STATES OUTLOOK FOR AMERICA BRIGHT

I am indeed happy to address your annual banquet.

You—the independent businessmen of this fine association—are symbols of the hard-working, free-enterprise system which is the mainspring of economic progress in our Nation.

The more than 340,000 independent food dealers across the country are transacting over $22 billion worth of business yearly. This represents a tremendous contribution to our overall national income.

In Wisconsin alone, as you know, there are more than 7,000 independent dealers, contributing to the wealth and growth of our Badger State.

YOUR ROLES IN WISCONSIN COMMUNITIES

I personally am definitely interested in the wellbeing of your group as a whole and in ample opportunity for every single member of this audience.

I am interested in all this, because each of you here plays not only an important economic role in your community—a vital role in the American distribution system—but because all of you are, I know, significant contributors to the social, political, church, veterans, and fraternal life of your communities.

THE MAN BEHIND THE COUNTER

The man behind the food counter is one of the vital men behind America's great happiness and growth.

The man who stands in front of the cash register, checking out food purchaseed by our citizens, is a man who is helping to satisfy the changing needs of the American people.

THE REVOLUTION IN MERCHANDISING

I emphasize "changing needs," because this is an era of change. The whole food distribution system has been and is being revolutionized—peacefully—by ingenious, daring sales—conscious pioneers, constantly evolving new techniques.

Indeed, the principal theme that I will submit to you tonight is that the helpful economic revolution which has occurred in America—with 65 million jobs and a constantly rising economy and population—is going to continue at an ever accelerated pace.

And it is up to all of us to contribute to progress in this peaceful revolution. Why? Because it means greater happiness, a higher

standard of living for all of us, better nutrition, healthier minds and bodies.

It means too, an ever healthier retail food industry for our country.

THOUSANDS OF NEW PRODUCTS

I need hardly remind you, my friends, that a century ago, less than 100 food items were available in the average food store.

Today, independent food stores combine together an average of 4,000 separate food and grocery items; and in the case of larger stores, as many as 15,000 different items.

Each of those items represent new businesses that have been established in our country—new products which have been developed, new skills, as well as new types of packaging, bottling, displaying, advertising, and merchandising, as a whole. In other words, every single day we are satisfying more and more needs of the average man, and you are contributing to this process.

You yourself are constantly perfecting your store—its physical appearance, its layout, its inventory, its signs, its lighting. You are constantly streamlining operations, cutting costs wherever possible, increasing efficiency, adding to volume, diversifying brands.

You represent America at its best—changing for the better, growing, serving.

You of course, are far more familiar than I with the details of this revolution in food merchandising. The entire growth of the self-service store, the growth of the frozen food industry, the development, say, of detergents—the installation of automatic machines—"silent salesmen"—are but a few instances of how the genius of American free enterprise has responded to American needs.

BARGAINS THROUGH COMPETITION

Mrs. Average Housewife today wants more of her foods precut, prepackaged, yes, precooked. Mrs. Average Housewife today is, however, always looking for bargains, and the food dealer is giving her bargains.

I know of few, if any, industries in America where independent owners are providing every single day a better example—than your industry—of competition at work.

But what you want and what I want is healthy, fair competition.

The kind that produces the best product for the public's consumption.

The kind that delivers the product at a price the consumer can afford.

The kind that provides a living return—a living profit—for both the producer and the retail dealer, based on their heavy capital investment.

THE FIGHT AGAINST MONOPOLY

I need not tell you that the independent food dealers of this country have had to wage down through the years, a continuous campaign in their own self-protection.

A peak of that campaign's effectiveness was reached on June 19, 1936, when the Robinson-Patman Act became law. The passage of that act marked a landmark in the fight to assure fairness in American competition. The passage of the law served to prevent the big man—the big chain—from competing unfairly with the little man; served to prevent the big man from getting, for example, price rebates in direct or disguised form—rebates on the basis of which he could slash his prices and thereby destroy his competition.

FULLY SUPPORT ROBINSON-PATMAN LAW

Of course, the Robinson-Patman Act did not prohibit anyone from competing or from meeting fair competition. It did, however, soundly require that when a price cut is given to a big mass distributor, it must be offered on equal terms to merchants who are competing with him.

This is a sound objective. For this reason and for other good reasons, I have supported the Robinson-Patman Act in its letter and in its spirit, since the day I came to Washington.

I support it now. I am definitely opposed to any efforts which would nullify it, which would emasculate it. I am for strengthening it wherever and whenever it is indicated it must be strengthened.

I am for clearing up any ambiguities, however, any inconsistencies.

The Robinson-Patman Act is not, of course, the "last word" in American antitrust laws.

There are continuous problems of working out the complex and overlapping relationship between the Sherman Law (now more than 65 years old), the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, (both over 41 years old) and the 19 year old Robinson-Patman Act.

There is a continuing problem in resolving some points of controversy in the letter and spirit of some of these acts.

One of my jobs in Washington is to make sure that all of these laws are, in practice, applied in a consistent manner which will best serve their most basic objectives, the objectives of 165 million Americans.

MY WORK ON MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

As you know, one of my important assignments in Washington, is to serve as senior Republican of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In turn, one of the important subcommittees of that group is its Subcommittee on Antitrust Laws and Monopoly.

I take my position on this subcommittee particularly seriously. We are dealing on that subcommittee, not only with enormous national problems, such as questions concerning the merger of large corporations, say, the proposed merger of Bethlehem Steel and Youngstown Steel—questions concerning competition in giant industries like automobiles; rather, we are dealing as well with the very lifeblood of the small retail food dealer and other small merchants of our country.

INTERIM REPORT BEING DRAFTED

Right now, we are in the process of writing an interim report of the subcommittee. It is not my purpose at the present time to attempt to anticipate our subcommittee findings. I may state, however, that in the interim report, it is our intention to suggest lines for further study—lines for additional hearings which should be held, e. g., as regards the respective jurisdictions of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice in antitrust matters.

As a Senator, serving in a quasi-judicial capacity, I don't want to attempt to prejudge any specific problem before those hearings are held.

But I do want to say this: I don't believe in antitrust laws remaining on the statute books as a dead letter.

I don't believe Congress wrote laws just for the "noble sound" or in order to have them clutter up the statute books.

If any law is not being applied, we must find out why it is not being applied. If it is obsolete in terms of the changing necessities of modern times, then it must be modernized.

Similarly, the law must be made clear. In many instances today, it is obviously very ambiguous—so ambiguous that the courts, in decision after decision, have condemned much of the language of our antitrust statutes as so fuzzy as to be inapplicable.

Of course, the language in statutes must, to a considerable extent, be kept general, because laws are designed to cover a vast number of situations.

Nevertheless, it is one thing to have broad language, which covers many instances; it is another thing to have cloudy, vague and unmeaningful language, which cannot possibly be applied in the Nation's courts.

FOSTERING SOUND ECONOMIC CLIMATE

But you and I know that the Retail Food Dealers of America are affected by more simply than antitrust laws.

You are affected by the general economic climate of our country. If our people have full confidence in America—if they believe that there are going to be more jobs tomorrow, rather than less; more purchasing power, rather than less; more opportunities, rather than less—then they are going to buy more of the good things of life from you and from other merchants.

It is our job, therefore, in Washintgon to help maintain confidence strong in America. It is our job in Washington to make sure that there is a continually favorable economic climate in our land.

TEN-POINT PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS

I want to suggest now several points in a program for assuring a favorable climate for our country:

1. We must pursue sound economic policies with the purpose of stimulating and encouraging growth and expansion in all fields of private enterprise.

There is one bill now before the Senate which would unfortunately do just the opposite. It is the Harris-Fulbright bill, which would gouge 400,000 Wisconsin consumers of natural gas. That is why I favor amending this bill, so as to protect home, store, and factory users of natural gas.

2. We must broaden our programs of developing skills and technology; this means training more people, more engineers and technicians, and expanding our scientific research.

3. We must increase and encourage the international flow of money and goods, for economic developments abroad are important to provide markets for our many products.

4. We must accelerate our atimic-energy development—for peacetime, as well as wartime uses. For example, we need atomic power to propel ships, run factories, generate electricity, and many other uses—medical and agricultural—known and yet undreamed of.

5. We must, of course, guard against attack from world communism.

Here in Wausau—a seemingly safe and distant place—we are dangerously close to enemy bases, as measured by time in the jet age. We may soon be less than 30 minutes away from possible guided-missile attack, and less than 6 hours away from jet bombers from Siberia. Consequently, we need a strong anti-Communist program. Our defense spending—about $40 billion a year—is necessarily geared to meet the Communist threat to our own and others' freedom.

6. We must increase our efforts to get the true story of the American way of life to the people of the world.

For this purpose, I am a cosponsor of a bill to make American participation in foreign trade fairs a permanent feature of our overall program to help bring the truth about America to the people abroad.

The trade fair is an opportunity to display our way of life—yes, our markets and our supermarkets—and our other technological advancements to foreign countries. It will help open new markets for our machines and our products, and it will create improved international relationships and understandings.

7. We must evolve stronger practices of conservation—that is, preserve our reservoir of strategic materials and conserve our water, soil, forests, and other natural resources.

8. We must embark on new, bold programs of internal development. For example, the St. Lawrence seaway, with deepened connecting channels, will, at completion, be a 2,300-mile deep-water artery of travel and trade into the heart of America, a tremendous asset to Wisconsin and to the Nation.

9. We must assure adequate purchasing power for the 10 percent of our population, which is aged 65 years or older. Yes, too many of our 14 million old folks can barely make ends meet these days. That is why

I have offered comprehensive old-age assistance legislation in the Senate to help them as regards jobs, housing, health, training, et cetera.

10. We must equip ourselves with a flexible economic policy to meet the needs of current, and future, situations. For instance, we need to provide relief for victims of flood disaster, drought, or other natural catastrophes. We need to take care of unemployment in isolated, depressed areas. We need to prevent unbalance in our economy, such as is now occurring in agriculture.

Of this, I shall have a bit more to say later on.

FULFILLING POSTAL SERVICE NEEDS

If time permitted. I would like to turn to in detail to certain other specific challenges which we face.

It may not be realized, for example, by the average man, but the food dealers of our country depend very heavily upon local newspaper advertising and direct mail advertising.

To strengthen our local papers, I have been urging steps to increase newsprint supply.

And, with reference to direct mail, I know that many of you use postal cards, as well as letter mail, to acquaint consumers with the latest food bargains.

I regard the fulfillment of postal service as one of the real pillars of the American free enterprise system, including our food distribution. I would oppose the false concept that the Post Office should not remain primarily a service institution.

The post office was created to serve America. We don't like postal deficits. But if we wanted to forget every other factor but profit and loss and run the post office strictly to get into the "black ink," then there are probably hundreds and even thousands of the 42,000 post offices in our country which might have to be closed. Such a thought would, of course, be utterly objectionable, and no thinking, fair-minded person seriously contemplates it. But some people do speak at times as if they wanted radically to change the post office and run it strictly for a profit, ignoring almost completely its essential service functions.

Instead, I say, the post office must serve you and serve your customers.

A sound retail food industry is a cornerstone of a sound America.

WE WANT A HEALTHY AGRICULTURE

I know that you will agree with me, too, that all of us want a healthy agricultural segment of our population. We want the farmer to earn his cost of production, plus a reasonable profit.

The retail grocer, selling, say, dairy products, does not want to profit at the expense of the dairy farmer. Nor does the thinking consumer.

At the same time, the farmer is glad to turn out ever higher quality food, and at a fair price for the distributor to move, for the trucker to deliver, for the food dealer to sell, and for the consumer to buy. There is no inconsistency in seeking fair play and a fair price for all.

Naturally, representing as I do America's dairyland, it is my hope that our food dealers will continue to sell an ever increasing proportion of dairy items—more nutritious fluid milk, more cheese, more butter, more nonfat dry milk solids, more ice cream. And attractive displays of dairy products on food counters, on shelves, and in food freezers are, of course, a most important element in increasing dairy item consumption.

I wish that time might have permitted me to comment in further detail on other phases of interest to you.

It has, however, been a pleasure to review, if only briefly, these few important matters.

I hope that when I return to Washington, you will continue to give me the benefit of your judgment, and let me know how I can be of service.

Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Integration Exhibit No. 1," which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on Sunday, February 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION EXHIBIT NO. 1

As a showcase for integration, District of Columbia schools do not display anything worth the ruinous prices asked.

The most damaging item in the exhibit is the drop in academic standards resulting from putting Negro and white pupils in the same classroom. The adverse effect on white students is incalculable.

In 1 of his 4 articles on the Washington school situation in this paper last week, Reporter Larry Weekley wrote:

"A fearful anticipation—that of wide intellectual and cultural differences between white and Negroes—has become a startling reality. The public's clearest idea of what this problem is came after a study of the results of citywide achievement tests given a year ago. * * *

"The results showed briefly:

"That one-fourth of the ninth-graders were reading on or below the level of the sixth-graders, and that 43 percent of the ninth-graders were doing arithmetic on or below the level of sixth-graders.

"There is no accurate statistical information on how many of these retarded children were Negroes, since authorities also have desegregated statistics. But there is no doubt in anybody's mind that at least 90 percent of the retarded children were Negro. One principal estimated that 99 percent of the retarded children in his former white school were Negro."

The United States Supreme Court has said that children of the minority group are deprived of equal educational opportunities when there is segregation solely on the basis of race.

Citing that ruling and referring to the Washington school situation, David Lawrence declared in his nationally syndicated column Thursday:

"The question now will be asked whether the children of the majority group are not being deprived of educational opportunities because of the achievement lag of children in the minority group who are put in the same schools with them."

Faced with a deteriorating academic situation, District of Columbia officials are calling for more money to operate the schools. Southern School News reports that District of Columbia school officials "have indicated to the [District] Commissioners during budget discussions that integration required more teachers and smaller classes, and that it would not save money."

Apologists for integration explain away the decline in academic standards in Washington by saying that the former all-Negro schools were inferior ones and that thus Negro pupils were not able to receive the quality of education given the whites.

Even if this were the right explanation, and there is no proof that it is, it still would not make sense to throw the Negro and white pupils together and thus compound the educational problem. The aim should be, instead, to improve the Negro schools, and this was being done in Virginia long before the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

Mr. Weekley's study of the Washington situation revealed other facts:

Integration has brought an end to or drastic curtailment of some types of extracurricular activities—social affairs and dramatic performances, for example.

Many white families apparently are fleeing to suburban areas outside of Washington to escape integration.

Tardiness, playing hookey, laziness, personal uncleanliness have increased markedly in some former all-white schools which are now integrated.

In considering those findings, it is important to remember that the climate of public opinion in Washington is far more favorable to integration than in most places farther South.

If integration has given rise to these problems in Washington, how much more serious would these and other problems be if schools were integrated in, say, southside Virginia, where whites are almost solidly opposed to integration, and determined to resist it by every lawful means?

Pandora's box is an overworked descriptive symbol, but what else could so aptly illustrate the multiplicity of difficulties that would be turned loose upon the South if coercive integration became a reality? Southerners will study every conceivable legal means to bypass the Supreme Court's ruling. In the meantime they will sit on the lid.

The Hughes Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 4, 1956:

THE HUGHES CASE

The trial of Paul H. Hughes now is over and comment by this newspaper is appropriate. Hughes came to members of our staff with stories of improper conduct by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. When these charges did not seem sufficiently serious to the editors to warrant publication, he returned with more serious allegations. They were so serious, in fact, that the editors alerted the Department of Justice to the possible of an imminent criminal act.

The charges against the Senator, on careful investigation, turned out to be false. Not a line of the story was ever set in type. Not a word of it was printed.

Hughes then falsely told a New York grand jury that his conversations with staff members also had concerned Harvey Matusow's recantation. The grand jury, after hearings extending over weeks, decided that he had committed perjury in making these statements, and indicted him on several counts. The jury which heard this case dismissed two charges and disagreed on the others.

The staff members who interviewed Hughes on his MCCARTHY story behaved as careful reporters ought to behave in checking allegations against public officials. Much time was

spent on this story. The time it takes to prove a story false is as well spent as the time it takes to prove a story true. Newspapers ought always to be credulous in listening to charges and skeptical before printing them.

This sort of credulity in the past produced the Teapot Dome story. Investigations by this newspaper led to the reform of the Washington Police Department and helped launch the Kefauver inquiry into organized crime. By the same token, the Hughes story is not the only story that our skepticism has kept out of print. Both qualities—credulity and skepticism—will, we trust, continue to be found in our staff.

We hope we never may be as incredulous of charges as the Ottawa Journal was when Igor Gouzenko vainly tried to tell it about Soviet espionage in North America. We hope we may never be so lacking in skepticism and responsibility as to print untrue charges, however expensive may be the inquiry required to prove them untrue, and whatever the reprisal of disappointed informers.

The Government's Investment in Surplus Grain and Fiber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news letter issued by Representative USHER L. BURDICK, Member of Congress from the State of North Dakota. The letter is in regard to "The $8 billion invested by the Government in surplus grain and fiber."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN COMMENTS

(By USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota)

THE $8 BILLION INVESTED BY THE GOVERNMENT IN SURPLUS GRAIN AND FIBER

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Those who are opposed to giving the farmer a near parity of price for his products compared to the price he has to pay out get right out and screech so they can be heard for four blocks, "Look what we have lost in supporting price of wheat! Look at the overpowering surplus! We can't stand such huge losses."

If these town criers, and that means administrators here, and everybody down to the line, would stop for a moment and compose themselves, here is what they would find:

The Government has not lost $8 billion or any major portion of it. We still have the grain and fiber, and it could be liquidated, in a pinch, and the loss would be reduced 82 percent. The amount of subsidies in this farm classification is a tiny part of the subsidies that are annually granted to others.

The last available figures on the sale of alcoholic liquors is illuminating. In 1953 the people of the United States spent over $10 billion for liquor—and what good has it done? That liquor is gone and those that used it cannot prove they are better off for having used it, but on the contrary, the proof is abundant that its users are worse off after consuming all this liquor.

The per capita consumption of alcoholic liquors in the United States in 1953 was $62.42, but here at the seat of government the per capita consumption was $168.38. I presume that great consumption here is due to the fact that we follow the world customs, and every visiting delegation to the capital has to be warmed up before the conferences begin. And from some of the results of some of these conferences it is obvious that liquor played a more important role than brains.

This $10 billion is a dead loss, or worse, while those who use it seem to holler the loudest against an investment in food, in which at best there is only a slight loss. I think Bernard Baruch is on the right track when he advocates putting a large part of our surplus wheat aside as a protection to this country embroiled in a threat of war. He is, no doubt, a student of history and knows that no army has any hitting power unless backed by food. What happened to Napoleon when he invaded Russia? His army ran out of food, and years later after the retreat of his army from Russia its course could be seen by the bleached bones of the French soldiers. What happened to the German armies in World Wars I and II? They ran out of food, not guns. The German people could not back up the armies because they were foodless at home.

What does the Army do with its surplus planes, guns and munitions? They are charged up to loss, and these losses run to many times the billions we have invested in food. What do the farm machine companies and the automobile companies do with their surplus machinery and cars? They sell them for what they can get in some other country, and keep up their manufacturing business. But if the farmer plants 2 acres of wheat more than his allotment he is haled into court and fined because he has contributed to this awful surplus. All we hear here is surplus, surplus, surplus. It is a good thing—but these criers don't know what a valuable thing surplus food is.

It is time for these objectors to take an invoice of themselves, and if they did they would learn how wrong they are. What would you rather have? Eight billion dollars invested in obsolete engines of war or $8 billion invested in food, especially since the investment in food is not a loss, while in obsolete guns it is.

Atoms and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 2, 1956. The editorial concerns the recent report of the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMS AND PUBLIC POLICY

The report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy must be regarded as one of the most important public documents issued in recent years. It reviews what has been done thus far with atomic energy in power production and in advancing medicine, agriculture, and industry; it examines and in general approves the policy which has been laid down by Congress in the Atomic Energy Act; it recommends modifications which would do away with unnecessary secrecy; it praises the Atomic Energy Commission for the manner in which it has performed the difficult task of meeting both military and civilian needs.

To prepare the report 15 seminar or discussion groups were convened, some 50 special studies prepared, and 327 authorities consulted. What we have, then, is a cross section of the best available opinion on the present state of atomic knowledge, so far as it can be applied in industry and for general practical purposes, the kind of cross section that a businessman, an investor or, for that matter, the general public needs to judge what lies before us in 1975, by which time, it is generally agreed, atomic power will play a conspicuous part in our daily lives.

There are many questions that demand answers. When will we have atomic powerplants? What will happen when radioisotopes play their part in increasing the output of crops at a time when we are perplexed by the problem presented by farm surpluses? What part can private enterprise play in developing atomic energy for civilian purposes? Scores of such questions arise. There is no attempt at evading answers in meaningless generalities. The report makes positive, constructive recommendations.

In the first place, there is the Atomic Energy Act. Though the doctrine on which it is based is accepted, the need of a revision that goes beyond the liberalization of 1954 is recognized. Until the fear of another world war is dispelled we cannot afford to weaken the military safeguard essential to the preservation of national security. However, access to information that designers of atomic power plants must have is difficult to obtain, which suggests that all reactor technology should be freely published. These and similar reommendations have been made before by scientists and engineers. They gain new strength by their repetition in this important official document. Secrecy in the industrial field is an obstacle to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and the report emphasizes the fact.

The panel insists that free enterprise must be permitted to play its part in the development of atomic energy, a policy that Rear Admiral Strauss, ever since he became chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has been trying to carry into effect within the limits imposed by the Atomic Energy Act. We cannot expect the Government to build all the atomically driven ships, locomotives, and central stations of the future or carry on or pay for all the research still required to make the most of atomic energy or forever to monopolize the ownership of all nuclear materials. The case for the proper participation of private industry and science in developing the peaceful atom has never been more convincingly put. Equally important is the technical assistance that we are to give to backward regions under the Eisenhower program for the improvement of their economic condition through the application of atomic energy and raising their deplorably low standard of living.

The humanitarian potentialities and the social implications of atomic energy in all its forms have never been fully appraised. Nor can they be appraised for lack of knowledge. Hence this report must be regarded as only the first of a series of similar reports to come. We need this appraisal and reappraisal of our atomic condition because of the tempo of research and because the impossibility of today becomes the possibility of tomorrow. Besides, we need time. We have about 20 years to prepare ourselves for a new order—time enough. Though the report considers possible disruptions in some industries when atomic power becomes cheap enough—coal mining is one such industry—it believes that they can be antipicated.

Taken as a whole, the report lays down the policies that ought to be followed in developing the peaceful atom. This means

above all a reconsideration of the Atomic Energy Act. It is the conviction of the panel that unless public opinion is thus expressed and heeded we shall find it difficult to maintain our acknowledged leadership in the exploitation of atomic energy.

Blaming Benson Won't Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert an editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register:

BLAMING BENSON WON'T HELP

Discontent always leads to a search for villains. The sag in prices of farm products has brought forth something of an uproar from farm people, quite understandably, especially since incomes of nonfarm people are continuing to rise, and the "villain" is Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson.

The recent series of articles by Clark Mollenhoff in The Register, reporting on attitudes of Iowans about the farm situation, brings this out pointedly. Secretary Benson is the target of abuse, the personal villain. The so-called flexible price support policy, which Mr. Benson advocates so determinedly, has become the subject of ridicule and blame.

It isn't that simple.

Secretary Benson has made some serious mistakes, to be sure. He has counted too heavily on the "automatic" adjustments of the market to correct farm surpluses and low prices. He gives the impression that he simply does not understand the position of agriculture in a booming industrial economy, dominated by administrative decisions made in business, labor, and Government. He talks and acts as though this was the halcyon period of growth in the 1900–14 period. He gives farmers the feeling that he wants to abandon Government action in agriculture as quickly as possible.

Still, Secretary Benson did not cause the decline in farm prices and incomes. Most of the decline occurred before the change in price support policy took effect. And Congress passed the law which permitted lowering price supports for basic crops.

Dislike for Mr. Benson has blinded many people, including Congressmen, to the bankruptcy of the Nation's agricultural policy prior to his taking office. The fixed 90-percent-of-parity price supports were creating unusable surpluses of wheat and cotton. They were forcing lower and lower acreage allotments. They were hampering exports and interfering with the basic national policy of freer international trade. They were shifting the surplus to the feed-livestock sector of farming.

The chief criticism which reasonably could be made of the new flexible price support law is that it is not flexible enough. Prices of cotton and wheat are still too high. The chief criticism of Secretary Benson and Congress which reasonably could be made is that they have not explored other methods for bringing about adjustment and maintaining farm incomes.

Making Mr. Benson a villain will not solve anything.

Making flexible price supports the tool of disaster will not solve anything. Making rigid price supports the tool of prosperity will not solve anything.

The present emotionalism might easily lead just to a return to 90 percent guaranties. What would that accomplish? It would leave the real maladjustments untouched.

Agricultural leaders and Congressmen need to center their attention on the problem of too many people in farming.

They need to think creatively of ways to get farm resources out of wheat and cotton.

They need to think creatively of ways to use an increasing supply of meat, milk, eggs, poultry, vegetables and fruit to improve American diets.

They need to think creatively about ways to use America's great agricultural producing power to lift living conditions in other lands.

Yes, and they need to think about ways of modifying the free market system to bring about more stability in production of farm products, and in incomes of farm people. No simple flexible or rigid price support program can possibly do the job.

Let's leave off berating Secretary Benson and flexible price supports and start applying reason and judgment to the farm problem.

General of the Armies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 1, 1956:

GENERAL OF THE ARMIES

Several bills are pending before the Congress which would confer the rank of General of the Armies upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur. They should be passed swiftly and unanimously as a tribute to one of America's greatest heroes.

The contribution which General MacArthur has made to the people of the United States in three wars and in the years between is far too well known to need detail. The youngest general officer in World War I, the Chief of Staff in the dark days of the depression, as the commander of our armies in the gallant defense of Bataan and Corregidor and in all the victorious campaigns back from Melbourne through New Guinea and the Philippines to Japan, he established a military record which almost unquestionably will never again be equaled in the annals of warfare.

As the representative of the free world in Japan, Gen. MacArthur did a job which can be characterized simply as unbelievably good. He did more in the space of a few years to advance Western prestige in the Orient than most people felt could be accomplished in a matter of centuries. His civilian administration will stand forever as a monument to the entire white race.

In Korea, he fought a superb war with pitifully few men and equipment to face the hordes opposing him. When the Truman administration, for reasons which unquestionably seemed proper to them at the time, forbade final victory, General MacArthur was recalled.

History must pass final assessment on this most unfortunate chapter, but as of this moment there seems little doubt that the entire cause of world peace would be farther advanced had General MacArthur's advice been heeded.

Of course he has been a controversial figure. Any great man is. General MacArthur, in the course of a supremely busy lifetime, has made mistakes which he would be the first to admit. None of these reasons, however, should be allowed to stand in the way of confering a most merited award by a grateful people on this superb soldier.

Only General John J. Pershing now has the title of General of the Armies. With no disrespect to General Pershing's fame, it is utterly impossible to compare the two. By the standards of the war in the Pacific, the First World War in terms of American participation was very minor indeed.

General MacArthur celebrated his 76th birthday last week. While he is in excellent health and has every reason to expect many years of the happiness and contentment he so richly earned, the Congress should not delay this most deserved honor.

There are few ways that America can further show its honor to a son who has received virtually every tribute to which any man may aspire. It is only because General MacArthur's contributions have been so unique and so vast and so completely irrepayable that this most merited tribute should be bestowed upon him by Congress in the name of the whole American people.

Remarks of Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas, Before the Kansas Republican Veterans, Topeka, Kans., January 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on January 28 Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, senior Senator from Kansas, delivered an address to the Kansas Republican Veterans. I believe this address to be most timely in view of the fact that veterans are indicating more and more interest in their Government. I commend this address.

Thank you for your kind invitation to be with you at this gathering. I appreciate it very much.

I am glad that I could get away with others of my colleagues to be with you.

Everything in Washington at the moment is a bit hectic, and most pressing, and of course charged with a slight degree of politics, on the eve of a national election.

I am here as a Republican, at this Republican gathering where we can speak frankly in the interest of our party, and as the Commentator John Cameron Swayze would say, "glad we can get together!"

I am not here to poke my head in the clouds or to shout fine platitudes, or to look down on you from on high (from the Washington scene).

Rather, I prefer to be one of you—with you. I hope I have an honest understanding of how you and I feel about our political policies, philosophies, and approaches to fundamental principles which tie us to our party and the principles for which it stands.

I hope that I will not approach these matters as bluntly as a filling-station attendant did recently over in a fine town in Missouri, when a gentleman in a yellow Cadillac convertible drove up to his filling station, presumably for gas. The attendant looked it over, stuck his head in the car, and said,

"Hello, boob, what question did you flub on the $64 TV program?"

We cannot afford to flub the $64 questions and approaches that we have confronting us today—more especially because we are on the eve of a tremendously important national election.

I am sure we would not want to be like the man in a rowboat on the Potomac River the other day, when a friend of mine, driving to the airport in Washington, noticed the individual in a rowboat hollering at the top of his voice, "No, no, no."

My friend thought the man was in serious trouble and immediately upon arriving at the airport contacted a policeman and told him what he had seen and heard, and suggested the policeman go out and care for him, as he appeared to be in trouble.

The officer studied a moment, and then hesitantly said, "Don't worry about that; that's a 'yes' man from the White House staff on vacation."

My Republican comrades, across this great Nation of ours a few nights ago there were gatherings of men and women by the tens of thousands, paying honor and respect to the President of the United States—a Republican President of the United States.

True, it is they who paid $100 or less for a plate or a box lunch.

True, it is and was that by that account they each contributed financial aid to our party and its organization throughout this land.

But, beyond that, something of greater import was manifested.

First, they respected and honored the man who as President of these United States had fought his way back from the near tragedy of a severe heart attack, with a will to carry on his responsibilities—and we all wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

Then they met to express and say that by and large the policies established and proposed by the Republican Party which he heads, are meeting with the approval of millions of Americans who were sick, disappointed, and disillusioned with the 20 years of the New and Fair Deal and what it portended for this Nation had it been continued.

Yes, I think by that outpouring they said most positively that we as Americans are interested in seeing our Nation remain steadfast to fundamental principles which embody honesty in public office, a loyal faith in our system of free government, the protection of the liberties of our people—and that here is and shall remain the principle that the Government shall not be the dictator and director of all activities or things.

That the industry and initiative of the individual was to be respected.

That the private-enterprise system was to continue under proper and necessary safeguards in the public interest.

That bureaucratic controls and regimentation was not to be the order of the day.

And further, that this Nation should be strong in its defenses both from within and from without.

I am well aware that I am speaking to men who offered their services and if need be, their lives, for our country.

There are those among you who did their job for $30 a month, hoping they had fought a war to end all wars and preserve this Nation in its way of life.

Also in this group are those who fought in two wars for the same objectives.

You have emerged from these wars, returned to civilian life, willing to live and to fight for the same principles which engaged you in fields of battle beyond our shores.

In the span of only a few years you have seen forces at work which challenged our economic system and which, if continued and carried to a logical conclusion, would have in time undermined and weakened our civic and our financial stability.

You have all learned the hard way, that you cannot take without giving. In simple terms, we cannot continue to give away or to borrow ourselves out of public debt.

At this juncture I want to point out that, thanks to a careful administration, we are able now, for the first time in many years, to do what I consider a most important thing—balance the budget of our Nation, and may even put a few hundreds of millions of dollars left over to apply on the national debt.

In my years in Washington as your Senator I have received thousands of letters from people protesting the billions of dollars which we have expended in foreign countries. Hundreds of them recognized the economic plight of our Nation and have in their way justified requests for more local projects and consideration on the theory that if we can throw it around the world, why not spend more of it at home?

Many have pointed to waste, duplication, and a lack of business methods in administering and spending these funds abroad.

In response to these inquiries, my friends, I have consistently said that waste of our funds abroad does not justify waste and extravagance at home, and that we should reevaluate the use to which our tax moneys are put abroad as diligently as we do at home.

I do not mean to infer that you should be precludod from making expenditures abroad for real and genuine national defense, but I fail to see, and I cannot condone, this apparently endless demand for foreign spending on projects that have little or no relationship to our national defense.

I do not deny that many countries need military aid and technical assistance in meeting problems of hunger, disease, military defense. But we have segments in our national economy that are also in need of serious consideration at this time.

The present plight of our farmers, our agricultural economy, is a good example of what I mean, and I again emphasize that the time has come when a new appraisal should be made of this entire foreign spending program. I am not unmindful that many of our so-called allies have presently exceeded the goals which we established when these programs were enacted. It seems to me that they should now be called upon to pay their fair share of any such program which we so liberally have contributed to in the past.

The time has come when the nations of the world which are with us should realize that this burden is not ours alone, but that of every country whose economy has reached the level where, in equity and good conscience, they can and should contribute to their and our collective program.

Fundamentally, there is little difference between our Nation and many others.

Every nation has its natural resources, its people, its tools, yet during our 167 years of national existence we have gone from a weak, loosely bound federation of 13 Colonies, ridiculed and despised by many of these foreign nations, until today we are reputed to be the strongest nation in the world.

I realize that we are even now criticized by some, feared by a few, and I hope respected by all.

What has been the basis of our success and our phenomenal growth? The people who settled this land had learned well their lessons from experience and the school of hard knocks.

They knew so well that every man lived by the fruits of his own labor. They built their homes, their churches, their schools, expanded their highways and means of communication.

In those days, my comrades, when times were rough, they did not have a government in Washington that could care for them in all of their needs. They did not expect, nor did they ask, for many of the programs which we now consider to be commonplace. What has caused this?

The answer probably is not simple, but many feel and think that a philosophy has been developed over the last 20 years and more, that the National Government can solve all of our people's problems. And there has been a growing tendency to look to Washington for the solution of all problems, without realizing that for every concession a powerful government grants it demands some portion of our liberty and freedoms as individuals and a submission to some type of Federal control.

Liberty is old in thought but new in the practices of our era. Our Government was conceived to foster freedom. Our people believe in liberty. This was and still is a revolutionary idea when for so much of historical time liberty has been suppressed by emperors, kings, dictators, and the so-called people's democracies.

As a political party Republicans must be eternally opposed to all forms of tyranny over the individual, whether it be fascism or communism abroad or a totalitarian creed at home which centralizes all power in government, regiments our people, and dictates the courses of our lives.

Liberty means more than freedom of speech, of religious worship, of the press, and the protections of equal justice under law. It means the freedom of each individual to choose his occupation, to start and develop a business of his own, to acquire and manage his own property, and to dispose of his property as he pleases, subject only to the rights of others to do the same.

At the heart of the problem of liberty and freedom is the relation of government to its people. In American Government, liberty is safeguarded by a constitutional system of checks and balances to prevent the rise of any special interest or power capable of dominating the Government.

If government becomes highly centralized, if it engages in enterprise in competition with its citizens, if it takes in taxes too much of the people's income to spend as bureaucrats dictate, if government becomes the controlling, directing, and dominating boss over the daily activities of the people—then the lights of individual freedom will be darkened.

Many of you before me today have gone through the horrors of war. You have been close to, and well may have been a part of, the interesting as well as terrible discoveries that have been made in this atomic age.

One of the most interesting of all discoveries to have come out of the atomic age is so mysterious that we have not as yet given it a name—our scientists refer to it as the binding force.

It is neither magnetic nor electrical, but is a billion times stronger than the force of gravity. They tell us it works only in the center of atoms. If it did not exist the universe would dissolve into hydrogen gas. This is the force which keeps all nature in balance.

I mention this phenomena of nature because in a way it is applicable to the American veteran. In our national life the American veteran should constitute the binding force. You represent no special interest. You are from the professions, the crafts, the businesses, the industries, and from amongst the tillers of the soil.

You share in the experience of having served your country. Your patriotism and your devotion to the country have been demonstrated by deeds and actions, and not alone with words.

As veterans, therefore, we have a responsibility to sell and resell our philosophy of government, and to put our shoulders to the wheel to see that we have men and women in responsible positions in our Government

who believe in our constitutional processes and the protection of our basic rights.

If time permitted, I could point out to you today that within the Halls of Congress there are being debated issues that are of great importance to the individual and to our Nation.

Specifically, in the past 3 years the Eisenhower administration has been able to record many accomplishments. Let me briefly state them for you.

1. We have secured peace—an uneasy peace, it is true, but nevertheless no American boys are being killed on foreign soil.

2. We have strengthened our defenses and those of the free world.

3. We have reduced spending and now have submitted a balanced budget.

4. We have reduced taxes with over 60 percent of the reduction going to individuals.

5. We have halted inflation and stabilized the dollar.

6. We have ended price, wage, and rent controls and restored these matters to the normal control of supply and demand.

7. We have strengthened our internal security against Communist infiltration.

8. We have extended our social security and retirement benefits.

9. We have restored honor and decency o government.

For your own particular interest as veterans I would like to mention some of the accomplishments of the first session of this Congress, in veterans' affairs.

1. We gave 5-percent increase in pensions and pay for veterans of all wars and their widows and dependents.

2. We gave Korean veterans the same benefits and preferences as World War II veterans in war housing, civil-service appointments, and GI training, and extended the period for initiating training under the GI bill.

3. We raised funds for building veterans' hospitals to record amounts; speeded construction.

4. We continued direct home- and farmhouse-loan programs for veterans—supported legislation liberalizing direct farmhouse loans and permitting Government-guaranteed loans to veterans for farmhouse purchase, construction, and repair; increased revolving funds so more direct loans could be made.

5. We continued Federal contributions to dependency allotments for more than 1 million enlisted personnel.

6. We continue paychecks and family allotments under the Missing Persons Act for Korean war prisoners and soldiers missing in action.

7. We provided automatic renewal of term insurance policies and simplified handling of veterans' life insurance policies.

8. We extended the period of granting military service credits toward old age and survivors' insurance, assuring many servicemen of larger retirement benefits.

9. Increased Federal payments for veterans cared for in State soldiers' homes.

I hope you will not consider me somewhat old-fashioned or ultra conservative, when I dwell upon some of these fundamental virtues that I think are a part of our American system.

Naturally, all the problems which we inherited have not been solved. We cannot undo the excesses of 20 years in 3 years. In my opinion, however, considerable progress has been made and more will be. We are at work seeking constructive solutions to the difficult problems of agriculture, education, civil liberties, highways, and many others.

We want your support—we need your help in furtherance of the program established by our Republican Party and our President.

In a few short months the people of this country will be engaged in a political campaign for the Presidency and the Congress. We have a message to bring to the American people, and you as veterans can wield a tremendous influence, with your enthusiasm and whole-hearted support, and I shall be with you in your endeavors.

In conclusion may I briefly review one matter which has caused me considerable concern and which I intend to restify if it be within my power. This is the so-called Status of Forces Treaty under which the criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces overseas was taken away from our military authorities and given to the country in which our troops were stationed. It was my contention when this abortive treaty was adopted that (1) it deprived American servicemen of their constitutional guaranties, (2) it exposed them to cruel and unusual punishments in foreign lands, (3) it exposed them to possible persecution by Communist judges for propaganda purposes; and (4) it was an abject surrender of American sovereignty.

To draft a Kansas farm boy, send him involuntarily to France for the defense of that nation and then to deprive him of his constitutional rights of due process and Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence seemed to me to be the height of folly and injustice.

Events have justified my concern. Though there are many others, I cite the case of Richard Keefe now in solitary confinement in a French jail serving a 5-year term for stealing a taxicab and attacking the driver. The press reports that Keefe must pay a customs duty on food packages sent to him by his mother and that the United States Army chaplain who visits him is not allowed to bring even cigarettes which Keefe must purchase from the French authorities at 55 cents a pack. Furthermore, he is even denied the privilege of American language newspapers.

I could mention the case of another young American soldier sentenced to 3 years at hard labor by a Japanese judge for commandeering a taxicab and taking 1,400 yen which was later restored to the driver.

If these were the only cases, it will be sufficient for the repeal of the atrocious arrangement. Unfortunately, there are many others. The last information I received indicated that 58 United States citizens, subject to military law, are in foreign prisons.

Therefore, in the coming session you have my assurance that everything will be done to restore to our soldiers the rights to which they are entitled under our Constitution.

With all the sincerity of my heart, I congratulate you on the work that you have done and the work which you will do in the future as the "binding force" of our beloved State.

Tax on Fuel for Farm Use

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, because of my long-standing support for the provisions of H. R. 8780, which exempts fuel used in farm production from Federal excise tax, and because I was delayed by inclement weather and could not return from an official business trip to my home district in time to register my vote, I wish to take this means of going on record in favor of the bill. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea." I have long been a proponent of this type of legislation. I am confident H. R. 8780 will soon become law and the farm people will shortly be enjoying this saving in production costs. I ask leave to have this statement entered in the permanent RECORD immediately following the vote on H. R. 8780.

A Taxpayer's Views on Government Employees' Junkets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at the National Reclamation Association's convention at Lincoln, Nebr., last fall Bureau of Reclamation personnel seemed to be present in generous numbers. I wondered then about it, but have been too busy on other matters meanwhile to make a point of it.

This morning I received the letter set forth below and its enclosure which shows what at least one taxpaying citizen is thinking in this regard. It seems valuable enough to place before the entire membership of Congress in this manner. I will send a tear sheet of these remarks to the House Committee on Government Operations for such action as its chairman may deem advisable.

I think it particularly important to reflect on Mr. Larson's conclusion both with respect to the lobbylike activities of these junketeers and as to the competency of the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with matters of economics.

DENVER, COLO., *February 2, 1956.*

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: I am herewith enclosing a copy of letter written to the Director of the Budget which, I thought, would be of interest to you.

I am calling the attention of the Director of the Budget to such matters as employees leaving their regular activities, and the question of expenditures. However, there is a far greater significance to sending 31 individuals, who are on the Government payroll, to a convention. These men, supported by their superiors of course, are determined to peddle their merchandise in the gullible mart of increasing pork-barrel projects, all at the expense of the American taxpayer. Such individuals have no interest whatever in the problems of the engineer engaged in private practice, or in any other activity connected with free enterprise, for that matter. But such people are definitely determined to saddle upon the taxpayer projects which can cost, as they have in the past, enormous sums of money. From personal experience with many such boondoggling ventures I know that the average Government employee, as well as heads of departments, sections, and/or subsections, do not give a continental about the economic value of the project which they may be planning. In fact many of these Government employees are not qualified to determine the economic worth of a project, which according to some newspaper accounts, one agency has worked on for two decades.

The question of economics is clearly overlooked by such an agency as the Bureau of Reclamation. Although I have known many

of the individuals connected with that agency, for a long time, and have discussed various projects with men who actually work on the investigations, plans, and specifications, they all shun the subject of economics. A few years ago one of the engineers from the Bureau of Reclamation discussed the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, at one of our local section meetings here in Denver. After talking about this proposed imposition upon the American people, various individuals, including myself, asked about the economic feasibility of this scheme. Is this project economical in the face of over production of agricultural products? The mumblings of the speaker produced no satisfactory answer. He even seemed surprised to know anyone was thinking. Then the request was made for copies of a detailed report including plans and specifications of this as well as other projects. But the response was a most emphatic, "No. We do not have the money to publish such reports." In other words, the Bureau will not permit others, some of whom are better qualified as professional men than they are, to even review a project which they are advocating. Their projects will not withstand the scrutiny on the part of other engineers and/or geologists who are quite competent in their own fields. But the nefarious purpose behind many of these meetings or conventions is merely to impose something upon the people so they in turn can keep their jobs.

Like the competent farmer who pulls weeds from his cornfield, it is now time to eradicate certain agencies which are rendering no useful service to our country, or at least, restore to them the functions for which they were established.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY LARSON.

FEBRUARY 1, 1956.

DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention: Mr. Percival F. Brundage, Deputy Director.)

DEAR SIR: Just recently a convention program prepared by a section of the American Society of Civil Engineers was received. It was immediately noted that there appears to be a preponderance of Government employees on this program. These are from various sections of the country and are scheduled to present papers at this convention which will be held at Dallas, Tex., on February 13–17, 1956. The names of these Government employees together with their respective titles and departments, as given in the subject program, and one Army officer, are as follows:

Herbert H. Howell, Director, Office of Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.

Harold Melville Martin, head, Hydraulics Laboratory, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colo.

Clarence F. Wicker, Chief, Engineering Division, Philadelphia District, Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia, Pa.

S. E. Travis, Jr., Deputy Chief, Airports Division, CAA, Region 2, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Fort Worth, Tex.

Louis A. Ness, Chief, Engineering Branch, Installation Division Headquarters, Air Materiel Command, Dayton, Ohio.

Frank M. Mellinger, civil engineer, Ohio River Division, Corps of Engineers, Cincinnati, Ohio.

James P. Sale, head, Soils Division, Ohio River Division Laboratories, Corps of Engineers, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Conrad P. Straub, senior sanitary engineer, Health Physics Division, USPHS, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Gerald Fitzgerald, Chief Topographic Engineer, United States Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.

G. Earl Harbeck, Jr., United States Geological Survey, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo.

Frank L. Weaver, Chief, Division of River Basins, Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

Charlie M. Moore, head, Design Section, Engineering and Watershed Planning Unit, Soil Conservation Service, Fort Worth, Tex.

Trigg Twichell, Regional Representative, United States Geological Survey, Austin, Tex.

George S. Vincent, bridge engineer, Structural Research Laboratory, Bureau of Public Roads, Seattle, Wash.

Hershel Engler, Sanitary Engineering Director, Assistant Chief, Health Services Branch, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, PHS, Washington, D. C.

Norman R. Moore, Chief, Engineering Division, Bower Mississippi Valley Division, Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, Miss.

W. P. McCrone, colonel, Corps of Engineers, district engineer, Galveston district, Galveston, Tex.

Alonzo O. Taylor, division engineer, United States Bureau of Public Roads, Manila, Philippine Islands, care of American Embassy, APO 928, Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

William E. Wood, Fort Worth District, Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth, Texas.

Kenneth Heagy, Chief, Engineering Division, Galveston District, Corps of Engineers, Galveston, Tex.

Joseph F. Friedkin, principal engineer, United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, El Paso, Tex.

Myron W. DeGeer, Assistant Chief, Engineering Division, Tulsa District, Corps of Engineers, Tulsa, Okla.

Gordon M. Kline, Chief, Organic Materials Division, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.

Edwin W. Eden, Jr., Chief, Hydrology and Hydraulics Section, Jacksonville District, Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville, Fla.

James V. Madison, supervisory soil scientist, Kansas River projects, Bureau of Reclamation, McCook, Nebr.

J. Willis Ervin, irrigation agriculturist, Kansas River projects, Bureau of Reclamation McCook, Nebr.

Willard J. Turnbull, Chief, Soils Division, Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

Charles I. Mansur, Assistant Chief, Embankment and Foundation Branch, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

R. I. Kaufman, Chief, Design and Analytical Section, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

Woodland G. Shockley, Chief, Embankment and Foundation Branch, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

T. B. Goode, Chief, Inspection and Exploration Section, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

I am constrained to call your attention to this matter and to the participation of these individuals in what appears to be extracurricular matters. People who engage in research work and investigations which constitute contributions to the science of engineering, are certainly to be commended, but such findings and results can be published. It is requested that an investigation be made in the case of each of the above named individuals to determine the authorization of absence from their established and designated places of activity, or station, and just what agency, or who, is paying the expenses of each individual while attending this convention. There certainly appears to be no justification in having travel and all other expenses paid by the American Taxpayer.

Very truly yours,

HARRY LARSON.

Helping Communist China With Strategic Goods—Let's Halt This Bloody Dollar Business Now

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely editorial that appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on January 27.

There is only a shadowy distinction between strategic goods and nonstrategic goods. When food is eaten by the Red soldier and when clothing material is used for his body, both food and clothing are strategic materials. Let us remember the scrap-metal situation prior to World War II. There should be an end to this bloody dollar business and now.

STRATEGIC GOODS

The annual report of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee of which Arkansas' Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman, reports an alarming increase of shipments of strategic materials to Red China.

This is not a new warning, by far. This same subcommittee, under this same Democrat chairman, issued the same warning a year ago.

For several years before that, this same subcommittee under the chairmanship of Wisconsin's Senator JOE MCCARTHY, issued repeated and highly documented warnings that this was so.

Like the McClellan-led reports, the McCarthy-led reports noted that our good old ally, Britain, was the worst offender in its bullheaded and shortsighted business-come-what-may policy with Peiping.

When Senator MCCARTHY spearheaded this able subcommittee's report on this sickening and destructive condition, it was tossed off as just so much more McCarthyism.

Now with Senator MCCLELLAN spearheading the past 2 years of reiterated warnings, are we to brand it just so much McClellanism?

It would be just as wrong, just as tragic, yes, just as immoral and suicidal, to brand such sound pro-American advice "McClellanism," as it was to brand it "McCarthyism."

It would be just as ill-advised and terrible to play politics or possum with the new MCCLELLAN-led report as it was with the MCCARTHY-led reports.

Let's get down to bedrock—to the too-often overlooked business of our survival.

There would be no better time, however overdue, for our Government to begin serving full and proper notice that this despicable practice must stop, than in the about-to-begin Eisenhower-Eden Washington talks.

It's high time, after all these costly years, that our friends and foes stand and be counted, and then dealt with accordingly.

It was this same miserable urge for profit-at-any-cost by the British and other of our "allies" that prevented our victory over the Communists with whom, even then, they were trading as our men were dying in Korea.

As the Sentinel has warned before in this shocking connection, for those who would close their eyes and open their purses for "business as usual" by which the Communists are permitted aid, comfort and strength, even by indirection, we repeat:

"Remember that scrap metal we once sent Japan—and remember the form in which it was returned—at Pearl Harbor."

When the Reds return such material, the Pearl Harbor can be Washington—and Milwaukee.

Let's bring this nauseous, bloody, dollar business to a halt—now.

Small Business in the Continued Growth of Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce, of February 2. I commend this excellent editorial to the attention of every Member of the House interested in promotion of the competitive status of small business in the continued growth of our economy. This editorial clearly shows that our small businesses are prospering, contrary to loose charges currently in circulation in the press and on the air. Mr. Speaker, just what is the situation?

Keeping in mind that there are now one-third more businesses than in 1939, from a statistical standpoint there should also be more than one-third more business failures.

Now, let us examine the record. In 1939 there were 14,768 failures. In 1955 there were 10,969—fewer failures than during 1939, although there were about a million more businesses in existence. But the important thing is the rate of failures. How many failures per certain number of businesses?

The average over the past 56 years has been 70 failures per 10,000 units of business during war and peace. The rate of failures in 1955 was 41.6 per 10,000, which is the lowest rate of failures during any normal year. This occurred during the Eisenhower administration. In relation to the total small business population of about 2,600,000 covered by Dun & Bradstreet only 10 businesses failed in 1955 out of every 2,600—an infinitesimal figure. And the other 2,590 are thriving, expanding, growing.

So when you hear that the rate of business failure was 10 percent higher in December than it was some previous month, bear in mind that the person is trying to get you greatly concerned over the fact that out of every 2,600 businesses in the country, one more business failed, and usually you are not told about the healthy condition of the other 2,599.

That is why it is important to examine carefully statistics that tell only part of the story. For instance, I have seen a report published in a national magazine that small business did not fare as well in the fourth quarter of 1955 as it did in the second quarter. Be careful if anyone gives you statistics for part of a year. The whole year, good or bad, is the correct yard stick.

The New York Journal of Commerce editorial of February 2 follows:

The Senate Small Business Committee is gravely concerned because smaller businesses do not seem to have shared in last year's overall prosperity.

In a recent report, the committee asks, first, why "more of the bloom of 1955's industrial bonanza did not rub off on small business" and, second, why there was such a "high rate of small-business bankruptcies.

For reasons which we may assume to be not entirely economic, it selects as its base period, for purposes of comparison, the first half of 1952. The committee finds that during this period the smallest manufacturers enjoyed a 10.6 percent return on stockholders' equity, which compared quite favorably with the 11.25 percent return to the largest size group.

In contrast, the profits rate has subsequently "held steady or increased" for the big companies, while the earnings of the smallest ones "plummeted to a low of 2.25 percent in the last half of 1954."

As to bankruptcies, the committee cites a rate of 42 failures per 10,000 in 1954 as the "highest rate in the past 12 years, exceeding the average for the post-World War II years 1946 through 1953 by 68 percent," and with 1955 failures expected at about the 1954 level.

It is curious that the committee should have elected to compare the experience of the smallest group, or companies with assets of $250,000 or less, with that of the so-called giants, those with $100 million and more.

While there is perhaps on sensible overall dividing line for small and other businesses, the difficulty with using groups at the two extremes is that you are not likely to have companies in the same competitive area, and, unless you do, your conclusions cannot be too meaningful.

The Small Business Administration, on the other hand, compares companies with assets over and under $1 million. Using this dividing line, the SBA, in its last midyear report, found not only that a long downtrend in net sales and earnings over the past several years had been halted, but that "the financial position of small business has improved substantially as the trend line has moved upwards. Small businesses are now sharing to a greater extent in the national prosperity."

The fact is that the sharp down movement began well before the period which followed 1952—in 1950, in fact—although there were interruptions in the trend.

Smaller firms did lose ground relative to the bigger ones, in part because they did not participate sufficiently in the Korean procurement program and, in part, too, because of material shortages affecting the civilian market. The bigger companies improved their competitive position relative to the smaller ones.

What is significant is that, beginning with 1954, there has been an upward movement for the smaller companies. The lowest point in earnings before taxes was 60 (using an index based on 1047–49). Through the third quarter of 1955 there has been a rebound to 76.

So while small businesses are admittedly not so well off relatively as in 1947–49, the reversal of the sharp downtrend which carried through in 1953 shows that they have made important gains during the period of prosperity.

There is, of course, no reason why the relative position of small businesses at any particular point of time ought necessarily to persist. Changes in technology and distributional shifts will be reflected in changes in the size structure of the economy. And it is quite obvious if, over a given period, industrial expansion is marked with respect to types of industries normally composed of relatively fewer units, this fact will be reflected in a changed proportion of smaller firms to the total, even though they are still doing quite well in their fields.

As for the specific profits comparisons used, a word of warning is needed with respect to the selection of any part-year data for smaller companies which tend to charge off depreciation in the fourth quarter. For instance, for 1952, the quarterly statistics for return on stockholders' equity were, respectively, 8.9 percent, 12.3 percent, 13 percent and 2.8 percent. For the big companies, they were 11.5, 11, 11.8, and 13.7.

Using the average of the first two quarters, the Senate committee is able to give the impression that, in 1952, the companies with assets under $250,000 were doing just about as well as the "giants."

The opposite, of course, could be proved by averaging the last half-year percentages, when the return to the smallest group would have been only 7.9, compared with 12.3 for the bigger ones. But, of course, that would not be valid either because of the depreciation element.

As for the matter of business failures, the rates of 42 per 10,000 is, as the committee claims, the highest rate in the past 12 years. But these were very abnormal years, leading up to 1953. In the period 1939–41, the failure rate was 63 per 10,000, and over the past half-century it was 263. So, once again, it depends a lot on what you are comparing.

The Political Crisis in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 5, I gave a report to my constituents over WHK Broadcasting Station, Cleveland, on a very serious situation now developing in Asia which bears upon the future security and well being of all the American people. This was part of my report to my constituents on a 7 weeks inspection tour of Asia which I undertook on behalf of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Because I believe what I had to say will be of interest to my colleagues in Congress, I ask unanimous consent to insert my address in the RECORD:

THE POLITICAL CRISIS IN ASIA

It is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to resume my talks of last year, made possible by the courtesy of WHK. This affords me an opportunity to tell you, my constituents, and all the people of Cleveland, about some developments which have come to my attention since the adjournment of the first session of this Congress.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I was requested to undertake a special study mission in Asia, the purpose of which was to evaluate the administration of the Refugee Relief Act, to estimate the upset of populations caused by Communist aggression in that part of the world, and generally to observe developments that may have a bearing on the future security and well-being of the American people. I undertook this mission because it was obvious to me that a political crisis was rapidly developing throughout all of Asia which could very well spell the difference between peace and war.

I left the United States by air on October 2 and visited the following countries—the Philippines, the Crown Colony of Hong Kong, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, Macao, Formosa, Korea, and Japan. This mission lasted 7 weeks and was a

most arduous one due to the difficulties of travel, lack of ordinary accommodations in so many of the countries and the need to be constantly alert to the many food problems Americans have traveling in that part of the world. Today I am going to try to give you some of the highlights of my findings on this special mission and in later weeks I will have more to say on this subject.

To begin with, I found that the population upsets throughout al of Asia caused by Communist aggression, had caused widespread human suffering and grave social and economic problems. However, despite these problems, I was encouraged by the spirit demonstrated to me by the hundreds of thousands of people who had risked their lives to escape from Communist tyranny and their determination to solve their own problems and eventually to rid their homelands of the scourge of communism. For example, in the wartorn country of Vietnam, I visited the refugee villages where some 700,000 victims of Communist aggression now reside. In these villages I talked with men, women, and children who had firsthand experiences with the cruelties of communism. They had lost all their material possessions and their homes, but they were convinced beyond any doubt that communism would lose in the end because it violated all the things that mankind everywhere regard as decent and just. As another example, in the Crown Colony of Hong Kong, the population has more than doubled during the past 5 years because well nigh over 800,000 refugees of Chinese aggression have been given political asylum in Hong Kong. Here I witnessed the splendid work of the American governmental agencies and the American voluntary agencies in providing temporary shelter for these victims of communism and in setting up fitting programs for the refugee children. You will be interested to know that surplus foods from the United States were used in this program which feeds over 25,000 children each day. I only wish that more programs like this could be developed for the victims of communism because it costs the American taxpayer practically nothing and the benefits that result are beyond measure.

In Korea I saw very much the same picture, but here again I was encouraged by the determination of the refugees to build a new life and to remain free and independent.

During my investigation I uncovered a very serious breach of the free world security which I would like to tell you about briefly at this time. Over 5,900 so-called White Russians have been moved out of Red China to some twenty-odd countries of the free world without having any security investigation whatever made on them. The vast majority of the so-called White Russians were traveling on valid passports issued by Soviet Russia and all of them were in possession of an exit visa given to them by the Chinese Reds. I was amazed to find out that the United States taxpayers' money was being used to pay the transportation costs of these so-called White Russian refugees from Hong Kong to the various countries of the free world. When I learned that the United States taxpayers' money was involved in this matter, I inquired as to why no investigation was made on these people, and the reason given was that no investigation was possible because their investigators would not be allowed into Red China.

On my return to Washington, I prepared and issued a special report on this breakdown in free world security and called upon responsible officials in the Government to take corrective action. To my knowledge, nothing has been done up to this time to close this breach in the free world security, so I will certainly have much to say about this at a later date.

There is a revolution taking place throughout all of Asia today. I call it a revolution because the changes taking place there are so basic and sweeping that the pre-World War II Asia will no longer exist. The people of Asia have awakened and are now demanding equal rights, equal recognition, and the opportunity to run their own affairs and chart their own destiny. The colonialism of the past which, in many respects, forms a dark chapter in the history of civilized mankind, is dead. Many new countries have fought for and secured their national independence. Still other countries, still held in colonial bondage, are seeking their national independence. Against this upswing of the people in free Asia, one finds the other part of Asia now gripped in a new type of colonialism 10 times more cruel and ruthless than the colonialism of the past. I refer, of course, to Russian colonialism, and the manner in which it has occupied and exploits the mainland of China, Manchuria, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Tibet, North Korea, and North Vietnam. I am sure all of you have heard a great deal about the Iron Curtain which the Russian Communists have erected between their world of slavery and the free and independent nations of Europe. I want to assure you that the curtain erected in Asia by the Kremlin is just as cold and cruel as the Iron Curtain in Europe. Just as in Europe, thousands of Asians are today risking their lives to escape from under that Asian curtain into the free world. In every respect, the colonial slavery of Moscow is the same in Asia as it is in the non-Russian nations of central and eastern Europe.

And so the political crisis in Asia today is the struggle between Russian communism and the national independence movements which have thrown off, or are seeking to throw off, the yoke of colonial bondage. Many of the nations which have but recently gained their rightful status as independent sovereign nations, are today threatened with the new colonialism of the Russian Communists. These newly independent nations look to the United States for leadership and support in the cause of justice and freedom. The stakes at issue in this struggle are indeed among the highest in all of history. The outcome of this struggle will determine not only the question of peace or war, but very well could determine the destiny of mankind for hundreds of years.

While this struggle is intense and apparent on all sides in every one of the countries I visited, I believe there are three countries that might well be used by the Russians as a fuse to set off world war III. The first one, of course, is the Republic of China, on Formosa. The Chinese Reds are constantly threatening to invade and occupy free China and threaten the most dire ends for all who would dare to support the just cause of free China. The free Chinese, of course, are determined that the stooges of Moscow will not successfully invade or occupy free China. The United States has made known to the world its intention to defend Formosa against the alien invasion and occupation of the Chinese Communists. Whether we will have total warfare between Red China and free China is now a matter of grave speculation. You and I know that the Chinese Communists would not hesitate to set off world war III if they thought they had a 50–50 chance of winning it.

Korea is another country in which the Communists pose a daily threat to freedom and justice. The Communists caused a war of aggression in Korea which cost us Americans dearly in terms of the loss of our loved ones. We know, too, that the toll of Korean lives taken by that Communist war of aggression was very, very heavy. The armed truce which now prevails in Korea is, in my judgment, a very thin and precarious guarantee of peace.

While in Korea I uncovered evidence which leads me to believe that the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists are determined to occupy all of Korea just as soon as we weaken our determination to stand by our good ally, the Republic of Korea. The people of the Korean Republic are equally determined that they shall not give up their freedom and independence. The Communist war lords might at any time choose Korea to set off a general war in Asia and probably world war III.

Vietnam is the third most critical area in Asia. Here the Russian Communists used one of their old comintern agents, Ho Chi Min, to masquerade as a Nationalist and seize temporary control of the national independence movement in Vietnam. The war with France followed, which was ended by a Geneva agreement splitting the country in two. One-half of it put under the tyranny of communism and the other half loosely allocated to the free world and which the United States had to immediately protect or the Communists would have gobbled up all of Vietnam.

In free Vietnam, a young democratic government is attempting to establish a permanent democratic way of life based on principles of law and justice. Here, too, I was impressed with the determination of these freedom-loving people to keep their independence and to unite all of the country under a government representative of the people. But the Communist-occupied section in North Vietnam now ruled by the same Ho Chi Min, is determined that all of Vietnam will be put under the colonial yoke of Russian communism. Here again we find the ever-present possibility of open conflict and war brought about by Communist aggression.

For example, only Friday we learned of the new Communist aggression and war taking place in the newly independent state of Laos, which borders on the state of Vietnam.

The political crisis in Asia is one that we, as free people, must understand and face up to. Involved in this political crisis is the choice of human freedom or the colonial slavery of communism. If the forces which stand up for human freedom and independence emerge as victors from this political crisis, there will be no war in Asia. I assure you, as your Congressman, that I shall do everything I can to make certain that our Government supports all those measures which advance the cause of human freedom in order to avert the catastrophe of world war III.

Procedures To Be Followed in Seeking Federal Help on Building Dams for Flood Control and Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a subject of transcendent importance to the American people today is that of water, its conservation and its use. The President recently submitted to Congress a report by an Advisory Committee concerning water resources. In my own State of Texas people in all walks of life have become acutely aware of the importance of water and its conservation.

Many questions are being asked by the man on the street about the methods to be employed in getting water projects initiated. With several agencies of the Federal Government participating in various types of water conservation,

there is considerable confusion on the part of the people in regard to when and under what conditions the Federal Government will interest itself in flood control, irrigation, power production, watershed-flood prevention, and similar activities.

In an attempt to be of some help in removing that confusion and providing understandable answers to many questions that are being asked each day, I have, in collaboration with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture, prepared a series of questions and answers. After preparing these, they were submitted to the respective department heads, and I believe it can be assumed that the answers are factually accurate. These questions and answers follow:

FLOOD CONTROL—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Question. Suppose a community thinks it proper that a dam be constructed on a stream, what steps should be taken to get the project built?

Answer. Local people who desire a flood-control project should contact their Congressman and give him as much information as possible to justify the project.

Question. Then what can the Congressman do?

Answer. Under the law the Corps of Engineers (which makes all surveys for Congress on justification for flood-control projects) cannot undertake such a survey and study unless Congress first authorizes it. Therefore unless the survey is already authorized, the Congressman would contact the committee having jurisdiction and seek a resolution enabling the engineers to proceed with the study.

Question. When such a survey is made by the engineers, do local people have a chance to present their views and any facts they have in support of the project?

Answer. Yes, the district engineers hold public hearings for that purpose.

Question. Under what authority does the Corps of Engineers make recommendations following surveys?

Answer. Under the Flood Control Act of 1936 which outlined the procedure and the formula which guides the engineers in their surveys and recommendations.

Question. What is that formula?

Answer. That law requires that, as a general rule, before the Corps of Engineers recommends the building of a flood-control dam the estimated value of the annual benefits resulting from the project must equal or exceed the annual costs.

ENGINEER SURVEYS ALREADY AUTHORIZED ON MOST TEXAS STREAMS AND WATERSHEDS

Question. Do the Corps of Engineers now have authorization from Congress to make surveys and studies of Texas streams?

Answer. Yes, most of them. That includes the upper Colorado watershed, the Nueces River watershed, Devils River, Pecan Bayou, and others.

Question. What is the status of the engineering survey work on the Colorado river watershed in Texas?

Answer. It is inactive at the present time. Under authority of Congress a comprehensive report on the Colorado River and its tributaries was submitted to the Chief of Engineers by the district engineer in 1944. But this report was returned to the district engineer in 1948 by the Chief of Engineers for further study and revision. Since that time the resurvey work has not been undertaken due to curtailment of funds.

Question. Did the 1944 report include studies of possible flood control projects on such streams as the Llano, San Saba, and Concho rivers?

Answer. Yes, as well as the main Colorado stream.

Question. Did the report recommend dams on the Llano and San Saba Rivers?

Answer. Actually three dams were recommended in that report as being economically feasible—one on the Colorado near Winchell, one on the Colorado near Marble Falls, and another on the San Saba a few miles above the town of San Saba.

Question. What about upper San Saba and its watershed area and the Llano and its watershed tributaries?

DAMS ON LLANO AND UPPER SAN SABA RIVERS NOT JUSTIFIED

Answer. From the study that was made the engineers did not find dams either on the Llano River or at any other site on the San Saba to be justified under the Flood Control Act of 1936.

Question. Is it possible under the law for the engineers to recommend the construction of a dam where the primary justification is for recreation and wildlife?

Answer. No, the law does not authorize that. Primary justification must be based upon benefits resulting from prevention of floods. There are other factors that may contribute to the justification, such as water supply to a city, irrigation, hydroelectric power, etc. If electric power is produced the government sells that and the revenue adds to the economic justification of the project.

Question. How do engineers predict probable benefits over the life of a project?

Answer. The engineers make a flood frequency analysis which is essentially a study of all past flood records and a projection into the future by means of statistical and mathematical procedure. They predict the probable damage that will be done without the improvement and how much damage can be prevented if the structure is built.

Question. Do the Corps of Engineers ever recommend flood control dams when the benefits do not equal or exceed the costs?

Answer. As a general rule, no. In rare instances where intangible values are involved such as abnormal loss of life, national defense, or economic security of a region as a whole—which is rare and exceptional—a project may be approved even though the costs may exceed direct benefits.

WHY SMALL DAMS ARE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Question. Why does the Corps of Engineers not recommend a series of small dams on streams to control floods rather than the larger dams?

Answer. There are several reasons why it is not feasible to build several small dams on a stream rather than one large one to control floods. First, the cost per acre-foot of water would be greater; secondly, small dams do not control the river basin but only a small immediate area. Thirdly, with small dams there is less opportunity for making multipurpose dams in cases where they are feasible. A fourth reason is that operation from a rainfall standpoint is far less satisfactory with several small dams and sometimes might be more disastrous than no dams at all. Finally, there is more evaporation in several small dams than in one large one.

This refers to main streams and not to watershed areas where the Soil Conservation Service builds small dams under watershed-protection programs.

INTERIM REPORT

Question. What is an interim report?

Answer. An interim report is essentially a report on a separable area of a project under survey. It does not affect the comprehensive planning of a watershed as a whole.

Question. In the case of the Colorado watershed report of 1944 where a dam was recommended on the San Saba in San Saba County, Tex. (along with two others on the Colorado), is it possible for an interim report to be made in regard to the San Saba project without waiting for the more expensive, time-consuming comprehensive resurvey to be made of the entire watershed?

Answer. The Chief of Engineers, after careful study of the situation, has ruled that it is not proper or feasible to make an interim report on the San Saba project.

Question. Why is that?

Answer. The Chief of Engineers tries to discourage interim reports because the whole project in a watershed is usually interrelated and when interlated to the extent of the Colorado watershed in Texas, it is difficult to make a separate report because so often plans called for in an interim report have to be changed when the whole survey is completed. If an interim report may affect the survey of the whole project, it is not recommended. And that was the basis of the Chief of Engineers' finding in respect to the San Saba project.

Question. What about local contributions on flood-control projects?

Answer. It varies, depending on the purpose and nature of the project. In the case of flood-control reservoirs the Corps of Engineers pays all or nearly all the cost and then operates and maintains the dam after completion.

Question. Under what conditions do cities get municipal water from flood-control projects?

Answer. The primary purpose of flood-control dams is to prevent damages from recurring floods, and the project must be justified on that ground, if built under flood-control authorization. The project may, of course, be a multipurpose one and not only fulfill its primary function but also supply a municipality its water for home and industrial use, provide power for electricity, and water for irrigation. In the event the project does supply a city with its water and an irrigation district with water, the city would have to pay for that portion of construction which is allocated to city water supply; and the farmers would have to pay for that portion allocated to irrigation.

Question. Assuming that a district engineer, after a survey, finds a flood-control project economically feasible, what is the next step?

Answer. The district engineer makes his report to the division engineer, who processes the report and forwards it to the Chief of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers submits it to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The latter makes its findings and recommendations.

Question. Do other governmental agencies also see the report?

Answer. Yes. The report is submitted to the Reclamation Bureau, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other agencies that may be interested. In addition, it is sent to the governor of the State for his comments.

Question. After all of that, what is the next step?

Answer. Assuming that the proposed project is approved by those who study it, and by the Bureau of the Budget, it is submitted by the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of the Army, who, in turn, submits it to Congress.

Question. Is legislation then required?

Answer. Yes; when submitted to Congress, the report is referred to the proper committees, and the usual procedure is for hearings to be held on it, along with all other projects that have been thus cleared, and if approved by the committee the project is included in an omnibus measure and is then advanced to the House and Senate for action.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Question. Under what authority does the Department of Interior get into the dam-building program?

Answer. The Reclamation Act of 1902 and subsequent acts and amendments, together constitute the reclamation law, authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, construct, and operate irrigation and multiple-purpose projects for development of the water resources of Texas and the 16 other Western States. The Bureau of Reclamation is the agency which is entrusted with these responsibilities.

Question. Is Federal reclamation limited to water resources only for the irrigation of farmlands?

Answer. No. Reclamation projects may also be multiple purpose, involving hydroelectric power, flood control, municipal, industrial and domestic water supply, salinity control, stream pollution abatement, fish and wildlife conservation, recreation and other purposes.

Question. How are needed projects brought to the attention of the Bureau?

Answer. Either by local interests, a Member of Congress, or from inventories of the development of water resources in a particular river basin in regular basin surveys made by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Question. Is the Bureau studying the entire water resources situation throughout the 17 Western States?

Answer. Yes, to the extent of available funds the Bureau is reviewing by means of comprehensive river-basin reports the entire water resources situation, thus planning for the optimum utilization of water. These basin reports inventory the potential developments from which projects are selected for more detailed investigations.

Question. Where does the Bureau get its money for general investigations of potential projects?

Answer. From Congress, which makes annual appropriations for the Bureau to proceed with a program of investigations.

Question. Are local interests expected to contribute to the general investigations funds?

Answer. General investigations funds are limited; local or State interests sometimes contribute additional funds to speed up investigation of a project. The law requires that one-half of costs of investigations not previously scheduled by the Bureau which are undertaken at the specific request of local interests are to be paid for by those local interests.

WHAT TO DO TO GET A PROJECT STARTED

Question. Who are the proper people for local interests to contact in connection with the development of a project?

Answer. Expression of interest may go to regional directors; in Texas the regional director is Robert W. Jennings, P. O. Box 1609, Amarillo. The interest may also be expressed to a Congressman who will bring it to the attention of the Commissioner of Reclamation.

Question. What is a feasibility investigation?

Answer. It is a detailed study directed toward a determination of (1) engineering feasibility—the planning and the estimating of costs of physical structures; (2) economic justification (benefits will exceed costs and operations of structure) and (3) financial feasibility—that is, that the project will pay for itself over a period of years and that the users have the ability to pay—irrigators, power users, etc.

LOCAL INTERESTS ARE CONSULTED

Questions. During the planning of a project does the Bureau consult with local interests and other governmental agencies?

Answer. Yes. The Bureau maintains close cooperation with local interests and with other Federal agencies in order to obtain the views, desires, and support of all concerned. The results of the various investigations by the Bureau are also summarized in a planning report which is submitted for review and comment by the affected local, State, and Federal agencies, and other interests.

Question. What happens to the report after it has been submitted to local and other interests?

Answer. Upon receipt of these comments, the regional director makes whatever revision in his report he considers proper in the light of these comments and then submits his report to the Commissioner of Reclamation. Upon approval of the regional director's report, the Commissioner submits his report to the Secretary of the Interior.

Question. What is the next step?

Answer. The Secretary of the Interior submits the report, as his proposed report, to the State where the project is located and to Federal agencies for official review and comment under the provision of the Flood Control Act of 1944; these States and agencies have 90 days in which to comment. Upon receipt of the comments from the reviews (or the expiration of the 90 days without receipt of the comments) the Secretary submits his report with his recommendation to the President through the Bureau of the Budget to determine if the authorization and construction of the project is in accordance with the program of the President.

REPORT FINALLY GOES TO CONGRESS

Question. Does the report finally go to Congress?

Answer. Yes. Upon receipt of clearance from the Bureau of the Budget the Secretary transmits the report to Congress. At or about this stage of the work your Congressman will introduce legislation to authorize the project, under the terms and conditions of reimbursement contained in the report.

Question. After a project has finally been officially authorized, when does construction get underway?

Answer. Construction cannot be undertaken until funds for the purpose have been appropriated by the Congress. These appropriations are made annually. Request for appropriations are made by the Bureau and is first cleared through the Bureau of the Budget.

Question. Does the Bureau of Reclamation do the actual construction work?

Answer. No. Construction is done by private contractors under the supervision of the Bureau.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE WATERSHED PROJECTS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Question. What is the general purpose of the watershed flood prevention projects?

Answer. Under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, the program is designed to supplement both the present agricultural soil and water conservation programs (of the individual farm or ranch) and the programs for development and flood protection of major river valleys (such as those undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and other agencies). It bridges the gap heretofore existing between the two types of programs.

Question. Does this law add to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Answer. Yes. It authorizes him to cooperate with States and local agencies in carrying out jointly planned and mutually agreed on flood-prevention and water-management projects.

Question. What is a watershed under the act?

Answer. All land and water within a natural drainage area of 250,000 acres or less.

KINDS OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Question. What kinds of Federal assistance are authorized under the act?

Answer. Technical help in working out and applying a watershed work plan, and determining its feasibility; also funds for the equitable Federal share of the costs of installing the needed flood-prevention and water-management measures. Storage capacity for other than flood preventions must be paid for from non-Federal funds.

Question. What must local people do?

Answer. They initiate the action and help develop a watershed work plan. They must acquire necessary land, easements or rights-of-way; assume an equitable share of the project's cost; arrange for operation and maintenance; acquire necessary water rights; and get agreements from owners of not less than half of the lands in the drainage areas above dams to carry out soil-conservation programs.

SIZE OF DAMS

Question. What size structures can be built?

Answer. Single dams are limited to total storage capacity of 5,000 acre-feet. Watershed work plans including any structures of more than 2,500 acre-feet total capacity must be approved by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees before funds can be provided for the project.

Question. May a farmer irrigate from a lake created on his land?

Answer. Yes. But storage capacity specifically for water for irrigation must be paid for from non-Federal funds. If the water is stored incidental to the primary purpose of the structure, no such payment is required.

MUNICIPAL USE, RECREATION

Question. What about municipal water supply?

Answer. Storage for municipal water supplies may be included as part of the watershed work plan, but structural costs above those necessary for flood prevention must be paid from non-Federal funds.

Question. What about recreation?

Answer. Many opportunities for recreation developments will arise incidental to the works of improvement. But the costs of developing recreational facilities must be borne by non-Federal funds.

PROJECT MUST BE FEASIBLE

Question. What, basically, is the requirement for a project on a watershed to be justified?

Answer. As a general rule, the project must be found to be economically feasible; that is, the estimated benefits must equal or exceed the cost.

Question. How would any local organization, such as a soil conservation district, initiate action under the law?

Answer. Formal application blanks and suggestions for filling them out are available in the State office of the Soil Conservation Service (in Texas, Henry N. Smith, State conservationist, Post Office Box 417, Temple), and the State agency (State Soil Conservation Board, 1012 First Street, National Bank Building, 1620 South Main, Temple), designated by the Governor to act on applications.

Question. At what stage do the Soil Conservation Service people begin to assist the local organization in developing a watershed work plan?

Answer. After the Soil Conservation Service, acting for the Secretary of Agriculture, has approved the project for planning. This approval can be given only after approval of the local organization's application by the authorized State agency or the Governor.

Question. If a satisfactory watershed work plan is developed, what is the next step?

Answer. The plan is transmitted to the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, acting for the Secretary. A period of up to 60 days is then allowed to the Corps of Engineers and the Reclamation Service, if they are concerned, in which to review and comment on the plan. The Secretary of Agriculture next forwards the plan to Congress, through the President, together with any recommendations of those agencies. Forty-five days during which the Congress is in session must then elapse before any installations involving Federal assistance are begun. In addition, as noted above, if the plan includes any structures larger than 2,500 acre-feet total capacity, it must be approved by the House and Senate Agriculture

Committees before appropriations can be made.

LOANS FOR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PURPOSES, FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Question. Under what authority may a farmer or an association borrow money from the Federal Government for financing soil conservation measures?

Answer. Public Law 597, 83d Congress, which makes available to farmers and ranchers a new type of credit for financing soil conservation measures.

Question. Who is eligible?

Answer. A farmer is eligible when he has sufficient experience to indicate reasonable prospects of conducting successful agricultural operations, and is unable to obtain the necessary credit on reasonable terms and conditions from private and cooperative sources. The applicant must be engaged primarily in agriculture. Associations are eligible which are primarily engaged in extending to their farm members services directly related to soil conservation, water conservation and use, or drainage of farmland.

LOCAL COMMITTEES PASS ON LOANS

Question. Who determines the eligibility of applicants?

Answer. The local three-member county committee of the Farmers Home Administration. This committee is composed of persons at least two of whom are farmers, who are familiar with local agricultural conditions and whose judgment is established and respected in the community in which they reside.

Question. Where can a farmer or rancher apply for these loans?

Answer. At the local county office of the Farmers Home Administration.

Question. What can the loans be used for?

Answer. The loans can be used to pay case costs of materials, equipment, and services directly related to the application or establishment of soil and water conservation practices, water facilities, and drainage. Water facilities means tanks, cisterns, wells, pumping and irrigation equipment, and similar facilities. Soil and water conservation practices include construction or repair of terraces, dikes, and ponds, pasture improvements, basic application of lime and fertilizer, tree planting, and similar measures.

Question. Is there any limit to the amount that can be loaned to an individual, corporation, or association?

Answer. Loans to individuals are limited to $25,000. Loans last year averaged about $5,000. Loans to associations are limited to $250,000.

Question. What is the interest rate?

Answer. On insured loans the interest rate is 3½ percent per year on the unpaid principal. In addition, each insured loan borrower will pay each year in advance an annual loan insurance charge of 1 percent on the unpaid principal. On loans made from appropriated funds the interest rate is 4½ percent.

Question. When do loans have to be repaid?

Answer. In no case will the repayment period on loans to individuals exceed 20 years. Loans to associations can be repaid over periods not to exceed 40 years.

Tension in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the noise of the Egyptian and Israelian guns, fired thousands of miles away, is having a depressing effect on political, military, and diplomatic officials in Washington. Last week President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Eden discussed the problem of what to do about mounting tension in the Middle East where the fuse has been burning for several years. Social, political, and economic unrest make this area the world's newest danger spot, especially vulnerable to Communist assault. We all know that a new war between the Arab States and Israel can only accelerate violent internal revolt, produce chaos, beneficial to no one, except perhaps to the enemies of freedom. Therefore, I contend, Mr. Speaker, that peace, freedom, and prosperity, are immediate imperatives for the Middle East. In the name of justice and America's good name among the nations I urge our Government to act firmly and decisively before it becomes too late. With these facts in mind I want to first discuss the problems which threaten the existence of the State of Israel and the peace and security of the entire free world, and second, the steps that would help resolve some of the problems in the area. I am convinced that if the proposals I suggest are accepted and fulfilled, the tension in the Middle East will subside, the stability of the region will be strengthened and a peaceful settlement on honorable terms could then be attained between Israel and the Arab States.

Seven years after its war of independence the State of Israel still faces a security problem of unusual complexity. The area of the country is only 8,100 square miles. Owing to the peculiar shape of its territory there are more than 400 miles of frontier. Three-quarters of the population of Israel lives in the coastal plain, running from north of Haifa to south of Tel Aviv, with a slender branch heading to Jerusalem. This densely settled area has an average width of no more than 12 miles between the Mediterranean and the Jordanian border. From the Israel Parliament buildings in Jerusalem, the armed sentries of the Jordanian Arab Legion can be seen a few hundred yards away. The headquarters of the Israel General Staff are within clear view from the hills which mark the Jordan frontier. The country's main roads and railways are exposed to swift and easy attack. Scarcely anywhere in Israel can a man live or work beyond the very easy range of enemy fire. Indeed, except in the Negev, no settlement is at a distance of more than 20 miles from an Arab frontier.

Obviously then, the term frontier security has little meaning in the context of Israel's geography. The entire country is a frontier, and the whole rhythm of national life is affected by any hostile activity from the territory of neighboring states. On the other hand, the Arab States are in no such position, especially Egypt. Border tensions affect only a narrow fringe of their territories, beyond which, stretch deep hinterlands entirely remote from the hazards and strains of frontier life. An American citizen who can cross a vast continent without seeing a foreign, let alone a hostile, face requires a highly unusual measure of imagination to understand the degree of vulnerability which geography imposes upon the people of Israel.

The effects of geographical vulnerability are aggravated by the fierce antagonism, directed against Israel across her embattled frontiers. There is no other State in the world community, whose very right to existence is so persistently challenged by all its contiguous neighbors. This is not the classic pattern of international conflict, in which neighboring peoples recognize each other's statehood but are divided by specific disputes which they have failed to reconcile. The struggle between the Arab States and Israel has passed through four phases: First, before 1948, there was a determination to prevent the establishment of an independent Israel; second, in 1948, there was an unsuccessful attempt to destroy Israel's independence at its birth by armed assault; and third, in the period 1948–54, there has been an attitude of inveterate revenge based on nonrecognition and the undying hope of Israel's extinction. Fourth, Egypt in 1955, as leader of the Arab world, has embarked on a special arms seeking policy in which it invited arms from Communist sources. The elementary duty of members of the United Nations to recognize each other's right to sovereignty and integrity has never been found in the relations of the Arab world with Israel.

It is necessary to take into consideration the expressed intentions of the leaders of Israeli's foes against the Israelis. The secretary general of the Arab League has said:

> This war (in 1948) against Israel will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacre and the crusades.

Indeed, the Arab attack, especially in its first guerrilla stage, did not lack instances of disregard of the rules of war. This is illustrated by the fact that at present there are more than 180,000 Arabs living in the State of Israel, but not one single Jew survives in any part of Palestine that came to be occupied by the invading Arab armies. The Jewish quarter in the old city of Jerusalem, with its ancient synagogues and monuments, was completely destroyed; even the Jewish cemetery of the Mount of Olives was desecrated and laid waste.

Naguib, then President of Egypt, said:

> The existence of Israel is a cancer in the body of the Arab Nation.

This was said on April 18, 1953. The man who succeeded Naguib, the former colonel and current President Nasser, said on May 8, 1954:

> Israel is an artificial state which must disappear.

During his visit at the Lebanese Parliament on July 1, 1954, the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, Maj. Salah Salem, stated:

> The evacuation of the occupation forces from our country will free essential forces of ours. We shall then be able to raise our voices and to liberate Palestine. We shall prepare the forces that will liberate Palestine. And, with the help of God, there will be a great revival.

Mohammed Salah-ad-Din said recently:

The Arabs will not be satisfied with the implementation of United Nations resolutions. We shall only have complete satisfaction when Israel is finally blotted out from the map of the Middle East. The Arabs will find no rest until this cancer has been removed from their heart.

On another sphere—an economic sphere—hostility has been shown the State of Israel. From the very inception of the State of Israel, an economic boycott has been enforced against it by the Arab States, of which the most significant aspect was the closing of the Suez Canal to all Israel shipping, and the interference with the passage of ships of other nations carrying cargoes to Israel. This action of the Egyptian Government was a violation of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 under which the power contiguous to the Suez Canal is bound to keep the canal—

Always * * * free and open in time of war as in times of peace, to every vessel of commerce or war without distinction of flag.

The Security Council of the United Nations on September 1, 1951, ruled that under the armistice agreement neither party could assert that it was actively a belligerent, or entitled to exercise the right of visit, search, and seizure. The Council found that Egyptian interference with the passage through the Suez Canal of goods destined for Israel was "inconsistent with the purpose of the armistice agreement" and an abuse of the exercise of the right of visit, search, and seizure. It called upon Egypt to terminate all such restrictions. No heed was paid to this decision and the Egyptian blockade went so far as to flagrantly seize an unarmed Israel ship, in the international waterway.

A widely ramified boycott machinery was set up with headquarters in Cairo to prevent trade between the Arab states and Israel, indeed between Israel and other countries. International firms trading with Israel were blacklisted, airlines and shipping companies are denied servicing in Arab airports and harbors if they insist on maintaining contact with Israel. A conspicuous example of this policy was the campaign of intimidation conducted by the Arab states against the German Federal Republic which has signed a reparations agreement with Israel. Danger to international air traffic has been caused by the refusal of Arab airports to provide flight information to aircraft proceeding to or from Israel. The boycott of the Arab states against Israel extends even to the denial of information on the movement of infectuous diseases or locusts.

Is it, therefore, unreasonable that Israel, in her isolation—the only democratic country in the world so isolated—should seek a pact with the United States, the country which once befriended her. The first country to recognize her as a free state?

The situation in the Middle East has deteriorated where it now constitutes one of our own weakest security links. Through a lack of firmness with the Western Powers, our obvious indecisiveness, so open to the Arab states that they have successfully played the East against the West, we now face Soviet penetration of the Middle East.

The Western World has reason for its alarm about the advances made by the Communists in the Middle East. It is amazing to me that the Western World, dedicated to the preservation and even to the expansion of democracy, should have turned its back on the one practicing democratic nation in that area of the world.

Is it that the Government of Great Britain considers Israel expendable? Can Eden on one hand deprecate an arms race in the Middle East and on the other condone the supply of arms to the country of declared and open hostility against Israel?

In all this, where is United States policy? Will our leadership go by virtue of its absence?

We cannot, of course, say that our Government will inevitably steer the wrong course in this area. We do know that there has been—and apparently still exists—a split among the State Department advisers as to what course will be followed. And we also do know that our diplomacy has not been successful in Egypt. However, a course must be set by us soon in the Middle East. We must act with realism, after staring the real facts straight in the face. We must stop merely hoping and start acting for we cannot afford any conflagration in this area in the name of our own security.

What then can be done? It would seem clear that the following steps would help resolve some of the problems in the area:

First. Under no circumstances sell any United States arms to Egypt. If Egypt desires peace she has more arms than she needs—if Egypt wants war she has more arms than she deserves.

Second. United States should enter a mutual security pact with all peace-loving nations of the Middle East. A pact which would not preclude the entrance of Israel into mutual defense against non-Middle East enemies and which would guarantee the borders of those countries.

Third. Impose economic sanctions on nations that breach the peace. That is, for example, unload our surplus cotton, for which all our taxpayers have paid their tax dollars to support, in Egyptian foreign markets at a low price, if Egypt should breach the peace in this area.

Fourth. Offer concrete help in order to develop Israel's oil resources to their fullest.

Fifth. Provide defensive arms needed by Israel to protect itself against any aggression.

Sixth. By educational methods and by the pressure of world opinion, try to bring to the consciousness of the Arab States that it is to their own self-interest that Israel survive. So that its men of learning, its doctors, its public health experts, its irrigation experts may be utilized by the people of the entire area. So that the whole of the Middle East may flower and peace again shine on the lands from which all mankind sprang.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, until these things are done it is only logical to expect that the prestige and influence of the United States will fall even lower in this most important and strategic area of the world.

Letter From a Senator—Goldwater Tells Stand on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter from the junior Senator from Arizona that appeared in the Arizona Republic of January 29, 1956. The junior Senator from Arizona has been the subject of some controversy concerning his views on unionism. I feel that it is proper to include this letter in the RECORD as it will set forth the Senator's feelings in his own language.

LETTER FROM A SENATOR—GOLDWATER TELLS STAND ON LABOR

(It is customary for Congressmen to answer all letters they receive, but few go to such lengths as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER did this week when a constituent wrote him. Because his answer explains why he is a friend, not a foe, of labor, the Republic publishes it in full herewith.)

DEAR SIR: From the comments made in your letter of January 6, it appears that you have misunderstood the statements I have been making for the past several months about the use of union funds for political purposes. You seem to have concluded that my criticism of certain leaders of organized labor in this connection constitutes an attack on all leaders of organized labor and on all unions. Nothing could be further from truth.

Do you remember back in 1949 when Phil Murray was attacking the Communist leadership of some of the unions in the CIO and went so far as to have those unions expelled from his organization? Or more recently, when George Meany was attacking the corrupt leadership of the longshoremen's union on the Atlantic seabord? Did anyone say that Phil Murray or George Meany, by courageously attacking some of their fellow labor leaders in those situations, was attacking all labor leaders and all unions? Certainly not. And I sincerely believe that in attacking certain labor leaders for corrupt political activity I am in the same boat as Phil Murray was when he was attacking Communists and George Meany was when he was attacking racketeers. The only difference is that I do not happen to hold office in a union.

What I have been talking about and what I am fighting for is political freedom, nothing more and nothing less. It so happens that certain labor leaders are engaged in activities which many besides myself believe constitute a grave threat to that freedom. If you or anyone else can point out to me where leaders of business are threatening political freedom by similar or any other activities, I will be the first to speak out against them and to expose them.

This is not a management versus unions issue. It is an issue that goes to the very heart of our existence as citizens of this great country. This Nation was founded for freedom and I will fight encroachments on freedom from any quarter, whether it be labor, management, government or any other group.

Millions of wage-earners join unions and pay dues to support those unions. They pay those dues to defray the expenses of collective activity in dealing with their employers, to gain and maintain for themselves

the best possible wages and working conditions. This is well and good.

As a result of the tremendous growth in union membership, these dues constitute, in the aggregate, vast sums of money. We have big unions and these big unions are big business. The individual union member is similar in many respects to a stockholder in a big corporation. He has a voice in electing the management of the union, but he must trust in the ability of integrity of those he elects to run this big business for the purposes for which he joined it and contributes to it. Unions, just like corporations, are made up of both Republicans and Democrats. In fact, as near as we can tell from polls and other surveys, about 40 percent of the union members in this country are Republicans. Therefore, Republicans and Democrats supply in almost equal proportions the vast sums of money which union leaders have at their command.

Now let's assume that you are both a union member and a Democrat. In 1956 John Smith is the Democrat candidate for Governor of Arizona. Bill Jones is the Republican candidate. You are very much in favor of John Smith. You spend a lot of your spare time working in his behalf and you even put up $25 as a contribution to his campaign. Now it happens that the leaders of your international union have some tie-in with Bill Jones, the Republican candidate—he's promised to do them some favor in exchange for their support. So they take $150,000 out of your union's coffers and contribute it to Bill Jones' campaign. With the help of this money Jones is able to beat Smith and to become Governor of Arizona. Your hopes for John Smith and your $25 have gone down the drain. And whose money sent them down the drain? Your money, the dues you and other Democrats and Republicans paid to the union to assist you in bargaining with your employer. How would you feel if a corporation in which you own some stock, or your church, did this to you? You would be plenty mad, I'm sure, in any case—whether it was your union, your corporation or your church. And you would wonder what had happened to your political freedom.

If your union did that to you in Arizona where you are free to join or not to join as you see fit, it would be bad enough, but think of our fellow wage earner in Michigan, for example, who has to join a union and pay dues in order to keep his job. Maybe he's a Republican and likes to give effective support to Republican candidates for office. Or maybe he's a Democrat who opposes the particular Democrat the union leaders back in the primary. You would fight for his right to do so. And yet in 1950, CIO unions spent $211,550 of union funds, some of it his money, to defeat candidates in Michigan, supported by many individual union members? How would you like to be in his shoes?

That's what I've been talking about. I don't care whether it's voluntary union dues or compulsory union dues or whether its used for Democrats or for Republicans, the principle, or rather the lack of principle, is the same. Many thousands of union members in this country are being disenfranchised as a result of the political activities of a few labor leaders. I am not contending that those union leaders are telling those union members how to vote—its been proven plenty of times that they can't. But I am contending that by using the money of those union members they are nullifying their votes. If this is an attack on all union leaders and all unions, then the same is true of an attack on Communists and racketeers in unions. You and I both know that that isn't so.

I want you and everyone else to know what I am trying to do. I am trying to eliminate the abuse by a few power-hungry leaders of a very fundamental right, the right to individual, effective political action. My sole objective is to defend and maintain political freedom. The few whom I have criticized on this score don't like it, and to cover up their wrongdoing they cry out in the very name of the persons whose political freedom they are shackling. The Communists and the waterfront racketeers did the same thing when Phil Murray and George Meany attacked them. The union men and women of this country were not fooled then. I don't believe they are fooled now.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

Highways for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News on January 28 published an editorial recommending that Alaska be included in any road bill considered by the Congress at this session. This, says the editorial, would be in the interest of the Nation as well as of the Territory. All the States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico now are under the Federal-aid highway system. Alaska is not. I am glad to present here the succinct and logical conclusions of the Washington News editorial:

HIGHWAYS FOR ALASKA

Leaders of both parties in Congress apparently are agreed that the Nation must have a large highway-building program.

If it will be paid for by those who use the highways, as seems to be the plan, we see no objection to it.

But why not include Alaska in the program?

No area under the American flag is in greater need of roads and highways. None ever was, for that matter. And Alaskans will pay whatever extra taxes are levied for the new road program, just as they pay every other tax that people in the 48 States pay.

The little highway construction that has taken place in Alaska—apart from the military roads—has been financed by the Interior Department. Its performance may be measured by the fact that Alaska has 3,784 miles of highways, while Nevada—with little more population and a far smaller area—has 25,000.

This year the Interior Department asked for less than $8 million for Alaska highways—about one-third of the amounts that were being spent yearly before the Korean war. Obviously the Department is as indifferent about Alaska's development in this respect as in its failure to prevent depletion of its fisheries.

Alaska cannot share as heavily in paying for highways as a developed State can. It is a vast Territory with less than 250,000 people. But they are willing to pay what they can, and Alaska should be brought into the Federal program under a formula which takes its special conditions into account.

More roads and highways will speed up the settlement and development of Alaska, which everyone agrees is as desirable in the national interest as in Alaska's own. Congress can and should remedy the Interior Department's failure.

The Plight of Small Business in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the following radio talk given by the distinguished newsman, Mr. Eric Sevareid, of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Broadcast on February 2, 1956, this searching analysis of the plight of small business in America merits wide attention and thought.

A transcript of the broadcast follows:

Good evening, all who read as they run are by now aware that one deep fissure or fault endangers the American prosperity structure, which looks so solid on the surface; they know that farmers generally are suffering a recession. But it is not yet widely recognized that there is a second fissure in the structural foundation. And that is the condition of American small business, defined as those concerns with less than a quarter million in assets; in net figures, they are not disappearing as small farms are disappearing; but neither are they growing in number as the economy grows, and the number of small business failures has risen to levels that alarm some observers.

While the press gives page 1 spreads to the profit margins of the giant concerns and their expansion plans, little is said about the present or the future where small business is concerned. But the information is there for anybody willing to look trouble in the face, in these days of mass hypnotic belief that there is no trouble. One so willing is the director of the Public Affairs Institute, who bases his argument on the uncontroverted figures of Dun and Bradstreet, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. For one thing, net growth in the number of business firms stopped in 1953, after growing by 200,000 new concerns in the previous 4-year period. Furthermore, the profit margin of small businesses has not only stopped growing, it has sharply dropped, while that of big business has continued to grow. For example the smallest size group of manufacturers last year suffered a tremendous 65-percent drop in profit after taxes, compared with 3 years before; funds available for reinvestment or expansion tell the same kind of story—a 40-percent drop.

The story and small business failures is quite a tale; the chapter on firms that handle wearing apparel, for example. The number of retail failures there increased last year by 7 percent over the year before, the number of wholesale failures increased by 36 percent.

In a report earlier this month, the Senate Small Business Committee reached essentially the same troubled conclusions—unanimously. And what deeply troubles them, they said, is that there simply is no evidence that the American small-business man is going to be able to hold his ground, shaky as it is, in the future. They find a direct ratio, not only between size and success, but size and survival.

There seems much agreement that what chiefly is choking down small business is heavy taxation plus lack of credit. Big business can arrange big, long-term loans; any workingman can buy a house, car, furniture, whatnot, for about 10 percent down and 3 years to pay. But, a small-business

man in Los Angeles writes me, what about the modest retailer, jobber, wholesaler, serviceman? He has to pay more for rent, labor, supplies, insurance, taxes, yet his credit situation hasn't changed at all; he still has to pay for his goods in 30 to 60 days. If he applies for extra help to the Federal Small Business Administration, what happens? Well, as the Public Affairs Institute points out, the SBA has received about 11,000 inquiries a month and has granted less than 400 direct loans in 2 long years.

So far, hardly a whisper of concern has been voiced by the administration over the profound social fact that the big get bigger, while the small get smaller; a fact, concludes the Senate committee, that will ultimately change the fundamental character of the American economy, perhaps beyond easy recognition by the present generation.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the second of a series of articles on mental illness. This series appeared in the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times and are the result of extensive research on the part of the writers, Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco. I heartily commend this series on this very serious national problem to the attention of all the Members of the House:

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—JUST WAITING TO GET LIKE THE REST OF THEM

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

The sweet-faced girl leaned forlornly against the door. She was pretty, or would have been if her bedraggled, neglected hair had been combed, her dress had not been so drab.

The door opened into a corridor of the Kansas State Hospital for the Insane in Topeka. And the doctor walking down the corridor noted the alert look in the blue eyes that watched his progress.

"What are you doing here?" He asked absent-mindedly, as he passed.

The bright look faded from the pretty face. "I guess I am just waiting to get like the rest of them."

KANSAS WAKES UP

The year was 1948. The doctor was Dr. William Menninger, the man who headed the mental health program for the 10 million American soldiers of World War II. He was in the State hospital because treatment of the patients there had become a State scandal.

A young Kansas University student, Harry Levinson (now a staff psychologist of the Menninger Foundation) had been in the hospital to collect material for a thesis. He found that a new superintendent, zealous for economy, had cut off even the drugs needed for treatment. Staff members quit. More than 1,800 patients were under the care of one nurse, and two doctors, one elderly and the other a dope-ridden alcoholic.

A newspaper reporter took up the crusade, and for the first time Kansans were aware of the conditions within their State hospitals.

The Governor and legislators moved quickly. No one knew exactly what to do but funds were provided—$1 million for training staff—above the regular appropriations for care and maintenance of more than 5,000 patients in the hospitals.

The people of Kansas had spoken. Never again would a pretty girl of 23 wait at the door to get like the rest of them, with no doctor to diagnose her trouble—slipping deeper and deeper into the darkness because no one cared.

(In Texas last year, the Texas Research League found more than 20 percent of all patients in the State mental hospitals has never been diagnosed, and that 30 percent who had been released from the State hospitals likewise lacked diagnosis.)

AND IT PAYS OFF, TOO

In less than 7 years, Kansas moved from 47th among the States to 4th place in the care of the mentally ill.

Kansas is the only State in the Union in which for 5 years the hospital population has decreased steadily. While nationally the population of the mental hospital has increased by more than 15 percent, Kansas hospitals have shown a decrease of 7 percent.

Admissions to Kansas State hospitals have increased 400 percent—proving that the mentally ill in Kansas are going to the hospitals for treatment. Kansas dismissals have increased so that 82 percent of newcomers leave after only 6 months' treatment—proving the mentally ill are being rehabilitated and returned to normal lives.

The cost: $189,653 less than the care of the mentally ill would have been under the pre-1949 program, but, more important, funds used have treated and rehabilitated patients instead of providing custodial care. The planning, researching, and staffing have built a broad base on which future costs can decrease because the Kansas staff knows how and where to divert its funds for solving the problems of the mentally ill, instead of providing only hospital beds to hold them.

THE OVERALL PROBLEM

What did Kansas do?

1. It changed its thinking; it substituted the care and treatment of the mentally ill for the custody of the insane.

2. Admission laws were changed because mental illness, like diseases requiring surgery, needs prompt attention. Diagnose and treat the trouble immediately, and the patient likely will be out of the hospital in a few months. Wait 5 years for diagnosis and treatment, and generally he will be in custody for life. If a man must be committed for insanity with consequent loss of civil rights, he will not seek treatment eagerly. Kansas removed this stigma from its basic State law, and now Kansans enter the hospital for treatment before they are so ill they become life-long custodial cases. (At the present Texas rate of $2.13 per patient per day, this means 30 years of custodial care will cost nearly $25,000 per patient.)

3. It substituted "brains for bricks." Not one dollar was spent to enlarge the "human warehouses" which were holding patients. The increased budgets went for hiring more personnel and for training psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses and aids, therapists, and social workers.

4. It overhauled the obsolete pattern of its social welfare programs for the most economic use of manpower and funds. Kansas in 1949 had—as Texas does today—special schools for the deaf, blind, and feebleminded; homes for aged and orphans; hospitals for insane, epileptic and tubercular; and prisons. It also had social workers for the old-age pensioners and public assistance programs out in the counties. Now the program for mental health, as it touches these varied activities, is one program.

Kansas tackled the overall problem, recognizing that the criminally insane were in hospitals and mentally ill in prisons—that the feeble-minded were in the insane hospital and the mentally ill were in the industrial schools—that there is a difference between the aged who need only homes or nursing care and those who require treatment for mental illness—that mental illness can appear in childhood and, therefore, a program for the mentally ill child must be planned. Kansas began to handle the problems of its neglected children and handicapped persons so they, too, would not gravistate eventually to the hospital for the insane.

STANDARDS ARE HIGH

Dr. George W. Jackson, one-time medical director of the Texas State hospitals and special schools, is now director of institutions for the Kansas State Board of Social Welfare. By basic Kansas law the man who holds that job must be a physician, graduated from a school approved by the American Medical Association, with a diploma of the American Board of Neurology and Psychiatry. He also must have had at least 5 years of experience in hospital administration.

The board, by State law, licenses all places where persons of unsound mind may be housed and is given the duty of "visitation and inspection of all private asylums." Therefore, Jackson can build a statewide, integrated system of mental-health care. First line of defense is the county social workers who, too, are board of social welfare employees and are on the alert for mentally ill persons. Often they are the ones who discover those borderline cases that need a little treatment to stave off eventual disabling illness. Frequently they can persuade those men and women voluntarily to enter the State hospitals for treatment.

Nursing and boarding homes, the children's receiving center, the industrial schools, the alcoholic clinics (operated by the Kansas Committee on Alcoholism), the training schools for the mentally defective are carefully integrated and, therefore, can screen for the mentally ill—and in turn receive those from the State hospitals who do not require hospital care.

"The Kansas hospitals are for the treatment of the mentally ill—not the old folks no one wants; not the mentally retarded whose rehabilitation demands training and education, not treatment for nonpsychotic physical illness; not the criminally insane who are diagnosed as psychopathic personalities and require only incarceration; not the nonpsychotic alcoholic whose primary need is for proper clinical care; not the patients who merely are indigent and need medical care," Dr. Jackson says.

The director thinks Kansas is on the right road, but not so far down it as he would like. Outpatient clinics are needed at all the hospitals (Topeka has the only one); traveling clinics, staffed by psychiatric teams from the hospitals, should go into all communities, and a vast preventive program against mental ill health should be started in every town in the State, he believes.

He is also concerned with the role the local community should play in care in the mentally ill, especially the aged senile. He is an advocate of nursing homes and boarding homes in the local communities and in the attachment of neuropsychiatric wards in the general hospitals. He sees the State hospital system as the research and training unit for the statewide mental-health program—not as the only treatment center for mental illness.

THE TAXPAYERS SAVE

As an administrator, Dr. Jackson particularly is pleased with some of the definite savings to Kansas taxpayers this integrated, hopeful plan has brought about.

In a recent study of the Kansas statistics balanced against those of 8 surrounding States, it was revealed that the care of the mentally ill was costing each Kansas citizen $3.63 per year as opposed to an average of $3.99 for the citizens of the other 8 States.

Kansas has cut its hospitalized patients to 2.26 per 1,000 Kansas citizens, while the others have 3.4 patients per 1,000 population.

These successes were bought by the Kansas citizens. Sometimes, as the programs began, they weren't too sure they didn't have a pig in a poke.

They learned (as Texans will have to learn) that the costs go up before they go down. In 1948, before the program started, the cost per patient released was $4,806. In 1951 the cost had risen to $10,867 in one hospital; to $12,712 in another by 1952. By 1955 the cost was back down to $5,266 and probably will continue to drop as the hospitals are at last reaching a point where at least the term of "adequately staffed" can be used.

In 1948 more than 48 percent of the inmates of Kansas State hospitals had permanent dismissal—death. In 1954 the rate was down to 16 percent and is falling fast this year.

In 1951 the Kansas Legislature was unhappy with the increased appropriations which seemingly had bought little progress. In 1953 the members raised their eyebrows at the rocketing costs but did not cut the appropriation. By 1955 they liked what they saw so well that they asked Kansas citizens to vote a half-mill tax on their property to modernize and renovate the buildings so the physical plant would be attractive. The measure carried 2 to 1.

LONG TRAINING NEEDED

Kansans are so sold on the program of training and paying dedicated workers to rehabilitate those who are mentally ill that the annual appropriation of $1 million for a training program is voted, whether or not the State hospital system has been able to spend all of the old appropriation.

Kansans now know money won't buy all of the needed personnel. It takes years of training added to professional degrees in medicine, social work, and psychology, to produce a worker proficient in the care of the mentally ill, and it takes time to find those who want such training.

Texans will learn the same hard facts.

Mixed Schools: Lower Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Meridian Star of February 2, 1956:

MIXED SCHOOLS: LOWER STANDARDS

Question: Do mixed schools lower classroom standards?

For the answer we refer to a copyrighted article in the U. S. News & World Report, an independent weekly news magazine published at Washington, about the problem there.

A close look at what has happened to schools in the Nation's Capital, after nearly 2 years of mixed classrooms shows this: Since Negro and white children were integrated, pupils' test averages have run below the national average; and costly new measures are being taken now to maintain standards and give help to lagging pupils.

Both Negro and white teachers agree on that answer.

In Washington, where 64 percent of all public-school children now are Negro, the resulting problem is a big one.

School officials are taking strong measures to prevent mixed schools from lowering the quality of education for the average or above-average children.

They are also taking steps to help the less-advanced Negroes and whites to catch up in their education.

These measures, however, cost much money. To some degree they involve a return to what might be called a form of segregated classes, if not schools.

The magazine relates that before integration the white school students were given tests which compared favorably with national standards, but in tests given last spring the results were far below national standards.

The difference in the educational levels shows up plainly in the results of last year's tests of students in two of the larger junior high schools.

At Miller Junior High School, where no white children had yet enrolled, 61 percent of the 6th grade pupils were at a reading level of the 4th grade or below.

At Paul Junior High School, where there are only 38 Negroes to 1,024 whites, only 9 percent of the 6th grade pupils had a reading level of the 4th grade or lower.

The article also points out that Washington educators are undecided as to when the education levels of the two groups will come closer together; some say it will be 10 years—others say it will be much longer.

The division into fast and slow learners is now producing a new type of partial segregation in education.

This is what white leaders have been holding out as a truth for these many, many years.

Thus the Washington problem affords new ammunition.

Akron, Ohio, Area Development Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1954, John S. Knight, editor of the Akron Beacon Journal wrote an editorial entitled "Akron, Let's Go." Few of us realized the impact of these three little words.

Amongst other things, Mr. Knight had this to say:

What we propose is that all of us stop kidding ourselves and start dealing with the facts of life.

Either we are determined to have a growing, thriving community, or let it slowly go backward by default.

Let's start selling Akron to its own people before we sell it to the world. Let's bring together all elements of our town—labor, business, industry, merchants, professional-men and every citizen who is vitally interested in Akron's future.

The facts can be laid on the table and discussed in the spirit of community unity.

We have managed to settle most of our civic problems in this manner, and it is our firm conviction that a study of the facts involved can bring labor and industry into a better understanding of each other's problems and lead the way to a mutually productive relationship that will give our town the tonic it needs.

The slogan caught on and it was decided that the area surrounding Akron should be included in the let's go, Akron, program.

A committee was selected by Akron's mayor, Leo Berg, to study the planning of Akron and the area's future and to seek new industries for the community.

Thoma A. Ferns, a dynamic personality, resigned as president of the Akron Chamber of Commerce to become chairman of what was termed the area development committee.

The committee met with representatives from Summit, Portage, and Medina Counties working together as a team. New industry became interested in locating in this area.

Although Youngstown, Ohio, is not located in this immediate vicinity, you can see from the article printed below that other communities are interested in what is being done by this group of devoted citizens:

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of December 18, 1955]

AKRON'S AREA DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE IS STUDY IN SUCCESS—YOUNG TEAM SPEARHEADS DRIVE FOR NEW PLANTS

(By Jack F. Ballantine)

AKRON, December 17.—It's like a rookie baseball player hitting a home run on his first trip to the plate in the big leagues..

The Area Development Committee here scored its home run by landing a huge new Chrysler Corp. plant for the Akron metropolitan district in its first bid to attract new industry to the three-county area it serves.

Now there are more irons in the fire, and and it's not unreasonable to assume that this hustling young organization will make future hits among at least five big industries with which it is dickering.

The ADC has had a Cinderella career. Whatever its future, the ADC already has been a tremendous success. It has brought to this area an $85 million plant with 3,800 employees and an $18 million annual payroll.

NEW CHRYSLER PLANT

The new Chrysler plant will be at Twinsburg. Geographically, that seems almost in the Cleveland area. Actually Twinsburg is in northern Summit County. The new plant's property will add to Summit County's tax duplicate, bring new prosperity to a Summit County village and provide employment for hundreds in Akron and nearby communities.

(Reports show that although the Ford Motor Co.'s Walton Hills plant is in Cuyahoga County, closer to Cleveland than Chrysler's plant will be, more than 900 Ford employees live in Akron proper and 40 percent in Summit, Portage, and Medina Counties.)

The Area Development Committee, in little more than a year, apparently has solved for Akron a problem that is not uncommon to other cities, including Youngstown. They, too, want new industries, but few have found how to go about getting them.

SUCCESS FORMULA

Akron may have found the answer now, but there was a time when it was just as backward as its neighbors. The Nation's industry outside of Akron was spending unprecedented millions for expansion. Akron wasn't getting any of it. The chamber of commerce's new industries committee was mildly active, but interested primarily in Akron only. Utilities and rail groups were doing some promoting. There were other agencies working in their own way to attract new business to Akron and to keep old industries from moving out.

But apparently no one was doing the job right. That's where ADC came into being on the heels of a thought-providing editorial in the Akron Beacon Journal entitled "Akron,

Let's Go," and written by the editor and publisher, John S. Knight.

Knight asserted that it was time for industry, labor, and others to forget their differences and to begin working together to sell Akron. He suggested that Mayor Leo Berg appoint a committee to do the job.

The Area Development Committee, organized in October 1954, and incorporated 2 months later, is the result. The ADC now numbers some 200 members, with its control vested in an executive committee of 20 members, headed by Thomas A. Ferns, a highly successful Akron insurance agent.

POLITICIANS EXCLUDED

The executive committee is noteworthy for at least two reasons. It includes no politicians, nor are there any representatives of the rubber companies, Akron's biggest employers. But both these groups are 100-percent cooperative with the committee's endeavors. The rubber firms were left out because it would not be fair to have only one company represented on the board, and four industry representatives would be too many. Politicians were not included because the committee wanted to be strictly nonpartisan.

The secret of ADC's success apparently has been a united effort by business, industry, and labor, plus a direct selling campaign that takes the area's big businessmen right to the prospective customer's front door.

The details of working out an attractive offer are left to a paid staff, but top men of business, industry, and labor, not their secretaries or agents, aid in the campaign. They take time off to work as a team in selling the Akron area to a new industry. Their approach calls for personal visits to a prospect, presentation of a package of facts on what the tricounty area offers in the way of sites and other facilities, friendly exchanges, and complete assurance that the area will provide the new plant wholehearted cooperation. Representatives of the prospective new firm are brought to the three-county area, shown sites, introduced to the community's leaders and provided information and any type of service they may desire. There is a constant followup on all prospects.

GIVE DETAILED INFORMATION

The committee has discovered that it must have ready at a moment's notice information of a highly technical nature, along with other facts. Prospects need detailed information on water, roads, schools, wages, housing, taxes, and other data as to sites.

The committee has found that it is best to present these facts in person through men whose experience permits them to speak with authority. They believe it is advantageous to lay the information before a prospect and have available men who can answer any questions immediately.

To this end, the committee has presented the top men of business, industry, and labor as the leaders in its movement. A glance down the membership roster proves this, and these men of high executive caliber will be found on the sales trips to get new industry for the area.

SELL ENTIRE AREA

The ADC is not selling Akron alone. Its territory includes Summit, Portage, and Medina Counties. Its leaders assert that what's good for Medina, Lodi, or Ravenna is also good for Akron and vice versa. And they will work just as hard for a new industry for Barberton as they will for Akron, even though many of them call Akron their home.

The complete absence of petty jealousies and political bickering among the communities in their intense desire to get new industry and promote the area's growth has been termed by some observers to be absolutely amazing.

ADC leaders see the day coming when they may be working closely with similar organizations promoting the welfare of possibly another northern Ohio area such as Trumbull, Mahoning, and Columbiana Counties. For, although 45 miles apart, there are close economic ties between Youngstown and Akron where larger affairs are concerned and their interests overlap.

While securing the Chrysler plant for the Akron area has won widespread recognition for the ADC, the committee's leaders consider their assignment important in other fields, such as planning and coordinating the economic and residential development of the entire tri-county area. They are looking as far ahead as 1980 with their plans for roads, sewers, zoning, and other community needs.

The ADC has learned, too, that it can do a valuable job of public relations. This was demonstrated recently when ADC leaders met opposition from representatives of a big eastern corporation who first said they would not consider Akron as a site for a new plant because Akron had a bad labor record and many strikes.

When it was shown that actually Akron's record for strikes in recent years has been good and labor is cooperating in the ADC's efforts, the firm not only agreed to listen to the ADC's offers but also sent a survey team to Akron to look over several potential industrial sites.

This is the type of objection that ADC believes can be overcome only by personal selling. A letter to that corporation advertising Akron as a likely site for industry would have been discarded in the waste basket.

In fact, ADC leaders are convinced that direct selling of an area's assets are a must in any campaign for new industry.

"You can throw away your circulars and letters. You've got to go and see them, and sell them," an ADC committeeman said.

EMPHASIS ON YOUTH

ADC leaders also have found that a one-man staff is too small to conduct a new industries campaign. They have a 4-man staff in addition to 3 secretaries. The committee's budget of $50,000 for its first year has been upped to $100,000 for next year. The funds are contributed by industry, business, and labor.

The ADC's young staff is typical of the hustling attitude of the organization. They are all go-getters, eager to serve and eager to please. They are just as willing to get new, fresh information as they are to show their elaborately prepared catalog listing hundreds of available industrial sites and their characteristics, complete to a log of all wells within a mile of a proposed plant. They are quartered in bright, new offices on the eighth floor of the First National Tower, Akron's tallest building.

The emphasis in the ADC's family is on youth. Its executive director, George E. Wilson, is only 32. His assistant, Robert Spaethe, is 27. Robert Schmidt, facilities engineer, is 30, and Nick Andreef, research director, is 25. Wilson is a former assistant secretary of the Akron Chamber of Commerce and Spaethe was head of the chamber's convention and business bureaus. Both are University of Akron graduates.

Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1956, in an official ceremony, ground was broken for the new Chrysler plant. President L. D. "Tex" Colbert came to Akron for the ceremony along with other Chrysler officials. It was a great day for the man who wrote the Akron, Let's Go editorial, Mr. John S. Knight. It was a happy occasion for the area citizens because we realize it is important to our economy to create more jobs for more people.

It was a memorable day for the Chrysler Corp. We welcome the forward look to our area.

It was a busy day for George Brittain, executive secretary of the chamber of commerce.

Our community will grow with America. With labor, management, and the area development committee pulling together you may rest assured that many new organizations will want to become part of this expanding spirit.

Farm Ideas Are Popping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert the following editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register:

FARM IDEAS ARE POPPING

One thing the drop in farm income has accomplished—it has stirred up the brain cells of a lot of city folks to thinking about farm problems. In Iowa, this is especially important, since the economy of the State is so closely tied to the welfare of agriculture.

We have received letters from a good many people "tossing into the hopper" ideas about curing the farm problem. Some of these are valuable contributions to thinking. Some are pretty fuzzy. But all of them show a healthy concern about one of the major domestic issues of the day.

A Knoxville, Iowa, businessman, William E. Lemaster, has proposed a variation on the food subsidy idea. He would have retail food dealers sell "distress" commodities below the wholesale price, this loss to be made up by a Government payment to the retailer. This plan has an advantage over some surplus disposal schemes in that it would operate through the regular channels of trade. There would be no stigma attached to buying cheap pork or beef from the store, as there sometimes is when distribution is through relief channels.

Under Mr. Lemaster's plan, the retailer would lose his profit on the surplus commodities he handled. He would get only the equivalent of the wholesale price. Mr. Lemaster thinks retailers would be agreeable to this, as a goodwill proposition and as a help toward solving the farm surplus problem.

This plan would increase consumption of certain foods, perhaps, but it probably would not increase total farm income. People would buy more pork, if they could get it at a bargain, but probably would reduce their spending for other meats and poultry. This has been a weakness of "surplus disposal" programs all along. It is a weakness in all the promotional schemes to boost certain foods.

If the farm surplus is to be alleviated by expanding consumption, then it should be done across the board. The program should be aimed at improving nutrition, not disposing of surpluses. Nevertheless, Mr. Lemaster's idea is worth study. It is better to subsidize consumption than to subsidize a reduction in production of foods so long as some people can't buy a nutritious diet.

Another proposal that has come our way is an effort to make the ever-normal granary of feed grains work more effective. Roscoe S. Jones, an Atlantic, Iowa, attorney, would have the Government insure the individual farmer up to 75 percent of his normal feed-grain production—payments on this insur-

ance to be made from the Government-held feed-grain reserve.

Mr. Jones suggests that the premium cost might be taken care of by a charge of a cent or two per bushel in connection with the corn-loan program. Or, he says, perhaps it would be enough just to require cooperation in the crop adjustment program.

This would be a way of protecting the farmer against a severe loss from drought, hail, or other natural calamity. However, it would not touch the surplus or low-price problem. Mr. Jones lives in a part of Iowa which has suffered drought for several years; naturally he is concerned about that phase of the farm situation.

Judging by experience with the experimental crop-insurance programs of the Government in recent years, there would be a considerable subsidy in any such guaranty of 75 percent of normal feed output. But maybe that is one good way to subsidize agriculture. At least it is a suggestion which deserves study.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has asked for ideas on farm programs. These two we have mentioned and others ought to be sent directly to him in Washington. Plainly, the country needs some new ideas. The old programs are not doing the job, yet there is a real danger that Congress will simply return to more of the same.

Tribute to the American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we owe a great debt to our American Indian people. I have received a most eloquent and moving tribute to the American Indian which was written by the Reverend H. Richard Rasmussen, pastor of the University Presbyterian Church of West LaFayette, Ind. I have been indebted for this fine sermon to Mr. Jimmie James, a constituent of mine in Portland, Oreg., who is a stalwart supporter and friend of the Indian people.

I ask unanimous consent that the Reverend Rasmussen's impressive sermon and Mr. James' brief letter appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 1, 1956.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR DICK: I would like to draw your attention to an article written by Mr. H. Richard Rasmussen, of West LaFayette, Ind. It is a wonderful article, and I believe it should be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Will you please read it over and tell me what you think of it?

I wish you every success during the coming year, and may health and happiness as well as success be yours.

Very sincerely yours,

JIMMIE JAMES.

BROTHERHOOD AND THE FIRST AMERICANS

(By H. Richard Rasmusson, University Presbyterian (All-Student) Church, West Lafayette, Ind.)

Like many preachers, I have had a blind spot. Always when I have preached on brotherhood I have preached about the Negro. The needs and plight of other minorities escaped me.

But I am being corrected. Traveling this past summer through the great West, both Northwest and Southwest, I became aware of our first Americans. Then a friend got me interested in the problem and began needling me to preach sometime on the Indian American.

Did you know that there are 400,000 Indian Americans living in these United States? This is only half of what were here when the first white man came to the New World, but still more than most people realize. Some people think the Indian problem is disappearing because the Indian is disappearing. How wrong these people are.

I write with hesitation on this matter because it is exceedingly complex. It is complex because the Indian Americans are located in 26 States and in Alaska; they live on lands (not necessarily good land) which, if put together, would be larger than six New England States. They are divided into 250 tribes, living on as many reservations. And as a Government bulletin puts it, "In actuality, there is not one Indian population; there are many Indian populations. They present differences in customs, languages, resources, concepts of religion and culture as great as those existing between the French and the Norwegians, the British and the Italians, or the Spanish and the Dutch.

But there are certain principles of justice and humanity and these I want to use in our consideration of the present plight of the Indian American, and whom we should have discovered in his plight and need long ago.

I

The first aspect of justice and humanity that needs stressing as we face the Indian problem is the need to operate in the framework of the democratic process as concerns the Indians.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER of Oregon has asked pertinently of all Americans the question, "What's a treaty with the Indians worth?" He has said: "Congress has now authorized an immense dam which will inundate Celilo Falls. Work is about done on this $348 million project near The Dalles, Oreg. The dam came first. The solemn treaty between the Government and the Yakimas came second. It is a clear disregard for the ultimate desires of these original inhabitants of North America, who had believed they were making a pact with the Great White Father to last for 'as long as the river runs, as the sun shines, and as the snow is on the mountains.'

"Why was the dam started first, and then the faded treaty considered last?

"This seems to me to betray our utter disregard for the elemental rights of these people who are the descendants of the people the Pilgrim Fathers, and Lewis and Clark found on this continent. The salmon fishing at Celilo Falls amounts to virtually the oldest cultural heritage of the Indians of the Northwest.

"Public opinion in the Nation should insist that a treaty with Indians be accorded the same respect as any other treaty. The United States, through its United Nations, often upbraids the Russians for violation of treaties, and rightfully so. Yet our country was in the position of violating a treaty with the Yakimas when it started construction of a dam first and negotiated with the Yakimas afterward. A pledge addressed to warriors in feathered bonnets is as binding as one made to an ermined ruler on a throne.

"This is a moral frontier on which much pioneering remains to be done."

The 1955 convention of the National Congress of American Indians, among many other decisions, asked one—the repeal of House Concurrent Resolution 108, which declares that it is the policy of the Congress to terminate Federal responsibility for carrying out its obligations under treaties and agreements with Indians; and two—the endorsing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, which requires consultation with Indians on any legislation affecting their welfare.

And let it be remembered that in his 1952 campaign, Mr. Eisenhower pledged, to consult with the Indian people of this country and to give them every opportunity for a full expression of their desires, suggestions, hopes, and aspirations.

In all decency, let this be done.

II

Another aspect of justice and humanity is concern for a decent economic existence for the Indian. Man doesn't live by bread alone, but neither does he live long without bread. Christianity has been called the most materialistic of the world's religions because it faces the bread and butter problem and deals realistically with man's existence in a body. "Give ye them to eat." "Heal the sick."

Anyone who has been in the Southwest knows the life there is in water. Where there is water, there is vegetation, growth, and the possibility of a people living even on poor land being able to make a fair living. But denied water, there can be only poverty.

Here for example, are the Pima Indians of Arizona. When the Gila River Reservation was established in 1859 by an act of Congress, it was specifically stated that the waters of the Gila and Salt Rivers should be for the use of its wards, the Indians. But powerful, selfish white interests, indifferent to the claims of humanity and justice, denied the Indians their right.

Then a heroic Presbyterian missionary by the name of Dirk Lay fought this injustice into the very Congress of the United States, and in 1924 Congress passed a law authorizing the building of Coolidge Dam across the Gila River and the act clearly stated that the dam was to provide water first for the Indians. But again injustice was done to the Indians and he didn't get his opportunity for a decent agricultural existence.

As. Dr. Fey of the Christian Century tells the story, political pressure was exerted on the Interior Department from white Arizonians that the Indians did not need all the water Congress had given them. The Indians protested through legal channels, but were never given a fair chance to present their case. Am I talking about terrible Russia? No! I am talking about the United States. The Gila River decree, which is still operative, has been described as one of the greatest crimes in history.

Let us write our Representatives in Congress and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Glenn L. Emmons, that adequate educational programs be set up preparing Indians to leave the reservation and find work outside when he or she so desires; expansion of job opportunities for competent Indian workers; adequate water rights, where these are now denied; loans for farming and ranching to those who wish to farm; farm-bureau assistance to Indians on crop rotation, better methods of farming, better housing, etc., etc.

The Government has been relocating Indians. In each of the past 2 years it has relocated about 2,600 people, including both workers and their family dependents. This we are happy to know. Funds for relocation have now been raised to $900,000. This is good news, too. Here is a new kind of displaced person program for the church to get interested in. What is your church doing about it? Let us be concerned with the words of Christ: "Give ye them to eat."

III

The third aspect of justice concerns health. Growing out of malnutrition, inadequate

dental care, uncorrected physical ailments, the health of the Indian is pitiful.

Consider these startling facts: The tuberculosis death rate for the Indian is nearly 6 times that of the general population. Pneumonia and influenza kills four times as many as the general population. The typhoid fever death rate is four times as high. There are 91.7 deaths of Indians under 1 year of age, per 1,000 live births, compared with 31.5 among other children. Among the Navahos, diarrhea enteritis is 20 times higher than general population. The average life expectancy of the Indian is just a little more than half of the non-Indian of the Nation. Among the Papagos in Arizona, it is 17 years against 68 for the Nation as a whole.

I am happy to learn that whereas in 1911, appropriations for Indian health were only $40,000 in 1955 it has been increased. Let us hope that now that legislation has been enacted transferring the health activities for Indians from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, effective July 1, 1955, frontal attack will be made on this disgraceful situation.

It's a big problem that should have been tackled realistically and humanitarian-wise long ago. The 51 hospitals, with a total bed capacity of 3,900, must be increased. Training for health programs should be enlarged. Indians in school should be equipped to bring to their people methods of sanitation and personal hygiene.

But the root of the matter is a more decent economic existence for the Indian. As a Government bulletin recognizes, "Poor diet is a direct result of a low economic base * * *. Inadequate income makes for insufficient housing, which leads to crowding and facilitates the spread of disease."

Let us insist that our leaders follow through on this matter, attacking it with information, science, and love. "Inasmuch as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me," says the Christ. Shakespeare makes one of his characters say:

"We came into this world like brother and brother.
And now let's go hand in hand, not one before another."

May this be our spirit toward all whom we, from our posiion of relative advantage, speak of as minorities. And may we become politically active, doers of what is right for all men.

Ohio Heading for No. 1 Industrial Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio has been the leading State in some ways for many years. I am happy to note that from an industrial standpoint Ohio has a good chance of becoming the leading industrial State in the Nation in a short time. In this connection, an editorial recently appeared in the Columbus Dispatch which indicates clearly that Ohio continues to move steadily to the No. 1 industrial spot in the United States. The editorial is as follows:

OHIO HEADING FOR NO. 1 INDUSTRIAL SPOT IN UNITED STATES

Ohio continues to move steadily toward the position of the first industrial State in the Nation.

It is now in second place, having passed both Michigan and Pennsylvania, but still some considerable distance behind New York, which remains in first place.

However, Ohio's increase in population, its increase in the amount of industrial production and its increase in factory capacity are greater than the similar increases being registered by New York.

Verification of these facts was made before the Ohio Chamber of Commerce Industrial Development Clinic here last week by George A Moore, manager of the Cleveland office of the United States Department of Commerce.

Mr. Moore supports his forecast of Ohio's preeminence by citing the factors of a central location for this State, the availability of raw materials, the nature of the population, the reasonableness of climate and the easy access to Ohio of users of its manufactured goods.

Ohio also has the room for large and swift development in many of its less crowded areas, and along with these is the site also of many raw materials used in many manufacturing processes.

Its transportation systems—rail, air, and highway—are either in excelelnt condition now or are potentially excellent, and with the State being the natural center and gathering point for communications both east and west and north and south across the Nation its attractiveness for new industry is bound to continue for a long time into the future.

The prospect is bright, and is made brighter by the present rate of development along the very lines noted by Mr. Moore.

Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., Friday, February 3, 1956, entitled "Permanent Peace."

PERMANENT PEACE

The current issue of Time magazine gives a remarkably lucid and clear explanation of the international race to produce the first ICBM; the letters ICBM stand for the phrase Inter Continental Ballistic Missile.

The successful ICBM will be able to span the Atlantic Ocean and reach into the heart of Europe. It will move so far above the speed of sound that it cannot be touched by any type of defense rockets. It cannot be jammed and thrown off course by radar or radio. It will be self-navigating and will probably set its course by a series of stars. It will be self-deaccelerating, so that when it comes back into the atmosphere of the earth, it will not burn up.

The first nation to secure the real ICBM will be able to write its own ticket. That is, it will be able to impose its will upon other nations without firing a single missile. As Time points out, probably an isolated area in the Pacific would be designated as a demonstration target area. When the qualified observers tracked a few ICBM's in on their radar screens and saw the ocean go up into the sky with atomic hits—that would be a demonstration of the ultimate weapon.

The above is not a Sunday supplement dream. If you happened to read the help wanted section of last Sunday's Boston Herald you noted advertisements for engineers qualified to work in the development of special navigation systems and controls. And these navigation systems were obviously for use in ultra long range missiles that could not be affected by radio jamming in any way.

The first notion to develop the ICBM will establish hundreds of launching sites.

Then any enemy action can be answered by a volley of missiles that will, for all practical purposes, wipe the people of the offending nation from the face of the earth.

Strange as it may seem, the development of the ICBM may lead to permanent peace. Or rather, to a permanent stalemate. No nation will dare to pull the trigger. For any aggressive action would be answered by the wipe-out volley.

This is a strange world in which we live. Living in a small country town, we pick up the paper on a quiet Sunday afternoon while the snow drifts down, and read advertisements seeking men who have the skill to design weapons that will wipe out a quarter of a million people at a shot—a missile that gives no warning of its coming except a quick flash on a radar screen.

If the Russians win the race to develop the ICBM, they will gain world dominance. If we win the race, or tie in development with them—we may know permanent peace through mutual fear and stalemate.

Upper Colorado Pays Its Own Freight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in all fields there is competition. Competition in the production of cotton is the keenest ever. Water belonging to the upper basin States of the Colorado River is flowing down to Mexico where cotton production is increasing in competition with our own.

The upper Colorado River Basin States do not expect to raise cotton. In fact they could not if they wanted to. The climate in those States does not lend itself to the production of cotton. Nor do we begrudge Mexico its ability to raise cotton, but we do believe that they should not be using water which belongs to the upper Colorado River States to do so. They will continue to use it and to expand—and you cannot blame them—so long as we do not build our own dams and reservoirs to hold and control the water that belongs to us.

I place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 14 issue of the Deseret News and Telegram of Salt Lake City, which points out that although Mexico is entitled to only 1,500,000 acre-feet of water, it is actually diverting 4 million acre-feet a year. The article reads as follows:

IT PAYS ITS OWN FREIGHT—RECLAMATION HAS BUILT THE WEST—WEALTH POURS INTO THE TREASURY LONG AFTER COSTS ARE REPAID

Opponents of the Colorado River storage project recently have broadened the scope of their attack to include reclamation itself.

"The Nation can no longer afford reclamation projects," they say.

Actually, the Nation cannot afford to pass up the opportunity.

Reclamation has built the modern West, and every westerner knows it. So does anyone who has taken the time to study the history and economy of our part of the country.

However, bitter foes of the Colorado River storage project currently are loudly proclaiming that the project is a western giveaway to be paid for by nonwestern taxpayers.

Quite frequently, uninformed citizens will be taken in by this pocketbook appeal; particularly if they are from the eastern or southern part of the Nation and are unfamiliar with the benefits which have resulted from our modern pays-for-itself reclamation policy.

These uninformed citizens are not aware that:

1. Today some 6,200,000 acres of arid and semiarid lands are irrigated from reclamation projects and are producing wealth in which all America shares.

2. Power-generating capacity of reclamation units now stands at 4,300,000 kilowatts—enough to supply the power needs of 8½ million citizens.

3. Crops produced with reclamation water last year were valued at $865 million.

4. People in the areas served by reclamation projects have paid some $2,500,000,000 in Federal taxes since 1916. This is 25 percent more than the entire cost of reclamation in our Nation to date.

5. The cumulative crop values on all reclamation projects up to 1953 is nearly $10 billion.

Reclamation creates wealth which continues to pour tax revenues into the public treasury long after the total cost of the project has been repaid.

"Here is just one example of how reclamation has more than paid for itself.

This fall the $11 million Salt River project will be paid in full. The last contract installment will be paid by the water users, repaying in full the original investment.

REPAID COST

But, like all reclamation projects, this unit has more than repaid its original cost. The annual return in Federal taxes from Maricopa County, Ariz., in which the Salt River project lies, equals about nine times the total Federal expenditure in the original Salt River project.

The project has been largely responsible for the development of this county from just another desert valley into its present position as one of the Nation's leading and most prosperous agricultural communities.

And the benefits from this single reclamation project will continue to pour in as long as water continues to flow down the Salt River.

If anyone is still skeptical about the success of our Nation's reclamation policy, he has but to study another typical reclamation project on which we have first-hand facts and figures.

STRAWBERRY PROJECT

That is Utah's Strawberry project. This project is the oldest one in Utah and one of the first in the Nation. It cost $3,348,518 back in 1905–1913 to build a 3.75-mile tunnel and other structures needed to divert surplus water into southern Utah County.

Today, 42 years later, more than 80 percent of its cost has been repaid by water users. In another 10 years, every cent the United States Government spent on the project will have been returned.

And here are some of the things the project has done:

1. Some 45,000 fertile acres are safeguarded against drought.

2. The assessed valuation of the southern end of Utah County—that part of the valley which the project directly affected—jumped from $6,271,000 in 1911 to $30,558,000 in 1920. Most of the increase is directly attributable to the Strawberry project.

The Strawberry project also resulted in many new crops being introduced by farmers of the area—crops which replaced the former dry-farm grain staples. Onions, string beans, tomatoes, peas, lima beans, carrots, cabbage, squash, lettuce seed, and grapes became major crops of the area.

And that example illustrates how the Colorado River storage project, even though it will bring new acreage into production, will not materially add to current crop surpluses.

As noted, crops presently in surplus are crops which can be grown on marginal lands—dry-farm crops like wheat, oats, rye, and barley. When those lands enjoy a stable water supply, the farmer then can grow diversified crops, crops which are in demand and not in surplus.

The Colorado project will provide supplemental water for 233,930 acres—acres now restricted to dry farm or limited irrigation crops, most of which is now producing Government-supported crops. It would do this while providing full water supplies to 132,360 new fertile but dry acres. (Both of these figures are based on the project as provided by the House-amended bill.)

DEMAND CROPS

With Colorado River project water, all this new acreage then could grow crops in demand: fruits, vegetables, livestock forage crops, beef, and related items.

On the other hand, if the Colorado River storage project isn't built the water belonging by solemn compact to the upper basin States will flow downhill to southern California and Mexico. And there it very materially will add to crops which are in surplus, cotton for example.

Few persons realize the phenomenal growth of cotton acreage in California in recent years. Immediately after the war, California's Imperial Valley—whose crops are entirely grown with water from the Colorado River—had a total of just 9 acres in cotton. Paloverda and Coachella Valleys in nearby Riverside County, also watered from the Colorado River, had a mere 829 acres in cotton production in 1946.

In 1953, however, Imperial Valley's 9 acres had grown to a staggering 116,630 acres and Riverside County had 46,500 acres in cotton production.

Cotton currently is California's most valuable crop, accounting for 13 percent of the total income of her farmers.

Cotton production also has been booming in parts of Mexico irrigated by the Colorado River. Mexico's cotton exports in 1946 totaled 47,664 metric tons; in 1954 the figure had risen to 259,419 metric tons. In recent years, Mexico, which is guaranteed 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water by treaty, has been diverting as much as 4 million acre-feet a year, the surplus being water belonging to the upper basin States which cannot be used there until the river system is regulated and controlled.

Endorsement of Chiropractic Hospital in Denver, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter I have received from L. B. Anderson, of Flatwoods, Ky.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLATWOODS, KY., *February 3, 1956.*

The Honorable SENATOR LANGER:

As I have been an asthma sufferer for 18 years and tried everything the medical doctors could do and finally went to Spears Hospital, Denver, Colo., which is a chiropractic hospital, and in 6 weeks I was able to return home and go back to work. And I would appreciate anything you could do or say to help this wonderful institution. They are doing so much for the sick and suffering.

Yours truly,

L. B. ANDERSON.

Are Veterans Being Studied, Stalled, Double-Crossed and Hooverized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, when the President appointed his $300,000 President's Commission on Veterans' Pension, those experienced in veteran affairs were not fooled, and the very thing they expected has come to pass.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, what does this Commission, outside of General Bradley, know about pensions? Are they expert legislators? I have their names and their professions. Not one of them is capable of writing a bill, not one of them has distinguished himself in the field of civil government.

Mindful of the fact that our Nation's veteran policy has always been the responsibility of the Congress, and knowing that this Democratic Congress would not jump through the hoop, an old holdover, self-perpetuating clique that attempted to sell President Truman a bill of goods, has pushed Eisenhower into a leaky boat. Their scheme is to transfer all aged VA pensioners to some sort of social-security scheme and thereby to fire the first shot in their campaign to eliminate the traditional veteran class.

But Mr. Speaker, that is not all. This Bradley commission is being used as a stalling device. In his budget message, the President stressed the point that "the Congress and the country would want to consider" this Commission's report. In brief, he told us to keep "hands off" until this Commission makes a report. When will that report come forth? That Commission has been in existence for more than 12 months. It was instructed to report in November, but an extension was granted, and today no Member of Congress knows when the Commission will report.

In the meantime, I suppose we are to sit and fiddle—just fiddle—until these pseudo experts decide to give us the benefit of their findings.

The distinguished ranking minority member of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, has forgotten more about the pension system than this Commission will ever learn; and I hope that our committee will never be influenced by an undisclosed commission report to be trans-

mitted to the Congress at some unknown future date.

Then, of course, Mr. Speaker, we have the residuals of numerous Hoover Commissions to cope with. Mr. Hoover's only noteworthy contribution in the field of veteran affairs is found in his order to General MacArthur to drive the starving bonus army out of Washington and to later have his Attorney General brand them criminals. So, the man who could not make good in government himself, now poses as an authority on everything from the lowly hamburger to management of the atomic energy program. With literally thousands of disabled veterans being denied VA medical care, the great victor over the unarmed bonus army demands that still more Veterans' Administration hospitals be closed.

Under leave granted, I am inserting an editorial from the National Tribune for January 26, 1956. The National Tribune is the oldest veterans' newspaper, and I commend the editorial to my colleagues.

TIME TO CLOSE RANKS

President Eisenhower has sent to the Congress his budget message for the year ending June 30, 1957. The message in fact spelled out in detail the many promises made in the state of the Union message and repeated the rosy results to be expected if his recommendations are followed. The budget makers peered into the crystal ball, pontificated at great length and, for the Chief Executive, came up with a document asking for record-breaking expenditures based upon the hope of a dynamic prosperity that anticipates a balance between income and spending and presages a small surplus to be used to retire a little of the vast public debt and lead, possibly, to a mild reduction in taxes. The budget proposes expenditures of nearly $66 billion, more than a billion dollars in excess of the outlays for 1955 and a billion and a half more than it is estimated will be spent by the end of the present fiscal year ending next June.

We would ourselves enter into the stargazing business if we were to pass judgment on expected revenues or on savings that it is hoped will be accomplished, but we have our own troubles and we shall leave that to self-claimed experts. We do know that regardless of the claims of budgeteers, the national budget has not been in balance for over a quarter of a century, and long-anticipated tax reductions appear to be futile election year promises predicated upon new revenue-raising legislation that we judge may well not be realized. Whether or not advice to young mothers or other proposals made in the message are sound, we hesitate to predict, nor would be express opinions about the advisability of building satellites in space or about placing new moons in the cosmos. We have our abiding doubts about the purpose expressed of outspending the Soviet in the long-range quest for friends abroad and concerning the bolstering of economies of friends and former enemies, because we consider it to be foolhardy to try to compete with Communist promises which we do not believe can be or will be kept. We also feel that charity should begin at home, but we note that while no effort seems to have been spared by this administration to spend its largess where it appears to be needed elsewhere in this country, we see that the veteran class has once more been held up as a specter of fear and the inference is made in the budget message that those who have saved the Nation and its economy by turning back foreign aggression are again considered to be the greatest menace to its well-being.

Unlike the state of the Union message that devoted a mere 43 words to sharing "a continuing concern for those who have served this Nation in the Armed Forces," the President's budget message devoted many paragraphs to veterans and their dependents and recommended that considerable money be spent on them and in their behalf. The request for the Veterans' Administration was for $4.9 billion, second only to the $36 billion plus for the Department of Defense and the $8 billion for the Treasury Department, and a little more than is requested for the President himself, who asked for $4,353,000,000 to run his office and manage by remote control the affairs of the world. The VA request is about $422 million more than was spent in 1954–55 and $86 million more than the expected outlay for this fiscal year. The biggest boost is for compensation and pensions that must be paid under existing laws. GI bill costs are expected to diminish sharply and it is asked that some rights be terminated, but expenditures for medical care and hospital construction and maintenance are considerable, and even the United States Soldiers' Home is going to be permitted to spend $5 million of its own money that was raised by court-martial fines and contributions from enlisted men. All this is on the credit side of the ledger, and even though nothing in the way of new legislation is taken into consideration, we cannot complain too much about the amounts proposed to administer veterans' laws. After all, new laws are always appropriated for only after they are enacted.

General Eisenhower, however, did not fail to enlarge upon those 43 words in his state of the Union message. Whereas, in the new message to the Congress he once more anticipated passage of the White House supported bill for survivor's benefits that makes no distinction between peacetime and wartime service and cares for widows and orphans of only about 4 percent of those who saw service in our major wars, he appeared in in his message to be greatly concerned about the expense of caring for the 22 million war veterans now extant and who, he indicates, will in time, with their loved once, compose nearly half the population, all potential claimants upon the country's income. It all seems a little silly to us, if for no other reason than that death and other considerations, to say nothing of the fact that only a minimum of war sufferers in all of our wars have ever claimed rightful benefits have kept down the numbers on pension rolls, but somebody has sold the President a bill of goods that has him worried. In his message, he spelled out this potential danger in great detail and projected his thinking to the end of the century when he said that direct payments of compensation and pension "may be twice their present yearly total of nearly $3 billion." General Eisenhower dwelt on this theme, noted that as time goes on many veterans of proper age will take a larger pension payment instead of lesser compensation rates and that costs would, therefore, multiply.

Then the cat was let out of the bag. The Congress and the public, the President stated, will want to give careful attention to the findings of his Bradley Commission that will report later this year on "the relation of existing nonmedical programs for veterans to each other and to the numerous civil benefits which the Nation now provides for the aged, the needy, the infirm, and the disabled—both veterans and others." The White House is obviously more concerned about this than anything else and, even though it would be idle to try to say now what will be included in the Bradley recommendations, it would appear that the President, who named the investigating group, is fully determined to lump together the veterans' compensation and pension program with that of social-security benefits, if the Congress will accept his proposal. There are more than words in this budget message insofar as the veteran class is concerned. There is money to take care of obligations already imposed by our legislators, but there is also the clear implication that a new deal for former servicemen and their dependents is going to be proposed, and there is the implicit warning to all Members of Congress to go slow until the proposals are relayed to them.

Meantime, the Congress is in session. Before appropriate committees are numerous relief measures advanced by organized veterans that deserve honest consideration before the solons close up shop and go home in July or early August to talk to their constituents about continuing their public service. Not the least among the pending bills are those seeking pension adjustments and our war veterans expect them to be given earnest attention, but of perhaps even greater consequence is the necessity for a sales compaign to impress upon all Congressmen the fact that there is a vast difference between relief measures for the worthy poor and a system of benefits that has been built up through the years with full public support to reward not only those who have become disabled in preserving this Republic, and to make reasonably secure the happiness of the dependents of their honored dead, but also to care for those others who also served and who have through age and disability required the aid of those whose rights and privileges have been preserved. It would be inexcusable for this Nation to attempt through any means to default on its responsibility. It would grossly insult those who have died in their country's uniform to recommend that this be done. And yet it is this possibility that today faces the veteran class. The implications are vividly present. All veterans' groups had better see to it that their numbers are strengthened and that every member is prepared to do his or her part in the battles ahead. It is time to close ranks.

Federal Aid to and Control of Education (The White House Conference)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding witnesses before the Committee on Education and Labor was Steve Stahl, of Oklahoma City, Okla. A partial résumé of his testimony and of his splendid report on the White House Conference is contained in a speech before the Rotary Club of Oklahoma City as follows:

SPEECH ON THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND ON THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BEFORE THE OKLAHOMA CITY ROTARY CLUB BY STEVE STAHL, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, OKLAHOMA PUBLIC EXPENDITURES COUNCIL, TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1956

This opportunity to bring to the Oklahoma City Rotary Club a report on the White House Conference on Education and to discuss the question of Federal aid to education is greatly appreciated.

Factual information in this report is either thoroughly documented or easily provable. Naturally, the conclusions are my own.

Copies of this report, with a documentation reference list attached, may be obtained by writing or calling the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, 207 Commerce Exchange Building, Oklahoma City.

During the past 2 years the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council has spent more than $20,000 in an effort to improve the quality of eductaion in Oklahoma. We are continuing and will continue these efforts.

The Conference was authorized by Congress at the request of President Eisenhower. The Conference in Washington was preceded by local, area, and State conferences.

Delegates to the Washington Conference were assigned to 160 tables of 10 or 11 each. Chairmen of each of these tables moved up to the second plateau of 16 tables of 10 each. Chairmen of these tables moved to the third plateau of 2 tables of 8 and the Chairmen of these 2 tables moved to the summit and wrote the final report.

Delegates were run through this procedure 6 different times on the 6 major topics outlined by the White House Committee. Please bear in mind the ratio of lay citizens to professional educators was supposed to be of 2 to 1.

Yet of the 12 people to reach the summit and who were selected to write the final reports on each of the topics, 9 were professional educators and 3 were lay citizens.

The odds against starting out at the bottom with a ratio of 2 to 1 and winding up at the top with a reverse ratio of 3 to 1, according to several of my mathematical friends, are 553 to 1, yet that is exactly what happened.

That fact by itself, I submit, is sufficient evidence to support my contention that the Conference was rigged.

I made that statement at the Conference and as Coordinator of the National Conference of State Taxpayer Associations, I requested an audit of the records at each of the 160 tables on the question of Federal aid, in a letter to Mr. Neil McElroy, Chairman of the White House Conference Committee.

It is now 2 months since the Conference became history and as yet I have no evidence which would cause me to change my mind.

Nor am I alone in my contention that the Conference was rigged. I have some illustrious company. Just to name a few—Gov. Alan Shivers, of Texas; M. E. Lundberg, chairman of the Nevada delegation; Mrs. Ruth Cole, president of the Los Angeles School Board; Mrs. Agnes Meyer, wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, and Dr. Joel Hildebrand, president of the American Chemical Society and professor emeritus of chemistry, University of California. Let me quote from the last two mentioned:

"The White House Conference on Education was a glaring example of how such large, nationwide conferences should not be conducted. Delegates had no opportunity for floor debate and open discussion on a conferencewide basis. Whether the original purpose of the Conference to control the delegates and their opinions was successful or not, the fact remains that this phony type of organization can be used for that purpose."—Mrs. Meyer.

"The White House Conference followed the Soviet pattern by letting people express themselves freely at the bottom levels and then by the so-called process of distillation making sure and certain that party policy would be written at the top."—Dr. Hildebrand.

Please do not get the idea that all the rigging took place in Washington. It started back in a goodly number of the States. Let's examine the picture in Oklahoma.

Much publicity has been given to this 2 to 1 citizen-educator ratio. Frankly, I dislike the idea of labeling people and I firmly believe it was a mistake to do so in connection with the conferences on education.

However, that was the method employed. How did it work out in Oklahoma? There were 34 people named to the committee for the Oklahoma conference on education. This committee planned the area and State conferences, set up the mechanics by which delegates to the National Conference were selected and, in some instances, actually made the selections.

Twenty of the 34 people on this committee are professional educators; 6 are officers of State educational organizations affiliated with national associations on record in favor of Federal aid; 2 are officers of the State School Board Association and both have been proponents of Federal aid. This leaves 6 who might be classified as lay citizens.[1]

Delegates to the State conference never had an opportunity to vote on any question nor did they have an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of the final report. This report was written by two professional educators, the 2 top officers of the State Boards Association and the presidents of 2 school organizations on record for Federal aid.[1]

Oklahoma is on record at the National Conference as one of the States in favor of Federal aid although at a meeting of the Oklahoma delegation in Washington the suggestion that Oklahoma delegates be polled on the question was vigorously opposed and quickly rejected.

The Oklahoma delegation, according to the White House Committee's official list of delegates in attendance, was composed of 21 members, 13 of whom were professional educators or officials of organizations on record for Federal aid.

You have been given the impression that the question of Federal aid was a relatively minor one at the Washington Conference—that only one-sixtieth of conference time was devoted to it—that it was not even discussed at some tables.

Truth of the matter is—it was the question.— As proof, I hold here a booklet entitled "Suggested Homework" which was prepared by the White House Conference Committee and sent to all delegates in advance of the conference.[2] This booklet contains 83 pages, 22 of which are devoted to a discussion of the Federal aid question.

I should also like to call your attention to an article by William Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, on page 9 of the January NEA Journal, in which he labels the question "the major specific national issue before the conference."[3]

Who wrote the report on this major specific national question? Mrs. Pearl Wanamaker, Washington State Superintendent of Schools, and, Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers.[4] The two have long been known as outstanding, aggressive, and extremely vocal advocates of Federal aid.

It is also interesting to analyze the composition of the final two tables of eight each on this major question. Twelve were professional educators; two were State senators and chairmen of the senate education committee in their respective States; one was a newspaperman and a long-time advocate of Federal aid; and the final member is employed as an educational expert by a large industrial company.

You may draw your own conclusions as to whether the conference was rigged or not. I still say that it was and still feel I had a perfect right to ask for a look at the deck.

Regrettably all the publicity and all of the headlines have been devoted to the so-called conference attitude on Federal aid. I should like to call your attention to a pertinent statement from the official report which is really significant and which has been almost completely overlooked.

You can find it on page 7 of the official report and it reads as follows: "No State represented"—and all States were—"has a demonstrated financial incapacity to build the schools it will need during the next 5 years. But, with the exception of a few States, none of the States presently has plans which indicate a political determination powerful enough to overcome all the obstacles."[4]

I, for one, am not willing to concede that the American people are morally and politically bankrupt to that extent. If we are, I assure you it is a malady which cannot be cured by doses of Federal aid.

Now apparently the rarified atmosphere in Washington had a profound and peculiar effect on some of the delegates.

That conclusion is inspired by a comparison of the Washington report with State conference reports. Delegates at Washington were reported as 2 to 1 in favor of Federal aid for school ocnstruction and about even on the question of Federal aid for general operating costs. An analysis of the State reports—and all have been examined with the exception of Delaware—shows the following:[5]

1. On the question of Federal aid for school construction, 18 States were in favor without qualification; 5 States were in favor with qualifications, 12 were opposed, and 12 were uncommitted. In other words, only 18 of the 47 States were on record in favor of construction aid on a general basis.

2. On the question of Federal aid for general operating costs, 8 States were in favor without qualifications, 2 were in favor with qualifications, 17 were opposed, and 20 were uncommitted. Does that indicate an even split?

It is most certainly apparent that grassroots sentiments as expressed in the State reports took a beating in the distillation process in Washington.

On the other side of the coin, the White House Conference plan has served a worthwhile purpose. Through community, area, and State conferences it has stimulated a great amount of citizen interest in the problems of education and it has served to focus the spotlight of public attention on the many weaknesses in present efforts to educate our future citizens. Believe me, these weaknesses cannot all be measured by dollar signs.

I do say it was indeed regrettable that the Conference was subverted into an empty drum on which to beat out the theme song of Federal aid. As such it became a major factor in a campaign of fraud and deceit.

Let me assure you I would not make such a statement without evidence to back it up. The best way to present that evidence is to trace the history of this long-drawn-out campaign for Federal funds which started in the early forties.

In the first place, this drive for Federal Aid does not stem from a demand on the part of the people in any State. To my knowledge no Governor has ever appeared before Congress to request financial assistance for the schools of his State. So far as I know there has been only one legislature which has passed a resolution requesting such aid.

The whole idea was conceived in Washington, packaged in Washington, and shipped down to the grass roots by top officials of several national organizations who helped wrap the package.

For the last 10 years at least, Congress and the American people have been bombarded with phony facts and figures in an, as yet, unsuccessful effort to sell this package.

This campaign has been carried on relentlessly with but little, if any, consideration given to efforts being made by the several States to solve their own problems.

From 1942 to 1952, year after year, bill after bill was considered by Congress. While the method of allocation was changed from time to time, the amount requested

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

remained constant at $300 million. During that same period the 19 so-called poor States had increased school expenditures by more than $1 billion. Nevertheless the need, according to proponents, remained the same.

Now, let's take a look at more recent history. The 81st Congress appropriated $3 million to conduct a nationwide survey to determine the school building needs in each State and to measure the financial ability of the States to meet their respective needs.

The first report on this school facilities survey was released in December, 1953.[6] Thirty-nine States had participated and according to the report, not a single one was shown as able to finance its own school building requirements.

As coordinator of the National Conference of State Taxpayer Association Executives, I sent copies of this report to each of my colleagues, with the request that they compare the Federal report with actual conditions in their respective States.

Some 20 States responded to this request. The specific details varied from State to State but the overall pattern was constant. Building needs had been magnified, costs exaggerated and the measure of financial ability totally unrealistic.

Time does not permit the presentation of statements from the various States, but I will give you an example from right here at home. The Oklahoma report set the financial capacity of the Oklahoma city school district for building purposes at $3,801,587. The survey started in 1951. In the last 4 years we have spent $16 million on building sites and new construction. That's more than four times the amount of our federally reported ability. For the entire State, applicable resources or financial ability was reported to be $34.5 million.[6] A check at the Attorney General's office shows that school bond issues during the past 5 years totaled $51.1 million.

I presented this evidence to the House Committee on Education and Labor on April 21 of last year. In doing so I branded the Federal School Facilities Survey as one of the great frauds of the fifties. This statement was supported by witnesses from 11 other State associations.[7] It was publicized in newspapers and magazines across the Nation. To this good day it has not been denied.

However, and I think this is significant, Secretary Hobby, who knew the validity of the survey was being questioned, appeared before this same committee and made the statement that, "Taking the new State figures of estimated need and the current construction level of 60,000 per year, we find that the estimated classroom deficit by the year 1959–60 would be 176,000 classrooms instead of 407,000 classrooms."[7]

In other words, the original estimates exaggerated the building needs by 231,000 classrooms and the financial requirements by nearly $3 billion. By this exaggeration a problem was magnified into a crisis which, we are told, calls for immediate action on the part of the Federal Government.

While one side of the picture was being grossly exaggerated, another side was being almost completely concealed.

The report of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission created by Congress with the approval of the President is a case in point. This Commission was composed of 15 members appointed by the President, 5 by the President of the Senate and 5 by the Speaker of the House.

The Commission appointed 10 study committees, one of them being a Committee on Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education. This committee was composed of 16 members. Eight were from the field of education, one was a school board member and all had long records of friendly, active interest in education.

Armed with a competent research staff they spent more than a year in a dispassionate, objective study of the Federal-aid question. They held numerous hearings at which both proponents and opponents were heard. They assembled and studied 40 tables of statistical information.

And they concluded that "Federal aid is not necessary either for current operating expenses for public schools or for capital expenditures for new school facilities."[8] In fairness, I will tell you that three educators refused to sign the report.

This report was accepted and approved by the parent Commission. The Commission's statement, which appears on page 194 of the official report to the President, reads as follows:

"The Commission recommends that responsibility for providing general public education continue to rest squarely upon the States and their political subdivisions. The Commission further recommends that the States act vigorously and promptly to discharge this responsibility. The Commission does not recommend a general program of Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary education, believing that the States have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. However, where, upon a clear factual finding of need and lack of resources, it is demonstrated that one or more States do not have sufficient tax resources to support an adequate school system, the National Government, through some appropriate means, would be justified in assisting such States temporarily in financing the construction of school facilities—exercising particular caution to avoid interference by the National Government in educational processes or programs."[9]

I have yet to see a digest of this report in any educational journal. And, quite frankly, I am amazed to note that the President completely ignored the work and recommendations of this committee in his recent message to Congress in which he recommended a program of Federal aid.

Let's now consider two questions:

1. Does Oklahoma need Federal assistance in order to meet building needs and to provide adequate educational opportunities for all Oklahoma children?

2. What would Oklahoma gain dollarwise in a Federal-aid program?

The answer to the first is a definite "No." In the official report of the Oklahoma Conference on Education, "It is estimated a total of 7,939 new classrooms will be needed by 1960. Of this number, 3,811 will be needed to care for increased enrollments and 4,128 for replacement of obsolete, unsafe, or unsatisfactory facilities. This is the finding of the Oklahoma School Facilities Survey conducted under the sponsorship of the State department of education."[10]

In this same survey, the average cost per classroom was estimated at $20,000. Twenty thousand dollars times 7,939 classrooms equals $158,780,000.

The increase in school debt capacity approved by Oklahoma citizens last year, based on present valuations, amounts to $96.5 million. Revenues from the 5-mill building fund levy over a 5-year period will amount to $48.2 million, and this figure does not include any capacity available under the old 5 percent debt limit or any increase in net assessed valuation which increased more than 50 percent from 1945 to 1955.

The sum of these two figures is $144.7 million. On the basis of simple arithmetic it is apparent that we are not in any desperate need of Federal aid. It may well be that we will have to forego the luxury of million-dollar field houses and monumental school edifices until our classroom shortage is met. I contend that is a sacrifice we can make without too much hardship.

It is difficult to answer the second question in a specific manner. I have not yet seen any legislation designed to carry out the proposals requested in the President's message. Consequently it is impossible to determine how much money Oklahoma would receive from the suggested $1.2 billion direct grant appropriation.[11] Oklahoma's share in the cost of that program would be $13.2 million.

Under the direct grant provisions of the Kelley bill which is now out of committee and before the House, Oklahoma, over a 4-year period, would receive $24 million and Oklahoma's share in the cost of that program would amount to a minimum of $18 million.

Do you want to sell control of education in Oklahoma to the Federal Government for $6 million?

There is another factor in the Kelley bill which merits your attention. As you well know, much of the clamor for Federal aid is based on the need for equalizing educational opportunities among the States. How does the Kelley bill propose to meet this desirable goal? Under the proposed formula Mississippi, the poorest State, would receive $6.7 million annually for 4 years. New York would receive $32.2 million annually.

In fact, the 24 wealthiest States would receive $960 million and the 24 poorest States would receive $592 million.[12] How we can equalize opportunities by giving the wealthiest States $368 million more than the poorer States over a 4-year period, is something I would like to have explained.

In summation, I should like to quote from my statement to the House Committee last April:

1. The Federal Government, so deeply in debt that interest payments constitute the second largest item in the budget, is in no position to shoulder additional responsibilities.

2. Congress cannot keep faith with our children by charging a substantial part of the cost of their education and leaving them either a bankrupt Nation or an unmanageable debt.

3. The States and local communities can meet their responsibilities in the field of education if they are willing to do so. The operation will not be painless but the patient will recover more rapidly if no Federal sedatives are prescribed.

4. The alluring prospect of Federal aid over the past 10 years has served to retard improvement in our educational systems. Many States and local communities have been dragging their feet, waiting for the Federal Government to come to the rescue.

5. Members of Congress—and particularly members of this committee—are entitled to more accurate information than they have been furnished thus far before reaching any decision on this important question.

6. Congress has appropriated $1,074,000 to finance the work of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission which it created. One of the Commission's assignments was a study of Fededal responsibilities in the field of education. The Commission's report on that subject should be disinterred so that Members of Congress and interested citizens may have an opportunity of reviewing its recommendations before committing the Federal Government to an entirely new aid program.

7. It is to be hoped that neither this committee nor the public will be misled by doctored information or pressured into hasty action on any proposal committing the Federal Government to a program which will cost billions annually and which can lead only to Federal domination in the education of our children.

A moment ago I mentioned the matter of Federal control. Let's elaborate on that subject because it is important.

"Federal aid without Federal control" has been repeated so often it has become the theme song for Federal aid proponents. Let

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

me tell you there is no such thing. Nor should there be.

Advocates of Federal aid without Federal control are advocates of irresponsible government. Anytime one unit of government allocates money to another in the form of a blank check, it is opening the door to waste, inefficiency, and corruption. If any of you doubt this statement, you are invited to spend a few days with us in county courthouses where you can observe for yourselves the terrific waste of county-road funds which commissioners are receiving from the State and spending without supervision and control.

Furthermore:

1. The Supreme Court has ruled that the Federal Government has the right to control that which it subsidizes.

2. This Congress cannot control, by legislative act, the decisions or legislation of any future Congress.

3. The lives of the American people today are affected more by rules and regulations promulgated by Federal agencies than we are by laws enacted by the Congress.

I am not at all convinced that some of the leaders in this continuing campaign for Federal aid really mean what they say when they piously insist that control must remain in the local community.

Mrs. Wanamaker, who made the report on the question of Federal aid at the White House Conference, just recently overruled one of her county superintendents who had fired a teacher because she pleaded the fifth amendment when asked by the House Un-American Activities Committee if she were a Communist. Certainly that is interfering with local control.

On July 9, 1947, William G. Carr, the present executive secretary of the National Education Association, addressed the 85th annual meeting of that association in Cincinnati. The title of his speech was "On Waging the Peace." Incidentally, Mr. Carr was one of the two people who wrote the White House report on what should our schools accomplish? In this address to the assembled delegates, he declared:

"Finally, lay the ground for a stronger United Nations by developing in your students a sense of world community. The United Nations should be transformed into a limited world government. But that cannot happen until the psychological foundations have been laid.

"Encourage, therefore, all kinds of international contacts, however slight, as long as they are cooperative and constructive. Teach about the various proposals that have been made for the strengthening of the United Nations and the establishment of world law. Teach these attitudes which would result ultimately in the creation of a world citizenship * * *. World government, when and if we get it, will be the product of planned education." [12]

Mr. Carr should tell the public—and particularly the teachers for whom he presumes to speak—just how we can have planned education without controlled education.

Right here I want to digress for a moment to pay tribute to International Rotary for the magnificent job it has done over the years in promoting mutual understanding and friendly cooperation among nations. This worthwhile program should be accelerated. Certainly it has no relationship to Mr. Carr's proposal that we sell political world government by brainwashing our children under a system of planned education.

And I beg of you never to forget that if world government can be sold by planning education, so can any other foreign ideology.

I suspect I am looked upon by a great many people as an alarmist. Frankly, I am alarmed over a great many things which are taking place in this country in which, by the grace of God, I was born and which has been so very, very good to me.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Again, I thank you for this opportunity to speak to you. But frankly, it has been a waste of your time and mine if this meeting is the end result.

Therefore, I ask you to check the accuracy of this report thoroughly. Make up your own mind as to whether you want Federal aid to and Federal control of education and then tell your representatives in the Congress what you want.

And the time to do it is now.

[From the Oklahoma City Times of January 26, 1956]

NO OCCASION FOR A RUSH ACT

The more that is seen of the present frantic drive for Federal school aid, the more suspicious it looks.

The movement has all the earmarks of an artificially directed and engineered effort to maneuver the American public-school system into the position of serving as a socialist propaganda medium, under Federal bureaucratic control.

It happens that we have some fresh local information on this point.

A statement by Governor Gary Wednesday says that only 66 of the 1,732 school districts in the State voted the emergency levy authorized by the constitutional amendment adopted last year. About $2 million of the statewide total of taxes, amounting to $2,482,791 was voted by 2 districts—Oklahoma City and Tulsa—and everybody who knows anything about the Oklahoma economic situation knows that these 2 cities are not suffering from hardship such as might call for Federal aid. The reason for voting emergency levies in the two largest cities of the State had to do with unusually sudden and rapid growth in school population, temporary congestion in defense industry locations, and other factors which do not reflect the longtime economic status. This is one of many indices produced by the Oklahoma Public Expenditure Council in the effort to halt the frantic rush into a socialistic Federal aid program.

Steve Stahl, director of OPEC, was a delegate to the so-called White House Conference, for which the the White House was not to blame, since it was engineered and controlled by professional promoters of Federal aid.

To illustrate the confusion that arose after this conference, the magazine News Week published an obviously slanted story in the January 23 issue called Too Big a Package? Mr. Stahl vigorously dissents from the implications of the article, which says, among other things, that the conference "voted 2 to 1 for Federal aid." The fact is that no such vote was taken. The article furthermore said that "470,000 new classrooms are necessary," whereas Secretary Hobby, on March 29, 1955, specifically denied this, saying the shortage was 176,000 classrooms.

The House Rule Committee, as this is written, is holding hearings on H. R. 7535, the Kelley school construction bill. Those who have views on Federal aid, for or against, should make their views known now, or forever hold their peace.

For some unknown reason the report by the Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, adverse to Federal aid, has been ignored, in favor of the garbled and slanted output of the misnamed "White House Conference." But even the "White House Conference" said that, "No State represented has a demonstrated financial incapacity to build the schools it will need during the next 5 years; but, with the exception of a few States, none of the States presently has plans which indicate a political determination powerful enough to overcome all the obstacles."

These scattered indices show that there is a flimsy and ill-supported but highly vocal clamor for Federal aid.

Mr. Stahl says, on this point: "I am unwilling to concede that we are politically bankrupt to that extent. If we are, it is a disease which canont be cured by Federal aid."

Four of the outsanding facts about this present attempt at a rush act are: (1) A definite part of the Fabian Socialist program is to put as many activities as possible under centralized Federal control; (2) conspicuous educators that heavily influence the National Education Association have come out openly in favor of making over the public-school system on a socialistic basis, by use of slanted texts; (3) despite all denials and disclaimers it is an inexorable truth that the Federal Government may control that which it subsidizes; (4) the money for Federal aid would have to come from local communities in any event, so why ship it to Washington and then go there begging to get some of it back?

---

[1] Report on the Oklahoma Conference on Education.

[2] Suggested homework provided by the Committee for the White House Conference on Education.

[3] National Education Association Journal, January 1956.

[4] Report of the White House Conference on Education, pp. 7, 14.

[5] State conference reports filed with White House Conference Committee.

[6] Report of the status phase of the Federal school facilities survey.

[7] Pt. 2, hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on proposed legislation for Federal assistance to States for school construction purposes, pp. 282, 516–538.

[8] Study committee report on Federal responsibility in the field of education, p. 97.

[9] The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, report to the President, p. 194.

[10] Oklahoma conference report on What Are Our School Building Needs?

[11] President's message to Congress dated January 12, 1956.

[12] Report on Kelley bill (H. R. 7535) by House Education and Labor Committee, July 28, 1955.

[13] Proceedings of 85th annual meeting (1947) of the National Education Association, p. 22.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. U. A. Hauber and Davenport Daily Times Support Billion Dollar Mud Puddle Charges

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 31 the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times verified my charges that Chinle shale found extensively in the Glen Canyon Dam reservoir site might produce gigantic landslides at this $421 million key finance unit of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage proposal.

The Daily Times had samples of Chinle tested by the Right Reverend Monsignor U. A. Hauber, chairman of the division of natural sciences and mathematics at St. Ambrose College, Davenport. The Daily Times carried a picture of the Right Reverend Monsignor Hauber inspecting the rock in his

laboratory which carried the following caption:

Inspects rock: The Right Reverend Monsignor U. A. Hauber, chairman of the division of natural sciences and mathematics at St. Ambrose College, Davenport, inspects the rock which Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican of California, says is Chinle shale. The rock according to Representative HOSMER, was taken from the walls of Glen Canyon, where it is proposed to build a $421 million power dam and reservoir. It disintegrated when water was poured on it.

The accompanying articles in the Daily Times was as follows:

CHALLENGES $421 MILLION JOB—TESTS HERE BEAR OUT LEGISLATOR'S CHARGES

Tests made in Davenport apparently verify charges by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican of California, that gigantic landslides might destroy the $421 million Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, key unit of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

Representative HOSMER claimed that 50 miles of the immense walls of the long, narrow reservoir site are composed of rock so soft that it swells to nearly twice its normal size and disintegrates when touched by water.

Rock samples sent to the Daily Times were taken to St. Ambrose College for inspection by the Right Reverend Monsignor U. A. Hauber, chairman of the division of natural sciences and mathematics. When he poured water on the rock it distintegrated immediately.

Representative HOSMER sent the following certification with the rocks:

"To Whom It May Concern:

"I, Harold W. Hoots, Ph. D., previously with the United States Geological Survey, hereby certify that on December 13, 1955, Geologist Peter Gardett and I personally collected a large quantity of samples of Chinle formation in the area of the Colorado and the San Juan Rivers to be covered by the reservoir of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam."

The reservoir would extend 186 miles along the Colorado River and 70 miles along the San Juan River, according to HOSMER.

"If this is permitted to happen," HOSMER said, "the Nation's taxpayers would be left with a billion dollar mud puddle. Congress should withhold any consideration of the legislation pending a full and complete geological survey and report of the site."

What Price Federal Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the condensation of a recent speech by Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa., who, during 1954 and 1955, was chairman of the Water Resources and Power Task Force of the second Hoover Commission, which studied reorganization of the executive department of the Federal Government. His speech was entitled "What Price Federal Power?" and should be carefully read by everyone concerned with this vital subject.

There being no objection, the condensation of the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE FEDERAL POWER?

(By Adm. Ben Moreell, Chairman, Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power)

The following excerpts from the Hoover task-force report is pertinent to our consideration of this subject:

"Since there is no present or prospective necessity for Federal power development to overbalance the social undesirability of continuing such activities, the task force finds that they are not essential Federal activities. This task force believes that the Federal Government does not owe a responsibility to supply any community, section, or region, with its power requirements. Nor does the presence of potential waterpower in a Federal water resource development project necessarily constitute a mandate for its development; but when such potential power can be developed in accordance with sound business principles, it should be developed in the national interest by selling the potential or the power at the lowest technological level which will produce fair returns to the Federal Government."

Without doubt, power generation and distribution are the most important of our studies, for two reasons: First, because those who advocate intrusion by the Government into the economic affairs of its citizens have found that this issue has a strong popular appeal, which makes it a convenient vehicle on which political demagogs can hitchhike into public office; and second, because socialization of electric power can easily lead to socialization of all large-scale industry. He who controls power can have a large measure of control over all of industry.

There is no logical reason for the popular appeal of public power. But demagogues have been able to hoodwink the public into believing that it is an important factor in their cost of living. Actually, the cost of power to the average householder is about 1 percent of his family budget, as against 29 percent for food, 9 percent for clothing, and 2 percent for tobacco and smoking supplies. A reduction of only 3 percent in his tax bill would pay for all of his power. But the damagogue conveniently forgets about tax reduction. He says that high taxes, the spending of which he controls, are essential to promote the general welfare.

As for manufacturing, except for the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries, the cost of power averages little more than one-half of 1 percent of the product value. For the two industries it averages a little over 10 percent.

Technically and financially there is no present nor prospective need for Federal public power. Private industry is amply able to finance and install needed generating, transmission, and distribution facilities. Since the end of World War II, investor-owned electric companies have spent approximately $20 billion for such facilities, as against an approximate total expenditure by the Federal Government, from the very beginning of its program in 1906 to mid-1953, of only $2.3 billion.

FEDERAL AGENCIES IN THE RED

The task force concluded that if all Federal power rates had been based on power values computed in accordance with methods prescribed by the Federal Power Commission, the rates would be increased 30 to 50 percent; and the Government would have received $130 million more in power revenue in 1953 alone. If the present Federal rates are continued for the power projects now programed, this revenue loss, which in its effect is a subsidy, could amount to $400 million a year.

Proponents of the public-power program have charged that since public power systems never have been called upon to pay Federal income taxes, they should be exempt from any participation in support of the Government. These partisans have taken figures prepared by the task force and purport to show that the requirements proposed by the task force, excepting all taxes, could have been met and still have left a surplus for the Federal Treasury. Their arithmetic conceals the facts. For the year 1953 the TVA record shows that even on this basis, there should have been a deficiency of approximately $2 million, provided, however, that TVA would not be reimbursed for the $3.4 million paid by it to State and local governments as compensation for taxable properties removed from their tax rolls.

The Southwest Power Administration and the Southeast Power Administration make no payment in lieu of taxes and the deficiencies of these two systems would have been respectively approximately $2½ million and $4¾ million. The whole Federal power program for that year would have been deficient by about $1¼ million.

The General Accounting Office, in its audit, reported that additional revenue necessary to cover the cost of producing electric energy and to amortize the Government's investment in Southwestern Power Administration as based on Corps of Engineers' estimates was deficient in 1952 by $818,000 and in 1953 by $1,230,000. The task force figures, of course, show that the deficiencies for these 2 years were considerably greater. Our studies used an interest rate of 3 percent and made allowance for Federal, State, and local taxes. My point is that the revenues do not even meet the costs as computed by the agencies themselves.

DOUBLE STANDARD BOOKKEEPING

Those favoring big government, paternalism, government-ownership, socialism—call it what you will—give control of electric energy by Government high priority. Such control can be obtained only if the movement has popular support—or lacks popular opposition. This means that there must be a strong appeal if Government ownership is to be sold to the people. The most obvious appeal is price. Actually, in a country of such technological competence as ours, cost differences in power production, as between public and private development, in a given area, will be slight, provided all costs are included by each. With true costs the same, the only way an advantage can be shown for public power is by subsidizing it. Subsidy is, therefore, a political necessity, and our studies show that all Federal power is subsidized. The subsidy takes one or more of the following which are evidenced in lower power rates:

Use of interest rates which are lower than the actual cost of long-term money and risk capital. The law provides that the Bureau of Reclamation include 3 percent interest in its rates for power from its projects. The practice is to include 2½ percent in the rates for energy produced at Corps of Engineers' projects. The TVA charges 4 percent to the Atomic Energy Commission, another Federal agency, but on the overall earned in 1953 and 1952 only 3.2 percent and 2.7 percent, respectively. REA charges 2 percent for the money it lends.

The average interest rate on the whole Federal indebtedness is approximately 2½ percent; but this is made up largely of short-term borrowings. For years there were no long-term borrowings. Long-term money has been obtained by the present administration through issues paying, most recently, 3 percent and as high as 3¼ percent. A return to the Treasury of less than 3 percent clearly involves subsidy.

The figures I have just recounted are a measure of the subsidy involved in the difference between what the Government pays directly for money and what it charges its power activities for the same money. Actually the subsidy is greater. It is the differ-

ence between the cost of money and the amount paid for it by the power activities.

The real subsidy in the low interest rates can best be measured by the difference between the cost of money in the open market for a specific kind of private project and the amounts charged by Government to the same kind of public projects.

Omission of Federal income taxes or comparable contribution to the cost of the Federal Government. No Federal income taxes are paid by Federal projects; and the supporters of the public-power program argue that since there is no income from the projects, there should be no income tax. However, all costs of government must ultimately be borne by production. Wealth to support nonproductive services is created solely by changing materials and energy to usable forms that are in demand. To exempt all or a part of any one form of production from its share of the cost of running the Federal Government—that is our national defense machine, as well as the continuing overhead costs of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches—constitutes a subsidy to that particular item.

The Hoover Dam pays $500,000 annually from its revenues into a fund to finance Federal studies for the further development of the Colorado River. While it is not proven that this annual payment fianances a sound activity, it can perhaps be argued that the amount involved in some measure a payment to the Federal Government in lieu of taxes. But it is the only payment by Federal public power that can be so classed.

The full measure of subsidy through failure to pay taxes is not solely the amonut of corporate tax foregone. The income earned by private investors in power projects is also subject to tax and this amount is also lost to the Government in a power project. It is only partially offset by the taxes that are paid by holders of Government securities.

A study of the 1953 financial records of the investor-owned electric utilities indicates that on an average basis stockholders and bondholders paid taxes equal to about 25 percent of those paid at the corporate level. At the top-bracket level the ratio would have been nearer 38 percent. Roughly, half of this would be offset by income taxes paid by investors in Federal Government bonds used to finance Federal public power projects. Thus, something in the neighborhood of six to nine million dollars which would have been paid by investors was lost to the Federal Government by reason of tax exemptions and Federal public power practices. Such a tax loss must be made up from other sources, and it constitutes another element of subsidy involved in the whole activity.

With two exceptions, Hoover Dam and TVA, omission of State or local taxes: Only two projects make payments in lieu of State and local taxes. The Hoover Dam pays a fixed annual amount to the States of Nevada and Arizona. The Tennessee Valley Authority pays amounts to the local government within its area in lieu of the taxes those governments would have received from TVA properties if they had remained in the State of their original acquisition by the Federal Government.

Charging large parts of the initial capital costs to wholly subsidized Federal activities such as flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife, etc.: A few years ago a congressional study gave considerable publicity to the difference in proposed allocations to power in the Southwest Power Administration area between, on the one hand, the figures of the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission as contrasted, on the other hand, with the figures of the Department of the Interior. In capital costs alone the Department of the Interior proposed charging some $200 million more to flood control, navigation, and other nonreimbursable items than did the other two agencies.

Excessive charge-off has not yet stopped. Under the general control fof the Department of State a reservoir has been built on the Rio Grande in Texas and Mexico to provide flood control, water for irrigation, and hydroelectric power. As the United States share, $5,872,165 has been allocated as the cost for 31,500 kilowatts installed electric capacity. This is a current 1955 figure. It means an allocation of only $186 per kilowatt as against current costs of $300 or more. This allocation includes nothing for the dam and reservoir but is limited to the cost of the power plant proper. Those other costs are charged to flood control and water supply, gifts of the Federal Government to the people in the area.

Charging administrative costs, insurance, and pensions to other Government accounts.

The Bonneville Power Administration includes in its energy rates a component to provide for miscellaneous administrative costs of the Government that are not paid for directly by that agency. In no other Federal power project is there any attempt to provide reimbursement of the Federal Government for the costs involved in funding, auditing, insuring, or providing employee retirement. In general, there is no provision for meeting any of the administrative costs beyond those incurred for personnel directly assigned to the project or the costs of rentals and materials furnished by the General Services Administration.

Any one of these examples should show just why no private business can compete with a Government business. A private entrepreneur must meet all costs. The Government can always shift some costs to the general taxpayer.

ACCOUNTING—PLAIN AND FANCY

In addition to these obvious forms of subsidy, more obscure subsidy is introduced by what I call "accommodation accounting," i.e., accounting which accommodates the wishes of those who desire to prove that public power is a blessing showered upon us like manna from heaven.

Now for a few brief examples of plain and fancy accounting. The act authorizing the Hoover Dam provided that $25 million of the cost would be allocated to flood control and would be repaid without interest after the amounts allocated to power had been repaid. The law also provided that other amounts advanced for construction from the Treasury would be charged interest. When the amendatory Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act was put into law, it provided that for the purposes of accounting, the first $25 million advanced by the Treasury would be considered to be that allocated to flood control. In other words, the first money advanced, and the last to be repaid, would not bear interest. At a 3-percent rate this means that the annual interest load would be about $750,000 less than it might otherwise have been during the construction period.

POWER AT 30 PERCENT OF VALUE

Something super is performed in the accounting of the Cumberland River Projects. Here we have three dams built for flood control and hydroelectric power development by the Corps of Engineers on the Cumberland River. The Corps of Engineers has proposed allocating $120 million of the cost to power. The sales agency, the Southeastern Power Administration, has proposed to allocate only $103 million to this purpose. The Corps of Engineers has estimated the annual charge for power for the three projects at $5,112,000. The Southeastern Power Administration has made a comparable estimate of $4,134,000. The estimated average annual power benefits based on power values furnished by the Federal Power Commission are $11,540,000. The payoff comes in the next figure. The Southeastern Power Administration has contracted to sell the energy to TVA and estimates that the gross annual revenue will average $3,500,000. These figures indicate that the power will be sold for about 30 percent of its value and somewhere between 60 and 80 percent of its cost as computed by the agencies themselves. This cost, of course, assumes interest at no more than 2½ percent and makes no allowance for Federal, State, or local taxes.

A more complicated accounting "gimmick" revolves around the so-called interest component.

The scheme was developed by the Department of the Interior in connection with the Columbia River project. In brief, the net effect is to permit interest received by the Federal Government on the unamortized portion of investment allocated to power in a reclamation project to be applied to liquidation of costs allocated to irrigation rather than, as might be expected, returned to the Treasury as payment for the use of money. It is clear that this device provides a subsidy to irrigation. Some of the more naive have argued that the device does not provide a subsidy to power. However, the Director of the Power Division advocated approval of the interest component because lower charges could be made for both irrigation and power.

TAXPAYER PAYS DIFFERENCE

Data furnished out task force showed payout schedules for many projects still computed on the basis of using the interest component.

The most recent proposal of the Department has been to defer repayment of amounts charged to irrigation, but beyond the ability of the water users to repay until after the amounts allocated to power have been repaid by power revenues. These deferred irrigation charges would then be repaid by power revenues. Remember, however, that the costs allocated to irrigation do not pay interest. Who, then, pays the interest during a long period of deferment? Correct, the general taxpayer.

Thus does our Government openly and brazenly renounce any pretense of conforming to our traditional system of private enterprise in the field of electric power generation and distribution; instead, it charted a bold and ruthless course which could lead only to complete socialization of this basic industry.

AN EVIL PATTERN

I believe that all public power which is subsidized by tax funds, whether on the Federal, State, or local level, is economically and morally wrong. Where a local community, or even a State, desires to indulge in such socialistic adventures, I deplore it greatly. In the field of morality, honest compromise is impossible. Where this solely is a matter of governmental and economic policies, I would say that the hazard of economic waste is not so great when State and local governments undertake such activities provided they pay all local, State, and Federal taxes. If their socialistic exactions become too onerous, many citizens will move out taking their wealth with them. But the Federal Government is in competition with no one. It is an all-powerful monopoly with unlimited taxing power, plus the power to devalue the currency by issuing printing-press money.

Federal power sets an evil pattern for all other segments of the economy to indulge in self-seeking competition for Government handouts. These handouts are bought with votes; and when votes are thus prostituted, freedom is endangered.

Perhaps you will conclude from the foregoing that I do not believe in public power. If so you are absolutely correct.

The Bricker Amendment: We Still Need It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a timely editorial that appeared in the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times of January 26. The writer points out that this is the time to pass the Bricker amendment to control treaty-making powers which violate our Constitution or domestic laws. The editorial follows:

WE STILL NEED IT

This is as good a time as any to pass along a reminder that Senator Bricker's proposed amendment to control treaty making powers still is pending in Washington.

Senator BRICKER is at odds with many of his Republican associates in this proposal, among them Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. Most certainly, his proposal still is frowned upon by those of both parties who seem to have absorbed an international attitude toward meeting the problems of today.

In brief, Senator BRICKER proposes this policy: That any treaty in conflict with provisions of the Constitution shall be null and void; that no President shall make law binding on the citizens by executive agreement, and that approval of treaties shall not be achieved with only a handful of Senators participating in the vote.

Long range purpose of the Bricker amendment proposal, of course, is to make certain no international agreement infringing on freedom of individual Americans, as guaranteed by the Constitution, shall become the law of the land.

Such a safeguard, many Americans believe, has become vitally necessary under our new role in international affairs, and particularly under our participation in the United Nations.

When first presented in compromise form in February 1954, the Bricker proposal came within one vote of the required two-thirds of the Senators taking part, 60 to 31. Forty-four Democrats back the idea, while 32 of the 46 Republicans also supported it.

The next time around, that amendment proposal will have a tougher time—unless citizens generally inform their Senators they want that safeguard.

Samuel B. Pettingill, former Congressman and constitutional law authority, has brought to light one point overlooked so far in the Bricker amendment discussion.

Pettingill says that to become law of the land, acts of Congress must be "in pursuance" of the Constitution, while treaties need only be "under the authority of the United States."

In view of this confusion, the Supreme Court has held a treaty need not be in pursuance with the Constitution.

Reason for this confusing situation, he explains, is this: the United States existed for 13 years before the Constitution was ratified. During that time, several treaties were placed in effect which the Constitution framers wanted kept in force.

The language "under authority of the United States," therefore was used to protect those early treaties.

Subsequently, the Supreme Court ruled treaties do not need to conform to the Constitution. This gives the President and two-thirds of the Senate treatymaking powers, or the President and foreign governments, under executive order, power to circumvent the Constitution.

We sincerely believe the Bricker amendment to be a necessary clarifying addition to the Constitution. We also believe that action is needed as soon as possible in view of trends toward international action.

That belief does not reflect any lack of confidence in Mr. Eisenhower's desire to protect the rights of citizens. It does, however, concern a realization that in other dangerous emergencies to come there may be other hands directing the affairs from the White House.

Another Soviet Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the provocative but frightening series of articles being written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop on the critical problem of America's defenses. The article in the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post of January 23, 1956, is one of the best in the series.

The Alsops have a very profound understanding of airpower. It was the Alsops, in an article published several years ago, who first used the phrase, "a shield," to describe our United States Air Force. That great Air Force is a protecting shield behind which our national defense can be built, and ways to permanent peace explored. It was very much a shield during the days of the Berlin airlift, which so captured the public imagination. Unfortunately, we have failed to build the strength we require while the shield was still able to protect us.

As Senator JACKSON, of Washington, previously pointed out, the Alsops now reveal that the American Government has convincing evidence that the Soviet Union has built a guided rocket with a striking range of approximately 1,500 miles. Thus once more it appears that Soviet technology has caught up with us, perhaps even overtaken us. To quote the Alsops:

> In the form of this IRBM (intermediate range ballistic missile), the Soviets * * * have a solid leg in the race for the intercontinental ballistics missile, which we are now trying to win by a crash effort.

In terms of strategic air power, the intermediate range ballistic missile may be compared with medium range B–47 bombers. We need both. We also need most urgently the ICBM and truly intercontinental bombers.

General LeMay, SAC's great commander, has asked that this year's budget make provision for greatly stepped-up production of B–52's. His request was rejected for reasons of budgetary economy. It is not too late for the Congress, however, to grant what the budget makers refused. I trust that the news of another Soviet achievement will be clearly in our minds when we set to work to make the appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1957.

With the consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert the Alsop article, "Soviet IRBM," which follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

SOVIET IRBM

The American Government now has convincing evidence that the Soviet Union has built a guided rocket with a striking range of approximately 1,500 miles.

This is the so-called intermediate range ballistic missile, or IRBM, in common Pentagon jargon. Building an American IRBM is the purpose of newly authorized, highest priority weapons development programs of the United States Army and Air Force.

There have been earlier reports that the Soviets might have this weapon which the American services have just begun scrambling to get. These have come from several sources, notably Senator HENRY JACKSON, of Washington. This is the first time, however, that it has been possible to state on undoubted authority that the Pentagon has in its hands virtually conclusive evidence of the existence of a Soviet IRBM.

There is a good deal more than this, in fact. One new weapon may be the result of a brilliant accidental breakthrough. Producing a family of new weapons requires a general forward movement on all technical fronts, and the evidence indicates that the Soviets have such a family of intermediate ballistic missiles with ranges varying from 800 to 1,500 miles.

This in turn confirms the long-prevalent suspicion that the Soviets have achieved massive advances in the missile art. To be sure, the data are lacking to show positively whether the Soviet test missiles have yet attained satisfactory accuracy in guidance. It is not positively known, either, whether these test missiles have been capable of being fitted with a nuclear warhead.

Yet these two unknowns in the equation are not so impressive as they may seem at first glance. The problem of fitting a nuclear warhead is relatively minor, compared to the really basic problems of ballistic missile design.

For these reasons, it must now be assumed that the time is fairly near at hand, if indeed it has not been reached already, when the Soviets will pass from the testing phase into the vital phase of producing intermediate range ballistic missiles in militarily significant quantities. By the same token, it is also reasonable to suppose that the Soviets are well on their way to building the even more important intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM—the ultimate weapon which will carry a nuclear warhead from continent to continent.

The Soviet IRBM tests are also rather final and decisive proof that this country has lagged far behind in missile development. Until a few months ago, the American missile program altogether neglected the intermediate ranges.

There were short range, tactical missile projects, such as those which have centered at the Army's Redstone Laboratory. There were also long range projects sponsored by the Air Force—"Atlas," for an intercontinental ballistic missile; "Navajo," for an intercontinental ramjet: and the highly dubious "Snark," for a long-range pilotless aircraft.

But the projects for intermediate range ballistic missiles only came to life some months ago. At that time the National Security Council, no doubt partly moved by the news of the Soviet IRBM, gave an overriding priority to guided missile development. Final approval of the Army's paper plans for producing an IRBM at the Redstone Labora-

tory was granted only last week by the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Science Advisory Committee, headed by Dr. John von Neumann.

Besides the Army project, there is one more American IRBM project controlled by the Air Force.

Thus the Soviets now have an intermediate range missile, which we do not have and can hardly get for a considerable time to come. In the form of this IRBM, the Soviets also have a solid leg in the race for the intercontinental missile, which we are now trying to win by a crash effort.

Curiously enough, however, the most important short-run effect of the Soviet success with the IRBM may well prove to be its effect on the American Strategic Air Command. Very few Americans realize that the great SAC force, which is the mainspring of American and free world strategy, is not really a long-range air force. Yet about 80 percent of SAC's fighting aircraft are medium-range B–47's.

To reach Soviet targets, the B–47's must either take off from overseas airbases, or else be twice refueled in the air, SAC's tanker fleet is insufficient to provide double air-refueling for more than about one-fifth of SAC's 1,500 B–47s. Hence SAC today is almost wholly dependent on its overseas bases. And it is precisely SAC's overseas airbases that the new Soviet IRBM's will threaten most directly.

With the overseas bases out of commission, in turn, there is every reason to think that our "massive retaliation" would not be nearly massive enough. The SAC commander, Gen. Curtis LeMay, would then be able to mount an attack on the scale of only a little more than 600 aircraft.

This explains, no doubt why General LeMay asked this year to have his B–47s replaced by urgent and greatly stepped-up production of B–52s. His request was rejected for reasons of budgetary economy, but here again, the news of the Soviet IRBM would seem to change the picture.

Can Farmers Agree on a Farm Policy?—This Is the $64,000 Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. W. E. Winn, president of the Pure Milk Association, which appeared in the January issue of Pure Milk News. This article points out that if the farmers cannot agree on a solution to their problems, how can Congress expect to write favorable legislation for them? The article follows:

The new Congress has announced that legislative assistance to stop the decline in net farm income is one of the first items to be taken up this year. Divided thinking among the leadership of our major farm organizations certainly makes the political problem of our Congressmen more complex.

If farmers themselves cannot agree on a solution to their problems, how can Congressmen be expected to, and since a part of their job is to satisfy the farmers they represent, why should they even try if their solution only pleases one of several groups of a divided agriculture?

We seem finally to have almost unanimous agreement that there is a problem in farmer income that is serious both to them and to the large segment of our economy dependent on farmer purchasing power.

Simply stated, farm net income reached its peak in 1947 at $17 billion. It has declined since then to $10.2 billion. This includes a 10 percent loss in 1955 and further decline is predicted in 1956. Consumer disposable income (net after taxes) has increased during that time from $169 billion in 1947 to $266 billion in 1955.

This constant increase in wages and prices since 1947 as represented in the cost of things farmers buy is the basis of the cost-price squeeze farmers are in.

The other end of the dilemma is the huge pile of surpluses of farm products in Government storage which depresses farm prices and will continue to do so as long as it exists.

Farmers are not entirely responsible for this situation. War and rehabilitation after war required a tremendous increase in farm production urgently needed by our country and its allies. Farmers responded with an increase of over 40 percent in total production since 1940, all of which was needed until 1952.

Today's problem is "How do we shrink this agricultural plant to present-day needs?"

If control, as in the auto industry, was vested in about six boards of directors, the solution would soon be arrived at. But we have 4,700,000 boards of directors, or farm families, each making separate decisions as they see their individual problems. And these problems are individual, not only as they relate to families, but as to the different farm commodities. Wheat, for instance, has 2 years' supply now on hand. Not a bushel would need be raised in 1956. But the hungry people abroad who would have starved without this wheat for the 10-year period ending in 1952 now have their own wheat and resent even our giving it to them .

Letting supply and demand have full sway immediately under these conditions would certainly bankrupt wheat growers.

The question now being debated among farmers is whether the price of the entire wheat crop should be lowered to the world level where surpluses can be exported, or should we have a two-price system, a higher price for wheat used in domestic consumption and a lower price for export?

Dairy products are at the other extreme end of the surplus situation. About 4 percent of our total production had to be purchased by CCC in 1955, and predictions are for an equal amount in 1956. But even these relatively small surpluses have lowered our milk price in the Chicago market 23 percent since 1952, and without supports our price would have been much lower.

Despite this sharp reduction in the price to producers, milk production has increased every year since 1952 and predictions are it will be higher in 1956.

Nor have the sales of dairy products responded to the decrease in price. Per capita sales of all dairy products, in terms of milk equivalent, declined from 686 pounds in 1952 to 682 pounds in 1955, according to the United States Department of Agriculture Outlook Report. It has long been known and proved that the responses in both production and sales of dairy products to changes in price are very slow.

Obviously we need a surplus-management program to put an end to wide fluctuations in price due to relatively small surpluses.

Our immediate need is for more understanding of the problems of different farm commodities and agreement among our organization leadership as to what legislative program will best fit the needs of the different farm commodities. Dairy farmers as the largest segment of agriculture have taken the lead.

In response to an invitation from the National Milk Producers Federation to all the major farm organizations, a meeting was held December 19 attended by representatives of the National Grange, National Farmers Union, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Milk Producers Federation.

The Federation's self-help plan, which would take the surplus dairy products out of Government hands and dispose of them through a stabilization organization while supporting market prices at higher levels than at present, received a great deal of attention.

Our $64,000 question is whether farm organizations can agree. The figure of $64,000 is fairly representative of the size of the problem. It is about the capital investment of an average PMA dairy farm. This investment is being eroded today by a milk price which does not protect us against the depreciation of our buildings and equipment.

Those who say that cutting our price to 75 percent of parity will cure our problem of supply and sales have been proved wrong. The need for study, willingness to compromise, and reach agreements, was never greater.

The best solution to the very complex problems of farmers today will be found by first making sure that our decisions are based on the facts and then presenting to Congress the request of a united, not a divided, agriculture.

The Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in the 23d Congressional District, I was honored by being the guest speaker at the South Gate Kiwanis Club. It was during the Commemoration of the American Bill of Rights Week. The young student, Gordon Outher, who wrote the following essay, recited at the Kiwanis luncheon, and he delivered it so splendidly and it seemed such an unusual approach to his worthy subject that I told him that if he would send it forward to me, I would be pleased to ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD. Heretofore I have received unanimous consent so to do.

The essay follows:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(An essay by Gordon Outhier, South Gate, Los Angeles County, Calif., 23d Congressional District)

Four thousand years ago you lived and toiled, Egyptian slave. Many times your back was bleeding from the whip when you faltered from fatigue. But you built the mighty pyramids which stand majestically in the desert, even now.

You steadied the huge block of stone while hundreds threw their weight against the rope to hoist it into its place. You knew that the rope was weakening from overuse, and you had complained of it to the other slaves. But no one would dare stand before the master and demand a new and safer rope. So you kept quiet and just hoped the rope would hold. But one day the rope gave way, and your legs were crushed under the slab of stone.

Your master was enraged because, in falling, the block of stone had been chipped, and a finely chiseled stone was hard to get. He took no notice of your pain; there were thousands of other slaves. So there you lay in great agony, watched only by your fellow slaves. You were left a cripple, with no legs, and you later died from starvation.

But remember how you felt during the rest of your short lived life. There burned within you a desire to gather the people of the streets and denounce your great injustice.

"Alas," you lamented, "I am but a slave."

Your tongue could not move in syllables of protest. If you had even whispered your feeling among your fellow slaves you might have been discovered by a spy and thrown into prison.

You might think it strange that I picked you, an Egyptian slave, in writing this essay, to be an unknown soldier in the long fight for freedom. But as your legs were being crushed under that massive stone your friends were thinking of you as getting your freedom from the whip. For no longer would you have to work on the pyramids. You thought that it would not be much longer and all of your friends would be free. However, you died, thinking that it was impossible to break away from the whip.

But you were wrong. Down through the ages, man has revolted against hard masters and slowly man's desires have found ways to express themselves in words, on paper, in the form of a doctrine. The doctrine that was created for my country is the greatest in the whole world. It is the foundation of my country.

This doctrine was proposed on September 25, 1789, and became a part of the National Government on December 15, 1791. This doctrine gives the people of my country some 38 rights. In this doctrine it states that what you wanted as freedoms or as payment for doing as you are told are not freedoms, but they are rights. We believe that these rights are granted to us by God. In His eyes we are all created equal and we are all deserving of these rights.

Most of the people in my country will admit that we are ashamed of some of the people in our country because they do not realize just how lucky they are to be born in a country where these rights are granted to them at birth. I know that if you had had these rights when you were living, you would have fought to the death, if need be, to keep them free for your children and your loved ones.

If you had been born when I was, your legs would not have been crushed under that slab of stone, and you would not have died from starvation. Now, Egyptian slave, you are wondering what is the name of this great country which has for its foundation such a great document that could have stopped my legs from being crushed and kept me from dying from starvation. What is the name of this great document and its coutry? They are, Egyptian slave, the United States of America and her Bill of Rights.

The Deceptive Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, so far as American airpower is concerned, the budget for fiscal year 1957 presented to Congress last week is deceptive. It falls miserably short of meeting the real needs of military airpower in the critical areas of research, development, production, and maintenance, even though it shows increases both in obligational authority and in expenditures. Evaluated in reference to current international problems, this budget is as unrealistic and deceptive as that of fiscal year 1950, which so strongly encouraged the Communists to launch their aggression in Korea.

There are three principal areas in which this airpower deception is being perpetrated: First, the modernization rate of the combat units is being artificially retarded by the stretchout of current aircraft production; second, the technical pace of our research and development will not be appreciably accelerated in spite of constantly recurring evidence that the Soviets are challenging us in technology and probably leading us in the race to perfect an intercontinental ballistic missile; third, funds for the procurement of new aircraft for the Air Force have been cut so substantially that only 1,900 new planes will be contracted for during the next year. This is about 1,400 planes short of what the United States Air Force estimates it needs annually merely to maintain and modernize its authorized 137 combat-wing strength.

During the past year all the responsible leaders of the Air Force have publicly warned that the tremendous technical progress made by Russian airpower poses one or the greatest challenges ever faced by this Nation. Only last Sunday, an Air Force spokesman stated that many of its newest and most powerful aircraft are spending most of their time on the ground because of a shortage of skilled maintenance crews. The new budget will put the Air Force's expansion program to 137 combat wings by the end of fiscal year 1957 on such a thin financial base that it cannot actually have the full strength of combat-ready wings currently scheduled for that date.

In 1950 the Air Force created paper wings to provide an illusion of meeting its program when in fact its real combat strength was inadequate. The new budget, if adopted by Congress, will encourage the Air Force to the same expediency.

At the end of June 1950, just as the fiscal year was ending, the Communists struck in Korea. The deceptive budget presented last week might well encourage the Communists to strike again in June 1957.

Mr. Speaker, all these facts are ably marshaled and presented by Mr. Robert Hotz in an editorial in Aviation Week of January 23, 1956. In asking unanimous consent of my colleagues for permission to extend my remarks and insert this editorial, I wish to quote the final paragraph of Mr. Hotz's editorial:

> We are reaching a critical point in the technological race with the Russians for superior weapons. The stakes in the race far surpass a political victory or a military promotion. This is a time for men's consciences to speak out before the airpower budget fraud becomes a fact.

The editorial is as follows:

THE NEW AIRPOWER FRAUD

The fiscal 1957 airpower budget presented to Congress last week is deceptive. Although the Defense Department budget shows increases both in new obligational authority ($2.5 billion) and in expenditures ($1 billion) for fiscal 1957, it falls miserably short in meeting the real needs of military airpower in the critical areas of research, development, production, and maintenance. Evaluated on the scale of current international problems, the fiscal 1957 budget imposes artificial limitations on the growth of airpower that are as bad as those in the now infamous fiscal 1950 budget of Louis Johnson, Defense Secretary of the Truman administration. It is significant to remember that Johnson's airpower budget that was once billed as adequate for our defense needs and as "cutting the fat but not the muscle," strongly encouraged the Communists to launch their Korean aggression and sent us into that bloody fray woefully weak in the air.

If the fiscal 1957 airpower budget is approved by Congress without change, it will serve notice to the Communists that our military airpower is again on the decline and that our policy of massive retaliation is being built on bluff and bluster rather than superior weapons. This airpower budget submitted by the executive branch of the Government will mean that American airpower will lose further ground in its technological race with the fast-growing Communist air forces. If the trends it initiates are continued, American airpower will not only fail to improve its present slim margin of superiority over the Communist air fleets but will not even maintain its present position.

For this fiscal 1957 defense budget is not a budget of airpower progress, as billed by Defense Secretary Wilson, but a budget of airpower stagnation followed by inevitable retrogression.

There are three principal areas in which this airpower deception is being perpetrated:

First, stretchout of current aircraft production is being continued by a limitation on expenditures. This means that the modernization rate of the combat units is being artificially retarded and that the aerial weapons in our usable arsenal will be deliberately kept closer to the beginning of their obsolescence curve.

Second, the fallacy of the constant level of funds for research and development that is adopted again in this budget (Aviation Week, Jan. 2, p. 13) will mean that our technical pace will not be appreciably accelerated and will certainly lose more ground in the race with the Russians.

Third, funds for procurement of new aircraft have been cut substantially for the Air Force so that only 1,900 new planes can be contracted for during the next year. This is a bare few hundred more planes than those lost every year through normal operational attrition. It is about 1,400 planes short of what USAF estimates it needs annually merely to maintain and modernize its authorized 137-combat-wing strength.

Censorship imposed by top-level Defense Department officials in the guise of military security has carefully concealed the real problems facing the Air Force in particular and our military airpower in general.

For example:

Nearly one-third of the fighter strength of Tactical Air Command is grounded due to lack of qualified maintenance personnel. Strategic Air Command has quantities of bombers grounded for the same reason, although it has not been hit as hard as TAC.

Strategic Air Command is rapidly losing its intercontinental atomic attack capability as the B–36, only bomber in the United States arsenal with genuine intercontinental range, is sliding rapidly down the obsolescence curve. SAC is now essentially a medium-range force relying almost entirely on B–47's

that require multiple aerial refueling from relatively-slow KC–97 tankers at low altitude to operate against the Russian heartland even from foreign bases. General LeMay's program to reequip SAC as fast as possible with longer range B–52's and its KC–135 jet tanker companion have been junked by the fiscal 1957 airpower budget. For the next several years, the retaliatory power of SAC will be significantly curtailed by this production stretchout, and its future power will be delayed by the research fund ceiling.

USAF's expansion program to 137 combat wings by the end of fiscal 1957 is programed on such a thin financial base that it will not actually have the full strength of combat-ready wings now scheduled for that date. USAF is rapidly reverting to its 1950 dilemma of organizing "paper" understrength wings to provide an illusion of meeting its program when in fact its real combat strength is not increasing.

In presenting this airpower budget to Congress, Defense Secretary Wilson testified that:

"Nothing has occurred in the international situation during the past year which would indicate the necessity for any major change in these policies and concepts."

Yet, during the past year, all of the responsible leaders of the Air Force including its Chief of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining; his vice chief, Gen. Thomas White; United States Air Force Secretary Donald Quarles; the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, Trevor Gardner, and Lt. Gen. Thomas Power, commander of the Air Research and Development Command, have all publicly warned that the tremendous technical progress made by Russian airpower poses one of the gravest challenges ever faced by this Nation.

In the face of this glaring contrast between the urgent warnings of the top military airpower leaders and the bland complacency expressed by Defense Secretary Wilson and his fiscal 1957 Defense Department program, Congress should make the most strenuous efforts to determine our genuine airpower problems and examine them in minute detail before reaching a verdict on this vital budget.

We can expect a barrage of official propaganda to support the fiscal 1957 defense budget combined with ruthless attempts to suppress its critics among responsible military leaders.

But we are reaching a critical point in the technological race with the Russians for superior weapons. The stakes in the race far surpass a political victory or a military promotion. This is a time for men's consciences to speak out before the airpower budget fraud becomes a fact.

The Pot Calls the Kettle Black—GOP Foreign Policy Differs Little From Truman's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Chamberlin has called attention to the fact that while the Democrats condemn Mr. Dulles and his foreign policy, there is little difference between our current policy and that when Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson called the shots. Mr. Chamberlin's article follows:

DESPITE DULLES TIFF, GOP FOREIGN POLICY DIFFERS LITTLE FROM TRUMAN'S

When an opposition party lacks issues, there is a temptation to sound off loudly on minor criticisms. This would seem to explain the furor over Secretary Dulles' remarks in Life magazine. There would be ground for criticism if Mr. Dulles had said that he led America to the verge of war three times. He said nothing of the kind. What he said was: "We were brought to the verge of war"—which is very different.

It is hard to see how the Democratic Party, without repudiating the whole foreign policy of the Truman Administration after 1946, could censure a Republican Secretary of State for facing up to the challenge of Communist aggression. We were brought to the brink of war, not by our own desire or fault, but by Mr. Truman's eminently correct decisions to give military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey and to refuse to be forced out or West Berlin. We were pushed over the brink of war when we refused to throw Korea to the wolves.

It might not have been necessary to fight in Korea had it not been for a careless speech by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, which omitted Korea from our defense perimeter. But, once the North Korean Army had moved in force into South Korea, President Truman's decision to fight was right and was backed by the majority of Republicans in Congress.

The three crises to which the Life article refers were all in the Far East and were all inherited from the previous administration. In the case of both Korea and Formosa, the Eisenhower administration was willing to settle for the half-loaf of the status quo, very much along the line marked out by its predecessor. To put it more concretely, we have made a big investment in giving Syngman Rhee the means to build up a powerful army, 650,000 strong. But we are not backing that army in any attempt to overrun North Korea.

We have given Chiang Kai-shek the protection of an alliance which pledges us to come to his aid if there is a Communist attempt to conquer Formosa. We have supplemented this with military and economic aid. But we have not made it technically possible for the Nationalists to attempt a landing on the mainland.

What to do in Indochina was a painful and difficult question, to which there is no sure or easy answer, even by hindsight. It is not happy to think of the huge sums which we poured down the drain of a French colonial war which could not be won militarily or politically. Yet there was no native force sufficiently popular and cohesive to represent an altogether promising alternative to the unsatisfactory policy of underwriting the annual French military deficits. Now a new chapter has begun in Indochina and perhaps it will be possible to bolster the government of Ngo Dinh Diem to a point where it will not be a pushover for an attack from the north.

Charges and countercharges in the field of foreign policy will be tossed back and forth during a hot election campaign. But the truth is that the Eisenhower-Dulles team has not steered the American ship of state as far from the course of its predecessor as some Republicans hoped and some Democrats feared. The talk has been a little tougher, the nationalist note has been struck more often, but the broad objectives have been the same: Peace without appeasement, holding the line against new Communist gains without taking the moral, political, and military responsibility of shooting first.

The decisive change in American foreign policy took place in 1946, when the inane idea that it was always up to us to get along with Stalin (with no corresponding obligation on his part) was abandoned. Unfortunately, the necessity of setting a firm barrier against Communist aggression in Asia was recognized later, after the attack on Korea and after China had been lost.

If one takes 1946 as the date of reference for Europe and 1950 for Asia, there is little the Eisenhower administration has attempted that was not implicit in the policy of its predecessor. German rearmament, which may get off the ground in 1956 or 1957, was first advocated by Acheson in 1950. Dulles has not departed from the model of NATO in encouraging SEATO for Southeast Asia and METO for the middle East.

It is all to the good that questions of foreign policy should be intelligently discussed. But there does not seem to be the basis for a great debate on party lines. On the basic issue of maintaining peace through strength and alliances with likeminded nations, there is no substantial difference of opinion along party lines

The Record Speaks for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News. I certainly am in accord that this editorial sets forth that the many charges of the New Dealers will not stand up. The record of President Eisenhower definitely establishes that the Republican administration has accomplished more in antitrust prosecutions than the previous New Deal administrations did in all the years they were in power. I am certain that the people will recognize this fact.

The editorial follows:

President Eisenhower, during his 3 years in office, has pursued a policy of modernization.

It is in keeping with the pledges he made during his campaign for the presidency.

He said then that if elected he would favor no minority; that he would serve in the best interests of all the people.

As a consequence he has the confidence of the people in all walks of life. The United States is unified as never before, in the opinion of some observers.

There have been charges of favoritism of big business from some Democrats.

These charges don't stand up, however. Let's look back at the Roosevelt and Truman administrations when the country's big corporations were under verbal and legal fire. They were blasted as "special interests" at every opportunity; nothing good was said of them.

Antitrust suits were numerous. Two of the Nation's biggest corporation, Du Pont and Aluminum Company of America, were brought into court on charges of restraining competition.

The corporations fought these and won their cases. That's not very much progress if breaking up big corporations is desirable just because they are big.

Mr. Eisenhower has done more in 3 years to win antitrust suits than the Roosevelt and Truman administrations combined, and without conducting warfare against bigness.

Two such suits were settled only recently, those against A. T. & T. and Interantional Business Machines, without long, expensive trials, in which the corporations agreed to make their patents available to other manufacturers.

The corporations, made angry by the Roosevelt and Truman thunder against them, fought back and won.

Mr. Eisenhower's policy of "moderation" did not produce any such resentment, and his administration won consent decrees from the two corporation giants.

It is difficult to see how the Democrats can use "big business" favoritism in the coming presidential campaign in view of the fact that the current Republican administration has accomplished more in antitrust prosecutions than the previous Democratic administrations did in all the years they were in power, and did it without any fanfare, just as a matter of duty as it saw it.

Rutgers University: The State University of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we in New Jersey have long been proud of our State university. Evidence of this feeling may be seen in a recent article which appeared in the Newark Sunday News. It is a story of the State university from its beginning as a private denominational school with just a few students to the present day when it has campuses throughout the State. The article, written by John T. Cunningham, is of interest to anyone interested in education for it shows what can be accomplished by the people of our Nation even though they start from small beginnings. The article follows:

THE STATE UNIVERSITY

(By John T. Cunningham)

Rising on the banks of the Raritan River is an $8 million skeleton of the Rutgers University of tomorrow, the harbinger of an onrushing decade when Rutgers must be braced to meet a flood of students whose parents suddenly will awaken to the fact that New Jersey does have a State university.

The $8 million skeleton comprises three 6-story dormitories and a $4 million library. These are splendid additions, but the impression remains that in a sense these are not buildings for the future. Rather, they are in a sense hurried effort to catch up with the past; they will be in full use as quickly as they are finished.

Actually, the 3 new dormitories may even accelerate the problems Rutgers faces as a State university. Just as a new turnpike or parkway creates remarkably new traffic demands, so the dormitories will probably create sharpened needs. The 1,008 beds will be filled immediately—and a thousand more parents might in justice ask: If a thousand beds can be found for those, why can't a thousand beds be found for ours?

That's the way it is with a State university. It must be alert to public requirements and responsive to public demands, and in New Jersey the problem is magnified many times. After all, New Jersey has had only 10 years to get used to having a State university; many other States have had a century or more.

The problems extend far beyond the mere banks of the Raritan. When Rutgers and the State of New Jersey were united in long delayed wedlock in 1945, the responsibilities of Rutgers—the State university of New Jersey—automatically spread to touch every corner from Cape May to High Point.

The Rutgers University which became the State university 10 years ago had grown in hodge-podge fashion, especially in its heterogeneous commitments to the State of New Jersey. Someone has said that the Rutgers of 1945 was "like an old inner tube—with patches on the patches."

Two especially large patches quickly joined the old inner tube as the Rutgers of New Brunswisk absorbed the former University of Newark in 1947 and the College of South Jersey in Camden in 1950. Fortunately the old tube had surprising resiliency, and happily, the two big new patches proved sound.

If there is one thing Rutgers must have, it is resiliency. There is an increasing certainty on the part of educators that 10 to 15 years from now the State university may have to take the responsibility for educating twice—and maybe 3 or more times—as many New Jersey sons and daughters as it now serves.

As the tide of students rolls inward, a private institution may say: "We'll expand 10 percent, or 20 percent, and no more." A State university is not afforded that luxury—and if the State university happens to be Rutgers, where facilities already are inadequate to meet the relatively moderate demands of 1955, the problem for tomorrow calls for serious discussion.

There is no easy way to make simple the complexity of Rutgers. It encompasses in New Brunswick alone the men's colleges (including the college of agriculture) and Douglass College for women. It embraces several varied schools and colleges in Newark and Camden. It includes a separate university college, a degree-granting evening unit offering courses in New Brunswick and Newark. It reaches out to thousands upon thousands of other people through extension courses, short courses, and other special courses.

Separate articles in this series will deal with Douglass College and with the Rutgers colleges in Newark and Camden. This article, therefore, is concerned chiefly with the men's colleges in New Brunswick and with the State University administration as it centers "on the banks of the old Raritan."

Even such circumscribing leaves complexity. Within New Brunswick there are three distinct Rutgers men's campuses—the main or downtown campus; the College of Agriculture a mile across town, and the Hillside campus, on the Raritan's north bank behind the football stadium.

Here on the banks of the Raritan is the very spirit of Rutgers, no matter how complex it has become. Here rose in 1766 a college called Queen's and later called Rutgers. Here generations have sung about a college where father sent a son to "learn to be a man." Here the scarlet of Rutgers and the orange and black of Princeton played the first intercollegiate football game. Here has grown a tradition of high academic standards, still as firm as ever, State university or no.

To appreciate the Rutgers of today it is well to understand the two main threads running through her long history—the early kinship with the Dutch Reformed Church and the later affinity with the State of New Jersey. As the influence of the church gradually declined in the late 19th century and then disappeared entirely in 1920, the hot-and-cold flirtation between Rutgers and State grew stronger.

A dissenting wing of the Dutch Reformed Church secured a charter for Queen's College in 1766 and 5 years later started classes in, of all places, a former New Brunswick tavern called "The Sign of the Red Lion."

One of only nine American colleges founded before the Revolution (and, incidentally, the only colonial college to become a State university) Queen's never knew early solidarity. Just one man, a Matthew Leydt, stood in the first graduating class in 1774. Twice during the Revolution the college fled to the hinterlands, first to North Branch and later to Millstone.

War-time jitters persisted. In 1793 Queen's unsuccessfully sougth a merger with Princeton; from 1795 to 1809 and from 1816 to 1825 Queen's closed her doors completely. Surprisingly enough, during those depressing two decades, in some areas Rutgers had a wider academic breadth than Princeton—including even a reasonably well-established medical school.

Reopening in 1825 found Queens with two assets: A new name, Rutgers College, and a solid building, Old Queens, whose cornerstone had been laid in 1809. The new name symbolized optimism—it honored wealthy Col. Henry Rutgers, of New York, seemingly in "lively hope of favors to come" (as Rutgers' historian puts it). Colonel Henry responded promptly (if modestly) with a bell for Queens tower, valued at $200, and a $5,000 trust fund (whose interest is still paid annually).

Church influence tightened and didn't relax one whit until 1848, when college and seminary became separate entities. True physical separation waited until 1856, when the seminary moved into Herzog Hall on what undergraduates soon dubbed "Holy Hill." In those days "Holy Hill" seemed far to the west; today it splits the downtown campus in half.

Passage in 1862 of the Morrill Act to support education in agricultural and the mechanical arts suddenly made Federal money available—a total of $116,000 for New Jersey, on which the annual interest totaled $5,800. Someone had to get it, and both Rutgers and Princeton tried. Rutgers caught the State's eye by establishing the Rutgers Scientific School in 1863; the following year the legislature voted Rutgers the $5,800.

Ostensibly Rutgers received a windfall. In actual practice it proved anything but that, since Rutgers first had to buy a 90-acre college farm for $15,000 and had to arrange education for both engineers and agriculturalists. Most important, Rutgers had embarked on the long voyage leading to State university status.

The Morrill Act implied that any State accepting its provisions would cooperate financially. New Jersey ignored the issue for 26 years—giving not one cent until 1890, when it established the first Rutgers State scholarships. Until that time the legislators simply passed Federal funds on to Rutgers, and if sometimes the public mistakenly believed New Jersey had been generous to higher education, so much the better.

There can be many a slip between scholarship approval and scholarship payment, Rutgers found. The State comptroller refused to pay anything to Rutgers, although the college continued to accept scholarship students (many of them recommended, naturally, by legislators). Rutgers sued the State, and the case proceeded somewhat leisurely, even for New Jersey courts of those days, before a ruling favoring Rutgers could be secured in 1905. The State paid up $80,000 in back scholarships 15 years late.

The Dutch Reformed Church, on the way out in control of Rutgers, crossed paths with the State on the way in during the presidency of Dr. William H. S. Demarest from 1905 to 1924. This Demarest administration was the transition period in Rutgers development.

Four years after Dr. Demarest assumed office the trustees dropped an old requirement that two-thirds of the trustees should be members of the Reformed Church. In 1920 Rutgers amended its 1766 charter to eliminate entirely a 154-year-old requirement that the president be a member of the Reformed Church.

The little college on the banks of the Raritan grew in many ways. New buildings spread over the downtown campus—the engineering building (1909), the chemistry building (1911), Ford Hall (1914), and the ceramics building (1920). Across town on the "Ag" campus, State funds erected four important new buildings. Old Grad James Neilson gave the rest of what is now Neilson campus, across Hamilton Street from Old Queen's, and Rutgers foresightedly purchased the Bishop estate (where most of the modern growth is taking place).

When Dr. Demarest became president, only a few more than 200 students greeted him; when he stepped down enrollment totaled 734. Old Rutgers, bursting her seams, bought several old houses along College Avenue to house departmental offices—competing for the houses at times in the real-estate market with undergraduate fraternities, then also buying old residences for frat houses.

Dr. Demarest in 1924 turned over to Dr. John Martin Thomas the reins of Rutgers University—officially so-named the year Dr. Demarest retired. It seemed only a matter of short time before Rutgers became the State university in both fact and name.

By now the old inner tube had some odd patches. A 1917 legislative act made the Rutgers Scientific School (or agricultural college) the State University of New Jersey. New Jersey College for Women in 1918 became a department of the scientific school There was a patch here and a patch there of State money—the ceramics building, New Jersey Hall, some money expended on the chemistry and engineering buildings.

Clearly the time had come for the fine old spinster named Rutgers and the reluctant old suitor named the State of New Jersey to make clear their intentions. Their engagement had been at least tacit in 1864, but despite the fact that the State had contributed modestly to her support actively since 1905, Rutgers resisted marriage. The State appeared only too happy to have it that way.

A study by Arthur J. Klein of the United States Bureau of Education, in 1927 threw the strange relationship into full focus. Dr. Klein said quite pointedly that few persons recognized Rutgers as a State university. He gave many reasons—the Dutch Reformed Church ties were hard to live down, retention of the old name Rutgers suggested private financing and utilization of a long-established institution made for confusion. He stressed particularly the problems inherent in a self-perpetuating private board of trustees in control of a public university—something Governor Meyner stressed even more pointedly last spring.

The lengthly Klein report summed up, dispassionately and incisively, the long overdue need for action by both university and State. The State acted typically: More studies followed by more studies. True enough the depression made any move involving State funds difficult, but more important, neither university nor State showed much inclination to relinquish old privileges or to assume new burdens.

World War II brought with it a need for accelerated programs and wise heads recognized that postwar educational demands would be tremendous. An 81-year courtship became legal; Rutgers and the State of New Jersey solemnized their union in the spring of 1945, when the State university act moved through the legislature.

Under the 1945 act, all Rutgers departments were "to be utilized as an instrumentality of the State for providing higher education." The State gained nine new positions of the board of trustees and general powers of control and supervision of the State university became vested in the State board of education. In return for using the Rutgers facilities, the State agreed to appropriate just and reasonable sums for the university.

Many a son of Old Queen's feared the loss of old traditions. If on the night of the wedding they drank to the good old days of Rutgers, they had much to be sentimental about. They had the right to be sentimental about their colonial history and the traditions of Old Queen's. They had rightful pride in the strict academic principles of their college.

Old grads (and new grads, too) recalled proudly that the first intercollegiate football game was played at Rutgers on November 6, 1869. Princeton came up that day and 25 men on each side took off their coats and ripped into one another. Rutgers won, 6 to 4, possibly helped by the scarlet turbans their valiants wore—the first distinctive football headgear ever worn.

Football is always easiest to recall, but Rutgers also could claim New Jersey's first Phi Beta Kappa chapter was formed at Rutgers in 1845. The first issue of Targum, undergraduate newspaper, appeared in 1867 as one of the Nation's earliest college newspapers. The Targum, some might recall, suggested scarlet as the official Rutgers color in 1869. Surely some could remember the university yearbook, the Scarlet Letter, dated from 1870.

Down in fraternity row, the Delta Phi's of 1945 could trace a history back 100 full years, back to 1845. If anyone could recall that Rutgers and NYU met in the Nation's first intercollegiate debate in 1881, he would be esteemed; history has chosen to make far more to-do about the first football game than the first debate. Possibly as they raised their voices to On the Banks of the Old Raritan, scattered old grads might recall that Howard N. Fuller, class of '74, wrote those words in a single afternoon in 1873 for the college glee club to sing in Metuchen that night.

But there was no time for any but the most sentimental to die because dear old Rutgers had surrendered to State control; the huge surge of returning veterans caught up Rutgers and moved it forward so rapidly that few had time to remember the bygone days. Enrollment in the men's colleges in 1947 tripled those of 1940. Rutgers almost overnight moved from the status of a relatively small university to a State university among the Nation's top 20 in total enrollment.

Dr. Robert C. Clothier, who assumed the Rutgers presidency in 1932 in the midst of the most acute financial distress the world has ever known, guided Rutgers through tremendously difficult days—through a depression, World War II, the changover to State university status, and the alavanche of returning veterans. Dr. Clothier served 19 momentous years before turning the presidency over to Dr. Lewis Webster Jones in 1951.

Dr. Jones, who came to Rutgers from the presidency of the University of Arkansas, has used his 4 years in New Jersey to sell actively the idea and the ideal of a State university. He believes the campus of Rutgers extends to the borders of the State, and its mission affects every phase of the cultural and economic life of her people."

State appropriations have been moving swiftly upward from the $1,400,000 the State granted Rutgers in 1945. The budget in 1951, when Dr. Jones took office, included slightly more than $5 million in State funds; today that total is just over $10 million. In addition, New Jersey annually provides 1,000 State scholarships worth $400,000.

Increased State funds have served many ends, not all of them quickly obvious. The new $4 million library is being paid for with State funds, but the three big new dormitories rising nearby are being financed with $4,500,000 in private capital. Across the Raritan on Hillside Campus, the splendid new $3,500,000 building housing the Institute of Microbiology has been financed from streptomycin royalties.

Principal emphasis in using State funds has been on improving the tone of a Rutgers education, wherever it be encountered—in New Brunswick, in Newark, in Camden or in one of the many other areas of academic influence. The faculty has been expanded, with ever-improving quality. Faculty salaries have been raised, particularly at the lower levels. Research facilities and fields of investigation have been broadened.

High academic distinction continues to be stressed at Rutgers, often to the distress of those perennially young alumni who hint that lowered admission requirements might improve the football team. Rare among State universities, Rutgers continues its policy of selective admissions—stressing academic fitness. This year, for example, of the 900 freshmen entering the men's colleges in New Brunswick, 90 percent had stood in the upper two-fifths of their high school classes. There is an understanding that Rutgers entrance requirements parallel Ivy League standards.

New Jersey's highly diversified economic pattern makes the task of her State university difficult, yet Dr. Jones declares the State's great variety makes for "enormous opportunities." At the same time, consider the obligations—to serve the farmer, to serve an industrial area whose output covers a wide range from chemicals to fine jewelry, to serve one of the Nation's most polyglot populations.

This year the agricultural experiment station celebrates its 75th anniversary and the College of Agriculture observes its 91st birthday, both stronger than ever—not only within the State but in national prestige. The State university started in 1864 in the Agricultural College, but today agriculture is merely one responsibility.

Rutgers serves nearly 3,000 undergraduates in its men's college in New Brunswick, studying agriculture, liberal arts courses, the sciences, engineering and education. On its statewide campus, including Douglas College and colleges in Newark and Camden, Rutgers has the responsibility for educating another 3,000 full-time undergraduates. Close to 20,000 more young men and women of varying ages and varying intentions each year seek Rutgers help for everything from 2-week short courses in agriculture to 8-year evening schedules leading to a degree.

That means constant vigilance to see that on the one hand the needs of a State are being met, and on the other hand that university offerings are not being spread too thin. Rutgers has moved to meet some serious wants of the State—by improving its law schools and its school of education, by inaugurating such new schools as those in library science and social work. Next year's budget will include funds for increased psychological studies.

Perhaps the biggest stumbling block at the moment for Rutgers is its comparative youth as a true State university. Indeed, Rutgers may well be said to have two histories—179 years as a private college and university; 10 years as a State university. Some confuse the two—the present study of the university's heavy emphasis on private trustees is one illustration that the kinship is not wholly resolved.

A scant decade as State university poses other problems. Tuition rates at Rutgers are as high as any State institution in the land—far higher than most. Stated another way, higher educational opportunities for

New Jersey boys and girls are not nearly as readily available as they are in other States.

If Rutgers is to meet the overwhelming tide of students coming by 1965, its physical facilities must be greatly revamped. Even now in New Brunswick there are obvious limitations. Many of the buildings on Queen's and Neilson campuses are seriously outmoded—some hopelessly outmoded. Academic departments are housed in remodeled old houses along College Avenue—and these are far from adequate accommodations. This isn't Rutgers propaganda; this is obvious to the inquiring eye.

Whether Rutgers will be ready by 1965—that's only 10 years hence—is dependent partially on the taxpayer and partially on sound administration. The pressure will be tremendous, not only from the rapid rise in enrollments which mere rising birth rates would dictate, but also because from many areas may come a cry for lowered admission standards.

Dr. Jones is determined that academic standards will remain high. Nevertheless, he says "to cope with increased numbers of students we must rethink the whole problem of our quality. We can't necessarily equate small size with quality." That by no means means Rutgers can, or will, seek only to educate an elite. That stresses Dr. Jones, is undemocratic: "We can't measure ability that accurately and we can't aim our education at an upper intelligence for recondite research; we need too many different types of people in our society."

There are those people who think "quality and quantity are somehow incompatible," Dr. Jones says. They believe "any attempt to make higher education more generally available would spread our culture perilously thin." Dr. Jones replies:

"I don't think much of that metaphor. It implies that culture is a substance like peanut butter, that we haven't much of it, and that if we try to share it more widely all the children will be skimped on their sandwiches. But knowledge, unlike peanut butter, does not diminish by being shared. It is more likely to increase."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*--------
Bell, John J., *Tex*----------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*-------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*------The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*-----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*------1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*------
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*----------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*--------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*---------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*------
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*---------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*-------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*--------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*-----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*------The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*-------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*---------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*-------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*--------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*-------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*------The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*---------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*-------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*----------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*--------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*---------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*-------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2313 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill.*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R S

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Seeking God's Way for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the First Methodist Church, Milwaukee, Wis., on February 4, 1956, at the Congressional District Peace Conference, Milwaukee Council of Churches.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES THAT THE ANNUAL ONE GREAT HOUR OF SHARING BE THE GREATEST IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH—SAYS THAT NEVER BEFORE HAS THE CHURCH HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO REACH SO MANY IN THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST AT SO LITTLE COST

It is a real pleasure to be with this fine group of Wisconsin Christian leaders.

I can think of no greater responsibility or opportunity in this Atomic Age than that of "Seeking God's Way for World Peace."

Down through the ages men and women of conviction—followers of the Way Shower—have blazed new trails along which too few have had the courage to trod.

Too many of us—in every age—look out on a world torn by hate and ungodliness and lose the will to bring to the world the constructive power and redeeming love of the faith we profess.

It is a time for spiritual greatness.

It is a time to turn to the letter to the Hebrews for spiritual strength and guidance:

"Therefore lift your drooping hands and strengthen your weak knees. * * *

"Strive for peace with all men, and for the holiness without which no one will see the Lord."

MANKIND'S BASIC RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS MAY BE ANNIHILATION INSURANCE

I was glad that a delegation of American Protestant leaders was named this week by the National Council of Churches to make a 10-day visit to Russia in an effort to increase mutual understanding. However, I agree with the note of caution in the comment by Dr. Eugene Blake, president of the council, when he announced this trip: "While we cannot be sure that an agreement can or should be reached at many points, we do hope that under the guidance of Almighty God that exchange of visits will contribute toward a large measure of understanding and good will."

We are living in an age where the only insurance from annihilation may be the basic religious convictions which—despite those who would deny them—I am convinced that all men share.

PRAYER IS THE POWER THAT LEADS TO CONSTRUCTIVE AND POSITIVE ACTION

What, then, is our real job in this time and age of crisis and confusion? I believe that there are three things that we must do if we would truly seek "God's way for world peace."

First, we must pray.

Prayer is the power that leads to constructive and positive action.

Prayer can be the point of departure for the better decisions which man is always capable of making.

May I suggest to you that a nation whose President opens each cabinet meeting with prayer is a nation that is earnestly seeking God's way to world peace.

May I say to you, also, that more decisions at high levels in our country are reached through prayer than anyone in America or the world realizes.

We must all turn to prayer if we are to achieve the calmness of spirit and the clear thinking that the terrible and awesome decisions of the atomic age require from us.

SHARING IS THE KEY

Secondly, we must share.

We must share the bounty of material blessings and know-how that have been showered upon our Nation.

During the past 2 months I have been working in Washington with the leaders of the major religious and secular overseas relief organizations who represent the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and with Mr. John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration. Effective and immediate action was needed and obtained in a stepped-up program of sharing of our surplus agricultural products.

I have been deeply impressed by the fact that the Catholic Relief Service of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and the United Jewish Appeal of the Synagogue Council of America are working in common purpose in this great program of sharing.

During 1955 upward of 800 million pounds of surplus dairy products and cottonseed oil were distributed in over 50 countries to needy people who have no means with which to buy.

I am encouraged by this kind of sharing.

These agencies have recently—after the greatest of perseverance in battling Government redtape—been able to obtain the release of grains in 1956 in addition to the dairy products.

This will mean that the people of the United States will be distributing through these fine relief agencies more than 1.6 billion pounds of commodities during the calendar year of 1956.

SHARING IS A MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

Now where did this program, of sharing, start?

It was started in churches like this one, by people like yourselves. Our Christian conscience keeps telling us to share.

I have received a great deal of support for the suggestion that I made on Christmas Day that this matter of sharing be strengthened by the appointment of a White House expediter who would seek out and meet the needs of the hungry and needy people both at home and abroad.

Now if there is one thing that I would urge all of you to do in your seeking of world peace, it would be to make March 11, 1956, the date of the eight annual one great hour of sharing, the greatest in the history of the American church. Why? Because the one great hour of sharing will help make possible not only the distribution in countries overseas of the foodstuffs for needy peoples, but it will make possible medicines and other supplies in emergency situations, long-term health and nutrition programs, resettlement and rehabilitation of refugees, self-help projects in vocational training, and the broadest kind of ministry to the homeless and destitute.

May I say that the good that can and will be accomplished with the $11 million to be raised through the 1956 united appeal is incalculable. May I urge that all of you see to it that this giving is oversubscribed in your church.

HUMAN NEEDS EVERYWHERE MUST BE MET

Your big job—our real job, is to see that this one great hour of sharing is successful and that the major areas of world need—Korea, the Near East, India, Pakistan, Japan, Greece, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and Hong Kong—will receive the best that Christian action can offer.

In Korea, the Vietnam, and the Near East refugee problems are still acute. Whole villages have been demolished, malnutrition and disease are widespread.

Japan is still rebuilding after overwhelming typhoon destruction. India and Pakistan have been devastated by floods.

In Hong Kong, 300,000 refugees still live in huts on cluttered hillsides.

In the Near East, hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees still exist in hopelessness and despair.

In Germany and Austria, millions of homeless are still crowded in refugee camps.

In Greece and Italy there are pressing human needs of all kinds.

These are but a few of the situations which are being met by the sharing which you and I can and must do.

Never has the church had the opportunity to reach so many in the spirit of Christ at such little cost.

WE MUST SET EXAMPLES FOR OTHERS

Thirdly, we must set an example for others.

If we can lead others from prayer to sharing then we are beginning to get on top of our real job as Christians. I do not think that this matter of an example to others has been said in any finer way than by that great and good man who is sharing his talents and Christian concern so deeply with other human beings—Albert Schweitzer:

"Example is not the main thing in influencing others. It is the only thing. Hope is renewed each time that you see a person you know who is deeply involved in the struggle of life helping another person. You are the unaffected witness and must agree that there is hope for mankind. And those who are not so tied down to the struggle for existence, who are freer, must give the example of service. Those not tied down by suffering are called to help those who are chained by suffering. But they should not think, 'Behold, I am giving an example;' that spoils it. Anyone who thinks of the example he will give to others is occupied with things he ought not be doing. He has lost his simplicity. Only as a man has simplicity can his example influence others."

CONCLUSION

I heard a very distinguished colleague of mine in the Senate say to us the other day that it is our thinking that determines the kind of example we are to others. He quoted the Wayshower and said "If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed" you can accomplish great things.

Jesus did not wipe out the armed aggressionof His day but He did teach that which, if understood, does away with evil in the individual. He stated that "God is a spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." He also said "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

We were told not simply to love those that love us but to love our enemies—but above all we were told to love God supremely. Hate (pride, egotism, bigotry) and intolerance must be displayed with love, fear and courage, lust with purity. Thus, when the individual—and Jesus impacted individuals—learns the way to the more abundant life by right thinking, followed by right living and right doing, that individual obtains peace—that peace which He said, "I leave with you."

We know that nations would not war with nations if hatred and lust for power and gain were destroyed in the consciousness of the individuals.

Saul of Tarsus was blinded by the creed and dogmas of his day. So much so, that he was a fanatic, ready to kill and imprison those who did not agree with the concept of the state church at that time. Something happened to Saul on the way to Tarsus. The Bible relates that Jesus spoke to him and a new light impacted the consciousness of Saul. It changed him from a persecutor, an intolerant human being, to Paul—one who hungered to bring the light of the Spirit to his fellows.

Now he didn't revolt against the armed aggression of Rome, but he did feed the hungry of mind. Like Paul, we too can hear, "Lo I am with you always."

Perhaps our real job is to escape, as Moses of old did, the bondage of Egypt—the limiting thoughts of the modern Pharisee and the fears and doubts of the materialistic period in which we live. We need what Jesus called "the spirit of truth which would guide us into all truth"—away from the bewilderment of human experience—away from the alarms of the atomic age, to courage and competence and faith. Not the faith that is blind but the faith that will life us above the storms to a spiritual serenity such as John had when he said "Now are we the sons of God." That is what we need.

Our real job is to know even as the Wayshower knew that "in Him we live and move and have our being." God never deserts man. Man loses sight of Him by living empty lives and having empty hearts. We must, like Paul, after he had his experience on the way to Damascus claim our heirship. We are told that "Truth will make us free." It is our right to claim our heirship with the Almighty and to apply the truth that makes us free.

With faith we can destroy apathy and fear and assure ourselves of alertness and strength and confidence. "Where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty."

Paul counselled you and me to "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." He renewed his mind by casting out the old religious dogmas. He said, "Now is the time to awake out of sleep" and yet in his word to the Philippians he said "I count not myself to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth to those things which are before I press toward the mark of the pride of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

I have dwelt upon these spiritual truths because thinking on these things one becomes more competent and adequate to meet the problems that he is confronted with. I am sure that you who are leaders in your church, who are teachers of the word, recognize the significance of Paul's words when he said "Have that mind in you which was in Christ Jesus. Or to put it in another way "Have those thoughts, the spiritual food, the ideas that Jesus lived with and expressed."

Our real job then is simply a job of more prayer, more sharing, more setting of examples. It is always a task of forever understanding more of the great spirited truths.

I suggest again that now is the time for all of us here to "lift our drooping hands and strengthen our weak knees. * * * Let us strive for peace with all men and for that Holiness without which no one of us will see the Lord."

Fairbanks, Morse Raid Follows a Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, again I call attention to the situation facing a stable American business concern and the possible overthrow of its sound business management by outsiders, who knowing a sound institution when they see it, seek to gain control, for purposes of their own, and best known to themselves.

It is not a new story. It is repeating a familiar strategic campaign as shown by the following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, which appeared in that paper on January 20, 1956:

BROKERS' FAIRBANKS, MORSE DEALS—PATTERN OF A RAID

(By Leslie Gould)

The purchase of Fairbanks, Morse shares in brokers' and nominee names forms an interesting pattern—a pattern of a raid—a bold takeover attempt.

Across it there falls a shadow—that of Leopold D. Silberstein and his Penn-Texas Corp., his vehicle for a long list of company takeovers.

This column exclusively revealed a group was buying Fairbanks, Morse stock in a move similar to that attempted by Louis E. Wolfson against Montgomery Ward & Co. Silberstein was named in that column. He denied that he or Penn-Texas or any associated company had bought any Fairbanks, Morse stock, but said a block of 10 to 15 percent was available and had been offered to Penn-Texas.

Salt should be taken with this denial, for in it Silberstein "emphasized that under no circumstances will Penn-Texas engage in a proxy fight for control of Fairbanks, Morse & Co."

DEALINGS WITH DU PONT

That block of available stock coincides with an accumulation of now more than 15 percent of Fairbanks, Morse shares in recent months. Most of this stock has been bought or transferred to the name of one of the larger New York Stock Exchange houses—F. I. du Pont & Co.

Most of Silberstein's and his company's stocks dealings are with the du Pont brokerage firm. His son-in-law—Peter M. Cats—is assistant manager of the firm's Savoy-Plaza office on Fifth Avenue. Mr. Cats, a Dutch national before becoming a naturalized American, has been with the du Pont firm since 1941, with time out for 3½ years in the United States Army intelligence. He came out of service with a second lieutenant's reserve commission.

Fairbanks, Morse has 1,200,000 shares outstanding, and 30 percent are held by Robert Morse, Jr., the president, his father, and the Morse family. So, the situation is somewhat different than in Montgomery Ward, where management held only a small percentage interest, but won nevertheless over the raiders.

The du Pont firm holds in its name as of late last week, 132,878 Fairbanks shares; Egger & Co., the nominee for a Zurich bank, around 52,000; Charles Frederic & Co., another nominee, 21,000, and Sutro Bros. & Co., another Stock Exchange firm close to Silberstein, 23,350.

HALF SINCE SEPTEMBER

These total 229,228 shares, and of these 191,064 have appeared in the above firms' names since September.

For a congressional committee interested in these takeover attempts, these stock transfers would provide meat for an interesting study.

Here's the transfer pattern:

	Sept. 9, 1955	Nov. 9, 1955	Dec. 9, 1955	Dec. 30, 1955	Jan. 6, 1956	Jan. 12, 1956
Du Pont	36,464	97,072	86,997	111,186	120,111	132,878
Egger	None	13,000	40,200	40,200	40,200	[1] 52,000
Frederic	400	100	20,900	21,000	21,000	21,000
Sutro Bros	1,300	600	16,000	23,725	23,700	23,350
All brokers	305,214	343,731	373,762	391,383	398,353	397,000

[1] Egger report for Jan. 17, 1956.

Another Proxy Fight Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously stated I own no interest in Fairbanks, Morse & Co. My sole concern with their future welfare is based upon what might happen to one of their plants in my hometown where right at 1,000 fellow Kansas Citians are profitably employed. If the management is changed from that which has succeeded so well, no one can tell what the future holds for this plant, and others as well.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know Mr. Silberstein or of his management capabilities. But I do know many of those presently managing the corporation affairs. For that reason, and those above expressed, I trust no change will come about as the result of the proxy fight predicted in an article by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American in the issue of January 27, 1956, part of which follows:

SILBERSTEIN NOW ADMITS HE'LL FIGHT FOR FAIRBANKS

(By Leslie Gould)

It is now out in the open—no thanks to the SEC—that Leopold D. Silberstein and his Penn-Texas Corp. are out after control of

the $125 million Fairbanks, Morse & Co. There will be a proxy fight.

After denials, the Silberstein interests confirm this column's exclusive 3 weeks ago that he and the Penn-Texas were after this old line, well-heeled company, headquartered in Chicago.

Silberstein, 51, came to these shores 8 years ago from Europe, and has built up in that short space of time a small industrial empire by a series of rapid take-overs of a wide variety of companies.

When this column first reported the Silberstein moves, he denied either he or any of his companies were buying stock, although he admitted a block of 10 to 15 percent had been offered to Penn-Texas. In his denial he made a surprising statement that "under no circumstances will Penn-Texas engage in a proxy fight for control of Fairbanks, Morse & Co."

The "no proxy" fight statement goes out the window with the rest of his denial, for he now says that having acquired 100,000 shares and agreements to buy more, he will force his way onto the Fairbanks, Morse board. That means a proxy fight unless the present management, headed by Robert Morse, Jr., backs down.

REVEALS SPLIT IN FAMILY

The Silberstein confirmation contained one surprise. The 82-year-old uncle of Robert Morse—brother of his father, who is board chairman—is selling 15,000 Fairbanks shares to Silberstein and has optioned 27,500 additional shares. This would amount to about 3½ percent of the outstanding Fairbanks shares.

The Morse family held around 30 percent of the shares. This will be reduced by the uncle's defection, and will give the Silberstein group between 20 and 25 percent. Purchases exceeding 225,000 shares have been bought in recent months through two stock exchange firms and a Swiss bank long associated with Silberstein. Silberstein's son-in-law, Peter M. Cats, is assistant manager in the Savoy-Plaza office of one of these house—F. I. du Pont & Co.

While shocked at his aged uncle's deal, Robert Morse, Jr., has vowed to fight any takeover.

HELPED BY VOTING RULE

Under the Illinois law, where Fairbanks, Morse is incorporated, there is cumulative voting. In a proxy fight Silberstein could get two or three places on the board. There are 1,226,000 shares outstanding.

This looks like a repetition of the Montgomery Ward fight, where Louis E. Wolfson, although he got three places on the board, lost his bid for control. He just resigned as a Ward director, giving up the fight.

Increases in Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to criticize the President's communication on the Post Office and on postal rate raises released February 1, 1956.

While I am not convinced of the need for a postal rate raise, I am against an increase as recommended by the administration. The report of the Postmaster General requests legislation from Congress to raise postal rates of the little man. By this same program he seeks to raise rates on postal services which are already turning in a profit to the Treasury. It appears to be a payoff to the weekly periodicals, some of which, like Time, Life, and Fortune, are little better than house organs for the Republican Party.

The report starts out decrying the expense of the Post Office deficit in its first paragraph. Then some paragraphs further on, the Postmaster's report gets down to some of its really iniquitous aspects. It recommends the increase of first-class mail rates, the little man's mail, from 3 cents per ounce to 4 cents per ounce, or an increase of 25 percent. This increase is to take place at once, or immediately upon passage of the legislation authorizing it.

Now, it so happens that, from the latest information available, first-class mail, the kind most used by the little man, is a profitmaker for the Post Office. According to the deficit figures for the fiscal year 1955, it earned $63,327,680, yet the administration proposes to raise the rates to capture an additional $295 million.

Very piously the report states that 75 percent of the first-class mail is used by business and that the raise in rates will only cost the average family 12 cents per month. However, the administration's report does not say that by far the greatest portion of the little man's mail goes first class. Stated differently, the postal rate raise means that the little man will be taxed about one quarter of $295 million, or $73.75 million more for his mail, which already turns into the Treasury a profit.

In like manner, airmail rates are to go up 1 cent per ounce, from 6 cents per ounce to 7 cents per ounce. Airmail also turns into the Treasury a tidy profit, which was $3,598,035 during fiscal year 1955. Airmail might properly be called the poor man's telegram, since it will carry letters between many of the major cities overnight. The result is that the little man is again buffeted by the administration that raises rates on a service which benefits him, and which already turns in a profit. Now if airmail is so much in need of a rate hike to be profitable, why does the administration have 21,000 tons a year of first-class mail paid for at 3 cents an ounce carried by air, when airmail at 6 cents per ounce is unprofitable. (Washington Sunday Star, February 5, 1956, on p. A–28.)

On second-class mail, the administration proposes to increase rates, which are now about 2½ cents per pound, by 2 successive annual raises of 15 percent each. The handling cost of this mail was 11½ cents per pound prior to the last postal pay raise, and is presumably higher now. The first raise will be about $0.00375, or less than four-tenths of 1 cent per pound, to use the administration's own figure.

The rate after the first raise will then be approximately $0.02875 per pound. The handling cost to Uncle Sam will still be more than 11½ cents. The second annual rate raise will be about $0.0043125, or in round figures about $0.0043, making the charge $0.0331, or about 3.3 cents per pound, while it will still cost the Government more than 11½ cents to ship that same pound of second-class mail.

I want to lay special emphasis on the fact that this class of mail is used for the shipment of periodicals, such as Time, Life, and Fortune, whose publisher is powerful in the ranks of the Republican Party.

Note that these 2 raises on second-class mail will raise $17 million, while the raise on the first-class mail will bring in $295 million a year. And yet first-class mail brings into the Treasury a substantial profit.

There is proposed for third-class mail a raise amounting to 30 percent to bring in $77 million per annum. This is again a shifting of the burden to the little man. Such third-class mail is primarily advertising matter, and now has a deficit, or had in fiscal 1955 a deficit, of $147,187,173. Even the most optimistic cannot see how either the second- or third-class mail can be made to support itself under this plan. In the case of second-class mail there remains a deficit of over 7 cents for each pound shipped; in the case of third-class mail the deficit will at best only be cut in half.

The plan is obviously rotten, and cries to be defeated. I will vote to defeat it, and I know my colleagues will join me.

I herein insert a table showing some of the rates and losses which the periodicals cause by the rates as they stand, which I have taken from a statement by Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., of California, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, July 7, 1954, at page A9983 of the Appendix.

Itemized breakdown of the amounts of deficit occasioned in handling mail of 5 largest-circulation magazines and 5 largest-circulation newspapers

	Quarterly weight	Copies	Quarterly postage at present rate	Cost of handling	Quarterly loss	Annual loss
	Million pounds	*Millions*				
Magazines:						
Life	47.5	45.8	$1,273,000	$3,424,000	$2,151,000	$8,604,000
Saturday Evening Post	34.1	36.9	690,000	2,321,000	1,631,000	6,524,000
Ladies' Home Journal	10.2	7.7	215,000	623,000	408,000	1,632,000
Collier's	17.4	33.1	386,000	1,623,000	1,237,000	4,948,000
Reader's Digest	7.0	23.5	134,000	1,051,000	917,000	3,668,000
Newspapers:						
Chicago Tribune	5.9	9.8	154,000	601,000	447,000	1,788,000
New York Times	5.6	7.6	211,000	636,000	425,000	1,700,000
Detroit Free Press	.8	1.4	17,000	75,000	58,000	232,000
St. Louis Post Dispatch	1.7	2.6	37,000	150,000	113,000	452,000
Los Angeles Times	.5	.7	24,000	69,000	45,000	180,000

NOTE.—The above figures are based on mailings for the quarter ended Dec. 31, 1952. Postage paid has been adjusted for the 10 percent increase on Apr. 1, 1953. Costs are based on expenditures for the fiscal year 1952.

These figures are the latest I could find on a representative group of periodicals. Since all the cost estimates antedate the last postal-rate raise, the cost of subsidizing the large periodicals like Time, Life, and Fortune would be substantially higher today.

It is interesting to note that the figures of the Post Office for profit and deficit on the various classes of mail, usually released by this time of year, are not yet available. These would properly help us to determine the current cost to the Post Office of shipping the various classes of mail. The inference is clear that Mr. Summerfield would prefer not to have the figures showing while his rate raise is before the Congress.

The current edition of Life magazine, dated February 6, 1956, weighs 15½ ounces. Publishers of magazines of this kind are charged postage according to the amount of reading and advertising matter contained in the edition. Reading matter is $0.0195 per pound, and advertising matter is approximately $0.0475 per pound. This is based on certain zone rates. Figuring that there is about 50 percent reading and 50 percent advertising in this edition, the postage would be $0.0335 per pound, or approximately $0.0325 for this edition which weighs 15½ ounces. With the handling costs to the Post Office exceeding 11½ cents per pound, the uncompensated cost to the Government for the handling of each copy will be almost 8 cents. If an individual sent the same edition of Life, weighing 15½ ounces, it would cost him 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1 cent for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof, making the total cost 9 cents. Even under second-class-mail rates the little man is made to bear the larger part of the burden because of two different rates. Incidentally, there is a minimum charge for newspapers and magazines sent out under the second-class rate. In no instance can the charge per publication be less than one-eighth cent per publication. It is obvious that the handling costs are far in excess of this.

The answer is clear. If there must be a postal-rate raise, it will be one which puts all classes of mail, and all classes of mail users on the same footing. It will not be one which prefers one class of users over other classes of users.

Your Valley and Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an address by Brig. Gen. W. E. Potter, Missouri River division engineer, before the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis on February 6, 1956. General Potter's talk reveals a comprehensive understanding of the need for effective and coordinated development of our water resources.

The address follows:

YOUR VALLEY AND MINE

A geographic link of compelling importance binds together the people of the 23 States who are assembled here for the 37th annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association.

This bond of mutual interest which brings us together today is a mighty river system, third longest in the world, that affects the economic and social welfare of an inland empire stretching from the Appalachians to the Rockies. Its drainage area comprises nearly one-half the land encompassed within the continental United States, the home of some 75 million Americans.

From early colonial days through the formative period of the young Republic of the United States, the Mississippi River system was a strategic factor in our history. Three Old World nations—England, France, and Spain—struggled for dominance in this New World, a struggle in which the great inland waterways played a dramatic role. For who controlled the Mississippi controlled the destiny of the West.

Some two centuries and a dozen wars later, we find ourselves assembled here in St. Louis for a purpose which involves the Mississippi system as a dominant influence in the growth and economic stability of our region and the Nation, both today and for the future. True, the emphasis has changed. The river is secured to us as a factor of national entity and solidarity. But we still need the river as urgently as we did in the year 1775. For water today, as never before, is the lifeblood of our expanding national existence.

Let us face an undeniable fact at the outset. There is no room for complacency in our approach to regional and national water resources problems. We have begun to make some progress in the last decade. But we are still a long, long way from mastery of the vast resources of the Mississippi and its skein of tributaries. We are still a long, tough distance from control and use of our water resources not only in this great mid-American region, but over the country as a whole. There still remains a tremendous job of planning, coordination, and execution, a job in which your association and its counterparts in other river basins must shoulder a major citizen responsibility.

This great river on whose banks we meet today still rolls along to the sea with much of its potential for human good neglected and wasted. Out of its mouth each year flows an average of 435 million acre-feet of water. Translated into gallons this amounts to about 142 trillion gallons a year, which is almost 5½ times the amount of water used by industry in the United States every year. Out of the Missouri's mouth some 16 miles above this city flows an average of 60 million acre-feet of water annually, and it, too, until recent years has had only a meager part of its total value skimmed off in the service of people. The same can be said broadly of the Ohio, the Arkansas, the Kansas, and other tributaries of what the Indians called the Father of Waters.

The Chief of Engineers, General Sturgis, whom I have the honor to represent here today, has repeatedly warned that the Nation is rapidly approaching a water crisis. Some of you in attendance today from the Ohio Valley heard him make such a statement at the October meeting of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. This is what he said:

"The Nation's water supply problem is a most serious problem. In fact, I believe that this constantly growing, inexorable, nationwide demand for more and more water in face of constantly diminishing natural underground supply has now reached such proportions that the most critical single future water resources problem facing the Nation is that of providing an assured adequate supply of water for future domestic, industrial, and other needs."

Experience in recent years has shown that we cannot depend upon underground water for solution of the water supply problem. Already the rate of demand exceeds the rate of replenishment in many communities and this adverse ratio is likely to continue rather than diminish. This condition is even today having its detrimental effect upon industrial expansion and threatening to limit municipal growth in some localities. There is no cause for panic in this prospect if we but act wisely and expeditiously, if we recognize that more and more the Nation must look to surface water supply for the solution. But there is an inherent danger which we cannot overlook.

The trouble lies not in the amount of natural precipitation. Over the Nation on the average 30 inches of moisture falls every year. There has been no appreciable change in this average for more than 100 years. The average runoff in the United States is estimated at about 1,600 billion gallons daily. The total withdrawal of water in the Nation is estimated at 180 billion gallons daily. It is obvious, therefore, that the basic problem is one of conservation and distribution. It is not enough to plan and build river controls to stop floods, serve irrigation and navigation needs, and produce hydro power. We must include basic provision for water supply in our planning and development programs. I consider this vital to the whole problem of water control. I feel very strongly that in our future water resources development program, water storage for consumptive use must be recognized as an important part of comprehensive, multiple-purpose planning. Any revision of existing policy should, I am convinced, emphasize this concept in comprehensive, basinwide multipurpose planning and development.

Based on this approach let us examine the water problems in the Mississippi River Basin. This vast river network is made up of an intricate system of tributaries, your valleys and mine. Here we have probably as great diversity of water demand, climatic conditions and economic factors as are to be found anywhere in the country. We have areas of extremely low rainfall classified as arid or semiarid in the upper Missouri Basin where annual precipitation ranges from 8 to 14 inches. We have high water yield areas in the south and east part of the basin where rainfall is in the 40- to 50-inch range. We have extreme heat and extreme cold.

Our agricultural industry runs the gamut from small truck farms to great cattle and wheat ranches. We have populous industrial centers in the eastern part in some of which live more people than in the entire State of Montana or Wyoming or North Dakota or South Dakota. In the dry, sparsely settled ranch and wheat regions of the upper Great Plains, where precious water rights go with the land, the farms or ranches are measured in terms of sections rather than acres.

The types of economy differ widely over the basin, yet water supply is in many respects a common denominator. Each segment of the basin, regardless of its yearly rainfall pattern, is a contributor in some degree to the vital water yield of the region as a whole. Hence it is tied in with the broad basin water problems. The water produced on the eastern slopes of the Rockies in Montana and Wyoming is of vital concern to every State through which it passes down the Missouri and the lower Mississippi. The lower river cannot afford to look upon its segment of the river as something set apart for its own wholly selfish interests. Conversely, the upper tributary areas are not wholly independent and must consider lower basin needs.

There is, I think, an obvious analogy between the interdependence of the segment areas or tributary river basins which make up the Mississippi region as a whole, and the member basin organizations which are represented in this parent organization. I am sure you will agree that the membership in the Valley Association of affiliate tributary groups would be meaningless if such groups merely joined to foster local, selfish interests. Each group must accept a measure of basinwide interest and responsibility. Only in this way can true integration and effective coordination be carried on successfully.

Communities along the lower Mississippi depend upon the waters of the Missouri, upper Mississippi, Ohio, Illinois, Tennessee, Arkansas and other tributaries for vital water services. These include sufficient flows to accommodate an 80-million-ton navigation industry every year, and water for cities, industries and sanitation. The upper tributary areas, of course, have their own specific needs for water, an important one being irrigation which, over the Nation as a whole, uses an average of 88 billion gallons a day.

Obviously there are conflicts of interest over the available water supply, and they must be reconciled on a reasonable and equitable basis in order to insure the best service to all. This has been accomplished to a remarkable degree in the Missouri Basin where basinwide unity of purpose has been fostered and engendered by this and other organizations, the States and Federal agencies and the people. This spirit of unity and cooperation has guided the Missouri Basin program through 10 successful years of construction on probably the most unique program of the kind ever undertaken in the world.

This experience offers some excellent guideposts for comprehensive water resources development, though there are many problems yet unsolved. A quick look at where we are in the Missouri Basin will serve to exemplify the gains that can be made through unified action. Today the main stem of the Missouri from Glasgow, Mont., to Kansas City is substantially under control. This has been accomplished by integrated operation of four main stem dams which are now in full or partial service. They are the Fort Peck Dam in Montana, Garrison Dam in North Dakota, and Fort Randall and Gavins Point dams in South Dakota.

OMAHA WATER FLOW

This system of dams and reservoirs during the drought summer and fall months of 1955 when water demands were at their peak, supplied three-fourths of the flow in the Missouri River all the way from Yankton, S. Dak., down through Missouri. This was accomplished in face of an extremely low natural water yield which amounted to only about 60 percent of normal. The 2 million people who use the river for water supply to run their cities and industries, navigation and sanitation, experienced no shortage of supply. This stored water turned the turbines of 2 hydro powerplants which during the year produced 1,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy.

The dams and reservoirs in 1955 had the capacity to capture and control a record flood such as that of 1952 and reduce it to less than bankfull stages at Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, and other communities and agricultural areas along the river's course. The 4 operating reservoirs have a combined storage capacity of approximately 50 million acre-feet, which is roughly twice the average annual flow of the Missouri at Sioux City. This represents a major step toward control and conservation of a tremendous amount of this natural resource with which we are concerned today.

Without the main stem system of dams, which ultimately will be expanded to 6 16 million acre-feet of water would have passed out of the mouth of the Missouri last year with only a minimum of service to anyone—water wasted and lost. Instead, there is presently impounded in these projects over 13 million acre-feet of water, which will be put to beneficial use as needed in the months and years ahead. When all 6 dams are in operation their combined capacity will be over 73 million acre-feet, enough to carry through a drought period such as that of the 1930's for all the purposes of the basin program.

Notwithstanding these important gains, some of the major tributaries of the lower Missouri are as yet almost wholly uncontrolled. Adequate flood protection at Kansas City and on down the Missouri cannot be attained until these tributaries are similarly controlled by reservoirs, many of which are authorized, but lack the necessary local and area push to get them started. This means more waste of water and continued threat of disastrous floods.

Let us turn now to the upper Mississippi, a producer of a large annual supply of surface water runoff. How fully is this resource utilized? Since the middle 1930's a partial system of locks and dams has been built which has made possible a navigation industry amounting to some 15 million tons of commerce annually. It supplies water for the intakes of many cities and industrial plants. Yet a large part of the river's flow is not utilized to the full potential. Frequently the flow in the middle Mississippi falls so low that navigation is impeded and adequate channel depths aided only by flows from the Missouri, and each year's hydrograph shows important volumes wasted that conservation could have kept for later needs.

The Ohio is another major source of water supply only partially utilized. Its system of locks and dams facilitates a volume of 60 million tons of river commerce annually. It is the principal source of water supply for a highly industrialized region. Today the Ohio is barely able to meet the demands of a great and growing industrial component with the help of upstream reservoirs. Industries in the city of Youngstown, Ohio, for example, use an estimated 1½ billion gallons of water a day, and on some occasions this demand has exceeded the flow of the Mahoning River, the chief source of supply, by 14 times. Upstream reservoirs so far are doing all they can to protect the present scale of development, but the situation is not good, and a solution must be found for this industrial empire.

Even now other industrial areas along the Ohio Valley are feeling the pinch of water shortages, and this in a region of favored rainfall. Year in and year out enough moisture falls in the Ohio Valley to meet all the foreseeable water needs of the future. But much of it is wasted in floods and high-water periods because there are insufficient storage facilities to hold it where needed. Topographically, the Ohio Basin has many excellent storage sites, and it has a number of authorized reservoir projects. They constitute a part of the backlog of authorized but static projects to which I have referred.

Those of you who live in the Ohio Valley know that your industrial giant has by no means reached full stature. It was in your valley that the first big effects of industrial decentralization took place. This is still continuing, as witness the reports showing that 2,500 new industries located along the Ohio since World War II. I am sure the people of that region do not intend to lose their favorable industrial position through failure to provide for one of its basic requirements—water. The situation is soluble—technically, the solution is simple—but whether the time exists is questionable. The demands that growing industry will continue to throw on the Ohio Valley will continue to inconvenience, if not actually stifle, the major communities until the reservoirs are provided which will do the double duty of flood protection and water supply. You solved your pollution problems after years of effort; you can solve this problem.

The Arkansas-White Basin is another important component of the overall water resources program in the Mississippi Basin. It presents another contrasting problem of semiarid sections in the upper reaches and ample precipitation at the lower end. Definite progress is being made there on a planned, comprehensive program in which all the needs of water must be carefully evaluated if that basin is to play its essential role in fulfilling the needs of the future. Perhaps no other tributary presents quite such a diversity of problems which must be largely solved within the basin itself. Great progress has taken place in the lower basin, monumented by the names of such projects as Bull Shoals, Norfork, Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, and others, but the remaining works, planned but not yet underway, are required items for continued success in meeting the demands of a blooming economy. The Arkansas-White-Red studies are not an end; they should be the stimuli for greater effort of all interests and a dedication to a task that will involve more than this generation.

The Red is similar to the Arkansas in its drainage of widely varying climate and rainfall conditions. Its problems are vital and need the continued drive that is so evident there now. Progress in the lower basin, I believe, can well be credited to the positive goals set up by a united organization. Texarkana and Bayou Bodcau are monuments to their efforts. They emphasize the importance of organization in achieving success.

Recent events have greatly accentuated the vital role the Illinois River holds in our developing inland waterway. It is the connecting link between the Mississippi complex and the Great Lakes. Already an important carrier of waterborne commerce feeding into the Mid-West from Chicago, its potential for the future has been enormously magnified by two new developments with which you are all familiar—the initiation of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the Calumet-Sag Canal.

These two developments, long delayed by sectional struggles, afford a classic example of the effects of lack of unity in arriving at a common goal of a greater Mississippi Basin.

The St. Lawrence project will bring ocean ports for world commerce some 800 miles close to mid-America. The two projects hold promise of breaking down the costly barriers of transportation cost differentials which have impeded development of the Mid-West. World commerce will be enabled to move into a number of Great Lakes ports such as Chicago, Duluth, Cincinnati, Buffalo, and others. The Calumet-Sag development will enable world goods to move by water, rail, and truck into our valley on a competitive basis with eastern seaboard industrial areas.

But this better competitive position is, in my mind, but a small part of the total achievement essential to providing a place for industrial expansion and population growth. Failure to provide these two channels would have forced expansion in already over-crowded areas outside our basin, to the great detriment of our national security and the economic health of our population.

I venture the further suggestion that these new developments may well be of great value in helping the United States in its fight to maintain a sound position in competitive world commerce. And I can foresee the possibility of Chicago and New Orleans becoming the future biggest ports in the Nation, with St. Louis sitting here as the focus of valley expansion. Such accomplishments will not be realized as a sequence of natural events. They will come only through imaginative, forceful and aggressive action. They will not materialize if our approach is from the selfish, local viewpoint

or if we lean solely upon the Federal Government for our thinking, planning, and unification of purpose.

There must, of course, be a measure of local approach to local water problems, but we must recognize that very few problems in water development can be solved in a local neighborhood. There is no such thing as a local navigation problem or a flood problem or a water supply problem that can be solved on an item basis. By and large our water resource for most dependable use in the Mississippi Basin is an interstate resource flowing in rivers which belong to all the people.

The course of progress, as we all have learned by sad experience, never runs smoothly. I want to say here that I think your organization can take considerable pride in the way it has solved some of its own internal problems in the last 3 years. It is to your great credit that you have been able to eliminate some elements of distrust and disorganization, and I think this is largely because you have recognized that integration, not sectionalism, is essential to your best contributions in this highly important field of water resources. This is evidenced by your policy of officer rotation and your insistence upon broad representation of all parts of the basin. I believe you are stronger and more ready to do a task that requires the existence of this group.

I did not conceive it within my province here today to specifically discuss national water resources policy, except to advance my own conviction that provision for water supply should be a specific function of Federal water resources development. Present laws do not make such provision. Although many reservoir projects of the Corps of Engineers throughout the country contribute substantially to water supply, such benefits are largely incidental to other primary, authorized functions.

It is my firm conviction that the reservoirs of the future should—not incidentally, but through deliberate, scientific planning and design—play increasing roles in the conservation of adequate water supply for the future. We of the Corps of Engineers believe that the time has come when no storage reservoir should be built by any agency, Federal or non-Federal, without appropriate provisions for inclusion of storage for the various needs of water supply.

To this I may add that I have a further conviction. It is that any developments for streamflow regulation by reservoirs, whether they be in the upper headwaters or on the main stream, should fit into and constitute part of an integral plan for the best interests of the entire stream basin. This means that upstream and downstream plans must be fully and carefully coordinated, not planned and built piecemeal.

And this leads to some final observations on the functions of public organizations such as yours which are devoted to the sound and effective use of our water resources. Stay broad in your thinking, planning and action; stay practical and work for integration of effort. Take an affirmative and constructive interest in the national study of warter policy. Your most important resource is at stake and its best use cannot be determined unless you do assess your interests and see that they are fully provided for in the determination of policy as it grows and expands with our Nation.

I think it must be obvious to all who have an interest in these problems that long-range planning, coordination and integration are basic ingredients for prevention of the tragic waste of the past, and positive action to meet the demands of a great and growing nation.

The alternative to such wise foresight and planning is written in the books of history which recount the story of ancient civilizations which have long since disappeared from the face of the earth.

Navaho Tribe Supports Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Navaho Indian Tribe strongly supports the Colorado River storage project because of immediate, direct, and future benefits that this project will bring to the tribe. An effort has been made to belittle these benefits and to discount the support of the Navahos. Any confusion in the minds of Congressmen may be due to the nature of the Navaho projects. There are two developments proposed that would be of ultimate benefit to the Navahos: First, Navaho Dam, a mainstream storage unit on the San Juan River in northern New Mexico; and, second, Navaho irrigation project, which puts the water to use on land to be irrigated and farmed by members of the tribe.

The Navaho Dam has been thoroughly studied and found feasible. It is included in H. R. 3383, and as part of the Colorado River storage project, it is reimbursable and financially sound.

The Navaho irrigation project, which will provide irrigation to Indians as well as non-Indians, will be submitted to Congress at the proper time with firm engineering feasibility reports, for firm authorization. We have confidence, of course, that those reports when prepared will show feasibility and that Congress will authorize them. The water on the San Juan must be harnessed, controlled, and used. A part of it belongs to the Indians and no Congress is going to take it away from them.

In the meantime, the Navaho Dam will give definite aid to the Navaho Tribe as soon as it is constructed. For one thing, it will provide flood control. It also will control silt in the muddiest river in the Nation. It will provide for mineral development of certain areas of the Navaho Reservation, rich in raw materials but lacking the water and power for their development. This dam will open the door for industrial progress for the Navahos, and it is necessary to make possible the second phase of the Navaho development, the irrigation project.

I am informed that one company has plans to construct a major raw materials processing plant on the reservation. Leases have been signed and everything is ready to move ahead if the river can be regulated and a year-round flow provided. This one contemplated addition to the tribal economy is expected to provide jobs for as many as 1,000 people. That will be a very great and material aid for the Navahos. This is just one example.

To show how the Navahos feel about H. R. 3383, which includes the Navaho Dam, I have asked unanimous consent to place in the RECORD this telegram received from Paul Jones, a farsighted Navaho who is chairman of the Navaho Tribal Council, its chief. The telegram reads as follows:

Regret misinformed people say benefits from present Colorado River storage project are negligible without Navaho irrigation project. Present bill includes Navaho Dam, and this will help provide immediate and direct benefit by making possible the development of our resources, flood control, river regulation, and the establishment of new industries to provide jobs. We fully support the project.

PAUL JONES,
Chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

Michigan's Houghton Lake Is Ice Fisherman's Bluegill Heaven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, national attention has recently been focused on Houghton Lake, Mich., located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, as the result of several magazine articles on the fruitful ice fishing sport at this lake.

Houghton Lake is situated in Roscommon County at the community by the same name, and is famous for its summer and winter catches of bluegills, northern and walleyed pike, perch, and rock bass.

East winter fishermen swarm to this lake to enjoy fishing through the ice. They come not only from Michigan but from surrounding States. A few days ago Houghton Lake observed its annual Tipuptown festival and over 10,000 ice fishermen and winter vacationers attended the event.

The February issue of the Ford Times contains an article calling Houghton Lake the bluegill heaven and says "Houghton Lake is Michigan's largest lake and its most prolific fishpond."

A splendid word picture of the pleasures of Houghton Lake ice fishing is contained in the January-February edition of the Lincoln-Mercury Times. In this article entitled "Houghton Lake—Michigan Calls It the Bluegill Champ," Franklin M. Reck carries the reader among the numerous small communities of fish shanties and shelters on the lake to his favorite spot and describes the sport of "tipup" fishing.

I am pleased to present the article to my colleagues and invite you to come to the 10th Congressional District of Michigan, either winter or summer, to enjoy the glories of our great out of doors.

The article follows:

HOUGHTON LAKE: MICHIGAN CALLS IT THE BLUEGILL CHAMP

(By Franklin M. Reck)

A favorite occupation of almost any chamber of commerce in the north temperate Midwest is to claim the best bluegill lake in the United States. You'll find title claimants in most of the Corn Belt States and several southern sommonwealths, where bluegills are called bream.

Michigan looks on all the ballyhood with tolerance. She will readily admit the excellence of Wisconsin's Lake Geneva, the copious and sustained yields of Ohio's pay lakes and the unbelievable fertility of Alabama's manmade ponds. These bodies of water affect Michigan not at all, for Michigan has Houghton, and Houghton, she says, is the champ.

A champion ought to have some size to him, and Houghton Lake is big. It's the largest lake in Michigan. If you stand on the shore of East Bay and look northwest, you're gazing across 15 miles of water. If you go over to the Heights and direct your eyes across the lake's bulging waistline you're looking at a 4-mile span.

LAKE MADE FOR FISHING

The lake was made for fishing. Its greatest known depth is a mere 19 feet. Its vast area is splotched with weedbeds—South Shore, Muddy Bay, Middle Ground, king-size weedbeds a mile long. Most of the fishing goes on around the edges of these submarine farms in 8 feet of water.

There's no closed season on the obliging and prolific bluegill, and the fishing is likely to be good at any time of the year, but enthusiasm mounts when ice forms in December and the bluegill craze becomes a raging epidemic during the Tipuptown Festival in late January or early February.

Fishing during the festival—or for that matter on any sunny winter weekend—is a neighborly, congenial business. It could hardly be otherwise with as many as 3,000 men, women, and children out on the ice. Last winter this reporter had driven less than 50 yards down the wandering "street" of the South Shore shanty town when he was offered refreshment by a total stranger and asked to take the tenor part of "I Had a Dream, Dear." Everyone knows everyone on the ice.

A CITY ON LAKE OF ICE

When the fisherman arrives at Houghton Lake, he drives first to one of the numerous and well-stocked tackle shops that line the highway between the Heights and Prudenville. Here he picks up wigglers (larvae of the mayfly) and waxworms for bluegills, plus a pail of minnows for walleyes and northern pike. Then he drives down any one of the resort streets leading to the lake's edge and takes off onto Michigan's frozen inland sea.

There's no danger of getting stuck in the snow. The scrapers have been out, clearing ice-paved roadways to the various colonies. The wise fisherman doesn't spud a hole at the edge of the first concentration he comes to.

Instead he drives slowly along, carefully noting the scene, biding his time. Entirely apart from the strategy involved, this is entertaining business. Some of the parties are hidden in shanties. Others are fishing from the open doors of their sedans, the cars serving as windbreaks. The standard device of the open-air fisherman is a box open at the front. In the box is a lantern, burning merrily away. The fisherman sits on the box, his big coat draped over it, so that the heat from the lantern filters upward inside his clothes. He keeps minnows inside the box where they won't freeze.

Motor scooters go by, dragging sleds. A jalopy careens over the ice, pulling an old-fashioned sleigh behind it. A strange rig on skis powered by an airplane propeller scorns the cleared roads, heading straight from one weedbed to another over the deep snow. Here and there vans and trucks converted into traveling restaurants are dispensing coffee, hamburgers, and chili to frostbitten fishermen. The frigid breeze faintly bears the notes of the latest hit parade tune from some distant loudspeaker. The driver reads the license plates—Ohio, Illinois, Indiana—each a tribute to Houghton's preeminence as the bluegill mecca of the Nation.

But he's interested in something besides license plates and the carnival spirit. What he seeks as he drives along is evidence that fish are present.

When he comes to a spot where a fisherman is hauling them in and the pile of fish on the ice is impressive, he stops the car and spuds a hole not 10 feet from the lucky fisherman.

VARIETY OF SHELTERS

This is known as "spudding the man in," and the victim raises no objection. In fact, he welcomes you. Like all Houghton veterans, he believes that the more baits lowered in that vicinity, the more fish will be attracted to the spot, either by hunger or curiosity.

Last winter, we cruised for 5 or 6 miles over the south shore weedbed without finding any exciting action. We drove over to the middle ground weedbed, found a couple of fishermen doing a hand-over-hand business, "spudded them in," and in about 2 hours the 4 of us had our 60 bluegills. The next day we went out to the same spot and caught 60 more.

On the second day the temperature dropped and we had a good chance to try out Bill Moss' pop tent. This unique shelter is a dome-shaped tent with Fiberglas ribs that opens out something like a Japanese lantern. It can be erected in less than a minute and is large enough to accommodate two ice fishermen. We kept the interior warm with cans of Sterno. Each can lasted an hour and provided enough radiation to keep the interior snugly warm.

"FLAG UP" MEANS FISH

The ambitious fisherman usually tends 2 or 3 bluegills and a couple of tipups. He has trouble watching all this, but his neighbors are glad to help by yelling out "Flag up" whenever a tipup rig is tripped by a pike or walleye, allowing the small flag to spring erect. Then, for a moment, the fisherman abandons his bluegill fishing to haul in a big fish—or a bare hook.

Ice fishing at Houghton Lake lasts from early December to late March. There isn't much doing in early spring, but in June when the bluegills are on their beds in shallow water, fly-fishermen have a brief circus with light rods, trout flies, and small popping bugs.

When the fisherman finds that he has his limit in 2 hours and wonders what to do with his time, he can entertain himself by driving around the lake. The entire south shore is one continuous main street bordered by resorts, restaurants, motels, and shops. The sandy beaches make this shore one of the most popular summer vacation centers in Michigan.

Over on the northwest, where the Muskegon River begins in a 5-mile backwater, is the Dead Stream Swamp, 193,000 acres of cedar and oak, a fine refuge for bear, beaver, partridge, bobcats, and innumerable deer.

WILDLIFE AT ITS BEST

Here the wildlife photographer goes to get closeups of deer, but before he sets up his blind, he would do well to listen to one of the guides. This guide claims that city folks smell different from the "cedar savages" who live thereabouts. The cedar savages smell just like the woods, and the deer are less likely to take fright—so he says.

"If you put up a tent for a blind, let it air out for a couple of days to get the city smell out of it. Air yourself out, too. Then get in there with your camera and the deer will come right up to you."

Houghton Lake is a contradiction. It is one of the most heavily populated resorts in the State. At the same time it is one of the State's wildest regions, its woods and swamps teeming with the game that was here before the white man came.

All this adds to its attraction. But it is the bluegill—big, fat, and apparently unlimited in supply—that brings people from a half dozen States to Michigan's heavyweight champion year after year.

The Food and Drug Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1956, will be the 50th anniversary of the enactment of an important Federal law, which embraces every family in the Nation, to assure them pure food, effective drugs, safe cosmetics, and related protection at less than the cost of a postage stamp per person.

The Food and Drug Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has the principal job of enforcing the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to insure that foods, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics are pure and wholesome, safe to use, made under sanitary conditions, and truthfully labeled.

The annual retail value of domestic and imported products subject to statutes enforced by the Food and Drug Administration is currently estimated at $65 billion. These products are consumed each year by a sharply increasing population who are spending an average of 25 percent of its personal disposable income for food alone.

The importance of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to the public health and safety is great. The last few decades have seen an extensive revolution in the production and distribution of foods and drugs in this country.

The need for increasing the resources of the Food and Drug Administration was recognized and authorized by the President and the Congress in the 1956 Appropriation Act.

Upon request of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the President, the Congress acted favorably upon a request to establist a Citizens Advisory Committee to study the Food and Drug Administration. The committee appointed were indeed a broad-gaged, non-partisan group of citizens with varying degrees of familiarity with food and drug work, including representatives of consumers, industry, labor, educational institutions, medicine, law, and the judiciary.

The committee focused attention upon long-term objectives of how best to administer the food, drug, and cosmetic laws to reach the maximum compliance in the best interest of the public. In its major recommendations the committee stated that:

1. Compliance with all phases of the law is not completely satisfactory.

2. Satisfactory compliance can be obtained only if the Federal Food and Drug Administration and its functions are properly understood, supported, financed, and staffed.

3. The committee is firmly of the opinion

that (a) the scope and complexity of the present enforcement and regulatory problems, if dealt with inadequately, constitute a threat to the health and the welfare of our citizens; and (b) that the resources of the FDA are woefully inadequate to discharge its present responsibilities.

With the fiscal year 1956 as the base from which an expansion must be launched to implement the recommendations in the committee report, the President's budget estimate for fiscal year 1957 is the first major step in a program to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration and provide the staff and facilities needed to attain the objectives envisioned by the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Food and Drug Administration to properly serve a purpose that is essential to the health and welfare of every person in the Nation.

United States Policy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the issuance yesterday of a joint declaration on the Near East by a number of Republican and Democrat Members of this body, a call to action has been made which I believe to be of profound significance.

As a signatory of this joint declaration, I would like to take this opportunity to state in detail the reasons why I support the substance of this message and the action which it urges to promote the self-defense of Israel.

It is impossible to understand the basis of the present tensions in the Near East without a proper historical perspective. For, in a very real sense, the hostile feelings which exist between the Arab peoples and the Jewish inhabitants of Israel can be traced to early Biblical times when Jews inhabited the regions of Palestine, with Jerusalem as their capital and Holy City. By the second century A. D., after years of revolt against Roman domination, Jewish resistance was crushed, Jerusalem destroyed, and the Jewish people dispersed throughout the Near and Middle East, the Mediterranean region, and later throughout the world. From that time until 1948, Palestine passed from one conqueror to another.

During World War I, when Britain defeated the Turks, Palestine fell under British military control. In 1917 the British Government issued the Balfour Declaration which stated that the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was looked upon favorably. The ambiguous wording of the declaration has lent itself to many interpretations, but the Zionists acted upon the assumption that the Balfour Declaration was a promise of a political as well as a spiritual homeland for the Jewish people.

In 1918 Palestine had a total population of 700,000—with Arabs outnumbering Jews 10 to 1. Between World War I and World War II, especially under the impetus of nazism, immigration swelled the number of Jews to 700,000, and by 1938, the ratio of Arabs to Jews had declined to 2 to 1.

In the 1930's, Arab fears and resentment, spurred by awakening nationalism, exploded in a series of rebellions. To curb the unrest, the British issued the White Paper of 1939 which rejected the idea of a Jewish state, put a stop to Jewish land purchases, and stipulated that after 5 years, further Jewish immigration would depend on Arab agreement. The Jews bitterly protested the White Paper, but the whole question was put in abeyance when World War II broke out.

At the end of the European conflict, Britain was caught between her interests in the Arab world and the question of what to do with the Jewish refugees. In 1946, President Truman issued a statement noting "that substantial immigration into Palestine cannot wait a solution to the Palestine problem and that it should begin at once." He mentioned 100,000 immigrants, and stated that the United States would lend its financial assistance in moving them. The Arabs, of course, opposed the suggestion, and the Secretary of the Arab higher committee, representing the Palestinian Arabs, threatened to ask the Arab League to sever all economic, cultural and diplomatic relations with the United States, revoke all oil and other concessions, and boycott American colleges if the plan was acted upon.

The British, on October 18, 1946, refused to grant any increase in the legal Jewish immigration quota into Palestine. Armed Jewish terrorist activities against the British stationed in Palestine became deadly frequent. Early in 1947, Britain presented the case to the United Nations. On November 29, 1947, 7 months later, the General Assembly voted 33 to 13—10 abstentions—for a partition plan creating an Arab state of 4,500 square miles and a Jewish state of 5,500 square miles, and an international regime for Jerusalem. The Soviet Union and the United States both supported the plan; Great Britain abstained from voting. The British were to withdraw their troops by August 1, 1948, while the 3 new entities were to come into being on October 1, 1948.

Upon announcement of the U. N. vote, heavy Arab-Jewish fighting broke out in Palestine. The United Nations-Palestine Commission, on February 16, 1948, reported the situation to the Security Council as follows:

> Powerful Arab interests, both inside and outside Palestine, are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged therein.

Britain, which as a mandatory power was still responsible for law and order, informed the U. N. that it would take no direct action—such as the use of military force—in implementing the partition plan. The U. N. Security Council deemed that it had no authority to enforce the plan, and thereafter armed affrays and acts of terrorism became commonplace in Palestine.

On May 14, 1948, Britain terminated its mandate, and the same day the Jews of Palestine proclaimed the independence of the State of Israel. Although boundaries were not specified, the Jewish-held areas corresponded almost exactly to the partition plan approved by the U. N. Within 1 hour after the independence proclamation, President Truman announced that the United States recognized Israel's provisional government. Soviet recognition followed 3 days later. The following day, armies of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan invaded the new State.

Between May 1948 and March 1949, hostilities between Israel and the Arab States went on intermittently. Efforts of the U. N. mediators to bring about peace were rewarded when negotiations between the 2 sides culminated in early 1949 in a series of armistice agreements between Israel, on the 1 hand, and the Arab States directly concerned, on the other.

The armistice terms greatly revised the U. N. partition plan. The proposed Arab State disappeared; the Arab countries received about 2,000 square miles of land formerly in mandatory Palestine, and Israel got a major portion of the Negev Desert, territory that had not been allotted to it under the partition plan. Control of Jerusalem was divided between Israel and Jordan. On May 11, 1949, Israel won admission to the United Nations by a 37 to 12 vote. As on the vote for partition, Britain abstained, while the United States and the Soviet Union approved.

The armistice agreements and the admittance of Israel into the family of nations did not, however, end the turmoil in the Middle East. If anything, the creation of Israel gave rise to new tensions. The problem of more than 800,000 Arabs who fled Palestine is a principal sore spot. Two hundred thousand now live in conditions close to destitution in Egypt's Gaza strip within sight of their former homes. Over 450,000 are in Jordan, the only Arab country which has offered the refugees citizenship but whose economy is so poor that it has proved difficult to absorb the newcomers. Syria and Lebanon also have sizable numbers of Palestine refugees.

Israel has offered the refugees compensation for their land but has refused to accept the return of the embittered and hostile Arabs who, it is argued, would be a security risk to the new nation. The Arabs are insisting on repatriation as a first step toward permanent peace with Israel.

A second troublesome problem has grown out of the haphazard delineation of boundary lines under the armistice agreements. The Arab States now maintain that the boundaries must be settled on the basis of the 1947 partition plan, which would deprive Israel of the Negev, almost one-third of her present territory. Israel, on the other hand, while it agrees that certain boundary rectifications of slight nature the justified, holds that the 1949 armistice lines should be the basis for peace negotiations since it was the Arab States themselves that went to war for the specific reason of destroying the

partition plan. Great Britain, France, and the United States, in what is now known as the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, are pledged to guarantee the present frontiers and armistice lines against forceful violations.

In the past 7 years, border clashes have been frequent. Israel claims to have had 1,100 citizens wounded or murdered, and has adopted a policy of retaliation for the raids, claiming that Jordan, Syria, and Egypt have the responsibility for controlling their citizens. The United Nations, however, has harshly censured Israel for its calculated attacks on Kibya, and more recently, for the raid into Syria near the Sea of Galilee.

Israeli officials feel that Arab determination to wipe out the new state has never abated. The purchase of arms last September by Egypt from Communist sources has added to Israel's uneasiness. On the other hand, competent observers of the Middle East say that there is a very real fear among the Arabs that if Israel continues to permit unlimited Jewish immigration, one day Israel will be compelled to expand territorially.

At the outset, the United States tangibly demonstrated its friendship for Israel by a loan in 1949 of $100 million from the Export-Import Bank. In 1951 a second loan of $35 million was granted. In addition to the loans, United States grants-in-aid, from the first grant approved in 1951 through June 30, 1955, have totaled well over $200 million.

In spite of the sizable economic aid of the last few years, Israeli officials since 1953 have been worried by United States policy in the Middle East.

Israel's Ambassador to the United States, Abba Eban, has attributed the gravity of American-Israel relations to "not so much a difference of opinion about American policy toward Israel, as a clash of judgment on American policy toward the Arab States." American policy makers, viewing with dread the possible loss of Middle East oil, communications, and bases to the Soviet orbit, have sought to maintain Western security in the Middle East through friendship with the Arabs as well as with Israel. However, the policy pursued by the United States is viewed in Israel as a threat to their security. The United States decision to arm Iraq set off vigorous protests from Israelis who asserted that even with the weapons Iraq could not stand up against a single Russian division, while on the other hand the weapons would be weighty if turned against Israel.

It is against this background, Mr. Speaker, that United States policy must be measured. Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole." At the same time, we emphasized that an arms race between the Arab States and Israel should not be permitted to develop and, together with Great Britain and France, we expressed our readiness to take action to prevent violations of the frontier lines established with the armistice of 1949.

Since that time, United States policy has repeatedly been described as being based on the fundamental principle of sympathetic and impartial friendship for all states in the Near East.

In a major policy statement of August 26, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles indicated certain steps which the United States would be prepared to take to contribute toward a solution of the Arab-Israel dispute. With reference to the question of a security guaranty, Secretary Dulles said that—

> Given a solution of other related problems, he (President Eisenhower) would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, this statement was, and continues to be, meaningless because one of the "other related problems" which would have to be solved as a condition to the United States security guaranty is Arab-Israeli agreement upon their borders.

The unhappy fact of the matter is that recent United States policy has done nothing to relieve tensions in the Near and Middle East, nor has it been successful, in any significant measure, in meeting the ghastly threat of all-out violence in that area—violence which may well spread to other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned because our policy of "impartiality" has not yet been clearly defined. It is important for us to state, for example, whether our Nation is prepared to support the present armistice lines or the U. N. Partition of 1947, or some compromise between them, as a basis for discussion.

The core of the problem for our country, Mr. Speaker, lies not in the Near East but here in the United States. We can make a real contribution only if we face the problem here—and this is a responsibility and a challenge which the administration and Congress must face up to.

Mr. Speaker, positive action is essential if we are to halt the drift toward war in the Near East. We must face the fact that the West is no longer able to curb an arms race in this area, as it has been successful in doing for more than 5 years. The reasons are clear. Moscow has become active; British troops are gone from the Suez Canal, and Britain's adherence to the Turco-Iraqi Pact has amounted to taking sides as between Arab League members. In short, the guaranties of moderation which have existed for nearly 5 years with some effectiveness have now vanished. The choices of policy now open to Western diplomats are narrow and none are attractive. The leapfrog move of the Soviets into the Middle East has made it clear that they intend to continue arming the Arab nations unless we scuttle our "northern tier" alliances with the nations along the southern border of the Soviet Union. Yet, if matters are allowed to ride, in the hope that time alone will prove the insincerity of Soviet promises, we run the high risk that in this interim period there will be an outbreak of fighting which, at the very least, would involve all the nations in the Middle East area.

Mr. Speaker, the joint declaration in which I joined with my Democrat and Republican colleagues includes the request that Israel be permitted to purchase $50 million of defensive arms which she needs for purposes of self-defense. I am sure that no one who signed this declaration believes for a moment that any long-range or permanent solution will evolve from the arming of Israel. Nor do I believe that there was any general feeling among us that this measure would, in any sense, reduce the present tensions which exist in the Near East.

The conviction, I believe, was that the sale of arms to Israel at this time is essential to the "internal security and legitimate self-defense" of that nation, and that the present threat of war will thereby—at least for a short period—be mitigated rather than increased.

It is not my purpose today to speak in a vein which is either pro-Israel or pro-Arab. Certainly, the best that any of us can do is to explore policies which have some promise of being propeace. However, I think that it can be stated accurately that no nation on earth today faces a more difficult geopolitical situation that does the nation of Israel.

With a population of only 1,600,000 and a territory of only 8,000 square miles, this tiny oasis of democracy is surrounded by hostile neighbors—Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon—with a total population of about 40 million and a total territory in excess of 1 million square miles. The Arab States have taken full advantage of Israel's geographical helplessness by blockading the country completely on land and as completely as they can manage by sea; Israel's ships are barred not only from the Suez Canal, but even from the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel's outlet to the Red Sea.

Can there be any question whether a weak and defenseless Israel can long survive these perilous circumstances? Surely not; and in 1950 our Government recognized this fact when, together with Great Britain and France, it entered into the Tripartite Declaration with recognized the necessity for Israel as well as the Arab States to maintain a certain level of armed forces.

Today, that need is all the more apparent and must again be acknowledged by positive declaration and action by this country.

We must face the fact that the realities of the situation in the Near East are not what they were a year ago. Soviet influence is now firmly established in Egypt which relies on the Communist bloc not only for arms, but as the main market for exports and as the source for economic aid and technical assistance. It is not by chance that Egypt's Nasser recently remarked that the arms deal alone "was worth more than a quarter of a billion dollars in propaganda to Soviet leaders."

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that nothing, now, can keep Russian Embassies and emissaries out of the Near or Middle East, and that it is wisest to enlist them, as soon and as publicly as possible, in the ranks of those who do not want a second Palestine war. We must make it unmistakably clear that our

policy of selling arms to Israel is designed only as a short-range measure to preserve a tenuous peace; and that the lang-range task of reducing tensions and establishing a stable and permanent peace can only be accomplished by patient, but persistent, negotiation of the complex problems which as yet have found no solution.

Finally—and above all—we must assert positive leadership to dispel the paralyzing fear which grips the Middle East today. Opportunities for peace are precious because they are only momentary; they must be taken by free people with courage and conviction.

EIGHTY-SIX DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSMEN ISSUE JOINT DECLARATION REQUESTING ARMS FOR ISRAEL

Eighty-six Democratic Members of the House of Representatives joined today in a declaration calling upon the Government to permit Israel to purchase defensive arms in the United States.

Pointing out the dangers to Israel and the free world resulting from the Egyptian purchase of arms from Czechoslovakia, the Congressmen called for decisive action by the United States to end the threat of war in the Near East through the promotion of "an honorable peace settlement" between the parties.

They proposed that the United States and other interested nations seek to negotiate "formal treaties within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations in the Near East that want peace and are ready to enter into such treaties."

However, in the absence of agreement by the Arab nationos to sit down at the peace table, there is the present danger of a major outbreak of hostilities, the Congressmen warned.

Accordingly, they proposed "that our Government permit Israel to purchase the $50 million of defensive arms which she seeks in this country strictly for purposes of self-defense."

They noted that "Israel is firmly a part of the free world and she may be counted upon not only to defend herself, but also to join in the defense of the free world."

While expressing opposition to an arms race in the Near East, the Congressmen asserted their belief that Israel's military capability for self-defense must be maintained.

"We believe the danger of war will be seriously increased if the Arab nations attain a military preponderance capable of use for aggression because of the Communist initiative," they declared.

At the same time they urged continued United States economic and technical assistance to the area and help in resettling the Palestine-Arab refugees "with impartial friendship to all in the Near East who will cooperate for peace."

They also expressed opposition to proposals that Israel be asked to yield territory to the Arab states, which they termed "the road to appeasement, not the road to peace."

The full text of the declaration and the names of the signers follow.

DECLARATION ON THE NEAR EAST

Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of Armed Forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole."

Communist weapons and technicians are now pouring into the Near East as a result of the Egyptian-Czech arms deal, imperiling the stability and peace of the region and weakening the defenses of the free world.

The Egyptian-Czech arms deal brings the front of the cold war to the Egyptian-Israel frontier, and the survival of Israel is directly and immediately menaced.

It is vital that our Government act decisively to end the threat of war in the Near East. The best way to do this is, of course, to promote an honorable peace settlement between the parties. To that end we urge that our Government and other interested nations seek by all possible means to negotiate formal treaties within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations in the Near East that want peace and are ready to enter into such treaties. But to make peace we need agreement to negotiate and until there is agreement by the Arab nations to sit down at the peace table, there is the present danger of a major outbreak of hostilities.

Accordingly, we make this further specific suggestion: that our Government permit Israel to purchase the $50 million of defensive arms which she seeks in this country strictly for purposes of self-defense. Israel is firmly a part of the free world and she may be counted upon not only to defend herself, but also to join in the defense of the free world.

While we are opposed to an arms race in the Near East, we believe that the military capability for safeguarding Israel's national existence must be maintained. We believe the danger of war will be seriously increased if the Arab nations attain a military preponderance capable of use for aggression because of the Communist initiative.

Our Government should continue to offer economic and technical assistance and help to resettle the Palestine Arab refugees with impartial friendship to all in the Near East who will cooperate for peace.

We have heard with regret that there are proposals that Israel be asked to yield vital territory of her small area to the Arab States. We believe this is the road to appeasement, not the road to peace.

The American people will not tolerate anything so immoral as the sacrifice of Israel to Communist infiltration of the Near East. The time to act is now. Failure to take action will encourage the Communist offensive, increase tension, and endanger freedom.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; CARL ALBERT, 3d District, Oklahoma; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, 8th District, New York; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, 9th District, Ohio; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, 4th District, Colorado; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, 3d District, West Virginia; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, 1st District, Pennsylvania; JOHN A. BLATNIK, 8th District, Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, 5th District, Missouri; JAMES B. BOWLER, 7th District, Illinois; CHARLES A. BOYLE, 12th District, Illinois; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, 24th District, New York; JAMES A. BYRNE, 3d District, Pennsylvania; CLARENCE CANNON, 9th District, Missouri; EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District New York; EARL CHUDOFF, 4th District, Pennsylvania; FRANK M. CLARK, 25th District, Pennsylvania; IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, 20th District, New York; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, 1st District, Illinois; JAMES J. DELANEY, 7th District, New York; JOHN J. DEMPSEY, Member at Large, New Mexico; CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., 13th District, Michigan; JOHN D. DINGELL, 15th District, Michigan; THOMAS J. DODD, 1st District, Connecticut; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, 23d District, New York; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, 4th District, Massachusetts; JAMES G. DONOVAN, 18th District, New York; CLYDE DOYLE, 23d District, California; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, 28th District, Pennsylvania; CARL ELLIOTT, 7th District, Alabama; GEORGE H. FALLON, 4th District, Maryland; DANIEL J. FLOOD, 11th District, Pennsylvania; JOHN E. FOGARTY, 2d District, Rhode Island; AIME J. FORAND, 1st District, Rhode Island; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, 7th District, Maryland; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, 3d District, Maryland; THOMAS S. GORDON, 8th District, Illinois; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, 2d District, Pennsylvania; Mrs. EDITH GREEN, 3d District, Oregon; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., 5th District, Pennsylvania; Mrs. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, 17th District, Michigan; HARLAN HAGEN, 14th District, California; WAYNE L. HAYS, 18th District, Ohio; DON HAYWORTH, 6th District, Michigan; CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; LESTER HOLTZMAN, 6th District, New York; Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY, 10th District, New York; EUGENE J. KEOGH, 9th District, New York; CECIL R. KING, 17th District, California; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, 19th District, Ohio; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, 19th District, New York; JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, 5th District, Illinois; Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, 9th District, Minnesota; THOMAS J. LANE, 7th District, Massachusetts; RICHARD E. LANKFORD, 5th District, Maryland; JOHN LESINSKI, Jr., 16th District, Michigan; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, 12th District, Massachusetts; TORBERT H. MACDONALD, 8th District, Massachusetts; HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr., Member at Large, Delaware; RAY J. MADDEN, 1st District, Indiana; THOMAS E. MORGAN, 26th District, Pennsylvania; MORGAN M. MOULDER, 11th District, Missouri; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, 13th District, New York; JAMES C. MURRAY, 3d District, Illinois; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, 6th District, Illinois; BARRATT O'HARA, 2d District, Illinois; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, 3d District, Massachusetts; MELVIN PRICE, 24th District, Illinois; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., 16th District, New York; JAMES M. QUIGLEY, 19th District, Pennsylvania; LOUIS C. RABAUT, 14th District, Michigan; HENRY S. REUSS, 5th District, Wisconsin; GEORGE M. RHODES, 14th District, Pennsylvania; PETER W. RODINO, Jr., 10th District, New Jersey; BYRON G. ROGERS, 1st District, Colorado; JOHN J. ROONEY, 14th District, New York; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; JOHN F. SHELLEY, 5th District, California; ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, 13th District, New Jersey; Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, 3d District, Missouri; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., 4th District, New Jersey; T. JAMES TUMULTY, 14th District, New Jersey; CHARLES A. VANIK, 21st District, Ohio; ROY W. WIER, 3d District, Minnesota; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., 6th District, New Jersey; SIDNEY R. YATES, 9th District, Illinois; HERBERT ZELENKO, 21st District, New York.

The Human Side of Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, back in 1866, the great Thomas A. Edison was a resident of Memphis, Tenn., and worked as a telegraph operator. It was back in those days and in Memphis that he began to invent and improve the telegraph apparatus which, when completed, he sold to Western Union. The proceeds provided him with

capital to equip his research laboratory from which grew almost 1,100 inventions.

On today in the city of Memphis, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Co., and longtime business associate of Mr. Edison, is speaking before the Civitan Club of that city.

Dr. Arthur R. Sample, past potentate of Al Chymia Shrine Temple and program chairman of the Civitan Club, introduced Mr. Stringfellow.

The speaker was a daily business associate of Mr. Edison for many years. He is now Imperial Assistant Rabban of the Imperial Council of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, holds offices in many important organizations, has been highly honored by colleges and possesses numerous honors and awards for his superior leadership in worthy civic undertakings.

Because of the excellency of the address, I have asked leave to include it as a part of my remarks. The address follows:

THE HUMAN SIDE OF EDISON

(Address by George E. Stringfellow)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Civitan Club, and honored guests, because I am one of the few survivors of those who had the rare privilege of working closely with Thomas A. Edison, I have been asked to tell you some of my observations about the human side of the great inventor.

Your city directory of 1866 lists Edison as a telegraph operator. The telegraph company was then under military law. Edison lived at 40 North Court Street, and boarded at the Delta Restaurant. It was here in Memphis that he began to invent and improve the telegraph apparatus which, when completed he sold to Western Union. The proceeds provided him with capital to equip his research laboratory from which grew almost 1,100 inventions.

With the respect and admiration that we have for any great man, we also have a certain amount of curiosity about the influences that made him great. One of the things we like to speculate about is whether he would have fulfilled his potentialities had he lived in a different era. For instance, in the case of Edison, we know that he holds the world's record for patented inventions—1,097 of them. Had he lived in the days of the caveman, we wonder if he would have invented the bow and arrow. Had he been around when the horse and ox were domesticated, would he have invented the wheel? If he had been in Egypt at the time of Archimedes, would he have reduced the enemy fleet to flames with a thousand mirrors. Would he have developed the water-screw, the forerunner of the screw propeller, to irrigate the fields of Egypt with water from the Nile?

The bow and arrow were not invented. Neither was the wheel. They were the products of gradual evolution, over thousands of years, in widely separated places. With all his wizardry, Edison could not have invented them.

There is a possibility that Edison might have done as Archimedes did when he instructed his soldiers to polish up their shields and reflect the sun's light and heat on the enemy ships and set them aflame. That was ingenious and reflected the thinking of an inventor.

Although basically a man of peace, Edison too came to the defense of his country in World War I by helping the United States Naval Consulting Board to improve the efficiency of the Navy. He was responsible for 42 items of new or improved means of naval attack or defense, including an underwater searchlight, a turbine head for submarine projectiles, a reacting bell, and a collision mat.

Since Edison devoted much of his time to lightening the burden of labor of mankind, I suspect that he would have invented the waterscrew and thus eliminated the laborious task of transporting water by means of pails tied to ropes.

What was Edison like, you may ask? Except for his deafness, he was remarkably sound physically, no doubt due to the kind of life he lived. He didn't use alcoholic beverages. His principal dissipation was strong coffee, chewing tobacco, and cigars. A number of years ago an intimate friend of mine visited me and expressed a desire to see Mr. Edison. Mr. Edison was a very easy person to see. Appointments were never necessary. All we had to do was to find out where the "old man" was. About 80 percent of the time he was in the chemical laboratories, so we looked there first, and if he wasn't there, we went to the library where we usually found him.

On the way to present my friend to the great inventor, he remarked, "I understand Mr. Edison chews tobacco. Wouldn't it be a joke if I asked him for a chew?" Now to get the point of the story, my friend neither smoked nor chewed tobacco.

Soon after the introductions, I remarked to Mr. Edison, in all seriousness, "My friend would like a chew of your tobacco." The "old man," as we reverently called him ran his hand down his right pants pocket, pulled out a plug of tobacco in a little case, laid it on his desk, ran his hand in his other pants pocket, pulled out a knife, opened it, took the plug of tobacco out of the case and handed the knife and the tobacco to my friend and invited him to cut off a good hunk. My friend didn't want to decline and yet he didn't want the tobacco. Bravely he cut off a piece about the size you could put in your eye, but Mr. Edison insisted that he take a much larger piece. When my friend took a larger piece, it still didn't suit the "old man's" generosity, so he took the knife and tobacco and cut off a good hunk and passed it to my friend and said, "Try this. You will get the full flavor if you take a big mouthful, as I do." My friend got the full flavor all right. He got out of Mr. Edison's library as quickly as he could and got rid of the tobacco on the steps of the building. Edison's generosity with chewing tobacco just wasn't appreciated.

Mr. Edison was opposed to smoking cigarettes for he felt that inhaling the smoke was bad for the lungs and that the chemicals in the paper were injurious to health. He felt so strongly about it, he issued instructions that no one in the library or laboratory should smoke cigarettes. Those instructions still appear on the timeclock in the laboratory:

"Cigarette smoking in the laboratory must be stopped. Anyone disobeying this will be dismissed.—Thomas A. Edison."

His friend Henry Ford was equally opposed to cigarettes and together they wrote a book on why people should not smoke cigarettes. The book created so much publicity for cigarettes that it had an opposite effect to what the authors intended. As a result, so far as I know, both of them refrained thereafter from talking about the injurious effects of cigarettes.

Edison was 5 feet 9½ inches and weighed around 175 pounds. He spent more hours at work and less at sleep than most people. In common with Napoleon, he slept more soundly and got more rest in a given time than the average person. He was serene and relaxed—seldom agitated.

I remember one time, however, when he really lost his patience. The machine shop of the Edison laboratories is on the first floor and the drafting room on the second floor. Mr. Edison used to commute between those two departments. Many times each day he would run up the stairway as often as he would use the slow freight elevator.

The elevator was an old contraption. On one occasion Mr. Edison yanked on the rope and the elevator started. Halfway up, the belt came off the motor and Mr. Edison and the elevator were suspended midway between the two floors. It was about 20 minutes before we could lower the elevator and its occupant to the machine-shop floor. During that time he was anything but serene. He used some selected language, and he made sure he could be heard throughout the two departments. So far as I know, he never used that elevator again, with or without an operator.

His step at 80 was spry as that of most men of 40. Edison liked to repeat the story Chauncey DePew told when DePew was in his nineties and still going strong. When asked, "How do you get your exercise?" DePew replied, "By acting as pallbearer for my 50-year-old athletic friends."

Edison got most of his exercise in his laboratory. He rarely sat at his desk. He moved around from one instrument to another, going from scale to tube, from report to drawing board, and from building to building, covering as many yards as most businessmen cover on their round of golf.

Edison had great patience and determination. His most difficult invention was the nickel-iron-alkaline storage battery. After conducting more than 45,000 experiments without any measure of success, an associate asked, "Are you not discouraged?"

"Discouraged?" responded the genius. "Certainly not. I have learned 45,000 ways the job cannot be done, and I am therefore 45,000 ways nearer my goal."

Though recognized for his prodigious industry as well as for remarkable intellect, the "old man," as his associates affectionately called him, loved a joke, not so much the sophisticated, sharp-witted kind, but more of the homespun variety of Abraham Lincoln. For example, he would with humility, walk into his legal department and apply for a job as an inventor. Or he could and would imitate the accent of a city lowbrow, or the pompous manner of the holier-than-thou reformer, or a smooth promoter.

Edison contended that integrity is man's greatest asset, and he valued his integrity and his honor above material gains. On learning that a product bearing his name had developed defects in service, Edison closed one of his factories and requested his customers to return their purchases and get their money. The inventor felt that his integrity was involved, and this priceless ingredient was not for sale. He was always careful to see that his customers received a little more than he promised.

I am sometimes asked if Edison was a religious man. He was, indeed, but he cannot be made to fit into the frame or pattern of any of our orthodox denominations. Edison was not a materialistic thinker. While he was a master magician in dealing with material things, he was awed by what he called "the mystery of life," which he found it impossible to comprehend or fathom in terms of matter and physical concepts. While he admitted his uncertainty as to the meaning and scope of life after death, he did believe in the fundamental premise of eternal life.

Edison was many times a winner and an acknowledged champion in many fields, but he was a modest winner and a good loser. He suffered many failures with calm and stoicism. His concern was for the present and the future. He did not live in the past.

He knew and ever practiced the motto: "Sweet are the uses of adversity." For example he turned his deafness into an asset in helping Alexander Graham Bell convert the telephone from a scientific curiosity to a practical instrument. He made his deaf-

ness a courtship asset. He taught his best girl the Morse code. In noisy, chattering social groups they conversed by hand pressure. That was an excuse for them to sit closer together. Overcoming his natural shyness, Edison built up the courage to propose when he could do so by hand pressure rather than by sales pressure.

Edison's pleasures were simple—his books and his music, and greatest of all was his pleasure in work. He gave the world light, warmth, joy, and a higher living standard. He asked only for the opportunity to carry on his experiments for the benefit of mankind.

I like to think of Edison as exemplifying the faithful servant in the parable of the talents. You have read the story in St. Matthew's gospel: how the master, before going to a far country, called his servants to him. To one he gave 5 talents, to another 2, and to another 1. The servant with one talent buried his in the ground. He who had 2 gained still another 2, and he who had 5 gained still another 5. Wherefore, when their master returned, he was pleased with the stewardship of the two servants who had made the most of their gifts, and because they had been faithful over a few things, he set them over many.

Edison was indeed, a faithful servant. Vision, imagination, genius, industry, and character were the potentialities with which he was endowed. By the wise use of the talents committed to his care, the world has been enriched a thousandfold. Little wonder that his memory commands the devotion rooted deeply in human gratitude.

No Concern of Yours?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article entitled "No Concern of Yours?" which appeared in the Daily Real Estate Report, of Fresno, Calif., on January 11, 1956:

NO CONCERN OF YOURS?

A recent survey, conducted in 19 States in the Midwest, South, and Southeast, reveals that there are almost 21 million acres of rich, idle farmland available for crop production, whenever more food is needed to feed the Nation.

At the same time Government plans are underway to take additional acreage out of production because of the millions of tons of food the Federal Government now has stored in bins and caves around the country.

Despite these facts, Congress is being asked to approve the incredible upper Colorado River project to irrigate some 583,000 acres of arid mountain land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming at a cost to the Nation's taxpayers (yes, you're included) of $4 billion in added taxes.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California, said that he would present to the House of Representatives evidence to show that while the Federal Bureau of Reclamation is seeking approval of enormous costly new irrigation projects, at least 20,937,153 acres (United States Soil Conservation Service figures) of the best American cropland are unused for any purpose.

Where the Reclamation Bureau wants to build the multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project, there is little population, few roads, no metropolitan markets, and few towns. The fabulous cost of establishing municipal governments, etc., would be added to the cost of developing the arid lands, and the crops would enhance the Federal Government food surplus.

Why is the Federal Bureau of Reclamation proposing such a project? Is there politics involved or Government job retention behind such a foolhardy scheme?

Many Californians, as well as citizens of other States, have shown little concern regarding this proposed tax-spending spree, but every thinking American should stand up and be counted in denouncing such fantastic and inconsistent plans.

Post Office Progress and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Birmingham (Ala.) News on January 23 took editorial cognizance of the Post Office Department's efforts in the last 3 years to modernize the handling of our mail.

The editorial refers to steps taken by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield to reorganize the Department's work to achieve the goal of faster, more efficient, and more economical mail service.

I present the editorial to my colleagues as an example of the recognition being given to the splendid efforts of the Postmaster General to place his Department on a business footing.

The editorial follows:

POSTOFFICE PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

The United States Postoffice Department's 508,000 employees now handle more than 50 billion pieces of mail annually and its financial transactions involve more than $20 billion a year. It now deals with a volume of mail 45 percent greater than a decade ago.

During the last 3 years the Department has undergone considerable reorganization. Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, reviewing the Department's work in the current Nation's Business magazine, believes the efforts have resulted in faster, more efficient and more economical mail service.

Broader and better use, Mr. Summerfield says, is being made of all facilities for speeding transportation, including expanded use of trucks and tractor-trailers, bus lines, highway postoffices and air cargo carriers. He further reports: Internal procedures of handling money, bookkeeping and financial reporting have been greatly streamlined, achieving a reduction of 5,000 positions from overhead. Postal operations have been decentralized into 15 regions and 91 districts and operated on a home-rule basis. Close cost control has been established over the 85,000 motor vehicles used; a postoffice fleet is being developed consisting of 4 basic standard production-line trucks instead of 7 former special-built types, resulting in savings of 20 percent in purchase prices and 20 percent or more in operating cost.

Unnecessary service units are being eliminated, with approximately 3,000 small postoffices having been closed, Mr. Summerfield says. But modern rural delivery service is being expanded and more city letter carrier routes are being added. Postoffices in most major cities are open longer and mail is collected later. A coordinated progressive personnel program has been established and practical training programs have been launched.

The Department has a major problem, however, in the inadequacy and deterioration of its physical plant. Many postoffices were built 50 or more years ago and others are badly rundown, outgrown, and outmoded.

Another major problem is the postal deficit, which amounted to $362,700,000 in the 1955 fiscal year and which, it is expected, would, under present postage rates, run around $500 million following the recently enacted employee pay raises costing $200 million a year. Mr. Summerfield points out that postal rates today are essentially the same as they were in 1932. To achieve a more nearly break-even basis in the Department, President Eisenhower asked Congress in his budget message to increase postal charges by enough to bring in $350 million additional money in the next fiscal year, though he did not specify what increases he had in mind.

Address by Hon. Frank E. Smith of Mississippi Before the Mississippi Valley Association Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Mo., February 6, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have no more able Member in this House than FRANK E. SMITH, from the State of Mississippi. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, he is alert to the needs of our rivers and harbors and has a comprehensive understanding of the whole problem of water resources.

On yesterday, he delivered a splendid speech before the Mississippi Valley Association at their annual meeting in St. Louis, Mo. Because of the increasing emphasis which must be given the subject matter of his address, I have asked permission to include it in its entirety that the full membership of the House may have the benefit of his views.

The speech follows:

I am very pleased and honored to have a part in the program of the Mississippi Valley Association. As a Representative in Congress of a region that is a vital part of the Mississippi Valley, I am proud of the constructive influence that this organization has had upon public policy for many years.

Proper development and use of the water resources of the Mississippi Valley are essential to the economic growth of the valley and of our Nation. This organization has made and will make an important contribution to public policy in this field. We have achieved much in our effort to fully utilize the great natural resource that is the Mississippi River and its tributaries, but there is far more yet to be done in the years ahead of us.

I am concerned primarily today about two important issues having to do with the role of our National Government in the field of water resources. I approach the problem,

not from any politically partisan sense, but only in a partisanship that holds an aggressive water resources policy as one of the essential activities of our Federal Government.

The Mississippi Delta area that I have the honor to represent in the Congress was first settled by hardy pioneers who used the Mississippi and its tributary, the Yazoo, as their means of transportation from the other settled areas of the country. Our oldest settlements are on the Mississippi and the Yazoo. Historically, the Mississippi has been a great waterway, tying together the economy of the heartland of America. All of the early settlements along the Mississippi came into being because the river was the natural path of the advancing settlements. We have long since passed the day when new settlements must be confined to points available to water transportation, but we are today realizing more than ever that adequate water transportation is a vital part of the economic growth and expansion of our area.

The river brought settlement up and down the great valley, but it also threatened death and destruction and floods. Consequently, the history of most of the valley from the time of its first settlement has been a long fight to control the waters of the Mississippi and its tributaries. With adequate flood protection for the Mississippi Delta, we are making new advances in our economy, both in industry and in agriculture. This same equation holds true for the entire Mississippi Valley.

The use of our waterways as channels of commerce and protection from the ravages of floods have been accepted as a proper responsibility of the Federal Government for many years. Although private business, and local and State governmental subdivisions, have contributed vast sums to this overall program, it is recognized that there is no way to properly coordinate the work except through the Federal Government. The benefits from the water resources program are shared by all the people of the country, and it is proper that a major portion of the cost should be assumed by the Government.

We have had our ups and downs in the continuing struggle to make proper use of our national water policy, but today we face two specific problems that could disrupt the pattern of orderly progress which we have sought to create. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources point up one of these major problems. The Hoover Commission task force report was so blatantly partisan in its opposition to virtually every phase of water resources policy that perhaps it has already been discredited enough to prevent any major recommendations from being adopted. The Hoover Commission itself refused to adopt most of the task force proposals, but the Commission report made two proposals which still should be of grave concern to us. I refer, of course, to the proposed toll system for inland waterways and the plan to establish a new, independent, board of review for water policy.

I think the very vocal opposition expressed to the toll system all over the country from every element of our political and economic life has eliminated the possibility, at least for the time being, that the Congress would approve a toll system, so I am not going to dwell further on that proposal.

I believe we face a real threat, however, in regard to the plan to establish the new board of review. The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has adopted this proposal in its recommendations made public a few weeks ago. It is not at all impossible that this board of review may be established through means of a reorganization plan under the authority granted the President in the current Reorganization Act. It is highly important that all of our people be alerted to the danger to prevent any possibility of the Congress' approving such a plan.

Just why should we be fearful of this new board of review? Primarily because it would be another barrier between the people and the Government in carrying on a sound national water policy. It would be a new instrument of bureaucratic control which would serve to delay and defeat navigation and flood-control projects vital to the sound development of our American system.

The people of the country act through their elected representatives in the Congress to establish water policy. I'm sure all of you are familiar with the long and complicated process that must be carried out in order to change a flood control or navigation project from an idea into a reality. There are at least 28 separate steps in the authorization of such a project. The process adds up usually to a number of years. Then, following authorization, there has been a long and sometimes even more difficult campaign to secure adequate appropriations to accomplish the work. The board of review proposal could only result in adding more years to this long process. It would serve as a bottleneck and an often insurmountable levee to hold back many projects that would normally gain approval of the Congress in rapid fashion. It could conceivably become a major instrument of political favoritism, far removed from the nonpartisan approach which most of our water agencies have adopted over the years as normal operating procedure.

Our Federal water agencies have made many mistakes in the past, and they are likely to make more in the future. There is no question but that there should be better coordination of policy from time to time, but these mistakes are minor by comparison with the possibilities of error that would be almost certain with any new centralized control.

We have achieved great progress in the past under our present system, and we are continuing to improve it. There is no demonstrable need for a new board of review, and I hope that we can prevent any such instrumentality from being established.

The other great problem which faces us in the field of water policy is the increasingly difficult fight we have to make to secure adequate appropriations for flood control and navigation projects.

In 1927 when the disastrous flood of that year had created nationwide interest in river control, the total approved program of civil works amounted, in estimated cost, to about $1,200 million, that is, some $1.2 billion. About $800 million had at that time been appropriated to carry out this authorized program, which means that a backlog existed even then of about $400 million worth of work, at 1927 prices.

In 1937, following the increased interest in flood control and waterway development reflected in the passage of the 1936 Flood Control Act—with its declaration of policy that prevention of floods in cooperation with the States and other local political subdivisions was a proper activity of the Federal Government—the backlog of uncompleted projects had grow from $400 million in 1927 to $900 million worth of construction, at 1937 prices. In 1947, after World War II, and when the concept of basinwide development was being generally accepted, the backlog had grown to $5.4 billion, at 1947 prices.

Today the estimated cost of construction of all civil works projects which have been approved for construction by the Congress is approximately $19 billion, of which a total of less than $7 billion has been appropriated; thus, there exists today a backlog of projects, either not started or not completed of about $12 billion worth of work, at today's prices.

Admittedly many of the projects in this backlog have now become obsolete, or for some other reason should not be built. For the sake of discussion, let us assume that one-third of all the work represented by today's accumulated backlog should, for some reason or another, never be built. Even so, there would still remain $8 billion worth of economically sound, urgently needed, congressionally approved work either not started or not finished. This amount—$8 billion—is greater than the accumulated total of all appropriations made since 1824 for new construction for the Corps of Engineers' civil-works projects.

Now certainly, if there is any statistical support needed for my belief that our water resources program is critically lagging, it can be found in this ever-mounting backlog of from $400 million in 1927 to the $8 billion of today. I submit that this is at least a red flag we must heed in connection with our endeavors to insure the welfare and even the survival of future generations.

An example of the present inadequate appropriations with which I happen to be familiar may be of interest to some of you in the audience who know the history of the St. Louis flood-protection project. I was a member of the committee which visited the site of the flood damage in this area in 1951. The long process of study and evaluation to remedy this situation and to provide adequate protection for St. Louis did not result in the authorization of the St. Louis project until 1955. The United States engineers told our committee that the project could be completed after 2 years' planning and 6 years' construction if adequate funds were made available during the period. I am told that in the budget for fiscal year 1957, less than 10 percent of the funds needed for planning alone are provided. If the appropriations do not develop at a better rate than this, the St. Louis flood-control project will be still a project and not a reality for many years beyond the 8-year goal that was first proposed.

A minor but vastly important failure of the Congress in the matter of appropriations in the past few years has been the drastic reduction in funds for examinations and surveys. These funds have been reduced so greatly that any major surveys must receive special earmarking from the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. The reduction in survey funds has been defended with the false logic that there is such a huge backlog of already authorized projects that there is no point to allowing further studies for any new project that might be authorized.

This is a splendid example of that overworked term "false economy." It means that the Corps of Engineers is prevented from making adequate studies of any flood-control problem until some major or minor disaster occurs in the area, bringing sufficient pressure upon the Bureau of the Budget and/or the Congress to make special funds available for the study. It means the Corps is barred by lack of funds from exercising the normal review of the worth of existing projects which should be carried on at all times. I hope the Congress during this session will rid itself of this burden of sharply restrictive survey funds.

According to the United States Weather Bureau, the climatic patterns of the Northern Hemisphere are undergoing a change. It is believed that our country will be more and more affected by tropical hurricanes. More in recent years, and even more in the near future, it is believed, of these dreaded hurricanes will strike the United States mainland with their unleashed fury. Most of them bring torrential downpours. Since the newly developing patterns carry the hurricanes through the most highly industrialized and densely populated sections of the country, the awful possibilities—nay, probabilities—for disastrous catastrophes are truly frightening. Already this new pattern has cost the country 500 lives and an unknown amount of property damage var-

iously estimated at between $1 and $2 billion.

What is true of the Northeastern States in recent years is in varying degrees true of the entire Nation. There have been floods of major proportions elsewhere, too. In 1952 the upper Mississippi River Basin was the scene of a flood of disaster proportions; this and lesser floods throughout the Nation snuffed out lives of 54 human beings and wreaked damage up to an estimated quarter billion dollars. Again in 1953, the State of Maine experienced a sudden thaw which swelled most of its rivers out of their banks; northwestern Iowa and most of the State of Louisiana were the scenes of major flooding. These and numerous smaller floods cost 40 lives and over $120 million in property damage.

In 1954 the Midwest suffered three major floods; the Des Moines River, the Ohio River Valley, and the Chicago area were the worst sufferers. In the same year the Rio Grande Valley was a heavy sufferer from floodwaters. High waters in the wake of Hurricane Hazel wreaked considerable damage to the northeastern section of the country. Total damage last year amounted to over $1.6 billion and 44 people lost their lives. As yet, the final toll of the Christmas disaster in California has not been determined.

Special emphasis has been given by the administration and many Members of Congress toward developing some type of disaster-insurance program to cope with situations such as developed in New England last year. I hope that some program can be worked out to alleviate the financial hardship brought on by tragic disasters which cannot be prevented by man, such as hurricanes which come in from the sea. Perhaps there is even some way of helping to establish some reasonable type of flood insurance.

It would be a legislative disaster, however, if the Congress were to accept the idea that the only help we can give the country in our fight against floods is some type of insurance to compensate for damage. The only real insurance there can be is in the form of flood-control projects which will prevent floods. It will be far cheaper in the long run and it is the type of forward-looking, affirmative approach to the problem which is consistent with every ideal of our American economy.

Our country should no more turn to insurance as a remedy for floods than it should turn to insurance for polio victims instead of devoting the funds to study and research for the development of the Salk vaccine to prevent the disease. Our primary job with floods should be to prevent them, not to alleviate the suffering they cause, as much as we want to do this when a disaster does strike an unprotected area.

The development of American water resources has contributed vastly to the story of American progress. We cannot afford to neglect their proper development in the future. Unless we move at a more rapid rate than we have in the past few years, we will lose irretrievable ground, at great cost to our people and our Government.

National Seed Storage Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I sent to the desk a bill to be introduced as a companion measure to S. 3095, a bill to provide for the establishment of a national seed storage facility.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower in his special agricultural message called attention to the fact that "we must find new crops offering new opportunities and benefits" to farmers. Much of the hope for increasing the economic well-being of agriculture and for keeping fully employed our agricultural resources depends upon developing new markets, new uses and new crops.

As you know, the President recommended an increase of 25 percent in the research appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service and for grants-in-aid to State experiment stations.

In the development of new plants and new crops, it is paramount that plant breeders have access to a wide variety of plant stocks since although the plants in themselves may not be valuable as new crops they often contain needed genetic characteristics which can be utilized in producing new commercial crops such as soybeans and grain sorghums which have become so important in our agriculture.

Although Federal and State experiment stations have been doing the best they can to preserve parent stocks of plants and seeds, they neither have adequate space nor appropriate storage facilities for holding such stocks over a long period of time. Since research is a primary activity of the Department of Agriculture and is carried on in the general public interest, it is necessary that the development of more extensive facilities to maintain crop plant and breeding materials must also primarily be carried on as a national function.

I, therefore, introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility.

Let's Look at the Record, Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Harry S. Truman lately has been bandying around, contrary to any fact, the impression that our great Vice President called him a traitor. I commend to the American people and to Mr. Truman, who has demonstrated his proficiency at name calling, the following article by David Lawrence, as it appeared in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

PRESIDENT'S VIEWS ARE CITED TO CLEAR UP "TRAITOR" ISSUE

WASHINGTON, February 6.—Nobody ever called Harry Truman a traitor or disloyal and the former President ought to know it. What his faulty memory is striving to recall rather vaguely, is that his administration was attacked in the 1952 and 1954 campaigns for being soft on communism. That's an issue which, if Mr. Truman wants it so, can readily be revived for public debate, and the facts spread upon the record once more.

For Mr. Truman has never explained why he signed two letters—one on April 30, 1946, and one on April 7, 1947, praising the late Harry Dexter White, whose connection with a Soviet spy ring had been called to his attention on February 4, 1946, by J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI.

When Attorney General Brownell disclosed the facts about the Harry Dexter White case in November 1953, he never called Mr. Truman disloyal, as the Trumanites were quick to charge in an effort to evoke sympathy for their side. What Mr. Brownell did was to question the judgment and administrative efficiency of the Truman administration in letting Communist stooges slip through their fingers. The most carefully worded statement of the case came not from Vice President NIXON or any other Republican spokesman but from General Eisenhower himself in an address delivered at Milwaukee on October 3, 1952.

The prepared text, which uses the word "treason" three times reads in part as follows:

"I have come to Milwaukee tonight to talk to you about communism and freedom. * * *

"These two ideas are as opposed as danger is to safety, as sickness is to health, as weakness to strength, as darkness to light. Great truths can, at times, be startlingly simple. This one is of that kind. It is so simple a truth that it seems almost too obvious, almost stale.

"But let not our memories be too short. Only a few years have passed since many moved among us who argued cunningly against this plain truth. Their speech was persuasive, and their vocabulary clever. Remember? It went like this: 'After all, while we stand for political democracy, they stand for economic democracy. Fundamentally these are but two slightly different roads to the same goal. We both believe in freedom.'

"We must all remember that sophisticated lie. We will never forget it. For it partly poisoned two whole decades of our national life. It insinuated itself into our schools, our public forums, some of our news channels, some of our labor unions and—most terrifyingly—into our Government itself.

"What did this penetration into Government mean? It meant contamination in some degree of virtually every department, every agency, every bureau, every section of our Government. It meant a government by men whose very brains were confused by the opiate of this deceit. These men were advisers in a foreign policy that—on one side of the world—weakly bowed before the triumph in China of Communists hailed as 'agrarian reformers.' On the other side of the world this policy condoned the surrender of whole nations to an implacable enemy whose appetite for conquest sharpened with every victory. This penetration meant a domestic policy whose tone was set by men who sneered and scoffed at warnings of the enemy infiltrating our most secret counsels.

"It meant—in its most ugly triumph—treason itself."

ILLUSION AND BETRAYAL

"These years have, indeed, been a harrowing time in our history. It has been a time of both honest illusion and dishonest betrayal—both terribly costly. It has been a time that should have taught us, with cold finality, the truth about freedom and communism.

"Most of us, young or old, wise or naive, have learned. An important few have not. They have learned very little—and they admit nothing. They are men about whom there is nothing great except their vanity and their complacency. They are proud prisoners of their own mistakes.

"Who are these men?

"They are those who cheered the blithe dismissal of the Alger Hiss case as a red herring. They are those who applauded 2

weeks ago when an administration servant grandly declared that Communists in our national life were not very important, and that we should not waste time chasing phantoms. They are those who slapped their sides with laughter when the same man dismissed the quest for Communists in our Government as a kind of silly game being played in the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries.

"Do you think these fish stories, ghost stories, and animal stories are really very amusing? Such comedy touches do little to relieve the tragic knowledge that we have been for years the gullible victims of Communist espionage experts. These experts in treason have plundered us of secrets involving our highest diplomatic decisions, our atomic research. Tragically, we do not know how much more our security may have been jeopardized. * * *

"You can never cure malignant growth just by a hearty bedside manner. I must be blunt, for this is a serious matter. I speak not as a partisan or as a candidate but simply as an American citizen—moved to honest anger by this persistent, gnawing threat of Communist treason in our national life. I know that millions of both parties today are moved to anger and to action.

"Neither these millions nor I have patience any longer with those whose complacency excuses our Government's failures as wholly unavoidable."

OBSERVED FIFTH COLUMNS

Mr. Eisenhower then recalled his own observation of fifth columns in Europe. He added that "it is the prerogative of government to set the strictest test upon loyalty" and that it is a privilege, not a right, to work for the United States Government. He declared that the Bill of Rights "contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to join together to destroy the Bill of Rights." He said:

"A group—like the Communist conspiracy—dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the Government."

It is a great speech and certainly its doctrines should appeal equally today to the rank and file of Democrats as well as Republicans. Reprints should be widely distributed by the Fund for the Republic, since it has sent out literature on the other side of the same controversy.

Compensation to the Crow Indians for Lands Needed in Construction of Yellowtail Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial from the February 3, 1956, issue of the Sheridan Press, a newspaper in Sheridan, Wyo. The editorial indicates some of the reasons why I think my colleagues should support House Joint Resolution 516, which authorizes and instructs the Secretary of the Interior to accept the $5 million offer of the Crow Tribal Council for the lands that will be needed for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Montana:

NO ACTUAL LOSS

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, appears to be the prime mover in the continued pressure against the Crow Indians to provide right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam. The Montana Senator insists that a major appropriation of $4 million for the dam for the fiscal year of 1956 will be lost unless that right-of-way is provided immediately.

Because there could be such a loss of an appropriation, Senator MURRAY and the Department of the Interior are insisting that condemnation proceedings be used to acquire this right-of-way. In fact, the Department of the Interior has announced that it has already asked the Department of Justice to institute this method to wrest legal possession from the Crows of approximately 7,000 acres of land in the Big Horn Canyon.

From the beginning we have strenuously opposed this method of seizing land from the Crow Indians. It is nothing more than a use of legal force to take land from the tribe. And the project itself would provide about one-third of its total irrigation for other Indian-owned lands.

To justify such methods of using legal force against the Crows simply because an appropriation would be lost is certainly clouding the issue. There is no permanent loss in the loss of an appropriation. Even though the legal status of the appropriation may expire, there is no actual loss. If Congress saw fit to make such an appropriation a year ago, it shouldn't be too difficult to convince the committees and Members of the House and Senate that it should be made again if it was properly justified in the first place.

Actually, this loss of an appropriation is about like removing cash in a business house from the cash register to the safe for safety over night. Since the Treasury or the taxpayers still have the money, it can be made available for use at some future time. And if the project is still justifiable and good, Congress would almost certainly reappropriate it.

The mere fact there appears to be such pressure and such a demand for haste in a project for which there is no great immediate need makes one wonder if Senator MURRAY is concerned lest Congress may refuse to set the funds up again. The river, the canyon, and the lands will all still be there when Congress is ready. The loss of an appropriation is not excuse for the use of threatening tactics against the Crow Indians.

Clearly water development means a larger population, and a larger economy. It means progress and prosperity. It means growth.

And it is something Wyoming can do something about, utilizing its own abilities and resources.

For other things, Wyoming might have to wait, but through heads-up promotion and planning, as provided by the Natural Resource Board, this State can expect a consistent growth.

There is a future in water in Wyoming.

Babel Drowns Call To Battle in Slum Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a very scholarly series of articles relating to the housing problem in America prepared by Phil G. Goulding, of the Washington Bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. The first article appeared on January 28, 1956, and is entitled "Babel Drowns Call To Battle in Slum Fight."

BABEL DROWNS CALL TO BATTLE IN SLUM FIGHT

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 28.—Decay can be whipped and American cities saved from eventual bankruptcy only if the flood of new slums growing each day can be brought under control.

Success is mandatory.

This is the consensus of top Government officials, including Albert M. Cole, boss of the Housing Home Finance Agency, whose jurisdiction extends to all Federal housing departments.

How can it be done? The opinions range widely, both in the executive branch and Congress. Real estate and home builders' lobbies are powerful. There are liberal and conservative approaches.

But one point is clear: Something must be done, and soon.

MAJOR PROBLEMS

The human disease, the killing sicknesses, the juvenile delinquency, the charred bodies found in firetrap ashes are news to no one. Slums are directly involved in 45 percent of major crimes, 55 percent of young delinquency, 60 percent of tuberculosis cases, 35 percent of fires.

They also cost you money.

A southern metropolis collected only 5½ percent of its property tax money from slums but gave those districts 53 percent of its health, police, and fire facilities.

Columbus, Ohio, estimates that it costs each person $14.63 a year to pay for the city's losses in deteriorated sections. Milwaukee bought a fire engine for $25,000 for a new neighborhood. Operation expenses run $90,000 a year. The fire chief pointed out that the cleaning up of a single blighted ward would have released 1 of its 3 engine companies for the new homes and avoided the expenditure.

Even multipled across the country, these extravagances are pennies compared to losses sustained by keeping such areas out of production.

Chicago has a downtown decayed area now 40 percent delinquent in taxes. If redeveloped, this could provide 2 million square feet of space for commercial use, add 21,000 jobs, boost the annual payroll by $84 million and increase tax receipts 7 times.

Cost of effective nationwide slum clearance, with renewal, redevelopment, and relocation, is so gigantic that even educated estimates must be accepted with reservations.

An advisory committee appointed by President Eisenhower in 1953 predicted that it would take an outlay of $15 billion to clear slums and another $9 billion for public improvements in rehabilitated areas.

ONLY A START

This would be only the beginning. It has been estimated that 5 million units would have to be built to replace those torn down, plus the salvaging of deteriorating units, plus dealing with millions of additional units beyond hope outside of slum areas.

Commissioner James W. Follin of the Urban Renewal Administration—one of the several principalities in Cole's jurisdiction—notes that only 27.5 million of 39.3 million nonfarm dwellings in the United States are "good housing."

SUBSTANDARD

At least 7 million of the remaining 12.1 are "substandard." Half of these are badly dilapidated. The other 5.1 million have varying degrees of deficiencies requiring correction.

Many Americans maintain that there will always be slums until there is sufficient low-

rent housing, and that there will never be enough low-rent housing until the Federal Government comes through with a gigantic public housing program.

The National Housing Conference, for instance, declares that there should be 500,000 units a year if reasonable progress is to be made. While recognizing that this would be presently impossible, it recommends a return to the provisions of the 1949 Housing Act and grants of 200,000 a year until the original 810,000 units authorized then by Congress are exhausted.

Agreement comes neither from the present administration nor from the present Congress.

In 1954, the legislators approved 35,000 new units. Added to 33,000 already under contract, this gave a workload of 68,000 for the following two years. Last year, Congress authorized 45,000. It also eliminated an administration feature of the 1954 act which tied the allocation of new public housing starts to urban renewal programs.

This was contrary to the Eisenhower approach. Cole insists that public housing cannot be detached from the overall operation of neighborhood improvement. He emphasizes that it cannot be a free-wheeling activity, heedless of other efforts to halt city decay.

Part of the basic thinking behind the 1954 act was this theory that public housing should be given only to communities which have developed comprehensive plans on how to better the living conditions of all citizens living in substandard homes, blighted areas, and slums beyond the hope of salvage.

The new law was founded on the theory that you cannot rebuild a city of 10 million families; that practical considerations make it necessary to restore and to renovate where possible.

It brought into the language such terms as "workable program" and "urban renewal" and "FHA section 220."

Its philosophy was two-pointed: Piecemeal attacks of slums will not work; local responsibility and private enterprise are the keystones of action.

This series of stories will deal with its progress to date.

Planning Is First Weapon in War on Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the second of a series of articles on the housing problem in America, written by Phil G. Goulding, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer Bureau in Washington. This article appeared on January 30, 1956, and is entitled "Planning Is First Weapon in War on Slums":

PLANNING IS FIRST WEAPON IN WAR ON SLUMS

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—You can't fight a slum without a program.

Eighty United States cities have carried their fights to the point of obtaining Federal approval of a workable program.

Another 16 communities have submitted programs to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Twelve of these are under review in regional offices. Four have been cleared to Washington.

Seventy more cities are in the process of developing these plans.

A workable program is more than a stack of papers in triplicate and a sheath of questionnaires. It is a preliminary analysis of a community's slum and blight problem and and an outline of how to solve it.

It must include an estimate of the cost and evidence of the financial capacity of the city to take action. It is a guaranty that there is something more in the works than an attempt to clear slums pocket by pocket, an approach believed to be fruitless by officials of this administration.

Approval by the city council is a prerequisite for the Federal aids to urban renewal—loans and capital grants, Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance under sections 220 and 221. Prior to a 1955 congressional amendment, it was a prerequisite also for low-rent public housing.

NO PATERNALISM

The workable program must come first, officials explain, because the present anti-slum law is not a paternalistic measure. It is based upon the principle that the Federal Government will help cities help themselves.

Critics who complain that Washington's part should be greater are advised to take their complaints to Congress, which wrote the Housing Act in 1954.

When a city council approves a program, it commits the locality to the attainment of these essential objectives:

Sound housing and health codes, so that illegal and substandard structures and areas will no longer be tolerated.

ZONES TO BE PLANNED

Master planning for the community's development, designating residential, commercial, industrial, and public land; plotting the roads; identifying necessary public improvements.

Basic analysis of neighborhoods and the kind of treatment needed. Where are the slums and blighted areas, what is their extent and density, what are the racial and income characteristics of the people involved?

An effective administrative organization to run the program, to assure that there is adequate legal authority for agencies undertaking slum clearance and rehabilitation, to guarantee that standards in zoning, housing, building, plumbing, and electricity can be enforced.

Financial capacity to carry out the program. The Federal Government will pay as much as two-thirds of the costs of land acquisition and site clearing. Communities must contribute the rest.

Rehousing of displaced persons.

Citizen participation.

CITY'S PLAN APPROVED

Cleveland received approval of its workable program last June, becoming the first Ohio city and the 35th in the country to qualify for Federal assistance under the 1954 act.

More recently, Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert M. Cole, has approved workable programs for three other Ohio cities—Cincinnati, Dayton, and Hamilton. Four more, Columbus, Martin's Ferry, Toledo, and Warren, have applications in the works.

Only New Jersey and Pennsylvania among Northern States have more plans approved or underway. Several Southern States, with smaller communities, are in the lead.

Cleveland had been engaged in various phases of urban redevelopment long before the 1954 act. So had many other cities. Slum clearance programs underway under the 1949 law could be continued or converted to take advantage of 1954 benefits.

Half Billion in Federal Funds Is Fighting United States Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the third of a series of articles on the housing problem in America which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer under date of January 31, 1956, written by Phil G. Goulding, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer Bureau in Washington. Mr. Goulding's very scholarly summarization is entitled "Half Billion in Federal Funds Is Fighting United States Slums":

HALF BILLION IN FEDERAL FUNDS IS FIGHTING UNITED STATES SLUMS

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—More than one-half billion dollars of Federal money is working to prevent and eliminate United States slums.

For every Federal dollar spent, housing officials point out, private enterprise and local governments spend five.

The men running the Washington end of the show concede some flaws in the law and some flaws in administration. But they believe they are making real progress. So does President Eisenhower.

Sixty-one urban renewal projects were initiated last year.

Twenty-three moved into actual site operations.

At year's end, there were 340 federally assisted slum clearance and urban renewal projects approved by the Federal Government. These were in 218 communities—in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and 29 States.

PROCESSED IN STEPS

This does not mean teams of men were busy demolishing dilapidated houses in this many areas. Projects in which Federal money is involved are processed by the Urban Renewal Administration in these steps:

Preapplication, survey and planning application, preliminary planning, preliminary project report, final planning, application for loan-and-grant funds, project execution.

All of these follow the drafting and approval of a city's workable program if they were initiated after the effective date of the new Housing Act, August 2, 1954. Those with earlier origins are under the 1949 law, before the days of the workable program requirement.

ONE BIG DIFFERENCE

So far as the antislum program is concerned, there is one major difference between the two acts.

Under the earlier bill, communities could undertake to clear slum areas with Federal assistance.

The 1954 act provides help not only to clear and redevelop sections which cannot be saved but also to prevent the spread of blight into good areas and to rehabilitate those economically restorable.

Federal help comes in three forms: Preparation of the area for redevelopment or rehabilitation, the actual redevelopment and the rehousing of displaced families.

EXECUTING 110 PROJECTS

Outright financial assistance is available only in the first instance. Included are

planning advances made to help communities finance surveys before site operations get under way, temporary loans used by the cities as working capital in acquiring slum land and structures and clearing them, and capital grants for this purpose.

Of the 340 projects in the mill, 110 are in the execution stage. Local governments, directly or through a qualified public agency, are making the areas ready for redevelopment or rehabilitation. The land is then sold to private enterprise or to public bodies for the uses called for in urban renewal plans.

UNITED STATES PAYS TWO-THIRDS

The difference between the amount received from this sale and the total cost of land acquisition and demolition of buildings is considered the net cost. The Federal Government will pay two-thirds of this. Federal funds are not used for actual construction or rehabilitation of houses in project areas.

Another 106 projects among the 340 are in final planning stages. The urban renewal administration has approved a preliminary report and the local authority has perfected a plan and presented it in final form. Allocation of loan-and-grant funds is just ahead.

APPLICATIONS APPROVED

One hundred and twenty-four projects are in preliminary planning. Applications for assistance have been approved by the URA. Planning advances may be issued if the local authorities request the money. Some $21 million in such advances have been cleared, a hike of nearly 45 percent over a year ago.

Besides $135 million in grant contracts committed, the Federal Government has reserved $369 million for others of these specific projects in the planning cycle.

Of the 340 projects initiated, 266 are being carried out under the 1949 act and 74 under the 1954 legislation. Sixty-one of the latter began after passage of the new law; 13 were converted from old to new.

ALL FUNDS COMMITTED

All of $500 million authorized in 1949 has been committed or specifically reserved. The housing agency is now working on an additional $200 million appropriated last summer for this fiscal year. That appropriation included another $200 million for fiscal 1957 and $100 million to be used at the President's discretion.

President Eisenhower said in his budget message that major progress was in sight for the first time. He predicted that by the end of the year 49 projects would be completed, 237 actively underway, and 112 in the planning stage.

Eight Ohio cities are participating in urban renewal, with 15 projects. Only 2 are in the execution stage—1 in Cleveland and 1 in Cincinnati. Six are in final planning—Toledo, Hamilton, Dayton, Columbus, and two in Cleveland. Four in Youngstown and one each in Cleveland, Columbus, and Steubenville are in preliminary planning.

Other supplemental Government aids include:

Outright planning grants to cities of less than 25,000, to regional planning authorities, and to metropolitan planning groups. Congress voted $3 million for these special cases in 1954. Some $819,000 has been approved or is reserved.

Demonstration grants for selected pilot operations. The Federal Government will pay two-thirds of the cost, on the theory that the results will add sufficiently to general knowledge to benefit the Nation. One example is a proposed test in which the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority wants to rehabilitate all dwellings on 15 parcels of land in one Garden Valley block.

Federal housing officials hope to get all of the 1949 law projects into development stage by June 30. They point out however, that they can only provide assistance. There are local, not Federal, projects.

Easier United States Slum Aid Bogged Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fourth of a series of articles on the housing problem in America, prepared by Phil G. Goulding, of the Washington Bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This article appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer under date of February 1, 1956, and is entitled "Easier United States Slum Aid Bogged Down":

EASIER UNITED STATES SLUM AID BOGGED DOWN—OFFICIALS DENY CRITICS' CRY OF FAILURE

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Federal Housing officials were jubilant over congressional action permitting liberal Government insurance of loans on homes and apartments in neighborhoods threatened by slums.

These sections of the law were to bring private money into the slum and urban renewal picture.

"They should do more to halt the decay of our cities than any single effort now being made."

This was the statement of Federal Housing Administrator Norman P. Mason. It was made in September 1954.

Sixteen months have passed.

Section 220 of the Housing Act provided for Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for single or multifamily rental dwellings in urban renewal areas, and for both new and rehabilitated structures.

Federal commitments have been made to only three projects, all in the Delano Village area of New York City.

FEW AUTHORIZED

Section 221 permits the FHA to stand behind mortgages on low-cost, owner-occupied private housing for persons displaced by slum-clearance operations.

A mere handful has been authorized.

Why has a law greeted with such enthusiasm apparently produced such meager results? Critics are crying failure. Government officials believe there has been no failure.

Since the results cited above appear to carry the case of the critics without further elaboration, these pieces will tell the Government's side of the story.

While other sections of the older housing law provided for Government insurance of mortgages on rental housing and individual homes, they were not designed for urban renewal. The new sections were.

Restrictions in the earlier act made it unfeasible for private builders to come into blighted areas. FHA could only go so far. The risk was in many cases considered too great for the Government to back apartment projects in slum areas with taxpayers' money.

Applications were submitted under sections 203 and 207 of the old act, and most of the projects initiated under that law have proceeded with Government insurance authorized by those provisions.

BELIEVED TOO BINDING

But the administration and the Congress believed the measure too binding. Principal difference is that under 220, passed in the 1954 act, the FHA can take into account the future redevelopment of an area under the urban renewal plan as its basis for accepting the mortgage risk.

Under other FHA mortgage programs, builders initiate their own undertakings, and apply through normal lending channels for Government insurance. Under 220, the initiative comes from local governments.

Before a project sponsor or builder may apply for section 220 insurance, the area in which he wants to build must first have been certified as eligible by housing and home finance administrator Albert M. Cole.

If the project is proceeding under the 1949 law, it must be established that it has received a Federal aid contract and meets other specific conditions.

THIRTY-FIVE JOBS CERTIFIED

If the project was initiated under the 1954 act, Cole's certification must follow approval of a workable program and completion of an urban renewal plan.

As of today, Cole has certified 35 projects as eligible for section 220.

Thirty-three received their eligibility stamp last April 19. These were in 11 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Included was the Longwood project in Cleveland.

Two have been added more recently—one in Kansas City and another in Philadelphia.

The 35 certifications may be measured against the 110 urban renewal projects which have reached the stage of execution. The obvious charge: Why have fewer than one-third of the projects been declared eligible for a program so joyously hailed?

BEGUN UNDER OLD LAW

The answer of Government officials are two:

With two exceptions, all 110 projects were begun under the 1949 law, before the days of 220. Many of them are strictly slum clearance ventures which do not provide for residential reuse of the land and are consequently not eligible for 220. They have no need of it.

Not more than 40 of the old-law projects have requested 220 assistance. That is an HHFA estimate.

Housing authorities emphasize, and critics agree, that the hope for section 220 is under the 1954 act, in projects designed from the beginning to take advantage of it. These are in the earlier stages of planning. Rehabilitation is a major advantage of the new law. The earlier legislation had no such provisions.

While these logical positions may clear Administrator Cole of allegations that he has not moved quickly enough in certification, they leave unaswered the next major question:

With 35 certifications, why has Mason's FHA made only 3 commitments and these all to 1 general project?

The next story will go into the FHA part of the operation.

United States Can Aid, Cannot Force, Building Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the

Members of Congress to the fifth of a series of articles on the housing problem in America by Phil G. Goulding, of the Washington bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on February 2, 1956. This very scholarly article is entitled "United States Can Aid, Cannot Force, Building Work."

UNITED STATES CAN AID, CANNOT FORCE, BUILDING WORK—FHA OFFICIALS ASSERT INVESTORS LAG

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—The Federal Government cannot put guns at the heads of private builders and demand that they start building.

This point is emphasized by top brass in the Federal Housing Administration when they are questioned about FHA-insured mortgages under section 220 of the 1954 Housing Act.

Thirty-five urban-renewal projects have been certified by the Housing and Home Finance Administration as eligible for such insurance. FHA has made only 3 commitments, and those 3 portions of 1 project.

That record looks poor. But officials point out, in at least half of the 35 areas there have been no active negotiations between private sponsors and FHA offices. Development authorities have not offered the land to builders. Builders have made no applications to take advantage of the certifications.

UNITED STATES NOT BUILDING

It is stressed that this is not a Federal program, such as the building of aircraft carriers, in which the Federal Government has only itself to blame for lack of progress. The Government is not supplying the money. It is not building the apartments. That is the job of the private builder, and it is the job of the local authorities running the cities' urban-renewal programs to offer land to builders and to interest them.

In seven cases, applications from builders have been received and are being processed.

Here is the rundown and the FHA comment on each:

Manhattantown, N. Y.: Negotiations began more than a year ago, simultaneously with those of Delano Village, where 762 units have received a commitment of $6,658,000. The sponsors were asked for credit information 9 months ago. This information has just been received.

SPEED EXPECTED

Pratt Institute in Brooklyn and Lenox Terrace in the Bronx: With the 2 above projects, these comprised the 4 original pilot cases. They all came in at the same time. It was agreed that priority would be given the others. These can now be wound up quickly, with action expected in 30 to 90 days.

St. John's Village in Jersey City and Parkway Triangle in Philadelphia: Applications were received last fall. Progress is good.

Southwest Tempoe, Philadelphia—application for 220 insurance has been in for more than a year. The FHA is all ready to go, and has been for some time. It is awaiting approval of plans by the Pennsylvania State Planning Commission.

Private Enterprise Redevelopment Corporation, Cleveland.—On the edge of commitment. It is believed that a contract satisfactory to the sponsor will be ready imminently—within a few days.

Several additional projects are being worked over in the preapplication stage, while Cleveland's Garden Valley has not been certified by Cole, negotiations with FHA have been underway for months.

CUTTING REDTAPE

Administrator Cole is hopeful of cutting redtape, but refuses to move without caution. He emphasizes that the impact of these projects will be felt for generations.

Activities involve separate considerations by municipal authorities, the Urban Renewals Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the builder sponsors and lending institutions. All must be coordinated.

Critics point out that it is not entirely the fault of the builder if restrictions eliminating his profit keep him out of the program. Change the law to lure him in, they say, or relax overly strict interpretation.

Housing officials believe the major hobbling feature which discouraged builders was one written in the 1954 act.

Congress directed that proposed projects be appraised on a basis of estimated value. This meant that the character of the neighborhood was necessarily taken into consideration.

APPRAISAL CHANGED

While mortgages on rental structures of five or more units could be insured up to 90 percent of the appraisal, this resulted in far less than 90 percent of the builder's cost. A million-dollar project in the heart of an urban renewal area could not be given the same appraisal as one in a swanky residential neighborhood.

This became obvious during the first year of the law.

At the administration's request, Congress last year amended the measure to make appraisals based on actual replacement cost. Higher appraisals mean less equity from the sponsor.

It is felt that this will have tremendous impact. President Eisenhower estimates that applications for urban renewal mortgage insurance will rise from less than 2,000 units in 1955 to 75,000 in 1957.

Housing bosses believe the builders will come in, now that they can get liberal terms under section 220 denied them in any other FHA mortgage insurance.

A final story will spell out specific builders' objections to the section and the replies of Government officials.

Officials Deny Windfall—Ghost of FHA Still Walks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the sixth and last of a series of articles which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on February 3, 1956, on the housing problem in America. This article was written by Phil G. Goulding, of the Washington Bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and is entitled "Officials Deny Windfall Ghost of FHA Still Walks." This article very graphically illustrates the need for revising the Federal laws on housing:

OFFICIALS DENY WINDFALL—GHOST OF FHA STILL WALKS

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Government officials scoff at the charge that the ghost of the infamous windfall scandals of 2 years ago still haunts the Federal Housing Administration.

Some builders and civic slum fighters allege that FHA is overly cautious in its administration of mortgage insurance for urban renewal projects, fearing a repetition of fantastic sponsor profits and embarrassing congressional investigations.

Authorities responsible for administering section 220 of the housing act contend that the ghost has been exorcised. They do admit to a period of ultraconservatism in the early days of the 1954 act, when the agency was still extremely windfall conscious.

Part of this conservatism sprang from congressional caution, which set up the yardstick to be used in appraising proposed projects. Amendments enacted last year changed the appraisal law and eliminated the major obstacle to 220 mortgage insurance.

TERMS LIBERALIZED

Part of it was exemplified in the FHA charter setup. The administration holds the majority of preferred stock in corporations established for 220 projects. Delayed dividend restrictions locked up the money put into the corporation by sponsor builders.

Thus hobbled, builders declined to participate. The terms were liberalized by FHA last February, so that builders could extract their money under certain circumstances. A recent directive removed the "bugs" of this liberalization, permitting sponsors to pay themselves back as return of capital rather than taxable earnings.

Housing officials here feel the second principal barrier to greater building activity under 220 was thus removed.

From the field, where sponsors are undergoing daily negotiations with local FHA offices, come many more complaints against the law and the manner in which it is being administered.

Here are a few with official answers:

The charge: That the law permits reasonable profit, but that FHA allows only 5 percent. With a 10 percent figure, the builder still must have cash equal to 3 percent of the total cost; with 5 percent profit, his equity must be 6 percent.

The reply: Congress warned FHA not to go over 10. A full 10 percent would amount to an outright subsidy in many areas. It is untrue that FHA will permit only five. In the one commitment made—three Delano village projects in New York—the builder was allowed 7 percent.

The pertinent directive to field offices reads that fees should be determined "on the basis of the utmost diligence exercised in determining the appropriate percentage, commensurate with the fees customarily being paid in the area for projects which are similar in type and size."

The charge: That FHA valuations resulted in mortgages below 90 percent of the actual cost to builders.

The reply: Before the 1955 amendment, FHA had to follow the law on appraisal. This did result in 85-percent-of-cost mortgages, which builders would not accept. It is no longer true, now that appraisals are based on replacement cost.

The charge: That there still is too much caution displayed, so much that Federal authorities are evidently not genuinely in sympathy with the law.

The reply: Tremendous risks are being taken. One example is the level-payment plan of amortization. The debt service is the same to begin with as it is in the 40th year. We are gambling that

the income of the project will remain constant throughout the life of the mortgage—a gamble against tenant dissatisfaction, inflation, and the character of the neighborhood. We are not required to heed the "economic soundness" required under section 207, and we do not.

Reporter's note: The only Federal people interviewed who appeared cool to the 220 program were a couple of oldtimers who felt that only wholesale public housing, and not Government insurance of private builders, could do the job.

The FHA official most directly responsible for 220 operations is W. Beverley Mason, Special Assistant for Urban Renewal, who is vitally interested, extremely able, and works far into the night on his job.

The charge: That there is no authority at the local level. Field personnel check and doublecheck with Washington on every detail.

The reply: Builders get this impression because they ask insuring offices for things far in excess of the law and administrative regulations. Some request 95, 100, or 110 percent insurance. We do need to perfect techniques on the rehabilitation advantages of 220, and we are now in the midst of boiling the process down.

The charge: That processing takes so long that banks will not become involved; they prefer to earn a return on their capital in other ways.

The reply: We know of no cases where the sponsor has failed to go ahead because he could not get bank financing.

The charge: That FHA is applying Shaker Heights standards to urban renewal apartment projects. The specifications: That in Garden Valley, for example, the Government has insisted upon the elimination of common walls in row houses, on blacktopping the parking area, on enlarging the buildings to make rooms of swanky-apartment size.

The reply: We seek the minimum construction that will have market acceptance. Garden Valley is on a slag fill, with settlement a major problem. The double wall was recommended so that the settlement of one unit would not pull down the adjoining one. Blacktop or asphalt-concrete was recommended for the parking area to cut down on the terrible slag dust.

Suggested change in building size was from 59 to 63 feet. The larger building provides for a living room 12.5 to 13 feet, 1 bedrom 9 by 12.5 and another 9 by 9.6. These are not luxury apartment standards. Rooms should be at least this large, to protect the taxpayers' money which is insuring the mortgage and to keep within the spirit of a law designed to improve housing conditions.

The charge: That rents proposed under 220 projects are too steep for persons whose homes are being lost as the slums they live in are being cleared and renewed.

The reply: Rental housing projects under 220 are not meant to be for these low-income families being displaced. Nowhere in the law, or in congressional comment on it, is this purpose suggested. There is wide misunderstanding on this point.

Section 220 is to help fight decay by establishing decent housing in areas now lost to communities. Public housing and private single-family homes under section 221 are designed for displaced low-income families.

Mortgage limitations written by Congress clearly indicate that 220 projects need not be low-rent projects. The law provides for a mortgage up to $2,250 per room. This may be hiked to $2,700 where elevators are included and an additional $3,700 in high-cost building areas. The mortgage on a 4-room apartment can, therefore, be $14,800.

Compare this with 221 limitations of a $8,600 top for a single house. It becomes obvious, not by administrative interpretation but by congressional law, that 220 was not enacted as a substitute for public housing.

Federal Housing Administration officials nonetheless strive to produce middle-income housing under the section—for those who earn too much to qualify for public housing, but not enough for decent private rental projects.

But communities and builders who want to improve slum property by shooting for the maximum limitation and more costly apartments will not be turned down. The Federal Government wants to lure private builders into constructing on slum land.

Rents, therefore, will vary tremendously. Where Garden Valley now proposes $85 for two-bedroom units, the rate in Delano Village in New York is $37 per room, $148 for a four-room suite. And on some slum land in Philadelphia, an air-conditioned project with elevators is on the way.

In Philadelphia's case, no Federal money went into the actual land acquisition or slum clearance. Building plans were delayed until passage of a 1955 amendment raising the limit on a single mortgage to private enterprise from $5 million to $12.5 million. Only 43 families were displaced, so relocation was not a major task.

But it remains one of the chief problems of the entire anti-slum fight—rehousing of those whose homes, however deteriorated, are leveled.

Adequate Funds for Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of the Members will be interested in a letter I have received on the subject of vocational education from Assistant Commissioner H. Pat Wardlaw, of the division of instruction, department of education in our State of Missouri. Mr. Wardlaw is director of vocational education in our State and therefore very familiar with the value of the vocational education program and of the need for adequate Federal appropriations to help the States maintain and expand their work in this important field.

Mr. Wardlaw points out that although there has been no cut in the President's budget for the 1956–57 fiscal year from the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year for vocational education, people interested in vocational education are disturbed that the President has not asked for the full amount authorized under the George-Barden Act. He points out that there have been increases in budget requests for vocational rehabilitation, for apprenticeship training, for agricultural extension work, and for agricultural research, and he feels it would not have been unreasonable to provide a similar percentage increase—and it would be about the same percent—for vocational education to provide the full amount authorized under the recent statute.

In view of the hard fight which we have had to carry forward here on the House floor in recent years to assure adeuate appropriations for vocational education, particularly when the admininstration sets its sight too low in this field, I think there would be general interest in reading Mr. Wardlaw's letter, and therefore I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
STATE OF MISSOURI,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 20, 1956.

MRS. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
United States Representatives, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: People interested in vocational education in Missouri were pleased to note that President Eisenhower, in his recent budget message to Congress, recommended no cut in Federal appropriations for vocational education for fiscal 1957. They are concerned, however, that he could not see fit to recommend the full amount authorized under the provisions of the George-Barden Act ($29,267,080.58), which they believe is so badly needed. An increase of 10.4 percent over the appropriation of last year ($26,500,000) would finance the George-Barden program in full, and, in view of the President's recommended increases for Vocational Rehabilitation (9.6 percent), Bureau of Apprenticeship (9.3 percent), Department of Agricultural Extension Service (8 percent), and Department of Agricultural Research Service (12.6 percent), the full appropriation under the George-Barden Act would not seem at all unreasonable.

You are, of course, aware of the needs of the public schools in Missouri and the commendable efforts of the Missouri General Assembly and the people of our State in the pasage of new legislation providing a foundation program of education. This greatly increased State support is only a minimum program, however, and the needs for continued expansion of our vocational programs for youth and adults is very great. For the past few years those youth enrolled in our secondary schools have been from the very light crop of "depression babies" born in the thirties. For the years ahead our secondary schools will be literally swamped with youth from the heavy crop of babies born in the forties. Over twice as many of our youth in numbers will need vocational training in the immediate future.

Of the total funds spent for vocational education in Missouri during recent years the percentage of Federal funds declined from 28 percent to 21 percent in a period of 4 years (1950–54). Such a fast declining percentage in Federal funds will not allow for needed expansion in our program to reach more youth and adults, and, therefore, the recent actions of Congress in halting this decline have been of utmost impor-

tance in Missouri. Vocational enrollments in Missouri schools are yet only a small fraction of our annual labor replacement needs in industrial services, business, or agriculture as estimated by the United States Department of Labor.

Please accept my thanks and comemndations as well as those of many other Missourians for all that you have done for vocational education in past years. Any support you can give toward our effort to get the full amount for fiscal 1957, as authorized under the provisions of the George-Barden Act, will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

H. PAT WARDLAW,
Assistant Commissioner, Division of Instruction, Director, Vocational Education.

President Eisenhower as a Candidate in the Minnesota Presidential Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement I made at St. Paul, Minn., at the time I placed the name of President Eisenhower in the Minnesota presidential primaries as a candidate for President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

The citizens of Minnesota in March of 1952 catapulted President Eisenhower into American political leadership with an unprecedented write-in vote in the Minnesota presidential primary. Today the Republican Party of Minnesota reaffirms its convictions and faith of 4 years ago by placing the name of President Eisenhower before the voters in the Minnesota primary to be held on March 20, 1956.

The petitions which have been filed in behalf of the President contain the names of approximately 1,000 people from all walks of life. We are entering the President in the Minnesota primary confident that he will be a candidate for reelection and certain that he will be returned to the White House for a second term by a landslide vote.

President Eisenhower's administration has been one of imagination, conscience, mind, and heart. He has breathed new life and has injected hope and faith into a sagging world.

During the campaign of 1952 he spoke plainly to the American people about world peace and domestic prosperity. This was done amid a backdrop of the Korean war, rigid controls on wages, prices, rents, a spiraling inflation, excessive deficit spending, high taxes, and a Government which was growing topheavy after 20 years of bureau operating on top of bureau.

Today just 3 years after his inauguration we find the United States at peace, enjoying an unprecedented prosperity without economic controls, and with a balanced budget in sight. Inflation has been arrested, taxes have been reduced, and Government operations have been streamlined. This all adds up to the fact that the President has kept faith with the American public and has fulfilled his campaign promises like no other presidential candidate in our time.

Today his opponents stand exposed before the public in a state of utter disbelief and frustration. These are the people who laughed in late 1952 when the President visited Korea personally in an attempt to end the Korean war. These are the same people who spread gloom and doom in 1953. They predicted a deep depression, the destruction of labor unions in the United States, and an isolationist approach to world affairs. They proved to be false prophets. They were wrong; President Eisenhower was a far greater leader than they were accustomed to.

President Eisenhower has unfolded a new and stimulating philosophy in government. It is neither radical nor reactionary. It does not constantly pull at the tender strings of emotion. It rejects the proposition that every phase of the individual's life must be planned and controlled from Washington. He has created an active partnership among the Federal Government, the State and local governments, and the individual citizen.

In foreign affairs the Republican administration has assumed world leadership which rejects the policy of appeasement toward Russia. We have made clear that we are desirous of world peace, but that we are prepared at the same time to thwart aggression wherever it may come. The United States has seized the initiative in the battle of nerves with Russia. No longer is our policy geared only to the timetable of Communist aggression.

As a vital part of this policy the administration has taken all steps to protect the security of the United States. The President with his military and diplomatic experience and background has been able to achieve these interrelated results by careful and prudent planning of our military needs and our diplomatic goals.

Perhaps the true greatness of the President can best be seen through his deep and sincere concern for the individual. It is in the field of human relations where we find the heart and conscience of a great humanitarian. He has charted a new course for the young and the aged. School construction and extended social-security benfits for millions will in time have a profound effect upon the population of this country. He has translated his compassion for the sick and bereaved into action by spearheading the drive for more intensive research into medical science to combat such ills as heart disease, cancer, polio, cerebral palsy, etc. Many have spoken pages of empty words about civil rights, but not since Lincoln have we had a President truly dedicated to the proposition that race, color, and creed do not determine the rights and privileges of our citizens. President Eisenhower has made it clear to all that every individual enjoys an inherent dignity which human bigotry cannot destroy. Herein lies the true reason why the President has become a member of every family in the United States.

President Eisenhower has brought out the best in our heritage of freedom, liberty, and opportunity. The American people will extend their thanks in November with a resounding vote of confidence in the President and the Republican Party.

The Peace Party's Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, world history records that in a free economy such as ours and which must be preserved here, segments of the people have for relatively short periods experienced financial setbacks until the aftermath of wars has been completely erased.

Our farm belt has been passing through just such an era. It had its origin on the day in 1951 when the Democrats rolled back cattle prices 10 percent—that was the day all farm prices started down the toboggan.

By honorable, peaceful means—without the stimulant of war and its heartaches—the Republican Peace Party will earnestly strive, and will succeed, in leading the way to genuine prosperity.

That is our sacred pledge to the American people.

Trade Unions in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter I received from Mike J. Armano, business agent, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, Local No. 187, of Lawrence, Mass., enclosing the most interesting and inspiring address of Mr. Vincent LaCapria, comanager of the New York joint board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

The letter and address follows:

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING
WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO.,
Lawrence, Mass., February 3, 1956.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
Lawrence, Mass.

DEAR MR. LANE: We are enclosing a copy of the speech made by Mr. Vincent LaCapria, comanager of the New York joint board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at our annual installation of officers banquet which was held on Saturday evening, January 28, 1956, at Central Catholic Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., at which time he installed the officers and executive boards of Local No. 187, Lawrence, Mass., and Locals No. 559 and No. 709, Lowell, Mass.

Sincerely,

MIKE J. ARMANO,
Business Agent, A. C. W. A., Local No. 187.

SPEECH OF VINCENT LACAPRIA

The installation of officers of an amalgamated local union is always a happy event. Only too often, however, we all become deeply involved in the forms and lose sight of the great material and spiritual values implicit in the installation ceremony. It is these values I would like to recall for you during these brief observations.

A labor union is a brotherhood. It does for men and women what they cannot do for themselves, singly as individuals. Without a union to give them collective strength, individual workers are as nothing when confronted by the great business corporations and other aggregations of industrial financial power.

In our modern society, it is the union, perhaps more than any other human agency, which helps the individual worker retain his self-respect, his sense of human dignity. Work by the sweat of our brow, without the

retention of dignity; and the conviction that man is made in God's image, belongs to the Dark Ages, and could only mean a bestial existence.

The labor union does other things beside helping man retain the sense of manhood, and a woman worker her womanhood. I put human dignity first, of course, because man does not live by bread alone, and bread without roses can be an existence only on a low animal plane.

But the union does bring a higher standard of living. It makes the necessities possible, and some of the luxuries. The late beloved Philip Murray put it simply, when he said the average worker aspires to a rug on the floor and a picture on the wall. The union makes this possible, and it makes possible a comprehensive system of social welfare benefits, including health, life, maternity, hospitalization, surgical, and retirement benefits, which cushion the blows of illness and death of the breadwinner, and the insecurities of old age.

The union does more. It makes possible better educational opportunities for our children, it makes possible vacation with pay and true leisure time in which we can consult our soul and indulge those simple pleasures which round out our lives and make them tolerable.

Finally, the unions help make workers a real part of the community. No longer are they disfranchised or second-class citizens. They participate in politics, in community welfare, in the great crusades against disease. There isn't a single Red Cross campaign, or community chest appeal, or fight against the ravages of polio, cancer, tuberculosis, and heart disease in which we do not participate. As a matter of fact, there isn't a humanitarian cause today that could get off the ground, without active labor support.

All this adds meaning and satisfaction to our lives as men and women. We are part of the community, and the community relies on us. And all this flows from the fact that labor unions in America have come of age, are strong and responsible and play their part in the life around us.

Furthermore, unions carry on an unceasing fight for civil liberties and civil rights, in the struggle against discrimination and segregation, in the fight for minorities, in the struggle for racial and religious equality.

Trade unions in America are a natural outgrowth of our democratic way of life. They are free associations of men and women who aspire to a better life, who understand that in unity there is strength and that mutual benefits carry mutual responsibilities.

When we install a new administration in a local labor union, or reelect an old one, we show our confidence in these men and women for their term of office. We believe they will do their duty conscientiously and well, that they will be guided by the best interests of the membership, that they will be inspired by the great traditions of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

It is fitting also, while we bask in the sunshine and security of our great influence and prestige today, and in the strength of our 400,000 members all over the land and in Canada, that we remember that all this was achieved not without a struggle and the great sacrifice of men and women, many of them nameless, who forged this union. Out of the sweatshops and the slums and the tenements of America they forged this mighty labor organization, so that they and those who came after them would enjoy the benefits of decent wage and working standards, security, and human dignity.

Let us remember and give thanks to those valiant men and women who fought in the shops and on the picket lines, who starved and bled, who sacrificed the little they had to make these blessings possible for all of us.

It is in this spirit of rededication to our highest ideals, our great and heroic past, and to our future goals, that I now install the officers of this Amalgamated local for the ensuing term.

Operation Pork Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in the form of a summary of efforts made by various communities in my State and in the neighboring State of Iowa to increase the consumption of meat stocks. Admittedly a publicity venture and gimmick, it nevertheless does show the efforts of some of our local people to make intelligent and alert efforts to solve a very trying problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPERATION PORK LIFT

(Statement by Senator HRUSKA)

Many studies of our farm problems have shown that consumption of our farm products lags far behind production despite our population increase and lower farm prices. As a result, we have plied up huge surpluses which hang over the market further depressing prices.

Statistics show that the American consumer is spending less money for meat despite his higher take-home pay. And, although the United States is the world's fifth largest meat producer, our meat consumption per capita lags far behind per capita meat consumption in Uruguay, Australia, Argentina, and other meat producing countries.

When pork prices dropped recently, Nebraskans and Iowans faced up to these facts and made a frontal attack on them. The result was a help your neighbor campaign, operation pork lift, aimed at increasing pork consumption and strengthening hog prices.

At the suggestion of the West Pottawattamie County, Iowa, Farm Bureau last December, operation pork life was organized in Omaha and Council Bluffs. Working committees were set up in each city, spearheaded by their respective chambers of commerce, and coordinated through the Omaha-Council Bluffs joint steering committee.

These groups represented all segments of the pork economy—producers, packers, labor unions, marketing interests, retail grocers, restaurants, and consumers. No advance notice was given the consumer so that he could save up his pork purchasing before a 3-day campaign held January 12 through 14.

Promotional material for the eat pork campaign was carried by the press, radio, and television, and in groceries, nonfood retailers, and restaurants. Pork featured school lunches, hospital meals, and service organization lunches.

At the end of the campaign not one food retailer was found who had not at least doubled his pork sales, and several reported increases up to 600 percent. The dollars-and-cents results for pork producers were immediate; at the end of the campaign week the Omaha hog market closed with hog prices 25 cents to 50 cents a hundred pounds higher, and the closing top, $12.25 a hundredweight, was the highest since November.

With Govs. Victor Anderson, of Nebraska, and Leo Hoegh, of Iowa, acting as spearheads, Operation Porklife now has reached statewide proportions.

A public-spirited city in each State—Cozad, Nebr., and Audubon, Iowa—symbolized the intensiveness of these campaigns by contesting for a pork-consumption championship. Each city enlisted surrounding cities and towns in the week-long effort, and caravans of pork purchasers visited each city daily. Airplanes were used as the contest neared an end to keep retailers supplied with pork products. Otoe County, Nebr., began its Porklife January 21.

Presented with the first ham sold in the Cozad campaign, President Eisenhower wrote Cozad citizens, "The friendly competition between Audubon and Cozad cannot fail to focus attention on the pork-disposal problem of the country as a whole."

The impact of these campaigns on our farm problems is, indeed, a significant one. In addition to encouraging pork consumption and working to relieve the surplus, these campaigns lead to better health by encouraging more consumption of pork in a greater variety. Housewives found more uses for other than the demand cuts which make up only about one-third of the hog, but have the same protein value.

This Nebraska-Iowa leadership shows the country, Mr. President, the contribution it can make directly toward licking our surplus problems. It again demonstrates that local initiative and resourcefulness can secure results quickly and economically without the need for Government interference.

The following item is taken from the Omaha World-Herald of January 31, 1956:

"A PINK GLOW IN THE SKIES

"Sure, it was a publicity gag.

"It won't solve the farm problem.

"But what a glorious time the people of Audubon, Iowa, and Cozad, Nebr., had in last week's pork-sale derby.

"And not the residents of those two towns only. Hosts of people flocked in from nearby communities—and far-away ones too—to take part in the contest. That probably is one of the big reasons why Audubon won. It has more neighbors.

"As for the spirit of the two towns, there wasn't much to choose. Both were superb. Both threw themselves into the contest with that high-octane enthusiasm which is experienced only by people who work selflessly for their neighbors and their community.

"We imagine there will be a pink glow in the skies over Audubon and Cozad for many a week to come."

Unsatisfactory Mail Service in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter which was sent to the Postmaster General on January 27, 1956, regarding unsatisfactory mail service in Montana. The letter was signed by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr.

MANSFIELD] by Representative METCALF, and myself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1956.

The Honorable ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SUMMERFIELD: From time to time we have contacted you or other members of your Department regarding unsatisfactory mail service in Montana. Recently complaints have been increasing.

They have come from Stanford, where the Commercial Club assigned a committee to investigate the "rapidly deteriorating mail service."

They have come from an official of the State of Montana, who reports that Montanans may suffer "serious financial loss" due to discontinuance of the post-office directory service.

They have come from a Miles City businessman who is disturbed by rumors that the Post Office Department is considering discontinuing the railway postal service between Miles City and Butte on Milwaukee trains 15 and 16.

They have come from major cities, like Billings, and from small communities like Forest Grove, between Lewistown and Winnett, the mail to this community having been curtailed, we are told, to 3 days a week.

Protests against proposed closing of small post offices continue to come in. And, as our voluminous correspondence on the matter indicates, there has been considerable dissatisfaction over discontinuance of week-end RPO service in northeastern Montana.

There, in outline, is the picture we are getting of inadequate mail service in Montana. This morning's mail indicates that Montana is not unique. The publisher of a daily newspaper with nationwide circulation reports an increasingly large number of complaints of poor mail delivery service from "almost every State in the Union."

A typical complaint, reports the publisher, is that his subscribers receive no papers at all for a week or 10 days, and then get all the missing numbers in 1 day's delivery.

We need not remind you, I am sure, of the Republican Party's 1952 platform pledge to provide a more efficient and frequent mail delivery service, which was followed by President Eisenhower's assurance that this program would be carried out to the letter.

We respectfully request that your personal attention be directed to the deteriorating postal delivery situation in Montana.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

Funds for Forest Recreation Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Great Falls Tribune, of Great Falls, Mont., on January 21, 1956. The editorial is entitled "METCALF Seeks More Funds for Forest Recreation Areas," and deals with Representative METCALF's bill, H. R. 1823.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METCALF SEEKS MORE FUNDS FOR FOREST RECREATION AREAS

Last year, after many unfruitful discussions of previous years about the inadequacy of national park facilities to meet growing tourist demands, Congress finally took action to provide money for a start on an extensive park improvement program.

There is, however, an even broader and more constant increase of recreation use in our national forests related to which the national parks are only special preserves. Provisions for this greater use have so far been spotty and inadequate.

Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, has given a great deal of attention to this matter and his efforts have gained favorable national attention.

He is author of a bill (H. R. 1823) now pending in the House which would provide more money to restore wornout recreational facilities in our national forest and build for the future.

In support of his measure, he points out that "the public's forests are making money for us." Receipts in fiscal 1955 from timber sales, grazing permits, recreation, and the like totaled more than $84 million. The same year Congres appropriated $66 million for care and improvement of the national forests—a net gain to the Treasury of $18 million.

METCALF's bill proposes for reinvestment of some of the profits in the business. It would declare public recreation use of the national forests to be a policy of Congress. Watershed protection and timber production at present are the primary objectives of the forest system.

Second, it would earmark 10 percent of the national forest receipts each year for recreation use, improvement and maintenance of wild habitat and provisions for adequate safety, sanitation, and health in connection with uses of the national forests—the amount so set aside not to exeeced $5½ million in any one year.

There are other features of the bill which would further implement the recreation use objectives. Its passage would be of benefit to the Nation as well as to Montana and other regions of extensive forest acreage.

Make It Permanent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Mirror of Tuesday, February 7, 1956:

MAKE IT PERMANENT

The United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, is a valuable institution to this area and, in the larger sense, to the defense of the Nation.

It deserves to become a permanent school for the training of marine officers.

That is the opinion of Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and Senator PAYNE, Republican, of Maine, who as chairman and member, respectively, of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, have just concluded a long study of Federal and State merchant marine academies.

They recommended the passage of the Kings Point bill (H. R. 6043) and continued Federal air for maritime academies in Maine, Massachusetts, and California.

The Senators refuted a false contention by the Defense Department and some labor unions that comparatively few graduates of the academies go to sea. The majority do. They also add to the strength of the Naval Reserve.

We believe the bill will bolster United States seapower both in commerce and war and that it should be passed.

Let the Farmers Run Their Own Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let the Farmers Run Their Own Business. They Can Do It Better, and At No Cost to the Taxpyer," which was written by Lester J. Bell, of 300 Eiden Drive, Boise, Idaho. I commend the reading of the article to my colleagues, so that they may have the thoughts of this distinguished Idahoan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE FARMERS RUN THEIR OWN BUSINESS—THEY CAN DO IT BETTER, AND AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER

Until farmers themselves take control of their affairs there will be no long-time solution of the problem of overproduction and low prices. Any kind of Government planning, support, or control is at best only a temporary palliative that does nothing to eradicate the cause of the trouble. And, while failing to give the farmer any sound, long-time assistance, Government help to date has resulted mostly in shouldering the taxpayer with the burden of billions of dollars spent for loans, incentives, purchases, and storage of surplus farm products.

The solution is so obvious that it appears to have escaped attention of the planners who have looked beyond the foreground to far horizons. The individual farmer has always seen it but his weak voice has been lost in the noise of the winds rushing toward state-planned economy.

To cure the sickness that ails agriculture Government only has to (1) enact basic legislation permitting and encouraging nationwide organizations of farmers on a commodity basis, (2) provide for referendums of producers to authorize and accept organization authority, and (3) loan sufficient funds to the organizations to set them up in business.

The organizations, so formed, would:

1. Set goals at exactly 100 percent of parity.
2. Permit marketing only at parity.
3. Establish production controls as needed and issue marketing cards.
4. Dispose of any surplus produced by: Selling on competitive foreign markets, donating to famine-stricken nations, diverting to industrial use, storing to meet future shortages, or letting the farmer keep it to

use on his own farm or turn in on next year's allotment.

5. Loan money to members unable to sell immediately on a glutted local market.

Legislation will undoubtely be necessary to permit organizations of such gigantic size, to supervise and control referendum elections, to provide for establishing parity, to establish any advisable police control and in general to protect free enterprise and the consuming public.

Full parity for the farmer is so eminently fair that no honest criticism can be raised; it is fundamental to national welfare whether imposed by Government or demanded by the farmer himself. The parity price should be set by the Secretary of Agriculture as necessary to meet changing levels of national economy.

The law of supply and demand, featuring agriculture to the exclusion of other productive enterprises, has been overworked in recent years; it has beaten down the price at the farm and brought no relief to the housewife for the food she buys. Demand, per capita, is greater today than at any period in our history. Under this suggested system the commodity group would exactly supply domestic demand, and any surplus could not be used as a leverage by the processor, middleman or speculator for his own gain; any extra would not be fighting for domestic consumptive acceptance but would be owned by the organization, or its members, to be disposed of elsewhere as seen fit. It would not depress the market. It would not burden the taxpaying public.

Production controls imposed by the organization should be on a bushel, bale, pound, and so forth, basis, not on acreage as in the past. The way it has actually worked is that the farmer, having his acreage cut down, has farmed the remaining acres better, trying to raise enough extra, at a reduced price, to still meet his money goals. The only possible outcome has been pyramiding surpluses—to be taken over by Government.

With a unit allotment the farmer will produce it on fewer acres and better husbandry. Having met his money goal by knowing how much he can sell and the price he will get he will plant the diverted acres to lower income on noncompetitive crops, try new crops that he cannot risk at present, or retire the acres to his own soil bank that won't cost the Government a cent. He will have every incentive for better farming and new initiative.

Under any type of full control, or freedom from all controls, bountiful Nature often brings forth harvests in overabundance. It is not Nature's plan to penalize a man for her own bounty. Any such surplus, whether held by individual farmers or stored in the organization's ever normal granary should contribute no evil to national welfare; on the contrary, it would be a blessing of security to meet future shortages, war or the uncertainties of the future. Our phenomenal national growth has thrived on the availability of abundance—even surplus—of everything our population needs. Today, we have more automobiles, TV sets, bath tubs than absolutely essential to meet lowest requirements; we have a few thousand able-bodied men without jobs; stores, factories and services are running full-tilt. Does that mean we're in a bad way? Individually or nationally, if we become financially pressed, we can wear last year's clothes or drive the 3-year-old jalopy, but we cannot live on the food we ate last year. The farmer does have a market, never better, and the working man has the means to satisfy a healthy appetite.

Tradition has it that farmers cannot get together nor stick together. That was undoubtedly true 40 years ago the same as it was in other walks of life when the economy of "dog eat dog and the devil take the hindmost" prevailed. But times have changed and everyone except the farmers are organized for their own protection. The heavy hand of Government has, instead of elevating the farmer to a par with others, actually held him under paternal bondage with an implied promise of a gift that has never been delivered. If he had been let alone, he would have long since organized as have his city cousins. Notwithstanding, Government controls and nursing has taught Mr. Farmer two things: he will get no real help from Government, and the individual must bow to a higher authority whether it be imposed by Uncle Sam or the mutual welfare of his own group.

The national soil-bank plan is the new promise of salvation for agriculture. Dozens of other schemes have been advanced and tried the past 20 years and each has been proclaimed the panacea of the ages. They have all had one outstanding characteristic in common: pay the farmer for not doing something. Erstwhile plans have failed, as will this one, for we are bucking nature and the history of progress if we insist on placing a reward on doing nothing instead of doing something.

The security of abundance, balance of national economy, and the well-being of agriculture will be attained when we let the farmers manage their own business. The boss himself can do it better than the hired man or the foreman.

The McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal American of Monday, January 23, 1956. It is entitled "Needs Fixing." It points out the injustice and unfairness of the present quota system, and calls for an amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDS FIXING

An important piece of unfinished business has been called to the attention of Congress by President Eisenhower.

It concerns proposed changes in our immigration laws.

Specifically, it concerns the discriminations inherent in certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, generally known as the McCarran-Walter act.

This legislation was in many ways constructive, and it contains many good features (screening out Communists who would sneak into the United States, for instance) favored by virtually all Americans.

But it also has provisions which create an "urgent need" for revision of the law, as the President put it in his state of the Union message. And it should be kept in mind that in calling for a revision of the act neither President Eisenhower nor this newspaper is urging or favors outright repeal of the McCarran-Walter measure. The distinction between "revision" and "repeal" is, we hope, clear to everyone interested in seeing that such an important act reflects the ageless principles of true Americanism.

The most pressing need is for revision of that section of the act containing the formula may have been, it is in effect discrim-

Whatever the original purpose of this formula may have been, it is in effect discriminatory.

Under the act as now written, immigration quotas are set up according to the national origins of the white population in the United States at the time of the 1920 census.

The practical result of this formula has been to assign about 82 percent of the annual immigration quota to the nations of northern and western Europe, and to discriminate cruelly against the others.

What the present law says, in effect, is that an Englishman or a German, for instance, is welcome in the United States, but that a Greek, or an Italian, or a Jew from eastern Europe is not.

This, obviously, is notoriously contrary to the American concept of judging a man by his individual worth, not by his nationality or religion, and the contrast is so stark that the Communists have seized upon it to make propaganda against America all over the world.

Ironically, the present act is keeping out of this country literally thousands of worthy and distressed human beings—many of them fugitives from Communist oppression—whose presence in this country would be an asset to the Nation.

A Disgusting Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that our Communist adversaries are busy today—busy telling a shameful story to confused people all over the world. The story is being circulated in India, in the Middle East, in the Far East—all over the globe. It is a powerful but completely distorted and false story of the American people.

We have spent billions to bring the truth to those already enslaved and on the brink of Communist enslavement, and now in one brief and disgusting incident, we and our message have suffered a setback from which we may never fully recover.

A small mob of cowardly hooligans, blinded by ignorance and hate, inflamed by liquor and bigoted venom, have caused all this, and have destroyed all that we have worked so assiduously to accomplish. The objective of this foul rabble's hatred is a single defenseless girl named Autherine Lucy, 26 years old. She happens to be a Negress. When she attempted to attend classes at the University of Alabama, the mob collected and greeted her with stones, mud balls, and eggs as fetid as the breath used by these erstwhile men, turned to beasts, in their vituperative catcalls.

To all of this, Alabama's Governor Folsom has as yet made no comment.

It is required for someone to say that this is not a picture of America. True Americans are agonized by this spectacle and pray to God that the Communist propaganda machine will not make the

people of the world lose confidence in America or faith in democracy.

Respect for the dignity of the individual is still the essence of democracy and the American creed, the actions of a disgraceful riotous mob of 1,000 cowards to the contrary notwithstanding.

Brink by Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address delivered by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON at the congressional dinner, nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, in Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1956.

The address follows:

Anyone who walks the corridors of the Capitol today finds his elected representatives absorbed by two problems: the farm problem and the problem of our foreign relations. Every participant in this nationalities group is immediately attracted to these questions because so many of us have ties back to another country where the way of life is largely agricultural. Naturally, many of these farmers who immigrated to this country found their way into agricultural pursuits. All through the States of Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas and Nebraska you find whole areas that were built up by those individuals who say in America a chance for freedoms, opportunities and the pursuit of happiness which they had not known in their homeland.

On my bookshelves at home I have a book entitled "The Swedes in South Dakota." There were huge immigrations of Swedes in the 1860's and as I turn the leaves of the book I find not only the name of my father, but of my cousins and uncles and aunts. A whole section of the Dakotas was filled by the Swedish migration.

They came looking for land, land that was free. Jim Hill became their patron saint because as he stretched his railroads across the western prairies he made advantageous sales to the Scandinavian and German immigrants. They could acquire one quarter of a section by homestead route, another quarter section by a tree claim, and then buy the alternate quarters from the railroad to give them a full section of land. It was a day of great opportunity not only to those who entered agriculture but to those who were employed in industry because if they did not like their jobs they could pick up their belongings and go west to make a new home and a good living.

It's because my father was born in Sweden that by instinct and inheritance I am attracted to the problems of the farm and to those matters of international relationships which touch the peoples in lands over the seas.

Every time we come closer to an election the farm problem gets more attention. For 3 years farm prices have been moving downward. We Democrats occasionally differ among ourselves as to causes and sometimes as to proposed remedies, but we are agreed on one subject. That is that the farmer has been getting proportionately less and less of the consumer's dollar, a smaller and ever smaller share of national income, and a persistent reduction in his markets at home and abroad.

I'm sure Secretary Benson has good intentions, but he may be headed the wrong way. For instance, he said this to the Farm Bureau Convention on December 16, 1953: "Let me assure you that though the solution of the farm problem may still be in the future, considerable progress has been made along the road to recovery. I believe that 1953 has marked the turning point—in the right direction."

Let's look at the farmer's road to recovery. On the day that Mr. Eisenhower was elected President, parity stood at 99 percent. I know it had been higher and I know it got lower before Mr. Eisenhower was inaugurated because people worried over what his administration would do to the farmers, but on the day he was elected, parity stood at 99 percent. And today it stands at 80 percent. That's the lowest it has been since 1940. That is one landmark on the road to recovery.

When Mr. Eisenhower was elected President, the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar was 47 percent. True, it had been up to 54 percent in 1945, but it went on down until today it stands at 38 percent, almost a record low and the lowest it has been since 1939. That is another milestone on the road to recovery.

When Mr. Eisenhower was elected, net farm income was running at the rate of 15 billions per year. Today it is running at the rate of 10.5 billion per year and the Department estimates it may drop lower in 1956. That is the third milestone on the road to recovery. From these we may conclude that what Mr. Benson referred to as the right direction is not the direction that agriculture was traveling during the years of Democratic administration.

When I read these comments by the Secretary, I am reminded of a flier who flew the Atlantic Ocean but claimed that he really thought he was flying to the west coast. The press named him "Wrong Way Corrigan." Now I worry, because the Secretary said on December 15, 1954, "We are headed in the right direction at last." That talk of the right direction bothers me because what seems to be meat to him is poison to the American farmers.

Of course the recent blast by Republican Congressmen against the Secretary might have been brought on by the speech of Secretary Benson to the National Council of Farm Cooperatives only 2 weeks ago in which he proclaimed that there was, and I quote, "a new buoyancy in the market place—a new hope—a new vigor and zest." Right after he said it, all grain prices dropped. The zest was not in the bulls, it was in the bears. Every farmer knows the difference.

Someone urged me to see a new film called "I'll Cry Tomorrow," I could not, farmers are crying today.

Frankly, I do a little farming myself, and my experience helps me understand the protests from livestock producers. On the 14th of January 1955, I bought 208 calves that weighed 87,155 pounds and I paid $15,339.47 for them. I put them on rough pasture for a few months, then on irrigated permanent pasture, and then put them in a feed lot and fed them ensilage, chopped alfalfa and oats with a generous mixture of prepared supplement with stilbestrol. I sold them in the last 2 weeks. I had lost a few head by bloat in the rich pasture where I kept them all summer, but the 198 head that remained weighed 140,750 pounds. They brought me $19,669.88 in the market. By the time I took off commissions, feed enroute to the market, charges of the livestock meat board, trucking and a delivery charge, I netted about $17,000 for cattle that had cost me a year ago $15,339. When I then take out the cost of the supplement I find that I broke even so far as cash is concerned. I got nothing for my roughage, nothing for my pasture, nothing for my ensilage, nothing for my alfalfa, nothing for my oats, nothing for the services of the men who fed them. In fact, I could sing the song, "I Got Plenty of Nothing." My only comfort is that my wife and I have had the company of the cattle all year long.

But on January 16 an Associated Press dispatch tells that John Morrell & Co., packers, reported that their net income for the last fiscal year has risen from 64 cents a share in the previous year to $3.37 a share this past year. The packers did all right but I was not looking in that direction. The movie star may cry tomorrow, but the farmers are crying today.

Now to pass from the dismal farming scene to a happier, more buoyant portion of the national spectrum. I refer to that very hopeful, happy, optimistic note sounded by the Secretary of State who is now engaged in a heroic effort to rewrite history in his own image and likeness. We had four brinks in the same week, one of them was the solution to a robbery in Boston, and the other three were triumphs in diplomacy. I am not sure which was the most fascinating recital, but I know that I read with wonder and amazement how we had been brought three times to the verge of war without getting into the war. Whether that is or is not what Mr. Dulles calls "the necessary art," people were certain to be attracted to the frankness of the observations by the Secretary of State to this effect: "If you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost."

Now in addition to the diplomatic consequences there may have been political consequences all along the pathway to the brink. Let's take a look—brink by brink.

The first brink came in 1953 when Syngman Rhee ordered the release of thousands of Communist war prisoners. Let's accept the appraisal of his accomplishment by Mr. Dulles, although in the published record at the time I find no evidence whatever that an American ultimatum was delivered, hinted at, or even contemplated. Right now my question is: What took place thereafter on the American scene where the people I know do not believe that the closer you get to war the nearer you are to peace? I overlook the possibility that the Communists may find in a magazine article excellent material for their propaganda mill as I try to see what took place at home.

From the Democratic standpoint, the first brink in 1953 did us no damage. That fall the Democrats won 6 out of 7 congressional elections. Two of these districts we won for the first time in history—the victory of LESTER JOHNSON in the Ninth District of Wisconsin and of HARRISON WILLIAMS in the Sixth District of New Jersey.

Also, in the fall of 1953, the Democrats won a victory of enormous strategic importance by the election of able and attractive Robert B. Meyner to the Governorship of New Jersey, the first time a Democrat had been elected Governor in that State in 20 years. So the 1953 brink was not so bad for us Domocrats at the polls.

Many touching scenes are connected with these heroic and historical episodes. For example, there was the very sweet scene which followed the dramatic speech of the President as he took office. He announced to a cheering joint session of the Senate and House that he was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek and would no longer allow the Sixth Fleet to hold him bottled up in Formosa but would let him rain his savage blows upon the Communists on the mainland of China. See him today as the Generalissimo stands among the tea gardens in Formosa and says over and over to himself:

"How dear to my heart are the scenes on the mainland
Since Ike has unleashed me to battle the Reds.
But now that we're free to depart from Formosa,
We pull up the covers and sleep in our beds."

The second brink was Indochina in early 1954. I have no way of knowing whether Eden did or did not find himself able to bargain from Dulles' strength, as the magazine article claims. If our Secretary of State was so pleased by what he accomplished at Geneva, why did he pack his bags and come home in high dudgeon? But if I accept for the moment his claims of great accomplishment in the Indochina crisis of 1954, I wonder what happened at home after we passed the brink? How did it affect the Americans? And particularly, what did it do to the Democrats?

That fall, to put it briefly, we won 25 out of 38 Senate races. Our Democratic candidates for Congress got the highest percentage of popular votes that they had received since 1934—a period of 20 years. We won 500 seats in State legislatures from the Republicans and we lost only 5—a nice comfortable ratio of 100 to 1.

We won eight more governors and lost none. We won in Maine, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania for the first time in 20 years, in New York for the first time in 12 years. New York and Pennsylvania, by the way, have the greatest number of votes in our electoral college. As a westerner I am glad we won in Connecticut with able and popular Governor Abe Ribicoff, but I take more joy out of the fact that we redeemed part of the great Democratic desert that had been building up in the arid Southwest. We won back the governorships of Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico. In these three, the desert now flourishes like the rose, and drought will never again invade our pleasant pastures. That brink wasn't too tough.

So I come to the third brink—Formosa Straits in 1955. The effects of this brink are not quite so stimulating to the Democrats because Democrats helped in the passage of a resolution which clarified the American position on Formosa and gave strength to the President in his position as our leader in foreign affairs. I do not regret that the Democrats displayed the true measure of a responsible party promptly upon taking over control of the Congress, but I point out that the brink itself did not disappoint our party. In California we elected the first Democratic State senator since 1912. In West Hartford we took control of the council for the first time in 100 years. In Michigan the Democrats won 5 out of 8 statewide contests, the first time they have had such success in a spring statewide election since 1933. In November, Indiana Democrats did a wonderful job in municipal elections, to the end that the Democrats now control the mayors' offices in 73 cities, whereas the partys' previous high record was 56 in 1930, just ahead of the Franklin Roosevelt landslide. So the third brink didn't hurt us.

Isn't there a nursery rhyme (if not, I'm sure there should be)—a nursery rhyme that goes like this:

"Every time he touched the brink
He plunged his party in the drink."

Now that we have joined the brink-of-the year club, no one knows where the 1956 salvation will take place. I can only predict that it will probably result in the same political disaster as have these past endeavors. We have won the cities after one of the brinks. We've won the legislatures after another brink. We won the governorships and control of the House and Senate after a third brink.

What can the fourth brink bring us except the Presidency itself, and to that task of winning the White House in 1956 I am sure the nationalities groups will steadfastly dedicate their endeavors from now until November.

Address by Hon. Abe Stark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Abe Stark, president of the Council of the City of New York, at a dinner given in his honor by the Jewish National Fund at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sunday, January 29, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply moved by the warmth of your greeting, and even more gratified to learn that this is the largest and most successful dinner ever sponsored by the Brooklyn division of the Jewish National Fund.

To all of you go my congratulations of the success of this affair. And to each one of you, personally, may I express my sincerest appreciation for your kindness in selecting me as your guest of honor tonight.

My friends, the economic development of the State of Israel is the cornerstone of Israel's future. Land is of tremendous significance to a people without roots. And Israel's soil is an inspiration to the Jewish people who have a deep-seated longing for security in a world beset by tension, trouble, and unrest.

The programs of the Jewish National Fund, including land reclamation and soil improvement, have given birth to hundreds of villages which have arisen, as if by magic, in the midst of desert land. Surrounding many of these settlements are newly-planted forests which embrace Israel's frontiers in a cloak of security and protect its borders against foreign invasion.

As a result of this evening's dinner, I understand that 10,000 trees will be planted in Israel in honor of Mrs. Stark and myself. These trees will be in good company indeed, just as I am tonight. I hope that they will be planted alongside of those already dedicated in honor of Benjamin Browdy, Judge Albert Schanzer, the late Senator Robert F. Wagner, and his distinguished son, my dear friend and colleague, the mayor of New York.

But perhaps we will be planting much more than forest seeds alone. Perhaps these seeds can truly become the seeds of peace, prosperity and understanding in the Middle East. Perhaps we can grow trees whose branches will stretch across the Arab border, offering an open hand of friendship. Let this be the beginning of a new harvest of mutual prosperity for Jew and Arab alike, instead of a continuing nightmare of mutual distrust.

But though a longing for peace is uppermost in our minds, it must not be a peace purchased at any price. It must not be a peace which will destroy the political independence, the territorial integrity or the civil liberties of Israel's population and above all, it must be a peace without appeasement.

In the next few days, Britain's Prime Minister, Anthony Eden, will arrive in Washington to confer with Secretary of State Dulles on the future of the Middle East. In the course of these discussions, we must make absolutely certain that Israel does not become a second Munich. The American people have the right to expect, and a right to demand, a full public accounting of these negotiations in accordance with Woodrow Wilson's doctrine of "open covenants openly arrived at."

America today is living under a shadow of secrecy. We have been told by Mr. Dulles that foreign policy cannot be discussed this year. In the short space of one week, our Secretary of State has taken us from the brink of war to the brink of silence.

My friends, the brink of war was bad enough, but the brink of silence is even more intolerable.

Democracy was once threatened by the outmoded theory of the divine right of kings. Today democracy is threatened by the divine right of the diplomats. But ladies and gentlemen, neither kings nor diplomats are always right, and American foreign policy is not the private domain of any appointive official—not even the Secretary of State.

I firmly believe that National debate on international issues is essential to the American way of life. And I also believe that President Eisenhower should be asked, once and for all, to repudiate Secretary Dulles' attempt to stifle public discussion on the crisis in the Middle East.

Our country's foreign policy must be just as sound and just as sensible as the economic policy of the Jewish National Fund. The JNF is helping to lay the foundations for a permanent economic peace in the Middle East. It is the responsibility of those in government to meet the challenge of diplomacy—by guaranteeing a world whose goal will be peace and whose policy will be brotherhood for all of mankind.

Mr. Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Representative," which appeared in a recent issue of the Legion News of Punxsutawney, Pa. It deals with Representative LEON GAVIN, of Oil City.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. REPRESENTATIVE

A number of years ago our town was on the fortunate end of an act of Congress. Due to a shift of population the legislative sections of our area were redistricted. In the shuffle we were moved from the Cambria-Indiana County area and placed in with Venango, Clarion, Warren, and several other counties to the north. For this we have much cause to be thankful.

It would be useless to pretend that this transformation was accomplished in peace and harmony. Far from it. Petitions were signed, appeals were made and the crepe hangers had a field day predicting the dire and drastic results of such a revolutionary move. Our tycoons of the market place wailed and beat their chests. Our editorial giants screamed like ruptured ducks and our citizens resolved to die in their front yards defending their rights to mediocrity. All those who resist change simply because they are afraid cried to heaven for surcease and gloom settled over the Mahoning Valley.

Despite our laments, progress had its way and as we gradually cut our way through the mist of hysteria and stick-in-the-mud philosophers we made a startling discovery. It would seem that in His wisdom the Lord passed His blessings to us and taught us the lesson that progress is ever forward and never backward or stationary.

Our new Representative was LEON GAVIN, of Oil City. Before Mr. GAVIN was on the job many months it became apparent to the thinking element of our population that we never knew what representation in the Congress of the United States was. In the past we had become accustomed to lipservice representation in the Halls of Congress. We saw our Representative along about every election time when he called at our town and contacted a few of the local big wheels. If he represented the desires of any but a favored few it was news to most of the local voters. In fact we did not even know whether he attended any sessions of the Congress or not.

LEON H. GAVIN gave us, for the first time, a Representative in the Congress who was not only ready but anxious to use the power of his office for the welfare of his district. In him we have a Representative whom every citizen of Jefferson County can be proud to claim. He has worked long and energetically to promote the welfare of not only this county but all the other counties in his district. Punxsutawney has much to thank him for. Our flood-control program was secured mostly by his efforts during a time when his party voted on the minority side of the House. If this does not speak for his ability what possibly could?

Recently Congressman GAVIN has secured a Federal armory building for our city. In this project the opposition was considerable. Despites the obstacles Congressman GAVIN represented us very efficiently and left no stone unturned until he carried the project to a successful conclusion. Some of us who know of the difficulties that had to be overcome realize that many times during the negotiations Representative GAVIN could have dropped the matter and not one of us could have found cause to be critical, but he stood his ground and fought back when the going got the toughest.

That makes LEON GAVIN our kind of a man and it makes us exceedingly proud to have him represent us in the Congress of the United States. The Legion does not endorse candidates according to their political affinity, but the Legion would be remiss if it did not point out the accomplishments of our men in public office. LEON GAVIN served in France in World War I and is a member of the Oil City Post. Regardless of your personal political registration Representative GAVIN has given this section the kind of representation it did not know existed prior to his inherting our section.

We hope that Mr. GAVIN has many, many more years in the Congress of our country as our Representative. We are proud to say that we come from Mr. Representative's district.

Partners in Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Partners in Progress," which appeared in the January 30, 1956, issue of the Salisbury Times, Salisbury, Md. This editorial is an excellent account of the progress of a small business, and is indicative of the healthy state of our free-enterprise economy. It describes in particular the growth of the Delmarva Peninsula.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

Today's Salisbury Times tells of the Delmarva Peninsula as we have seen it develop in the last few years. It tells of a history that should be recorded now, for it is a story of progress.

And yet all indications are that the progress over the last few years is merely the foundation for more spectacular growth, great population increase, and business and industrial development.

We at the Times had faith in the growth of the peninsula back in 1937 when the Times was purchased to become a part of Brush-Moore newspapers. That faith, expressed in dollars and cents, has been more than justified. This year the Times is spending several times its original purchase price in the construction and equipping of a new and modern newspaper plant to serve present and future needs.

CIRCULATION GROWTH IS CITED

In 1937 the Times had a circulation of less than 3,000, centered in Salisbury, a typical smalltown daily newspaper with a skeleton staff, a plant that had to work overtime to get out an 8- or 10-page paper, an 8-page press that would print approximately 2,400 papers an hour and no photographic or engraving facilities. It occupied only a part of its Main Street building.

In 18 years the Times outgrew its press, installed one with double capacity, outgrew that one, and is now printing with a tubular press that prints 20,000 papers an hour with a capacity of 24 pages. Each section of today's Times was printed separately and put together by hand.

As the Times grew it became one of a select 61 newspapers, out of 1,786 in the Nation, which have daily circulation larger than the population of the town in which it is printed.

The Times plant is outgrown, its Main Street building completely occupied and an adjoining building leased for newspaper purposes.

The 24-page press is outgrown, and its new press, in the new building, will be a high-speed metropolitan press of the type used by Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, and New York newspapers.

In the early days of 3,000 circulation newsprint consumption was 300 tons a year at $46 a ton, and an adequate supply of paper could be stored in the pressroom. Today consumption is 1,250 tons a year at $131 a ton and storage space is rented until the new building will provide adequate room to store as much as nine freight carloads of paper at a time.

COSTS MORE THAN PRICE RECEIVED

The Times now has a staff of 92 persons and each day's paper requires 696 man-hours to produce. Each copy of the Times, for which you pay 5 cents, actually costs 10.4 cents to publish and deliver.

Our circulation has spread out, first to saturation in Wicomico County and now into lower Delaware, the Eastern Shore of Virginia, and Worcester, Somerset, Dorchester, and Caroline Counties in Maryland. Our staff of 15 newsboys in Salisbury has grown to 152 in 57 Eastern Shore communities. Eight rural drivers fan out from Salisbury every afternoon, covering more than 100 miles each, making bundle drops for newsstands and newspaperboys throughout the lower peninsula, delivering more than 21,500 papers.

The Times has, as its circulation area has grown and the peninsula prospered, become one of Maryland's most accepted advertising mediums. Its advertising lineage has, for several years, exceeded that of every daily newspaper in the State with the exception of Baltimore City.

HAS OWN CORRESPONDENTS

Today the Times has its own correspondents throughout its circulation area, has its own photographers, it own darkroom facilities and makes it own newspaper cuts by electronics. Electronics have invaded the composing room, producing type automatically at formerly unheard of speeds.

The Times' new building gives room for growth. New equipment is on order.

As we look back to the days of 1937 we believe our faith in the future of our community was justified. As we pause to catch our breath, plan, build and occupy a new building this year, we are just as confident that those persons and businesses who, with us, believed in a prosperous and progressive peninsula are right in believing that our real future is ahead of us.

The Delmarva Peninsula is a land of progress, and to Delmarva and its progressive businesses this progress edition is dedicated. We at the Times are happy to have had a part in Delmarva's progress.

Speech by Grand Commissioner of Education George W. Lee to the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., January 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Lt. George W. Lee, grand commissioner of education of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World, made an address at the citizenship dinner at Philadelphia, January 28, 1956, which holds national interest, and I am pleased to present it for the RECORD, that it may be more widely read.

The educational department of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World, under the commissionership of Lieutenant Lee, sponsored last year, as it does each year, the awarding of some 50 Elks scholarships to students to go into the various colleges and universities of the United States. These scholarships are awarded on a competitive basis. They are making possible educational opportunities to these students which would not otherwise be open to them.

Lieutenant Lee and the grand exalted ruler, Robert H. Johnson, and the other officials deserve high commendation for the fine service which is being rendered.

The address follows:

Grand exalted ruler, grand daughter ruler, officers and members of the grand lodge, we have gathered here in this historic Hall of Independence to celebrate the rebirth of a new freedom. History changing from year

to year is being made so swiftly by our unhampered progress in the field of chemistry and technology that its stirring drama dims the whole story of the distant past and sometimes we almost forget the great events and the great men of our own American story. A story of tragic grandeur and impassioned beauty, but the world would be poor indeed if it failed to recognize among its great ones, heroes without laurels and conquerors without the jubilation of conquest. Even now with our democracy being challenged by communism all over the world for the rebirth of a new freedom and our Supreme Court coming forward with an act which might to the nonwhite world indicate that America is now determined to give up race prejudice as a motive for action; we must not forget that this is only another chapter in the book which our Founding Fathers began nearly two centuries ago.

Our fathers made one chapter come true at Appomatox when our Nation shivered amid fierce civil strife. Back there in the dim and distant past they stood like druids of old symbolizing a great faith in God and man. Even Valley Forge could not put out the light of their hope and faith that all men wanted to be free and would struggle against odds to attain that freedom which is the aim of man, the hope of the ages, the dream of the prophets. Long ago men had lit torches for the hills of freedom and kept them burning despite the efforts of dictators who sought to quench every spark in rivers of blood. A torch was lit by Moses when he led his people out of bondage. One was lit by Jesus of Nazareth when He cried out in the shadow of the cross, "I have overcome the world." Pericles lit one when he threw open the city of Athens to the world.

Jefferson and Franklin lit one when Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the only commentation of the Sermon on the Mount, and Franklin with the Constitution shaped a Nation into the proudest story of time. While the voice of the Liberty Bell proclaimed the dawn or a new era in human history. Lincoln lit one to illuminate the meeting ground of oppressed people in his Emancipation Proclamation which loosed freedom from the ugly grasp of night.

Eisenhower lit one when he made Washington a free city for all men. Like Jesus driving the money changers from the temple, he drove out discrimination from Washington hotels and restuarants and opened parks, playgrounds, golf courses, and theaters to all; integrated schools, forced bus and streetcar companies to have competent men regardless of color. In his state of the Union message he created an atmosphere in which a man is to be judged by what he is, rather than by his color or religion.

Many governments have risen and declined since the days of the Cross, the days of Athens, the days of Bunker Hill, and the days of Appomatox. But men armed with faith and hope have met the tyrants of the earth and refused for any length of time to be starved or tortured to death, but with bloody and unbowed heads have marched on through the corridors of the centuries carrying that torch nearer to the goals of the Founding Fathers. The torch of freedom flickered and almost died when Greece, the center of a free world, menaced by a world in chains failed and fell. It almost died again when the glory that was Rome's crumbled to dust; and still again in England sustained by minds as great as the world ever knew, yet refused to reverse its political policy on colonialism until it was too late. Only in America could Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison, authors of the Constitution, light the torch of freedom so brightly that it would never again go out.

All of us feel proud when we think of the contribution men of color have made along with others to make America the only free country that the world ever knew. We do not need to recall that when Von Steuben, a Prussian, was the drillmaster of Washington's army 200 men of color were guarding his tent and leaving their footprints of blood upon the snows of Valley Forge. While DeGrass, the French Admiral was bottling up Cornwallis at Yorktown, Peter Salem, a soldier of color was stopping Pitcairn at Bunker Hill. At Bunker Hill the enemy General Pitcairn, flashing the sword of his king cried to his advancing, "Onward, the day is ours." From the ranks, thin, weary and bleeding stepped Peter Salem. "It is not the day, sir, but the deed that counts," he said, and in a moment Pitcairn lay dead at his feet. Years later Daniel Webster said at Bunker Hill, "I stand near the spot where the blade of Salem flashed against the sun of victory."

While Thomas Jefferson the Virginian was completing the Declaration of Independence, Alexander Hamilton a man of color who came from the Virgin Islands at the age of 19 was creating the monetary system of our country. While Carl Miller, the Swedish sculptor, was dreaming of the foundation of our modern museum of art, Benjamin Bannacker, a man of color, was laying out plans for the construction of our Nation's Capitol. President Jefferson had been souly disturbed about the plans for laying out the Capitol. They had been entrusted to a French architect who in a huff had returned to is native land. It was then that Benjamin Franklin lifted Bannacker to the notice of Jefferson. Washington today is but the revelation of a stirring picture of what Franklin saw deep beneath the surface of the abject black man.

The American of color makes no boast, he enters no controversy with fellow natives, pleads no favors in the task, asks no special role, and yet he alone is native to American freedom. He and only he can say that around his fortunes, over his hopes, and amid his anxious tears gathered the great minds and souls of this Nation; he can say that around him broke the storm which shook heaven and earth and all but dismembered the Nation. He listens without alarm to the bruising words and unkind speech of angry orators of 44 southern organizations who would defy the Supreme Court mandate on integration and thus change the structure of American government. He remains unshakable in his faith that Eisenhower will move boldly in the glorious traditional path blazed by Lincoln.

The wand of destiny still moves above his onward march through a hundred years of freedom in which he has captured the attention of art, and music has entrusted her charm to his joyous care. His magic genius has opened the closed door, his achievements under the Stars and Stripes whether in lowly walks or amid the choicer realms of conquest engage the wonder of civilized man. He has yet to produce a Rosenberg, a Gold, a Greenglass, a Burgess, a Meredith, or Hiss. Though covered with a mantle of abuse such as no other race of modern times, he has cried out to his traducers, "Though you slay me, yet I trust you."

Now we are engaged in a great social war to prove that the State cannot evade or defy a clear mandate of the Supreme Court, a war to save the American Constitution and extend first-class citizenship to all. But the Constitution, as great as it is, cannot of itself create satisfactory relations between human beings, between North and South, East and West. If it could we would have no incentive to be here today. Only when the Constitution is rewritten in the heart of every American can it become a living reality for all Americans. This is the big, unfinished job which confronts us today. We hold with Bishop William T. Watkins when he says, "We can extend wholesome and healing influence in these days when some very good and sincere men are genuinely distressed. We are essentially conservative, especially in the South, but conservatism alone is like a spinister with noble ancestors but no descendants." Conservatism did not discover America or write the Constitution. The history of this country is a series of reforms.

Every day we read about the gathering storm of revolution of some section of our Southland against the Constitution and against race and religion. Teaching Americans how race prejudice can prevent men from uniting for a common cause, how it could set them fighting among themselves especially in America where people are drawn from all corners of the earth and where unity depends on equality in a nation whose essential life and vitality springs from the belief that men of the most diverse religions, colors and creeds can be Americans all, is a part of our unfinished job.

Not long ago we read about the children in Maryland and Delaware rioting against desegregation in the local schools. Teaching the parents how to give emotional security and comfort to their children when they encounter these new situations through good manners, good conduct, self-confidence, and self-pride is also a part of our unfinished job. Not since the days of Lincoln and Douglass has the prospects of a State defying the Constitution loomed so large. Teaching Americans that America must solve the problem of two groups who do not resemble each other in face and feature in order to carry out the dream of the Founding Fathers is another part of the unfinished job.

There are some 800 million people in the world who are not committed in the struggle between communism and democracy. America can win these people only by proving that Christianity is working. I believe we have arrived at the point where we must determine through interracial discussions at the grass roots what can be done to give direction to the Christian aspect of our American patriotism which makes it clear that it is our duty to share with others those things we cherish for ourselves.

These are the unfinished parts of the job that the department of education and other departments of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World along with other groups are tackling. All of us are moved by a deep love of America. We are called upon to complete that job on our domestic scene in order that we might carry the torch of freedom and democracy to light up the pathway of oppressed people everywhere and thus fulfill the dream of the Founding Fathers, a dream of freedom and brotherhood of man, dedicated to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We pray that with God's help it shall come to pass.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1956, I was privileged to participate in the ceremonies attendant to the presentation to Dr. Jonas E. Salk of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress of the United States. The medal was presented by the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of the Department of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As the one who introduced the resolution authorizing this unique recognition for Dr. Salk, I was invited by Mr. Folsom to say a few words. What I said at that time is of no particular importance. I attempted merely, on behalf of the Congress, to pay tribute to a great scientist who had made an outstanding contribution to the welfare of humanity. What is important is what was said by Jonas E. Salk. His remarks reveal a spirit of dedication, a modest and selfless scientific approach to the problems of mankind which I believe warrant perpetuation.

I therefore respectfully submit the remarks of this great man for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REMARKS BY JONAS E. SALK ON PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL

It is difficult to separate one from among the many feelings and thoughts that arise on this occasion, and it is difficult for me to acknowledge merely, in the brief manner that may be customary, what has transpired. I hope you will bear with me if I depart from convention and share with you some thoughts that came while thinking about this occasion.

Imagine a tall campanile, or bell tower, that had been in the process of being built for a long time—one that was needed and wanted by the people, to be used to call them to defend their city and themselves against attack. For years they contributed so that they might some day have what they wanted. And they gave still more; they gave of their time and effort, and they made personal sacrifice to build this bell tower, and to build it in a way that would be useful and would last. It had to be built soon and soundly because the attackers from without were getting stronger at each assault.

The tower was ready and was tested. When the bell rope was pulled the bell rang clear, and the people rejoiced. But this moment was long in coming; there had been differences of opinion on how it could be built, how it could be made to work, how it could be finished. It could have been a Tower of Babel, but it was not. This was not chance alone—there were the leaders who recognized the need, the solution, and the means for its implementation. And so, in togetherness the tower was built.

There was rejoicing, and the giving of accolades. The pleasure and satisfaction of near-completion could not be distinguished from the relief that came from the joyful dismissal of feelings of fear of an ever-present and impending danger.

It was not, however, the rejoicing and the giving of accolades that provided the incentive that moved each to contribute—it was not for glory, but for use, that each gave what he could. When one useful contribution was placed carefully upon another, it was soon discovered that the whole was greater than the sum of the parts. When the whole was together, the feelings of gratitude of each man for his neighbor, for what each contributed for all and for each, was showered upon but one—and he was from among the last of the many whose contributions were made near to the end. But they knew that the end could not have come without the beginning, and without all that transpired between the beginning and the end.

They wanted to do more; they wanted to build bastions, walls, and towers against other fears that plagued them. They had learned a new way and they became impatient. They were intoxicated by a concoction of fears, dreams, desires, and the fire of hope. In sobriety they remembered that Rome was not built in a day; but they remembered, also, that their bell tower might not have been, for a long time to come, were it not for those who wanted to have it built, and who gave moral and material support; and, were it not for mortar, and brick, and iron, and for those who labored.

There were some who heard the sound of the bells and who contemplated the significance of occasions of celebration of the near-completion of the tower. They were concerned and they hoped wisely that the comfort of its existence would not become the complacency of its presence.

And so—on an occasion such as this, when one reflects upon the passing of time and of events and of distinctions made among men—we realize the role of chance in time and in place and in the opportunities that we encounter. But, where there is freedom of opportunity, there then is choice of what to do, what to take, and what to give in return. For myself, and I will speak, too, for those whose contributions came before, but whose lot it was not to become a symbol for honor, I feel that the greatest reward for doing is the opportunity to do more.

To the President, to you, Mr. Secretary, to the Members of Congress, and to the people of our country, my response to the many warm sentiments that have been shared with me will be better expressed in my efforts to contribute what I can to enhance the health and happiness of people throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, these simple words were the expressions of Dr. Jonas E. Salk, a man who wants nothing for himself but the opportunity to serve his fellowman. I am sure that the mothers, the fathers, and the children of America will agree that Dr. Jonas E. Salk has served us well.

Comparison of School Construction Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because of the paramount interest in legislation dealing with Federal aid to school construction, I am submitting figures showing a comparison between H. R. 7535, the Kelley bill, and S. 2905, the administration bill.

Under the provisions of H. R. 7535, the requirements are that matching funds should be on a 50–50 basis over a 4-year period. Four hundred million dollars for 4 years amounts to $1,600,000,000. The column on the left shows what each State would receive from the Federal Government for a period of 4 years.

Under the provisions of S. 2905, the requirements are that $250 million be allotted annually, but on a different formula and for a period of 5 years. Two hundred and fifty million dollars for 5 years amounts to $1,250,000,000. The column on the right shows what each State would receive from the Federal Government for a period of 5 years.

Consequently, S. 2905 penalizes the wealthier States.

	H. R. 7535 [1]	S. 2905 [2]
Alabama	$37,591,776	$44,205,000
Arizona	10,256,416	9,595,000
Arkansas	22,907,488	26,610,000
California	105,817,232	50,195,000
Colorado	13,973,760	11,025,000
Connecticut	19,292,896	7,585,000
Delaware	3,208,320	1,430,000
Florida	31,356,608	25,050,000
Georgia	41,748,560	44,730,000
Idaho	7,003,280	7,025,000
Illinois	81,102,448	42,285,500
Indiana	36,709,360	24,050,000
Iowa	25,844,352	23,070,000
Kansas	19,247,712	15,070,000
Kentucky	33,660,912	34,500,000
Louisiana	32,937,984	34,995,000
Maine	9,397,952	7,165,000
Maryland	24,568,880	17,040,000
Massachusetts	43,058,848	25,740,000
Michigan	68,225,456	46,655,000
Minnesota	30,814,416	27,380,000
Mississippi	27,154,640	30,275,000
Missouri	37,908,048	23,835,000
Montana	6,461,088	5,315,000
Nebraska	13,057,728	11,200,000
Nevada	1,852,480	7,650,000
New Hampshire	5,015,248	4,060,000
New Jersey	44,820,960	20,900,000
New Mexico	9,217,216	10,320,000
New York	128,950,640	59,785,000
North Carolina	49,429,568	57,510,000
North Dakota	6,958,096	7,780,000
Ohio	79,385,520	41,245,000
Oklahoma	24,262,960	24,735,000
Oregon	15,452,384	11,660,000
Pennsylvania	100,485,712	70,945,000
Rhode Island	7,003,280	3,530,000
South Carolina	27,787,184	34,215,000
South Dakota	6,912,912	7,220,000
Tennessee	37,275,504	37,840,000
Texas	87,879,808	83,905,000
Utah	8,629,840	8,990,000
Vermont	3,976,048	4,005,000
Virginia	36,914,032	36,055,000
Washington	23,720,768	16,195,000
West Virginia	22,952,672	26,535,000
Wisconsin	34,880,832	27,735,000
Wyoming	3,207,952	2,485,000
District of Columbia	6,099,632	4,960,000
Alaska	1,039,200	1,790,000
American Samoa	303,656	----------
Guam	497,008	705,000
Hawaii	5,286,336	4,490,000
Peurto Rico	32,440,976	42,035,000
Virgin Islands	361,456	490,000

[1] $400 million annually for 4 years.
[2] $250 million annually for 5 years.

A Memorandum From the Kentucky Distillers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, we in Kentucky are greatly concerned over present inequitable trade agreements which permit millions of dollars worth of whisky being imported into this country from the United Kingdom while limiting our exports of the same product to that area to a negligible amount. I would like to submit for the consideration of this House a very informative statement on the subject by Hon. Millard Cox, counsel for the Kentucky Distillers' Association, as made to the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements and the Committee for Reciprocity Information, as follows:

The members of Kentucky Distillers' Association, comprising 17 operating companies, are manufacturers of premium quality American whiskies. They have been in continuous operation since the repeal of na-

tional prohibition except for the 4-year period during World War II when their facilities were devoted to production of alcohol for war purposes.

The repeal of national prohibition (December 5, 1933) opened up a vast American market for alcoholic beverages of all kinds. The supply of whisky of American origin was wholly insufficient to meet consumer demands; and since the manufacturing process for most whisky involves several years' storage before it is regarded ready for bottling and consumption, our Government undertook to help supply the demand by opening up the American market to imports from Canada and the United Kingdom.

This was done through the machinery of the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Acting under the authority of the act, the President of the United States, on November 15, 1935, signed a trade agreement with Canada, under the terms of which the then existing import duty of $5 per proof gallon on whisky was reduced to $2.50 with respect to whisky which had been aged in wooden containers for 4 years or more.

On November 18, 1935, the State Department announced that a trade agreement with Canada had been negotiated and in doing so gave the following reason for including whiskey in the list of products on which the 50-percent maximum reduction in import duty was granted:

"During the period of prohibition in the United States large quantities of whisky of American type (rye and bourbon) were manufactured in Canada. With the end of the prohibition period, Canadian distillers were left with great stocks of American type whisky for which Canada afforded only a small market. The shortage of properly aged whisky in the United States since the repeal of the prohibition amendment has created a demand for this Canadian supply. The 50-percent reduction in the heretofore high duty of $5 per gallon applies also to Scotch, Irish, and all other whisky aged 4 years or more in wood."

Regardless of the validity of the original reason for including whisky as an item for import concessions under the first Trade Agreements Treaty, it was not long before the situation in the United States was vastly changed due to revival of legitimate distillery operations.

By 1939 there were ample supplies of aged domestic whiskies available, and there have been ever since. Nevertheless, whisky has been included as an item of import concession in each renewal of the trade agreement with Canada and the United Kingdom.

On January 1, 1948, the duty was again cut in half, reducing it to $1.50 per gallon; and on June 6, 1951, a further reduction to $1.25 was made with respect to all distilled spirits except Scotch and Irish whisky which still take the $1.50 rate.

Under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, authority is delegated to the President to reduce present rates of duty by as much as 15 percent over a 3-year period. The notice of your honorable committees lists whisky as one of the imported articles (schedule 8, par. 802, p. 42) on which the United States may offer import concessions in forthcoming trade-agreement negotiations; so that a further reduction in the duty on this product is in prospect.

IMPORTANCE OF THE INDUSTRY IN THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

The alcoholic beverage industry is a tremendously important factor in the economy of our country. Starting from scratch, so to speak, just 22 years ago, it employs about 1,200,000 persons at all levels, or 1 out of every 60 adults. Its payrolls exceed $3 billion; it uses the products of more than 400 other domestic industries; and pays to United States farmers for the purchase of their grains the annual sum of about $260 million.

Tax levies on alcoholic beverages constitute the largest single source of tax revenue to our Federal Government with the exception of personal and corporate income taxes. Each year our industry supplies Federal, State, and local governments with more than $3,500,000,000 in tax revenues.

OUR INDUSTRY'S ECONOMIC CONDITION

If for no other reason than that of the revenue which it produces, our Government should be vitally interested in the economic health of the American distilling industry, which at present is far from good.

The industry's domestic market is a contracting one due almost entirely to the effect of the exorbitant rate of the Federal excise tax. From a prewar rate of $3 per gallon, the levy has been successfully raised since 1941 until today it is $10.50. The Revenue Act of 1944 which increased the rate from $6 to $9 per proof gallon carried a provision under which the tax was to revert to $6 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. The fiscal condition of the Treasury and subsequent world events not only prompted Congress to continue indefinitely the $9 rate, but to increase it to $10.50.

As a result of this high excise tax, distilled spirits consumption in the United States is less today than it was in 1942. Witness the figures:

Apparent consumption in 1942, 190,248,257 wine gallons; apparent consumption in 1954, 189,470,688 wine gallons; decrease, 777,569.

The consumption of distilled spirits in the United States decreased over three-quarters of a million gallons during this 12-year period, although during the same period there was a population increase of approximately twenty-eight million. There appears to be only one answer: distilled spirits are priced so high, because of the tax situation, that they have been effectively put beyond the reach of the pocketbooks of many people in the middle- and lower-income groups even though the country's income is at an all time high.

While the present total consumption of distilled spirits is less than it was in 1942, it becomes interesting to note the amazing progress which imported distilled spirits have made during the same period.

THE INCREASE IN IMPORTS

Imports of distilled spirits have more than doubled during this period.

United States imports of distilled spirits for consumption in 1942, 10,804,639 gallons; in 1954, 22,127,106 gallons.

Thus we see that during this 12-year period, two forces have been at work, to the detriment of the American distiller. The exorbitant rate of excise taxation has materially reduced consumption; and a considerable portion of what was the domestic market has been captured by whiskies of foreign origin, the importation of which has become increasingly easy under our liberal laws and regulations and successive tariff reductions.

We know of no country in the world, with whom we have trade treaties, whose alcoholic beverages do not come into the United States in free and open competition with our own domestic products on an equal basis, with the exception of slight and almost insignificant tariff differentials. We have no governmentally erected trade barriers against these products of foreign origin.

NEED FOR EXPANDED MARKETS

Finding itself saddled with the exorbitant excise tax which is strangling its domestic markets, our industry is nevertheless prepared to help fight its way out of its difficult position if we can get Government aid in developing expanded markets abroad. It is a job, however, which our industry is powerless to do alone, because when we seek export markets for American whiskies we are constantly met at foreign ports of entry by governmental trade barriers in the form of high duties, exchange controls, import licenses, quotas, and other restrictions which have the practical effect of completely excluding our American goods. If the products of all other countries were similarly treated we would have no just cause for complaint. But such is not the case. Products of some other countries enjoy import privileges to the exclusion of American merchandise. All that American distillers ask is an opportunity to compete in foreign markets on an even and nondiscriminatory basis.

Whenever negotiations have been announced for the making or renewal of a treaty under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, we have called the attention of our government representatives to the discriminations which exist against our exports. Briefs have been filed by our industry urging that trade barriers be removed, nevertheless they still exist, and although we have had ample evidence that our products have a definite appeal to peoples of many lands, not only they, but even our own citizens are denied the pleasure of enjoying American whiskies while traveling abroad.

According to recently available statistics, American tourists abroad spend approximately $1 billion a year. About one-third of this amount is spent in Europe and the Mediterranean area.

BRITISH TOKEN IMPORT PLAN

One of the principal beneficiaries of the American tourist trade is the United Kingdom. But in Great Britain it is all but impossible for the touring American to obtain the whiskey of his own country.

The trade barrier in the United Kingdom is a regulation of the Board of Trade known as the British Token Import Plan. Under its provisions, importations of American whiskies into the United Kingdom are limited to a percentage of the imports during the base period of 1936–38. During those years American distillers had little or no goods for exportation. Repeal had so recently come about that they did not have sufficient aged whiskies to supply the domestic market, much less any for export. As a consequence, the total exports today of American whiskies into the United Kingdom is limited to about $1,500 worth a year. For all intents and purposes therefore, the United Kingdom may be said to exclude entirely, whiskies of American origin. The same is true in greater or lesser degree in many of the other countries with which trade agreement negotiations are pending.

When contrasted with the importations of Scotch whisky into the United States, and the freedom with which the traveling Englishman may buy his native drink here, the discrimination being practiced against our industry and particularly against Americans touring in Great Britain is a considerable one and calls for correction.

We have recently made direct requests through British governmental sources for permission to send into the United Kingdom reasonable quantities of American whiskies so as to make them available to American tourists in the hotels and restaurants.

For the information of your honorable committees we quote below excerpts from an Associated Press dispatch of August 26 of this year taking notice of the situation:

"LONDON, August 26.—American bourbon whisky may soon be available in increased quantities to the Scots, English, and Welsh.

"The Board of Trade said today it was considering a three-cornered request to allow more American whisky to enter Britain.

"Behind the move are: the British Travel and Holiday Association, the Scotch Whisky Association and the Kentucky Distillers' Association.

"Only a token quantity of American whisky now enters Britain because of Board of Trade restrictions. Bourbon is allowed in at a rate of about $1,500 worth a year, a board spokesman said.

"Scotch whiskey producers sell about 21 million pounds ($58,800,000) worth of their produce in the United States.

"A spokesman for the Scotch whisky producers said:

" 'We are anxious to help the American producers. They often help us.'

"British newspapers reported that should the appeal to the Board of Trade for more bourbon be turned down American distillers may seek to curb the import of Scotch in the United States. Scotch is one of the country's best dollar earners.

" 'This is a request,' said The Evening Standard, 'that the Board of Trade should agree to without delay.' "

This report encourages us to believe that we may be making some headway, but the complete attainment of our objective will also require vigorous help from our Government, which we earnestly solicit through the medium of your honorable committees.

Reforms in the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles by Mr. Charles Lucey, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and also an editorial appearing in the Memphis Press-Scimitar January 31, 1956, dealing with the need for changing the electoral college system of choosing the President.

Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, is a farsighted, thoughtful editor, and I think that what he has to say about the possibility of a compromise between the Daniel-Kefauver plan and the Mundt-Coudert plan deserves the thoughtful consideration of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 23, 1956]

CONGRESS TO DEBATE NEEDED CHANGE—ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM THWARTS WILL OF AMERICAN VOTERS

(By Charles Lucey)

Congress will begin debate soon on proposals for a basic change in the most important step in the American political process, the election of a President.

The object of reform is the electoral college system which each 4 years gobbles up millions of votes cast nationwide for the Presidency and translates them into electoral votes.

Political sages have brooded 150 years about this. The electoral college is only a rubber stamp; in fact, it elects no one and it is too decrepit to be collegiate. Its usefulness ended even before there were torchlight parades and hard-cider campaigns.

Change is needed because the present electoral college machinery does not reflect the people's will accurately.

It thwarts that will.

It actually disfranchises millions, and in effect counts their votes not for the man they voted for but for the man they opposed.

Proposals before Congress now would amend the Constitution so the antiquated system of electing a President can be revised to make democracy work better.

GOAL

Simply, the goal is to end the unit rule or winner-take-all system of apportioning each State's electoral vote and to divide the electoral vote among candidates more nearly according to their popular vote.

If the American people knew the basic unfairness of the outmoded electoral-college system—if they knew that in effect millions lose the vote they cast for the Presidency—they almost certainly would do something about it.

Political students long have seen and acknowledged the existing flaws. But because the system is so complex—hard to understand and explain—the popular sentiment necessary to reform has been difficult to generate.

Only 50 to 60 percent of the total popular vote for President ordinarily has real effect.

In 1952 Dwight Eisenhower received 34 million votes and Adlai Stevenson 27,300,000. Mr. Eisenhower had 55 percent; Mr. Stevenson, 44.4 percent. Yet Mr. Stevenson got only 89 electoral votes to Mr. Eisenhower's 442.

Only 3,200,000 Stevenson votes were effective—less than 12 percent—in winning electoral votes for him.

In 1948 Harry Truman's nearly 3 million votes in New York counted for Thomas E. Dewey, who got the State's total 45 electoral votes. But in Illinois nearly 2 million Dewey votes went into the electoral vote for Mr. Truman.

FOUR PROPOSALS

Today four different proposals are before Congress to change this electoral system. The Senate leadership is ready to bring the issue to the floor if proponents can work out a compromise with a fair chance of acceptance. To amend the Constitution takes a two-thirds vote in both Senate and House, then a ratification by 36 of the 48 State legislatures.

None of the proposals would affect this year's presidential election.

To understand the need for reform, it is important to trace the development of the electoral college.

When the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution they scarcely thought in terms of today's brand of democracy. There was limited faith in the ordinary citizen's ability to vote wisely. Constitutional convention delegates were chary of giving one and all a shot at the ballot box.

"It were as natural," said Virginia's George Mason, "to refer the choice of a proper character for chief magistrate to the people as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man."

Popular election proposals got nowhere. The convention voted first to give Congress power to choose the President—and then changed its mind. But there was insistence on interposing some kind of election mechanism between the masses and the President. The final choice was to let States choose as electors well-informed men who in turn would choose a President.

The States could do this as they wished. Legislatures could name electors or they could be chosen by districts or on statewide tickets standing in block for one party or one candidate—the method used today.

It didn't take long for State political leaders to see they'd have more influence nationally if they could wield a whole State block of electoral votes than if the votes were split among candidates. Out of this grew today's winner-take-all system by which the candidate who gets the most votes in the State—by no matter how thin a margin—takes the State's total electoral vote.

There is a wide field for mischief in this museum piece. Electors actually could ignore the vote in their States and go their own way—and in a close election with the pressures great they might do just that. In 1948 a Tennessee elector ran on both Democratic and States Rights slates, then cast his vote for States Righter Strom Thurmon instead of Harry Truman despite the fact the State went for Mr. Truman.

It wasn't important—but conceivably it could happen when it would be important.

The idea of a presidential elector exercising independent judgment perished long ago. They're automatons now, hardly doing more than cluttering up the ballot in many States. But there's another hazard in this, too.

JUST SUPPOSE

What would happen, political students ask, if a man elected President in November died before taking office in January? Independently minded men might choose a President wisely, but what of today's obscure electoral college?

Remote, maybe, yet possible—and capable of chaos. Horace Greeley, who happened to be defeated by Ulysses S. Grant in 1872, died soon after the election. Suppose General Grant had died—or that Mr. Greeley had been the victor? It could have meant vast confusion—and while this has not often happened, the risk recurs with each presidential election.

Not one knows how many million Americans stay home and don't bother to vote each four years because of the winner-take-all system. Mr. Eisenhower's unusual personal appeal drummed up a fair vote in the South in 1952, but ordinarily Republicans there haven't turned out because they knew their States would go Democratic and their own vote would be lost.

If a State's electoral vote were split this would not be true. There would be greater incentive for Democrats to vote, also, if real competition came into Southern elections.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 24, 1956]

A BETTER WAY TO ELECT A PRESIDENT—CONGRESS HAS PLANS TO CHANGE OUTDATED ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Charles Lucey)

For 150 years political authorities have believed the United States should find a better way to elect its President and today a new ferment stirs in Congress to do something about it.

It takes a constitutional amendment to overhaul the antiquated and outmoded electoral college and at least four different methods of doing this are advanced in proposals to be before the Senate soon.

The goal of all is to end the unit-rule or winner-take-all system of counting each State's electoral vote and, instead, to divide this vote among all candidates more nearly according to their popular vote.

The two plans most likely to attract support are the so-called Daniel-Kefauver and Mundt-Coudert proposals. The Daniel-Kefauver plan has been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is expected to reach the floor in the next few weeks. Sponsors of the Mundt-Coudert and other proposals may offer their measures as substitutes when Senate debate begins.

Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, are advocating a simple nationwide popular polling for direct election of the President.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, who as 1948 States rights presidential candidate picked up a package of electoral votes himself, is urging a reform which would retain the electoral college but

divide each State's electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote.

Here is a size-up of the two plans now chiefly supported:

THE DANIEL-KEFAUVER PLAN

Backed by Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat of Texas, ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee and a score of other Senators, this plan would abolish the electoral college as such. It would retain, solely as a counting device, the present apportionment of electoral votes among the States. But electors as individuals or as a group would cease to exist.

A State's total electoral vote would be divided among candidates in direct ratio to their popular vote. If a candidate in New York or Ohio or California receives 42 percent of the popular vote, he would get 42 percent of that State's electoral vote, right down to decimal point figuring.

Say a State has 12 electoral votes and casts 2,400,000 popular votes. The Democratic presidential candidate receives 1,600,000, the Republican 600,000, and a third party candidate 200,000. Today the Democratic front runner gets all 12 electoral votes. Under the Daniel plan he'd get only the share the voters gave him—8. The Republican would get 3, and third party man 1 vote.

The Constitution now provides a candidate must receive 266 of the total 531 electoral votes. It has happened often that a candidate received a majority of the electoral vote while leading all other candidates, but without a majority of the popular vote. Three times a candidate won an electoral majority under the present system while actually running second in popular votes.

Senator DANIEL stipulates the winning candidates must have at least 40 percent of the electoral vote. If none has, the Presidency would be decided in both Senate and House, instead of the House alone, as happens now if an election majority is lacking. Instead of each State casting a single vote, as today, each Congressman would cast a vote—a more democratic system recognizing population differences among States.

Daniel plan opponents criticize chiefly one point—they say dividing the vote might lead to proportional representation. In fact, this is not what is known as "PR" or proportional representation as used in local elections in the United States—it might be called more properly a proportional counting plan.

But critics say that minor party votes are wasted now unless cast for the candidate of a major party. And that under the Daniel plan they would be cumulative from State to State across the country in a way to encourage development of minority parties. They see a threat to the two-party system.

Others say a danger would come, not in electing a President by the proportionate count, but in the pressure that would build up later to have Congressmen elected statewide rather than by districts, with each party getting a proportionate share. It is held this statewide cumulative process would let splinter groups elect Congressmen they cannot manage now in separate districts. Hence, it is contended, there is an encouragement to multiple parties and the danger of what has happened in France and other European countries.

THE MUNDT-COUDERT PLAN

This plan would retain the electoral college but would divide each State's electoral votes according to results in congressional districts.

That is, Presidential electors would be chosen the same as Senators and Representatives—two electors in each State chosen as are Senators, the rest elected by districts. The Mundt-Coudert plan holds to the requirement of a majority of all electoral votes for election.

This is the system favored by Jefferson and other Founding Fathers and many who came after them. In 1824, Missouri's famed Senator Thomas Hart Benton argued against the winner-take-all system of counting electoral votes:

"The intention of the Constitution is violated because it was the intention of that instrument to give each mass of persons, entitled to one elector, the power of giving that electoral vote to any person they preferred. In New York 36 electors are chosen. Nineteen is a majority and the candidate receiving this majority is entitled to count 19 votes—but he counts in reality 36 because the minority of 17 are added to the majority."

VOTES WASTED

Bring the figures up to date and the case is the same today. In 1948 Harry Truman's nearly 3 million votes in New York won him nothing whatever; the State's 45 electoral votes went to Thomas E. Dewey.

The Mundt-Coudert plan also would bring the Senate into a determination of who is President if no candidate gets an electoral majority.

The chief flaw charged against the Mundt-Coudert scheme is that unfairness results because of the unequal sizes of congressional districts. Houston often is cited as having roughly one-sixth the State's population but it has only one of the 24 Texas congressmen. The 11th Indiana (Indianapolis) District has more than 550,000 population but the Ninth Indiana District has only 260,000. The Dayton district in Ohio has twice as many persons as the smallest Ohio district.

The Mundt-Coudert answer is to urge a stronger law forcing States to make their congressional districts more nearly the same size—in the past legislatures often have dragged their feet on reapportionment.

No plan is without some objections from the constitutional experts. But there is wide agreement for the need of change to wipe out the inequities and dangers of today's electoral college system.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 25, 1956]

SOMETHING NEW AND HEALTHY—ELECTORAL COLLEGE OVERHAUL MEANS SHOT IN ARM FOR UNITED STATES

(By Charles Lucey)

America will see a brandnew kind of presidential election and democracy will get a healthy shot in the arm if the ancient electoral college system is overhauled.

Americans don't vote directly for a President now, of course.

They choose electors in each State and the electors cast the State's ballot for the front runner in the popular vote of that State.

Sometimes the margin is paper thin. Yet the winner takes all—and millions voting for the other candidates in effect see their votes wasted so far as the national count is concerned.

Each State has as many presidential electors as it has United States Senators and Representatives—New York 45, Pennsylvania and California 32, Ohio 25, Tennessee 11, and so on.

TWO PLANS

The constitutional amendment proposed by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, and Representative FREDERIC COUDERT, Republican, New York, would divide each State's electoral votes on the same basis as Senators and House Members are elected. That proposed by Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, would ignore congressional district lines and divide each State's electoral vote in direct mathematical proportion to what each candidate received statewide.

First result of all this is that millions of voters in effect now disfranchised would see their votes actually count for the man they prefer.

New vigor would be given the two-party system and almost certain more voters would have a part in choosing a President. In many States today—this is true especially in the South—voters do not bother to vote because one party nearly always wins and determines the State's voice under the unit rule.

But if the Republicans knew they had a chance on a congressional district or proportional-count basis to pick up odd votes in the South even though they could not carry a whole State, there would be incentive to extend and broaden the two-party system.

The same would be true of the Democrats in some normally Republican northern States.

TRUE INDICATION

A presidential campaign would become more truly national in scope instead of the present concentrated efforts in the big States and cities.

A presidential candidate knows today if he can carry New York or Pennsylvania or Ohio by even the barest margin he gets the entire electoral package. So he devotes most of his time to such States. Under a congressional district or proportional division of electoral votes, in which he would get a fair share of votes cast, there would be inducement for spreading a campaign more evenly over the whole country.

A major evil of today's presidential elections—kow-towing by both major parties to splinter or minority groups—would be ended. Today's winner-take-all system lets the pressure blocs in close States claim they have the number of votes needed to tilt such States. For fun? Not at all—for hard-boiled pledge and promise of what is to be delivered after the election by the winner. It's a what-do-we-get-out-of-it kind of democratic process.

Take away the system which gives the State's entire block of electoral votes to the top runner and the pressure group which has 100,000 votes in New York or Chicago cannot claim its 100,000 is more potent than the same number in Nebraska or Indiana.

NO MORE ARGUMENT

For many years an argument put forth for a presidential candidate was that "he can carry Ohio" or "he can carry New York." The large States have dominated the choice of men to go on the national tickets. Those who would do away with the winner-take-all system say it would give able men from lesser States a reasonable shot at the highest office in the land.

Altogether, proponents of all plans say reforming the electoral college system would bring more people into the active working of American democracy at the highest level. The country could stand it. In 1952 some 61,000,000 voted for Messrs. Eisenhower and Stevenson—the highest total ever—yet an estimated 37,000,000 eligible voters stayed home.

The case for electoral reform is old—but few roads are harder to travel than those leading to constitutional amendment. Altogether, since within a very short time after adoption of the Constitution, nearly 200 proposals for a change in the electoral system have been made in Congress.

Most recent was in 1950, sponsored by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican, Massachusetts, and Representative Ed Gossett, Democrat, Texas. This plan, forerunner of today's Daniel-Kefauver proposal, passed the Senate but was lost in the House. Some of the old lines of opposition would hold in a new test this year, but there have been important conversions, too.

BREAK NEEDED

Amending the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress and subsequent ratification by 36 of the 48

States. Once the dam breaks the process sometimes is completed rapidly. It needed only a year to get three-fourths of the States to approve electing United States Senators by popular vote. It needed a year to get the Prohibition amendment into the Constitution and 10 months to get it out. It took 4 years to ratify the no-third-term amendment.

Today Hill sponsors of the differing plans are seeking a compromise. If there is no compromise all plans may fail; if there is, one may get through. The Senate leadership is ready to give the green light for floor debate.

None of the measures would affect the 1956 election. But reform could be ready for 1960 if what a Senate committee wrote 20 years ago were to be heeded:

"The only object of an election is to accomplish the will of the people.

"If we permit a system to prevail that thwarts that will, we will trifle with one of the most serious purposes of government. Under our present method, then and now, that will of the people will be clearly thwarted."

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

The following table shows what has happened in the last four presidential elections under the present electoral college system and how major party candidates would be affected under proposed electoral reform plans. Electoral totals under reform plans exclude those electoral votes that would have gone to minor party candidates.

	Popular vote	Electoral vote (present system)	Daniel-Kefauver plan	Mundt-Coudert plan
1952				
Eisenhower	33,666,062	442	290.4	375
Stevenson	27,314,987	89	236	156
1948				
Dewey	21,969,500	189	221	203
Truman	24,104,836	303	258	289
Thurmond	1,169,000	39	52	39
1944				
Dewey	22,066,078	99	223.8	214
Roosevelt	25,602,505	432	294.7	315
1940				
Willkie	22,304,755	82	214.6	182
Roosevelt	27,243,466	449	313.3	344

[From the Washington Daily News of January 31, 1956]

LET THE STATES CHOOSE

The movement in Congress to modernize the electoral college actually is two movements. Backers of the Daniel-Kefauver bill want the vote for President in each State to be represented precisely in the electoral count, making the State as a whole the unit for that purpose. Senator MUNDT, Republican, of North Dakota, and Representative COUDERT, Republican, of New York, seek to make the congressional district the unit, except for the two electoral votes which correspond to the United States Senators, and let the winner take all at the district level.

Either plan would be so great an improvement over the present method of electing a President that this newspaper would welcome it enthusiastically, as would—we believe—most of the members of the public who think the existing system unfair and antiquated. In fact, our analysis of recent presidential elections shows that the net totals nationally would have been about the same under both methods.

Now, backers of the two reforms, aware that neither may have enough support to win, are discussing a compromise that would permit each State to choose either of the methods of computing its electoral vote for President.

This seems reasonable enough.

The important thing is to make sure that the people's choice always will be elected to the Presidency, and prevent pressure groups from dictating nominations for the office, as is an ever-present danger under the existing system.

Eightieth Anniversary of Society of Ethical Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on January 10 of this year the Society of Ethical Culture celebrated its 80th anniversary. The society's contributions in the field of education, settlement work, child study, housing, race relations, and labor, have been many and truly significant. This organization has always represented the best ideals of America.

At this point I should like to make reference to a speech delivered on that occasion by Mr. Sidney H. Scheuer, a friend of mine of many years standing and vice president of the American Ethical Union. His speech is a thoughtful commentary indeed upon the American scene.

On the same occasion, Mr. President, congratulatory messages were received from President Eisenhower and Gov. Adlai Stevenson. I ask that the text of the speech by Mr. Scheuer and the messages from President Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in recognition of the 80th anniversary of this fine organization, the Society for Ethical Culture.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAMS SENT TO THE DINNER OF THE ETHICAL CULTURE SOCIETY AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, JANUARY 10, OPENING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE ETHICAL CULTURE MOVEMENT

My warm greetings to the members and friends of the New York Society for Ethical Culture as you mark your 80th anniversary. I know of your splendid work in the service of human need and wish you many decades more of great achievement.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

To the members of the Society for Ethical Culture I extend warm greetings on its 80th anniversary. It is gratifying to know of the society's work, over the years, in social service, education, and citizenship training. All of you have my warm best wishes for the continued fruitfulness of your efforts to advance the well being and happiness of your fellowman.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SIDNEY H. SCHEUER

The celebration of an anniversary affords an occasion for nostalgia and stock-taking. Therefore, let me pause briefly to describe the general character of the founding group of Ethical Culturists as I knew them. They were a dedicated band of men and women who found in their ethical faith a new vehicle and inspiration for enriching their lives, for serving their community, for creative citizenship, for making their lives more meaningful. They were enthusiasts and worked at their ethical culture every day of the week.

Their backgrounds were varied. The majority perhaps stemmed from German stock but the membership included people of widespread national origins. Their careers covered almost every activity; these included publishers and editors, educators and businessmen, all the professions, liberals and conservatives and middle-of-the-roaders. It was an effective mixture. Members knew one another rather well and mixed socially.

The Sunday platform was the fountainhead of the society. Our leaders, then as now, accorded it central importance. The inspirational character of the Sunday meetings was high; the subject matter and presentation followed a consistent pattern. Group activities multiplied and a high percentage of members participated.

Almost from the inception, new approaches to education were recognized as the most hopeful transforming potential in modern society. Throughout the life of the movement significant educational contributions have been made at all levels—Sunday school, elementary, secondary and adult. Our Ethical Culture schools today offer privileged opportunities to students and continue to enrich the bloodstream of educational theory and practice.

These founders and their followers enjoyed widespread attention and high respect in the community. Government officials, religious leaders, educators, labor organizations, and newspapers continuously acknowledged the value of the society's work and its beliefs.

We should be grateful to this courageous group for their leadership and the loftiness of their thinking. I commend to you a study of their views and insights, what they had to say on the meaning of life, immortality, love and marriage, ideals, spiritual progress, suffering, religion, government, labor, and world affairs. Their views stand the test of time better than most other statements on these subjects made by religious leaders of the day. They reflect profound erudition and truly prophetic vision. We have leaned heavily on the foundations they laid and in our time have added immeasurably to the structure. During the 10 years which have elapsed since we gathered to celebrate our 70th anniversary, our leaders and trustees have carried the movement forward in important ways. It has been a difficult period but nonetheless vital advances have been made.

We are living in an age in which conformity has come to be regarded as being almost identical with trustworthiness, and we ethical culturists are essentially nonconformists. Therefore we carry heavier responsibilities now than we have at any period in our movement's history. We are living in an age in which American institutions are changing radically; in a time in which bigness of industry, of government, of labor, of the arts, tends to obliterate the still, small voice of wisdom, dissent, critical judgment, and courageous independence. Worship of the bigness to which I refer affects almost every phase of American life.

Taxes are an important element in accelerating the trend toward bigness. They have become a dominating influence upon the morality and purposes of people. They pervade politics and government, industry and education, our cultures and our religious thinking in ways which are not always pleasant to contemplate.

The operations of large foundations have played a role in changing American institutions. Some of these, more especially in

recent decades, have been created with the dual purpose of maintaining control and domination of large industrial corporations and at the same time avoiding inheritance taxes by providing that all the profits and dividends be used for philantropic, educational, and religious purposes. They possess vast power to influence the American way of life. Their support of opinion-creating media can be troublesome. Moreover, poorly directed or undirected financial support of education and research without definite goals is not in itself good. Indulgence in the oversimplified belief that organized research in depth and quantity inevitably produce formulations for the foolproof guidance of life, science, government, and industry is equally disturbing. This hunger for prescription and formula is being carried to absurd extremes in all aspects of American life. I do not underestimate the good that such foundations have done and can do, but I see increasing possibilities for unwise, indeed unworthy, employment of their resources which should not be ignored. They are tax-exempt, self-perpetuating organizations and as such their activities are matters of public concern, and warrant the continuing consideration of each of us. The recent witch-hunting investigation of foundations, under the chairmanship of Representative CARROLL REECE, served to impede a constructive and unbiased study which I am confident all concientious foundation trustees would welcome.

Educational, religious, and philanthropic bodies have become enormous operations and as a result must curry favor of businessmen in order to gain support. This is another phase of the bigness trend. It is symptomatic of our times; it is symptomatic of our worship of bigness, of business success and of our willingness to be practical in soliciting and accepting financial assistance, sometimes with indifference to other basic considerations.

Political parties too must seek the support of both business and labor in order to conduct modern campaigns. Large-scale advertising and public-relations methods have been adopted. Techniques successfully employed in the marketing of trademarked consumer products have, with suitable alterations, been used with the result that officials in and out of office are continuously manipulated to produce contrived impacts upon the public. The emphasis is to popularize rather than to educate and inform. It is a disturbing development and a rather degrading one which I hope will be repudiated in time.

This weakness for oversimplification is reflected in the average citizen's consideration of complicated national and international affairs. He reads headlines, listens to columnists and becomes increasingly impatient for quick solutions which of course are not attainable. This sometimes gives people in other countries an impression of arrogance which I am certain is not intended; and this rather superficial attitude is further reflected in the quality and influence of our international thinking and upon the freedom of action of our statesmen. They are continuously compromised by such thinking—indeed to a degree they themselves show inability to rise above the general desire for foolproof, quick, and final solutions and what might best be described as the blow-by-blow concept of dealing with international life.

The popular acceptance of the meeting at the summit as a substantial and creative accomplishment reflects this character of evaluation. Sometimes I fear we suffer from the serious malady of being taken in by our own propaganda. Some thoughtful and competent observers feel we missed a rare opportunity to speak to the people of the world on that occasion over the heads of their governments, and have them hear and understand the true voice of America as interpreted by our President. Such a pronouncement might have ranked with the most influential in the history of our country. This might have been the occasion for reassessing and reappraising democracy, its meaning and purposes in this 20th century and of convincing mankind how these serve humanity. Moreover, specific proposals and discussions at the summit there and then which led to tangible commitments might have been more realistic than the deferment which occurred. Instead we accepted a superficial show of good will and by preference allowed the tangibles to be postponed for later consideration.

I have mentioned a variety of changes in American institutions and our way of life. The list is not all-inclusive by any means but will suffice to make my point. The pace of change since World War II has been more rapid perhaps than during any like period in our history. What should you and I do about it? Should we be complacent and indifferent? Are we helpless? Indeed not. The fact that such changes are becoming increasingly apparent is their most hopeful aspect. Consciousness of what they are, what is good and what is bad about them can be our strongest resource. To exaggerate, to take undue advantage, to misapply, to go too far in any direction or in any phase of American life generates self-correction in our society; and if you believe in the effectiveness of the democratic process as I do you will be confident that some of the extreme swings of the pendulum which I have indicated will settle down to more balanced positions. The McCarthy censure illustrates the point I am making. The very excess creates the process of reexamination and change but this will not occur without vigilant, thoughtful, and devoted application to the redefinition of values. You and I cannot abdicate. We must do our job as citizens and as ethical culturists. If the day of balancing the pendulum is to be speeded, we must express our views to our fellowman through our lives and our organized activities.

Before leaving this subject, I would like to speak briefly too about the current religious revivals, the campaigns for identification with the three big religions. They tend to cast doubt upon the worthiness of our ethical culture dedication. They are being promoted as necessary to the accomplishment of our country's spiritual strength and world peace; as if religious spirit and religious conduct can be stimulated on a seasonal or annual basis; as if men educated in the 20th century should all adopt an unquestioning faith, should uniformly believe in religious leaders because they are members of the cloth and regard them as interpreters of His word and as trustees in their relationship with their God. These revivals, I suspect, are not born of deep individual conviction and therefore, I fear, will not accomplish enduring results. They appear to be another manifestation of the promotional psychology of the craving for identification and for bigness. I doubt revivals so stimulated will impress or influence world opinion. In making this reference, I do so with deepest respect for the people of integrity and conviction who believe in their creedal faiths and carry their ethics and philosophy into their lives. They, of course, contribute indispensable strength.

What about the next 80 years? I believe the world will be a better place to live in and that it will be here and not blown to bits; however, I can safely say this because none of us here tonight will be able to say I was wrong. But I will risk something more meaningful—I am confident that well within 20 years mankind will be doing much better with its opportunities and we in this country will play a more creative role, will recapture our greatness and contribute mightily to the perspective and vision of mankind.

We ethical culturists believe that the great men of our civilization are more frequently than not unsung heroes, modest figures who are rich in wisdom, selfishness, character and competence; people who leave the world a better place to live in and whose presence radiates in all directions and in mysterious but enduring ways. We have great belief in people and in the quality of the American people, in their deep responsiveness to calls upon their better selves. Our citizenry expects and hungers for lofty and creative leadership. We miss great opportunities to serve our time and ourselves when it is lacking. This has always been true; this always will be true. We never forget that government and institutions are no better than the people who man them.

I think the first 80 years of ethical culture is but a small measure of what our future should be. On all sides we feel urgent interest, need and desire for assistance in organizing groups and societies; and the work of our leaders has contributed mightily to this accomplishment. There are fourteen full fledged recognized societies in the United States, members of the American Ethical Union, and an equal number of affiliated groups who are on the way, we hope, to becoming societies. Had we the means we could be training many more leaders and then we could help service these and other groups who urgently need assistance.

There is an unfilled religious need in America—a vacuum consisting of many religiously unaffiliated people throughout the length and breadth of this land—indeed the world—who are calling upon us for help. There is terrific power for good in this group which is being dissipated. These conscientious and thoughtful people want to join with others and are eager to do so with integrity and conviction. They will not become members of creedal religions. We are the only organized fellowship available to such people. Some of you may agree with them or some of you may not. You might question how important it is if they do not affiliate or why they can't find satisfaction in one of the orthodox faiths. It may not be important to those who raise such questions, but it is vital to those who cannot honestly accept belief in the gospel or in the creeds and yet have an urge to identify themselves with like-minded people, dedicated to all that is best in human existence. Throughout the world we learn of similar needs in India, Japan, and Europe. As a result, in 1952 the first International Humanist and Ethical Union conference was held and another is scheduled for the summer of 1957. I hope many of you will be able to attend. Moral ferment of such persistent character should be nourished. The world can ill afford to discourage such valuable strivings. Unfortunately the large American philanthropic foundations have not yet recognized this need; they have until now confined their assistance in the field of religion to the divinity schools of the three big faiths. Our small leadership training program could be enriched and expanded greatly if the urgency of our need and the services we perform were recognized by such foundations.

The financial endowments which our New York Ethical Society holds have been bequeathed to us by our founders and their successors. These have made possible much of what we have been able to do, but they are not adequate to the increasing demands which are made upon us. They offer inspiring, tangible testimony of the confidence of our predecessors in the enduring need for carrying forward ethical culture. Anniversary funds raised previously have been largely consumed; they must be renewed in this 80th year and in generous dimensions. We move in a new cost era and it is a commonplace which we all recognize that the dollar buys less and less each year, and religious leaders and staffs must be paid living

compensations. In order to meet this responsibility we must develop our talents for giving, for sacrifice, for perspective. All of us can afford to become more talented.

Ethical membership cannot be delegated. It is, or should be, a most demanding commitment. Every leader and every member is a spokesman. Our ethical society is continuously called upon for infinite services in the community, especially where conflicting interests, creedal, industrial, interracial are involved. The assistance and judgment of our professional and lay leadership are constantly being drawn upon to serve, whenever others are found to be less acceptable or less useful. We are trusted and needed.

The question I ask members here tonight is: How important and how basic do you feel is your membership in this society? To sympathetic friends I ask: Would you want our community to be without such a facility available to those who can find no other answer? Would you have those who need us drift into secularism, crass materialism, cynicism or, indeed, pure politicalism?

If we address ourselves to these questions and evaluate them as we should against other claims that are made upon us we will, I am sure, say that this Ethical Society is a most fundamental necessity. We will conclude that it goes to the very roots of life and helps create people of integrity and dedication, of greatness, grandeur, and magnificence—qualities which are none too abundant in the world today. Our ethical movement has contributed its share to the supply of such people and all of you know many of them who have been and are ornaments of civilization. Every dollar spent in strengthening our movement can mean more to our times than equal expenditures for palliatives or to promote conformity.

Our work justifies the necessity of what we do, have done, and plan to do. Like the Society of Friends, we have a claim on the community as well as the community having a claim on us. We have not asserted this often enough or in sufficiently constructive and organized manner. But first I ask each of you to reexamine his or her pledge, to question himself as to whether or not he has done all he can or should do.

You will find pledge cards at your places. Please fill them out and hand them to the young ladies who will gather them. Some of you have already contributed; if so, perhaps you will be willing to fill out a card which reflects your gift—it may encourage your neighbor. I need not assure you that we never call out names or read cards—so if only because we do not follow this unpleasant coercive practice your society should be amply rewarded.

I am confident that we will raise the modest $150,000 we need if you will all make up your minds that this is a must—that it is one of your primary responsibilities—a responsibility which should not be deferred and should not be forgotten tomorrow—that it is an investment in mankind—that it is our way of making our influence felt in the establishment of a better world.

It Doesn't Work Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "It Doesn't Work Here," written by Merle Thorpe, published in the American Legion magazine for February 1956. The article deals with the subject of Communist experiments in this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT DOESN'T WORK HERE

(By Merle Thorpe)

Communist leaders have told us again and again that communism and capitalism cannot exist together. And they are right. Coexistence has been tried, time and again, right here in America. It has never worked.

There have been 75 communistic experiments in the United States. All were based on the idea of common ownership of land and equal sharing of the products of labor. They were not organized by nitwits nor crackpots, but by the finest minds of their day. Nor was there anything but cooperation on the part of government. Yet all failed, and for the same reasons.

Those who have examined these reasons discovered valuable material in connection with present-day discussions of world conquest, Iron Curtains, and coexistence. They observed how these colonies lived and died. All died young, discredited and in debt, their members disillusioned. All died from the same ailment. All, that is, except those few which adopted the ways of capitalism.

They all would fail again today in a fair and open trial. They failed not because of lack of intelligence nor ability nor money not tangible assets nor substantial sponsorship.

Robert Owen, who founded New Harmony in Indiana in 1825, had the sympathetic ear of John Quincy Adams, the President-elect and upon invitation, spoke before the Congress of the United States.

The North American Phalanx, founded near Red Bank, N. J., in 1843, was endorsed by Horace Greeley.

Brook Farm in Massachusetts was promoted by the capable pens of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Bronson Alcott, and Margaret Fuller. It was the most brilliantly intellectual of the communistic settlements. There Charles Dana, later the great editor of the New York Sun, transplanted trees and shrubs, and Nathaniel Hawthorne shoveled manure. The food was often scanty, consisting of graham bread stewed with milk, but the table talk was full of protein. It was rich with "alert sallies and quick retorts * * * pat allusions * * * shrewd witicisms" from the lips of members and such guests as Emerson and Greeley.

Brook Farm consisted of 200 acres of land, was well financed, and entered into with enthusiasm by 115 members. This ambitious project lasted 5 years.

The 75 experiments were inspired by many different motives. Some were religious. Others had a sincere desire to improve the social and economic lot of the poor and underprivileged. Their geographic locations were even more varied than their motives.

The Shakers established 4 communities in Massachusetts, 2 in New York, 2 in Maine, 2 in New Hampshire, and 1 in Connecticut. Massachusetts also had its Brook Farm, its Hopedale, and its Fruitlands. Indiana had Harmony, New Harmony, Blue Springs, and Forrestville. Ohio had its Yellow Springs, Kendal, Zoar, and Snowberger communities. Pennsylvania was the site of two Rappite experiments and of another at Ephrata. New York had more than one Fourier project along with its Shakers, a Franklin Community, Haverstraw, Coxsackie, Oneida, Skaneateles, and the Ebenezers.

Frances Wright founded a Communist community called Hashoba in Tennessee. The Phalanx movement, a form of Fourierism, went west as far as Illinois and Wisconsin. None of the settlements was hampered by trying to till rocky, barren land. All chose fertile soil, many the finest river-bottom land.

Geography seems to have nothing to do with the failure of communism in America.

The movements excited Americans most in the 40 years from about 1820 to the beginning of the Civil War. Several groups had foreign origins. They came to America because it offered freedom of action. They could set up their little circles without governmental interference or restrictions.

New Harmony was the first nonreligious experiment of any great size. Its founder, Robert Owen, had made a fortune operating textile mills on a profit-sharing pattern. With this experience he envisioned a social revolution which he said would "give the death blow to a tyranny which, for unnumbered ages, has held the human mind spellbound in chains of such mysterious forms that no mortal has dared approach to set the suffering prisoner free." These words were sloganized by modern Marxists into the rallying cry, "Workers of the world, arise! You have nothing to lose but your chains!"

The start was auspicious. Owen had bought 30,000 fertile acres, along with cabins, stables, and other farm buildings. This domain was at the confluence of the Wabash and Ohio Rivers.

Owen's business success in Scotland had won him the confidence and patronage of British nobility; and he came to America with prestige that admitted him to the House of Representatives, where he delivered more than one lecture. President James Monroe, President-elect John Quincy Adams, the justices of the Supreme Court, and all Cabinet members were present to hear him.

In public lectures, delivered in many places, Mr. Owen invited the industrious and well disposed of all nations to emigrate to New Harmony. Within 6 weeks after the purchase of New Harmony 600 persons had gathered there, and in less than a year the population was more than 900. Many intellectuals of the day were Owen converts. Yet there was no harmony in New Harmony. Even table manners degenerated. Parents complained that their children were deprived of food because of the piggishness of others.

As one experiment after another proved a failure, the leaders, grasping at straws, fell back upon the practices of capitalism. One of the most curious and complicated of these was the time store set up at New Harmony. On the wall hung a clock and beneath it a dial. When the customer entered, the storekeeper set the dial to check the time. The merchandise was sold at cost and paid for in cash. The storekeeper was paid for the time he spent on showing the merchandise and making the sale. He was not paid in money, but in labor notes. These were printed promises that the bearer would do 2 hours of work for him or bring him 12 pounds of corn. Change for these notes was not dimes and quarters, but small tickets representing 5, 10, and 15 minutes of labor.

The time store was established to do away with inflation and to make sure that labor was paid for with labor. It closed, its founder complaining of the difficulties of the arrangement and of the lack of common honesty among the customers.

The founder of the North American Phalanx was Albert Brisbane, an able writer, who in 1840 had published the Social Destiny of Man. Bisbane was a disciple of Francois Marie Charles Fourier, the French creator of a communistic system which became known as Fourierism. Bisbane's book caught the interest of religious, liberal, and antislavery groups and was the fount of much social-revolutionary excitement.

The experiment got underway as a result of Brisbane's promotion, and it hung on to life for about 12 years. Old members left, and new members were recruited; but the group never attained the size its founders envisioned. It finally broke up because, one

member wrote later, "it lacked the faculty of agreement" and lacked management—men with the ability to lead, to organize, and to keep production at high levels through the enthusiasm of members.

Bronson Alcott found Brook Farm not idealistic enough and withdrew to establish another community, known as Fruitlands, at Harvard, Mass. It lasted through the pleasant weather of the summer of 1843. As cold weather approached, members left on one pretext or another, and with the first frosts the Alcott family, according to Bronson's famous daughter, Louisa May, was left without food or fuel. So Bronson loaded his household goods and his family into a borrowed wagon and went back to Concord.

The Amana Society in Iowa and the Oneida Community in New York State still survive, but both turned from communism to capitalism when their common efforts for equal rewards failed.

Each communistic group had some distinguishing feature. Oneida stood for complex marriage and an experiment in eugenics, although it was not called eugenics. The Skaneateles Community held the orthodox view of marriage and encouraged normal family relationships. The Communists of Ephrata, the Rappites, the Snowbergers, and some others required lives of celibacy. The Zoarites and Jacobites might marry or not, as they chose. The Ebenezers permitted marriage "when the guiding spirit consented."

Religious views and practices differed widely, from complete nonreligion to strict belief in every word of the Bible. Governing authority was sometimes vested in one leader, sometimes in a committee, sometimes in a town meeting type of free-for-all.

But whatever their differences might have been, all the Communist groups in America held to one guiding principle: Common ownership of all property and equal division of the products of members' labor. Volumes have been written on these experiments and all students of these efforts attribute failure, with minor variations, to one cause:

Human beings, created as they are, and feeling as they do, will work for those for whom they care, but not so hard or not at all for those for whom they do not care.

Even religious fanaticism, it was found, could not overcome this universal attribute of human behavior. Nor could the hope of reward at the end of some five-year plan.

The only way, it was pointed out, that a communistic settlement could even approximate production equal to bare living standards was by force, by compulsion, by spies, by fear, by liquidation.

If Khrushchev were given enough land and people in the United States to equal the population and area, say of Iowa, and permitted to organize it after the modern Russion pattern—make it 100 percent communistic—it would not work. If he would turn over comparable population and area for the United States to organize a capitalistic society in Russia—it would work, and would probably wreck the hopes of Moscow and Leninism for years to come. Most readers will recall that Lenin was forced to try a modified capitalistic experiment in 1921, in order to put bread in the mouths of his people. It did so well that when Stalin came into power he put a stop to this "temporary retreat" from the principles of socialized living.

When people are given a free choice between communism and capitalism, they will always, in the end, choose the opportunity to get on and up in the world.

A capitalistic experiment in the Ukraine would ring the death knell of Moscow and Leninism. And the Russians know it. Hence the Iron Curtain, rigid barrier to information from capitalist countries. Hence incidents like this:

A Polish-American sent a Sears Roebuck catalog to his mother and father in the old country. They passed it around the community and it caused so much astounded and incredulous comment that the police paid them a visit.

"Give us that book we've been hearing about," they ordered. "It's nothing but a piece of dirty, capitalistic propaganda."

A communistic experiment in the Dakotas would not last out the year. The Non-Partisan League is evidence of that, although it only got its feet wet in the practices of the Kremlin.

The American members of these communistic experiments again and again deserted their ideological islands to try their enterprise and resourcefulness in the free air of competition. It is a sad commentary that the hegira started with the first cold breezes from the north and empty larders and woodboxes.

Within 2 years Robert Owen divided the town of New Harmony into building lots, and sold them to individuals. Fifteen years later one of the original members returned to the town and said of his visit. "I was cautioned not to speak of socialism. (Social experimenters at that time used the words socialism and communism interchangeably.) It was unpopular and with good reason. The people had been wearied and disappointed by it, had been filled full with theories until they were nauseated. * * * An enthusiastic Socialist would soon be cooled down at New Harmony."

A member of the Yellow Springs group described the failure of that short-lived communistic experiment: "The industrious, the skillful and the strong saw the products of their labor enjoyed by the indolent, the unskilled and the improvident. * * * It was useless to remind all parties that the common labor of all ministered to the prosperity of the community. Individual happiness was the law of nature, and it could not be obliterated."

Students of communistic enterprises in the United States, with few dissenting voices, find the cause of failure best expressed by William Bradford, governor of Plymouth Colony, the earliest comunistic experiment on these shores. His eyewitness account, of Plymouth Plantation, reports that "the young men did repine that they should spend their time and strength to work for other men's wives and children. And for men's wives to be commanded to do service for other men, as dressing their meat, washing their clothes, etc., they deemed it a kind of slavery, neither could many husbands well brook it."

Without doubt this is why Marxist leaders have contended in and out of season that capitalism and communism cannot exist side by side.

If modern Communists were less concerned with propaganda and more with truth, they would have to say that communism fails in any free society because it won't work without the whip, without the secret police, the spies, and the threat of punishment or death—just because human nature is what it is.

Kipling created an imaginary experiment in which "the strong shall wait for the weary, the hale shall halt for the weak," and gave, in verse, the same reason for failure that appears in all the American communistic experiments.

"But till we are built like the angels, with hammer and chisel and pen,
We shall work for ourselves and a woman, for ever and ever, amen."

Not that Americans are selfish. The record, any way you read it, shows them to be generous beyond measure. The old cliche, "generous to a fault," applies. By some persons and peoples it has been counted as a weakness. Americans give, and with relish, because what they give has been won in the open field of contest. The spirit of rivalry is the strongest fiber in our national life. The chance to get on and up in the world and to have and to hold the rewards, if any, make impossible any successful frontal attack upon us by the protagonists of communism. The case histories of America's communistic experiments show clearly the impracticability of so-called coexistence.

Tribute to Leonard D. Long, Builder of Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Leonard D. Long, Former Newsboy, Climbs to Noted Builder of Cities," which was published in the Anderson Independent of February 6, 1956. The article concerns Leonard Darlington Long, who has built thousands of homes in Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and many millions of dollars of construction in Georgia. I have known Mr. Long for many years, and I know what an outstanding citizen and builder he is.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEONARD D. LONG: FORMER NEWSBOY CLIMBS TO NOTED BUILDER OF CITIES

(By Frank A. Dickson)

Leonard Darlington Long, Charleston builder who ranks among the leading home constructors of the Nation, reports that his motto is: "Give a man an opportunity to own a home and he will automatically become a progressive citizen concerned with the problems of the community."

He amounts to such a firm believer in this motto that he, as president of the Long Construction Co., has developed in Puerto Rico 11 gigantic projects at a cost of no less than $66 million during the past 10 years, earning him the title of "Builder of Cities."

"My experience developed from contact for so many years with people who did not own homes and now do," the South Carolinian declares, "is that the ownership of a home is the best anitdote aganist communism."

In addition to making an invaluable contribution to the economic development of Puerto Rico during the past decade through his solution of the acute housing problem, Long has instilled initiative among the population of that country who with their fighting spirit have won over apathy and jealousy.

The Long enterprises in Puerto Rico have provided employment for 7,000 laborers of the land, and these workers have not only drawn millions of dollars in wages but have obtained a sound preparation in the completely new field of construction there, which now holds first place among the industries in Puerto Rico.

Yet at the age of 12 Long was a newsboy, selling copies of the two newspapers published in the Florida town of Pensacola, where he resided with his parents.

The famous builder is closely associated with South Carolina although he was born in a large, old farmhouse on an orange grove operated by his father in the section of Florida known as Orlando. He is a descendant of one of the oldest families of South

Carolina, and a small community on the South Carolina-North Carolina border carries the name of Long as a means of tribute to Leonard's grandfather, John W. Long.

The schooling of Long came to an end in the fifth grade, but his determination to make himself useful in the world led the youth to obtain a self-education even if it involved sacrifices and privations.

For 3 years, beginning at the age of 12, he held jobs as an usher in a movie house, a helper to the motion picture machine operator, an elevator boy, a helper to the sign painter doing the advertising for the theater, and finally a timekeeper for a large sawmill in Bagdad, Fla., where he formed the decision to enter carpentry.

Soon becoming a first-rate carpenter, young Long worked with his father and other contractors in Tampa and received the highest salary given carpenters, $21.60 weekly.

Within a few months, he gave up the trade of carpentry for a dollar-a-day position.

He took up work as an apprentice in an architect's office, making tracings of building plans. In his ambition to learn architectural drawing he enrolled in a course in architectural and mechanical illustration offered by the Fred W. Dobe School and the International Schools.

Due to the rapid advancement in his work, Long earned appointment as architectural supervisor of the firm Francis J. Kannard, which built the People's or Tom Bank, a 12-story steel structure in Tampa. Another accomplishment to his credit during his connection with the architect's office was his collaboration in the design of buildings for the Spanish Center Club, the Italian Club, and others in Tampa.

Deciding to establish a company of his own following his association with his father in the construction of buildings, Long engaged in the Colonial Drive development in Orlando, where he bought, sold, and constructed houses, selling them on installment payments.

That was slightly more than 40 years ago, and Long still follows the practice of the large-scale building of houses to be sold on installments to persons unable to pay cash. His records show that he has constructed far more than 30,000 housing units, in Puerto Rico and also in the United States, particularly in several Florida cities and Atlanta, Ga., and Charleston in this State.

Long built the Darlington Apartments, a 14-story structure with 612 apartments, in Atlanta, and also the 18-story Howell House, having 540 apartments. While in Charleston he became owner of another Darlington, 12 stories with 156 apartments. Total cost of these buildings: $14 million.

Among the greatest achievements in Long's career is Puerto Nuevo, which, in Puerto Rico, is the largest low cost home project in the world and contains 4,500 units—all concrete houses with water, lights and sewer connections. Erected at an expense of $18 million, they consist of 2 bedrooms, living room, kitchen, bath, and porch, and sold for $4,000 each, payable in a 20-year period.

Long, who was backed by the former governor of Puerto Rico, Jesus Pinero, devoted all his efforts toward the rapid development of Puerto Nuevo, because he recognized the urgency to solve the pressing housing problem for white-collared employees.

A self-sufficient city, Puerto Nuevo has modern schools, churches, parks, post offices, public health units, internal revenue offices, police headquarters, lodges, civic clubs, and important commercial centers.

The progress has been so amazing that the valuation of the property, residential as well as commercial, has increased at least 25 percent in a direct benefit to persons who purchased homes from the constructor at a relative low cost.

How Long, with unbreakable faith first in God and then in himself, came as a benefactor to Puerto Rico and founded Puerto Nuevo, and also the Caparra Terrace and Caparra Heights developments, is a story dating back 8 years when the Puerto Rican government was not meeting with any success in its fight against the housing problem.

For one thing, there was lack of economic means, and the second drawback was the absence of confidence in the Puerto Rico investors on the sale of houses built under huge projects.

Despite these discouraging conditions, Long, inspired by the support of Pinero and endowed with foresight and a complete faith in himself, launched a program never tried by a government and private initiative: The mass production of homes for the white-collar class, which forms the largest population of the island.

Long's strong will scored an amazing triumph, leaving open to the local constructors the path to the mass production of homes. "Long was the inspiration of our engineers and constructors," Mariano Arroyo Suarez of Puerto Rico states. "Long educated, opening the way of hope, and leaving to Puerto Rico an achievement that will endure and be an eternal monument to his memory."

The Caparra Terrace project, costing $20 million has 1,515 duplex buildings which have helped to solve the lack of homes for families who come to San Juan, sometimes from the United States and others from the interior of Puerto Rico.

The apartments constructed of concrete with floors of first-class tile, are composed of three comfortable bedrooms, living room, kitchen, bath, and porch. Caparra Terrace, boasting broad concrete streets, lights, sewerage, aqueduct service, plus elementary schools, churches of all religious sects, and numerous commercial centers, is matching Puerto Nuevo in its growth.

In the area of Puerto Nuevo and Caparra Terrace is the attractive Caparra Heights development, which was the first initiated in this section by Borinquen Home Corp., one of the subsidiary corporations of Long Construction Co. It is a development of 531 homes especially designed for a family of higher income than those of Puerto Nuevo and Caparra Terrace.

The concrete houses feature three bedrooms, living room, hall, dining room, kitchen, bath, and porch, and the sale of the homes fluctuated in accordance with the type of construction and the size of the lot, ranging from $7,200 to $11,000.

Caparra Heights has a commercial center constructed by the Long organization, and the center includes markets, a post office, a drug store, soda fountains, an electric appliance store, a vegetable market, a gas station, an elementary school, a Catholic church, and also several park areas, which the Government has not developed in spite of requests by the people.

Besides Puerto Nuevo, Caparra Terrace, and Caparra Heights in Rio Piedras, the Long Construction Co. has developed the following projects in Puerto Rico: Bayview in Catano (258 units), Villa Turabo in Caguas (369 units), Villa Grillasca in Ponce (720 units), Mayaguez Terrace in Mayaguez (508 units), San Juan Darlington (312 apartments), Rio Piedras Darlington (122 apartments), Ponce Darlington (122 apartments), and Ramey Air Base Homes in Aquadilla (575 units).

By the telephone in his office in the Darlington Building in Miramar, Long communicates with his business offces in the island and in the United States, all of which he orients and directs from San Juan.

The favorite hobby of this giant of the construction industry, who climbed the ladder of success from newsboy to builder of cities, points to his intense mission of helping his fellow men through his life work.

"My one and only hobby," Long says, "is building houses—to provide homes for families who want and can have them but lack the money to buy."

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government has actively supported the International Labor Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations, for many years. Our delegation has included two governmental representatives, a representative from industry, and a representative from organized labor.

The unique feature of the ILO is its tripartite organization. The governing body consists of 20 government representatives, 10 employer representatives, and 10 worker representatives. For many years, the employer representative of the United States delegation has been Mr. Wiliam L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio, the president of the Williamson Heater Co.

Until 1954, the Russians and the other satellite countries had not participated in the ILO. They decided to participate at that time which, of course, they had the right to do, inasmuch as they are members of the United Nations. This action has created a crisis for the ILO. It is obviously impossible to maintain its tripartite character with Communist countries participating in its work, as there are no free labor representatives appointed by free labor unions in Russia, nor are there any private employers. The entire Russian delegation, including the so-called employer and labor representatives, are actually Soviet officials.

Mr. McGrath has reviewed this situation and has reluctantly come to the conclusion that the United States should withdraw from participation in the ILO and grant it no further support. This matter is of immediate import because, at this session, the Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 annually to $3 million.

For the benefit of my colleague, I am inserting in the RECORD Mr. McGrath's report, and I hope that it will be given very careful consideration:

MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION GOVERNING BODY IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, NOVEMBER 9 TO NOVEMBER 18, 1955

(Report by W. L. McGrath, president, the Williamson Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; United States employer delegate, 1955 and 1954, ILO annual conferences; United States employer adviser, 1952, 1951, 1950 and 1949, ILO annual conferences; member ILO governing body)

In my brief address to the governing body of the International Labor Organization at the close of its November 1955 session in Geneva, Switzerland, I made the following statement:

"It is my intention to recommend not only to the employers of my country that they refrain from sending delegations to the ILO until such time as the situation created by participation of Communist so-called employers in the ILO is cleared up, but also that the United States Government do likewise."

Upon my return to the United States, I formally recommended to the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce that under present circumstances they not only refrain from nominating employer delegations to annual ILO conferences, but also cease to participate in ILO industrial committee meetings or other ILO meetings for which they nominate United States employer representatives.

I likewise addressed a letter to the President of the United States, urging that our country forthwith withdraw from participation in the International Labor Organization and withhold from it any financial support whatever, unless and until the Communist issue within the ILO can be clarified and resolved.

THE COMMUNIST ISSUE IN THE ILO

What is the Communist issue? It is simply this:

In the ILO, the employer delegation from each country is supposed to represent free associations of employers, and the worker delegation is supposed to represent free associations of workers; by contrast to the government delegation, which represents government. But are there free associations of employers or workers in Communist countries? You know the answer as well as I do.

Therefore, when, at the 1954 conference, Russia, which had long been absent from the ILO, came back as three countries, the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia—reinforced by five satellites, namely, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Albania, and Czechoslovakia—the question of the eligibility of Communist so-called employer and worker delegations became paramount.

It was obvious that Communist employer and worker delegations represented, in fact, neither employers nor workers, but were simply agents of the Communist Party, echoing and reinforcing the government delegations from the Russian and satellite countries.

This completely violated the original concept of the ILO constitution, which assumes that each country will send to ILO conferences workers and employers, respectively, who are free to speak independently of their governments on behalf of their constituents.

The employer delegations of the free countries in the world therefore challenged the right of the so-called employer delegations from Communist countries to participate in the conference. A block of worker delegates representing free trade unions likewise challenged the eligibility of so-called worker delegations from Communist countries. I said to the conference on that issue:

"What will remain of the tripartite nature of this body, if we admit a solid block of votes, none of which represent free workers or employers, and all of which are under the direct dictation of the Kremlin?

"I charge that the purpose of the attempted reentry of Russia into the ILO is that of disrupting this organization and using it as a springboard for Communist propaganda.

"Unless steps are taken to preserve the tripartite structure of this organization, it is my intention to recommend to my Government and to the employers of the United States that they refrain from sending future employer delegations to this conference."

My position was thus clearly stated at the 1954 conference.

The conference voted, however, by a substantial majority, that Communist so-called employer and worker delegations should be accredited.

This, however, by no means settled the issue; for basic principles remained unchanged.

Realizing that something would have to be done to attempt to quiet continuing employer objections, the governing body, at its November 1954 meeting, voted that there should be placed on the agenda, for consideration at its March 1955 meeting, a resolution to the effect that the governing body should establish a tripartite committee "to examine article 3, section 5, of the constitution, which provides for the appointment of worker and employer representatives, and make proposals for such amendments as would insure that worker and employer representatives could only be appointed after nomination by organizations of workers and employers which are free and independent of their governments."

It was presumed that this might lead to the amending of the ILO constitution in such a way as to disqualify Communist so-called employer and worker delegations.

But at the March 1955 meeting of the governing body, when the issue came up for actual determination, the courage to face it squarely was lacking. The governing body abandoned completely any suggestion of amending the ILO constitution, and instead passed a watered-down resolution to request the Director General to arrange for the preparation of a report covering the membership of the ILO regarding the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from government domination or control—the report to be prepared by a committee of independent persons specially appointed for that purpose by the Director General.

It was at that stage that I personally became very doubtful indeed as to whether the ILO would ever have the courage to purge itself of the Communist elements which it had admitted contrary to the original principles of its constitution. I voted, however, for the above proposal, in the hope that it might possibly lead to constructive action.

It was with this background that we went into the annual ILO Conference in June 1955.

At this conference representatives of the free employers, still firm in their insistence that Communist so-called "employer" delegations could not possibly represent free associations of free employers, naturally did not elect any Communist "employer" representatives as employer members of Conference committees. The Communist "employers" who had put their names up for election thereupon appealed to the entire Conference for placement upon the committees to which they had failed to be elected. The Conference as a whole voted that they should be seated on these committees.

Everyone at the ILO knew what these Communist so-called employer representatives were. They were simply agents of the Communist Party. Putting these men in the ILO employer groups which were supposed to represent viewpoints of employers as contrasted to workers or governments, was as ridiculous as if the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce were asked to put Communist agents on their boards of Directors. Nevertheless, such was the action taken by the 1955 ILO Conference.

The United States Employer Delegation thereupon withdrew from participation in the 4 committees upon which Communist so-called employers were seated; continuing to participate, however, in the other committees and in the Plenary Session of the Conference.

There was considerable talk, at the 1955 conference, to the effect that since the Director General had in fact appointed a committee to study "the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from government domination and control" (as directed by the governing body at its March meeting) and this committee was supposed to submit its report to the governing body at its November 1955 meeting, no attempt to resolve the Communist issue should be made at the conference itself. The obvious way out of a difficult situation was to "put it off until November."

But upon my arrival at the November 1955 meeting of the governing body, I found the report of this committee was not ready. We were told that it was in the process of completion, and would probably be drafted in final form by about the end of January 1956.

This news was, as near as I could judge, what the majority of the ILO governing body wanted. They had no desire to come to grips with this issue. Governments especially welcomed anything that would enable them to postpone and delay.

The crucial point as to timing was this:

The November 1955 meeting of the governing body was the last possible time at which, under the ILO constitution, the matter could be put on the agenda of the 1956 conference.

Failure to take action by the governing body at that meeting would therefore make it impossible for the matter to come up as a formal agenda item before the entire conference until June of 1957.

By that time Communist "employer" (and "worker") delegations from Communist countries would have been accredited for 4 consecutive years—and in the face of that accepted fact, it would be well nigh impossible to unseat them.

Recognizing this situation, I pressed, at the November 1955 governing body meeting, for immediate definitive action.

I pointed out that if the committee report was complete by February it could be discussed by the governing body at its March 1956 meeting and governments would have plenty of time to study it before June. Therefore, I insisted, there was no reason why, if the governing body wanted it done, it could not be put on the formal agenda for discussion at the 1956 conference.

Toward this purpose I prepared a draft resolution to the effect that the committee report should be reviewed at the 1956 conference and in light of its disclosures steps should be taken to amend the constitution in such a way as to preserve the tripartite structure of the ILO. (See appendix A.) To me this was an entirely reasonable and procedurally possible approach. It was an approach which, if accepted, would have enabled me to believe that the ILO wished to face and solve the problem. But, as matters developed, it was impossible to gain any concerted support for any such resolution.

A compromise was then suggested, to the effect that the governing body might put the committee report on the agenda of the 1956 conference in such a way that the conference would not actually have to deal with it at all, but could merely refer it to a committee for further discussion (see appendix B), but even as to this proposal no agreement could be reached.

If this proposal, which was far more indirect than mine, had proved to be generally accepted, I would have been glad to go along in hope that it would lead to some definitive action. But since even this was unacceptable, I felt that I had arrived at the end of the road. I became convinced that the ILO had no sincere intention of resolving the Communist issue. The attitude of the governing body majority was to stick their heads in the sand and let matters take their course.

I therefore reviewed the entire issue in a brief address to the governing body, concluding with the statement quoted at the beginning of this report. My complete address is attached hereto as appendix C.

If we are simply to accept the present situation in the ILO, the end result is, to my mind, inevitable. The Communists, with 8 nations to our 1, and 32 votes to our 4, will remain firmly entrenched and will progressively dominate the ILO. It will become merely an international forum for the dissemination of Communist propaganda,

financed to at least 25 percent by the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, at its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year.

At annual ILO conferences Communist orators, outnumbering ours in the ratio of 32 to 4, will tell the representatives of 69 nations about the decadence of the free enterprise system, the superiority of the Communist system, the exploitation of the working man by the American capitalists, and our greed and desire for war. These speeches will be reprinted by the ILO and circulated all over the world. One cannot imagine a better ready-made vehicle for the promotion of Communist indoctrination. Do we want to continue to finance this Communist operation?

The future of the ILO, unless strenuous corrective measures are taken, has been well foretold by the history of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

According to Sir Alfred Roberts, United Kingdom's worker delegate to the ILO, following World War II, when the World Federation of Trade Unions resumed sessions, there was an agreement with the Communist unions, who were members, that political issues would be outlawed so that mutual progress could be made on behalf of the welfare of labor.

But the ink was no more dry on the agreement than the Communists set out to use the WFTU as a springboard. They blocked and obfuscated any accomplishments, while they made the most of any opportunity for political propaganda.

Within 18 months they had completely destroyed the usefulness of the WFTU. The free trade unions of the world were thereupon compelled to pull out, which they did, and form their own organization—the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

There is a time that calls for action. In my opinion, that time is now.

If the ILO does not have the courage to stand by the initial principles of its constitution, and is simply going to temporize and beat around the bush and let things ride and allow time to pass until it becomes internationally recognized as a Communist-dominated organization, I think the time to get out of it is today.

On the other hand, it is barely possible that sufficiently forceful action might yet spur the ILO into an effort to prevent that organization from being taken over and destroyed by the Communists. The strongest action that can possibly be taken is financial action. The withdrawal of United States support and participation "until such time as the situation created by the participation of Communist so-called employers in the ILO is cleared up" might effect the desired result.

It is on the above basis that I recommend the course of action which I have outlined in this report.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSAL FOR WHICH SUFFICIENT SUPPORT COULD NOT BE GAINED (SEE REPORT, P. 7)

The governing body—

1. Recalls that its resolution adopted at the March 1955 session provided for a report to be made by a committee of independent persons regarding the extent of freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from Government domination and control, with the understanding that every effort would be made to submit the report to the governing body by the end of October 1955;

2. Recognizes with regret that this report will not be available for consideration at its present session;

3. Repeats its belief that the maintenance of the tripartite system of representation which is a unique feature of the ILO, is essential to the effective functioning of the Organization;

4. Reaffirms its desire to consider at the earliest possible time, in the light of the results of the report, whether any and if so what steps might be taken as a matter of urgency to deal with the situation disclosed therein;

5. Expresses the view that the subject matter of the report is of critical importance to the Organization;

Decides—

1. That notwithstanding the failure to submit the report to the present session of the governing body for its consideration, the agenda of the 1956 International Labor Conference shall nevertheless include consideration of the report and of steps to be taken by the Organization to preserve the integrity of the tripartite composition of the ILO, such agenda item to be expressed in the following terms:

(a) Consideration of the report of the committee on the extent of freedom of employers' and workers' organizations,

(b) Consideration of the steps to be taken by the Organization, including if necessary the revision of sections 1 and 5 of article 3 of the constitution to preserve the tripartite character of the ILO.

2. That the governing body, at its March 1956 session, will consider and discuss the report for the purpose of defining and clarifying the scope and nature of the conference discussion.

APPENDIX B

COMPROMISE PROPOSED FOR WHICH SUFFICIENT SUPPORT COULD NOT BE GAINED (SEE REPORT, P. 7)

It is agreed that the governing body will submit to the 1956 conference a report, with or without proposals or resolutions, on the subject of the extent of the freedom of the employers' and workers' organizations from Government domination or control, to be referred to the resolutions committee or to the selection committee or dealt with in any other way which the conferences may think fit to adopt.

Agreed further that the state members be informed of the above decision.

APPENDIX C

SPEECH BY W. L. M'GRATH AT ILO GOVERNING BODY MEETING, NOVEMBER 18, 1955

Immediately prior to the 1954 International Labor Conference a bloc of 3 Communist countries, exercising their right as members of the United Nations, chose to join the ILO. The exercise of this right could not in any way be challenged.

Because of the complete inability of these 3 nations to send legitimate employer and worker delegates to the ILO, since there are no free employers or free workers in those countries, it was obvious that instead of the usual 2 government, 1 employer and 1 worker delegates, these nations instead would have 4 government voting delegates.

Coupled with the fact that 5 other nations which had been members of the ILO for a number of years and which are now under Communist domination, this meant that there would be a bloc of 8 Communist controlled countries in the ILO—8 countries with a total voting strength of 32 votes, all of which would be government votes, when they are only entitled to 16 government votes—2 per country.

Now the views of the free employers of the world were made perfectly clear at the 1954 Conference. We believed then and we believe today that all so-called employer representatives from these totalitarian countries should be disqualified from sitting in any of the councils of the ILO.

We therefore challenged the credentials of these men who would come into what had been a free employer group of the ILO. We challenged these credentials on the very fundamental ground that violence would be done to the constitution of this organization if it forced Communist government agents into the employer group. As all in this room know, the 1954 conference refused to sustain our challenge which was put forth as vigorously and as sincerely and as persuasively as possible.

What has happened since then?

At its first session following that conference, in November 1954, this governing body at Rome, decided that at its March 1955 session, it would consider a resolution providing for the appointment of a governing body committee, the terms of reference of which would be to make proposals for such amendments to the ILO constitution as would insure that worker and employer representatives could only be appointed after nomination by organizations of workers and employers which are free and independent of their governments.

At its next session in March 1955, the governing body did not adopt such a resolution. Instead, it decided to request the director general to arrange for the preparation of a report covering the membership of the ILO regarding the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from government domination or control. It also decided that this report would be prepared by a committee of independent persons, and, because of the extreme gravity of the situation, it was understood that every effort would be made to submit the report to the governing body by the end of October 1955.

At the same time, the governing body decided that it would consider immediately in the light of the results of the report, whether any, and if so what, steps might be taken as a matter of urgency to deal with the situation disclosed therein.

Following the March, 1955, session of the governing body, the 38th International Labor Conference was held in Geneva in June, 1955. At this conference, despite the universal opposition of the free employers, so-called employer representatives from Iron Curtain countries were seated as deputy members on four conference tripartite working committees. This decision was reached in total disregard of the autonomy of the employer group who, through established procedures of the Organization, had elected their representatives to serve on these committees. That decision breached these traditional and accepted procedures. Neither the constitution of the ILO nor the standing orders required the conference to vote these Communist representatives seats on the conference committees as deputy members.

Following this decision, I withdrew from partcipation on the four working committees in question. I did this because I felt that positive action was imperative in order to emphasize the need for maintaining a stand on principle on behalf of preserving not only the tripartite structure of the ILO but its very existence as well.

We are now at the first session of the governing body following that conference. The sixth item on our agenda is the report of the committee on the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations. The report of this committee is not before us for consideration notwithstanding the urgency with which the entire matter was viewed by the governing body in March, 1955.

If the organization sincerely wished to face this issue and resolve the problem we have had for over 18 months, it would hasten to bring the matter formally before the earliest possible session of the international labor conference, and take remedial steps to correct the situation.

Even though the report of the committee on freedom is not before us, this governing body session could place the matter before the 1956 conference. In my opinion, such action would not prejudge the contents of that report in any way, because on such an important issue as this—which the governing

body itself has found to be urgent—only the conference can take remedial measures. Therefore, there is no valid reason why, even though we do not have the report, the conference should not be presented with this issue at its 1956 session.

Apparently, however, no further urgency is attached to this problem. There is no inclination to take this course of action which has the merit of bringing about prompt conference consideration, but more importantly, telling the world the ILO governing body recognizes it as a problem, and is willing to do something about it.

We are soon to face the 1956 conference. What will happen then? For one thing, we can look forward to the grim fact that Communist so-called employers will again be seated on the working committees of the conference. That course has already been charted, and the precedent established. The deterioration of the ILO's tripartite structure, begun at the 1954 conference, will be further advanced because the organization will have refused to take steps to purge itself of a threat to its very existence.

My deep concern over this matter has been repeatedly expressed, not only in the governing body and conference, but in the United States as well. I have prepared detailed reports on each conference and governing body session I have attended, and in these reports I have endeavored to focus attention upon the serious matters of principle that are involved.

Rather than compromise in the slightest with my position, demonstrated by my withdrawal from the committees of the 1955 conference, I find that in view of all the above circumstances, there is no further constructive purpose to be gained by the continued participation of United States employers in the ILO.

Accordingly, it is my intention to recommend not only to the employers of my country that they refrain from sending delegations to the ILO until such time as the situation created by participation of Communist so-called employers in the ILO is cleared up, but also that the United States Government do likewise.

Congress Might Consider Removing Penitentiary Sentence as Major Penalty for Income-Tax Evasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., which, I think, will be of interest to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS MIGHT CONSIDER REMOVING PENITENTIARY SENTENCE AS MAJOR PENALTY FOR INCOME-TAX EVASION

Debtors' prisons, several hundred years ago, were fixtures in every English-speaking country and they have gradually faded from the scene in all countries which we in our day refer to as civilized.

As matters now stand, there is only one debt for which any citizen may be sent to prison and that is one for income tax. Of course as a technical matter, criminal prosecutions in these cases are based on charges of fraud which puts them in the category of theft, but still it is a matter of debt to the Federal Government which is involved.

The history of income tax prosecutions has been interesting in this way—they have been most successful when the Government sought them as a means of bringing defendants to book for crimes other than the one actually involved in the court proceedings.

The late Al Capone's case could be used as typical of all these cases in which the Government sought conviction for one thing but actually had another in mind. In the thirties, the reader will recall, Capone and other hoodlums in the rackets thriving under prohibition got out of hand. They bought their protection from a multitude of local governments and these in turn thwarted the efforts of the Federal Government to enforce the laws. In the meantime, gangsterism developed to a point where it threatened to supersede government itself.

Then some bright individual thought of the income tax and Capone was finally sent to Federal prison, and the public was relieved of his evil presence, not by law officers armed with guns but by accountants laboriously checking his income.

Since the time of that noted case, a succession of gansters, murders, dope peddlers, and all kinds of public enemies have been put away by Federal courts on the basis of charges sustained that they evaded payment of income tax.

But while the Government has been highly successful in the use of income-tax prosecutions as instruments of punishment for other assorted crimes, the history of such prosecutions in cases involving citizens in other categories has been replete with failure on the Government's part. In such cases, where well-known citizens are involved, who are unimpeachable as to character and reputation in any other respect until they become defendants in income-tax cases, failure to convict is almost a certainty.

A variety of theories is offered by the public for this being the case. One is that Federal juries are prejudiced in favor of any defendant because they consciously or unconsciously resent the burden of taxation which modern government lays upon all of us. Another theory is that the Internal Revenue Service is frequently unfair and arbitrary where the taxpayer is concerned, and in addition the tax laws themselves are an invitation to confusion and honest error.

Most of us don't know enough about the facts in any case to justifiably disagree with either the charges of the Government or the findings of the courts. All we can sensibly do is to look at the results, which indicate that there is something wrong with the existing system.

It occurs to us, and we suspect has to many others, that Congress could well reexamine its policy in this vital part of the income tax situation, with the thought in mind that the ultimate purpose is to collect all the revenue due the Government and that sending citizens to jail, or trying to do so, has not proved a successful approach to this goal.

What would be the effect, for example, or revising the law so that when a taxpayer was found cheating, instead of facing any threat whatever of a penitentiary term, the Government would be empowered to inflict a spectacular penalty in money? Generally speaking, those citizens who attempt fraud to keep from paying their taxes are persons to whom money is of transcendent importance. That must be the case or they would not be willing to risk going to jail to keep it. Individuals of this type, it seems to us, would be more greatly deterred from criminal action by the threat of a confiscatory penalty than they would by the penitentiary risk, which, rightly or wrongly, the Government now finds it difficult to enforce. If the penalty against the suspected taxpayer were made a matter of money only, rather than one of being locked up, Federal juries might be more strongly impelled to give the Government, rather than the taxpayer, the benefit of the doubt.

A Statement of Principles, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of principles as published in the January 28, 1956, edition of Protestant Church Life, the official publication of the Protestant Council of the City of New York. Our southern friends will note that we, too, have segregation problems. We approach them and attempt their solution without name-calling, threats of secession, or even interposition. We accept the law of the land and in good spirit will abide by it. Our Catholic friends may strongly oppose the principles enunciated under the heading of "Gambling"—my Jewish coreligionists will split down the middle on those principles. But all concede that a discussion thereof will be in the interests of good will even though it does not bring about complete agreement.

The statement follows:

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES, 1956

Believing that faith without works is dead and that Chirstian people have a duty in giving effect to Christian principles in society, the legislative committee of the Protestant Council of the City of New York believes that the churches have a right to speak and act on political issues which affect the moral standards of New York City. In setting forth major principles as guides for 1956, the committee has endeavored not to be exhaustive, but to deal with only those matters which have been subjects of discussions, in order that the borough divisions of the Protestant council and the constituent denominations may consider the same with unanimity.

1. Discrimination: It is the conviction of the committee that discrimination on account of a person's or group's race or religious or national origin is both un-Christian and un-American. Particularly is the committee opposed to the discriminatory practices current in the area of housing. Progress has been made in legislation relative to discrimination in publicly assisted housing. The committee favors legislation to create a commission to study the extent to which segregation and discrimination in private housing are practiced in New York State and to make recommendations for bringing it to an end.

2. Housing: One of the requirements for wholesome family relations and stable community life is adequate and decent housing. The prevalence of overcrowded and substandard dwellings and slum areas are major evils which are a menace to good health and moral well-being, as well as a blight upon responsible citizenship. To help overcome these evils, the committee is in favor of the continuation, for the time being, of Federal and State subsidies for the construction of housing for low-income groups. It urges private industry, with support from the Government, if necessary, to provide more housing units for middle income groups; it supports legislation for a commission to investigate the urban blight of slums in metropolitan areas; it recommends a more adequate program of new housing construction planned to meet all the problems involved: overcrowding, slum clearance, rehabilitating buildings not yet at the substandard stage, and the relocation

of families displaced by such a housing program.

3. Gambling: The legislative committee reaffirms its contention that gambling is a social and moral evil which has a disruptive effect upon the community and social structure, and is destructive of personality. Furthermore, the committee believes that bingo is a specially vicious type of gambling which appeals to and feeds the instincts of greed and social irresponsibility. Accordingly, bingo has no place in the revenue-raising of the church. When employed it is detrimental to the principle of Christian stewardship. Therefore, the committee, being opposed to the legislation enacted in 1955 by which it is proposed to legalize bingo for religious, charitable, and other nonprofit organizations, will use its influence to defeat similar legislation during the legislative session of 1957.

4. Sabbath laws: The committee believes that observance of Sunday as a day of rest is not only in conformity with religious principles, but is sound as a matter of health and morals and an appropriate subject for legislation. If special provision can be made, however, without insuperable administrative difficulties, for those who actually observe a different day as their holy day, the committee would not oppose such action.

Keeping a merchandising office open on Sunday to take care of orders in response to advertisements on radio or television or in newspapers appears to the committee to be just as serious a commercialization of the Sabbath as actually keeping the store doors open, and it is unfair to the small storekeeper who observes the Sabbath laws. The committee favors legislation to prohibit such activities.

5. Alcohol and narcotics: The use of alcohol and narcotics is a cause for great alarm. The committee urges programs of education and legislative regulation to reduce the menace to our society caused by both the sale and the use of alcohol and of narcotics. Specifically, it is in favor of legislation—

(a) To curb the drinking driver;

(b) To prevent the extension of legal hours and conditions of sale or the increasing of the number of legal outlets for alcoholic beverages, and to increase to 21 the age of persons to whom alcoholic beverages may not be sold;

(c) To implement the mandatory instruction in schools on the harmful effects of alcohol, narcotics and habit-forming drugs;

(d) To curb liquor advertising;

(e) To support and foster the local option approach to the granting of licenses for sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages;

(f) To place upon the beverage alcohol industry a greater share of the cost of the beverage alcohol traffic to society in terms of its contributory part in increasing the rate of mental ailments, industrial absences, motor vehicle accidents, juvenile delinquency and broken and destitute homes;

(g) To provide:

(1) More adequate facilities for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts;

(2) A better follow-up system for those who have been convicted as narcotic victims and released; and

(3) Stricter enforcement of the laws which prohibit the sale of narcotics and a more severe punishment for "pushers."

6. Juvenile delinquency: Believing that a juvenile delinquent is the product of his total environment and that his antisocial behavior is a reflection of a failure on the part of the home, the church, the school, and society in general to help him know the abundant life, the committee feels that the emphasis in legislation should be directed primarily to a prevention program. Better housing, more stability in homes and families, less necessity for mothers to work, a more uniform method of treating cases coming before the children's courts, more adequate probation facilities and machinery for closer cooperation among church, home, and court, are felt to be positive steps in this complicated field.

7. Family laws: The family is the basic unit in society and the preservation of its ties is a Christian duty. Present laws relating to marriage, divorce, and other family relations are confused and antiquated and in some cases actually encourage fraud. The temporary commission on the courts has proposed helpful changes in the court structure, but does not have power to deal with the entire problem. The committee favors the creation of a temporary State commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the family and to recommend changes. It does not favor liberal divorce. It believes there is opportunity to strengthen the bonds of marriage through providing conciliatory services in courts dealing with family relations.

Officers of the Future—For Ships of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, United States Maritime Service, Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, at joint meeting of the Propeller Club, Port of New Orleans, and the National Defense Transportation Association, at New Orleans, La., January 10, 1956:

OFFICERS OF THE FUTURE—FOR SHIPS OF THE FUTURE

Thank you Mr. Turman, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Kelley, distinguished guests, members of the Propeller Club and the NDTA, and ladies and gentlemen. May I express to you my thanks and appreciation for the opportunity to address you at this luncheon jointly sponsored by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of New Orleans, and the National Defense Transportation Association, both of which organizations render such great service to American shipping and the allied industries.

I am glad to say I am far from being a stranger to New Orleans. For some years I ran between New Orleans and Los Angeles, Mexico, Montevideo and Buenos Aires, in the Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co. I passed for second mate in New Orleans. In addition I have the Mississippi River pilot's license from South Pass to Destrehan, some 30 miles above New Orleans, which I have kept current, although I should hate to have to use it again without some preliminary breaking in. I certainly hope you have straightened out the South Pass Bar so that ships no longer have to make that oblique approach with a hard right rudder at the crucial moment. Among my friends of those days were Mr. P. J. Dromgool, our marine superintendent; Mr. Cecil N. Bean, supervising inspector of the Steamship Inspection Service, who was one of the signers of my application when I took the examination for that service; Capt. Harry Koch, who for some years has been vice president of the Avondale Marine Ways, Inc., and is now also president of Koch-Ellis, Inc. In recent years I have made more friends and in addition have had the pleasure of meeting many of your shipping and transportation executives in the course of their visits to New York.

I am very grateful for the opportunity to meet with you here in New Orleans to discuss one of shipping's valuable assets—the United States Merchant Marine Academy. There has always existed a strong link between the shipping and transportation interests of the gulf region and Kings Point, extending back to the time our basic school was established at Pass Christian in 1943 to cope with the increased demand for both merchant and Naval Reserve officers during World War II. This bond has become strengthened as more and more of our graduates have entered your employ as officers abroad your ships, and as a number of them, having become chief engineers and masters have been promoted into your shore employ. As an example I need only to invite attention to your Propeller Club of New Orleans vice president, Capt. J. W. Clark, and vice president of the Delta Line, a graduate of the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, class of 1940; Mr. Bartley W. Farrell, vice president, Standard Stevedoring Co., class of 1945; Capt. Richard E. McNeeley, River pilot and secretary, Crescent River Port Pilots, class of 1943; Mr. Erik F. Johnsen, operations manager, States Marine Line, class of 1945; Mr. Lawrence J. Hill, average adjuster, C. A. Sporl & Co., class of 1943; Mr. David M. Brown, Jr., southern representative, the American Waterways Operators, Inc., and president of the Kings Point Alumni Chapter here, class of 1944; and other distinguished graduates too numerous to mention at this time.

The merchant fleet is one of our country's greatest assets. We prepare our cadets to be the servants of the merchant fleet in peacetime and in time of war.

I do not intend to go into what I am sure would be repetitious details of when the Academy was established, why it was established, the construction of its buildings, or the record of its accomplishments during World War II, or the details of its wartime courses. I do believe, however, that you will be interested in knowing a little more about what we are doing now in the way of training officers for a career at sea in the merchant marine, with a collateral status as Naval Reserve officers. Also you will be interested in knowing what our courses of the future will embrace insofar as we can see the picture at this time.

During World War II the courageous and heroic actions of Kings Pointers serving aboard merchant ships in war zones throughout the world won well-deserved credit for themselves and the corps from distinguished military leaders—Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz paid us a handsome tribute when he visited Kings Point and afterward sent me a photograph of the signing of the Japanese surrender on board the U. S. S. *Missouri*. He had written underneath: "In recognition of the part the cadet-midshipmen of Kings Point played in making the above scene possible." From Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the following telegram:

HONSHU, HOKKAIDO, JAPAN,
October 16, 1945.

SUPERINTENDENT, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY,
Kings Point, N. Y.

I have directed that the surrender sword of Vice Admiral Ugaki, who commanded the Japanese naval forces of northern Honshu and Hokkaido, be forwarded to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., as a memento of the valiant service rendered by the sons of the Academy in our struggle in the Pacific.

MACARTHUR,
Commander in Chief, American Forces, Pacific.

Many a Kings Pointer spent long days and nights in a lifeboat after being forced to abandon ship after torpedoing. Many of them were lost with their ships right off the mouth of the Mississippi during the early days of the war. The percentage of casualties sustained by the merchant marine during the war was nearly as large as the 4 percent experienced by the Army and Navy. Kings Pointers numbered only 3.6 percent of the entire complement of the merchant marine but the Academy is proud of the fact that her sons won 6 percent of the Distinguished Service Medals for outstanding acts of heroism. Two hundred and twelve Kings Pointers paid the supreme sacrifice in combat action during the war.

The Academy was formally accredited by the Middle States Association and has since then awarded the bachelor of science degree. We did not seek accreditation per se; we sought to graduate a highly professionally trained and well-rounded officer, and we were awarded the accolade of accreditation because of the successful manner in which we were accomplishing our mission. We believe that today's merchant-marine officer must be judged in terms of his general education, his physical superiority and good practical ability, his belief in democracy, his attitude toward America's leadership in world affairs, his readiness to serve his country as well as his developed professional abilities to perform new and complex shipboard duties as he enters upon his sea career. We endeavor to inculcate in him and to foster and mold the qualities of courage, loyalty, and integrity. In the confused and critical years which lie ahead he will be called upon to use more than a little of each. Education is essential. At the same time, without character and leadership, nothing is of any avail.

The young man who is admitted to the Merchant Marine Academy prepares for a definite goal: If he is to become a deck officer, he takes one specified curriculum; if he aspires to be an engineering officer, he takes another. In order to assist in promoting a proper working relationship between the deck and engine departments and to increase the efficiency of the ship as a whole, our deck cadets are given the rudiments of what we call engineering knowledge for deck officers, and similarly our engine cadets are given elementary instruction in the rudiments of navigation, etc.

To enter the Academy, he must take a competitive scholastic examination. To be eligible for consideration for appointment he must stand well up among those taking the examination. Then he is accepted for appointment within the population-determined State quotas and on the basis of demonstrated ability and promise. It is not believed the new permanency bill for the Academy will fundamentally change this procedure.

All of our cadet-midshipmen, so called, must become accepted in the Reserve component of the Navy as a condition of their appointment to the Academy, and upon graduation they receive commissions as ensigns in the Naval Reserve.

I believe it is typical of a Kings Pointer that he is forehanded and efficient and knows how to obey and to command. It is necessary that our cadets learn to discipline themselves in order that they can discipline others. It is essential for a merchant officer just as it is for a naval officer. We have been complimented on the appearance of the Kings Point cadets. I want to tell you that except for our regular Saturday morning inspections we have no drill periods in our curriculum, and the high standard which observers have been good enough to attribute to us comes, I believe, from that esprit de corps which is an integral part of every Kings Pointer.

You will note that in much the same way that the United States Military Academy is referred to as West Point, the United States Merchant Marine Academy is, because of its location in the village of Kings Point, known as Kings Point, and the cadets as Kings Pointers. Less than a mile away is the much larger village of Great Neck, and but for this accident of geography we might easily have been known as Great Neckers.

The Academy has enjoyed, indeed has been inspired, by the encouragement and cooperation it has received from the shipping industry.

The individual steamship companies and the organizations in which they are grouped demonstrate an active interest in the Academy and are most cooperative. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you gentlemen here, representing the steamship companies of the gulf area, for your demonstrated interest in our cadets during their course of training and for the employment opportunities you havo offered them and continue to offer them upon their graduation. Knowing that most of you are active in the Propeller Club I should also tell you how much we appreciate the fine resolution with respect to Kings Point, and merchant marine officer training, sponsored by your group at the American Merchant Marine Conference in October last year.

For the betterment of Academy courses and the devolopment of new ideas for the program, the advice and recommendations of the industry are sought. This applies not only to steamship operators but to companies related to maritime activities or serving the industry with machinery, boilers and a variety of other equipment. A great many of these companies have responded most generously by giving us equipment and a number have stimulated interest on the part of cadet-midshipmen through the establishment of prizes for award at graduation.

I must also mention the assistance and encouragement we have always received from the armed services—the United States Merchant Marine Academy has always enjoyed a close liaison and the full cooperative support of the Navy, the Army, the Air Force and the Coast Guard, and the citizenry. When President Eisenhower was inaugurated the Navy very kindly transported our entire student body by ship to Washington, D. C., in order that it might participate in the inaugural parade. In addition, the Navy offers our first classmen the opportunity of making training cruises in naval vessels from time to time.

The Army has given Kings Point, as a Federal Academy, pride of place in the Armed Forces Day parade line of march in New York City immediately behind West Point.

These are of course highlights, but there is a constant interchange of helpful information and a continuing readiness on the part of the armed services—the Army, Navy, Air Force and Coast Guard to help Kings Point achieve its mission in every possible way.

On the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Academy, President Eisenhower sent a congratulatory telegram which expressed the hope that "The United States Merchant Marine Academy continue in the years ahead to prepare young Americans for leadership in our modern merchant marine."

Senator Lachèvre, head of the French Senate Committee for Merchant Marine Affairs visited the Academy last year in connection with a French program to coordinate all of their scattered training schools in one Federal institution. He appeared to be very favorably impressed with Kings Point, and in fact his concluding comment was: "c'est magnifique!" We were constrained not to disagree with him. Subsequently we received a very nice letter from the French Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Maurice Couve de Murville.

The enrollment at Kings Point is approximately 750 in residence, with a class, the third class, of about 220 at sea. We take in something over 300 cadets each year and each year graduate in the neighborhood of 200—that is to say, 100 deck officers and 100 engineer officers. While no one knows better than you, gentlemen, the fluctuations of the maritime industry and the varying periods of overemployment and underemployment, it is generally agreed that on a long-range basis a minimum of 1,200 replacement officers are required annually. Of this number, the Federal academy and the State maritime academies are now providing nearly 500. It will be seen, therefore, that opportunity for advancement from the ranks remains open for outstanding, unlicensed personnel. At present, the balance of the annual required replacement is furnished from the unlicensed categories—some 700.

I should like, here, to pay a tribute to those officers of the merchant marine who have come up "through the hawsepipe." This includes some of our outstanding merchant marine officers. There are always a goodly number of cadet-midshipmen at Kings Point who have come from before the mast, and naturally they are among our best, having chosen the sea as their profession and then having done something about bettering themselves.

In our studies of the background, educational and empfloyment experiences, of the young men who come to Kings Point, we have noted with satisfaction that the number of candidates who have had previous service aboard a ship is increasing from year to year. In our present plebe class, which entered the Academy last August, 41 of the 300-odd entering cadet-midshipmen, or 12 percent, had previous sea experience. It is interesting to note, too, that in this class over 100 of the young men have near relatives who have served in either the merchant marine, Navy, or Coast Guard as a career. We believe this to be a good sign, indicating that men of the sea are influencing the careers of their sons and nephews, bringing to the profession men with salt water in their veins.

We are not completely satisfied with the number of candidates from the sea. We are making every effort to increase the percentage and have begun a program which we hope will lead to a still greater number of applications from young men who have already gained experience at sea and have found it to be the career of their choice. We are embarking upon a program to distribute press releases concerning scheduled entrance examinations to officials of all seamen's unions. These releases include general information regarding basic eligibility requirements and tell how one can obtain additional detailed information about entering Kings Point. We will attempt to secure space in various union periodicals for the purpose of regularly and periodically presenting information about entrance requirements. We are going to endeavor to arrange, through union officials, for the display of Academy posters and information on bulletin boards in union hiring halls. Finally, our cadet-midshipmen themselves, when they go aboard ship during their second year, will be better prepared in the future to tell the story of Kings Point and its opportunities to any qualified young men with whom they are shipmates.

We do, as many of you know, credit an applicant who has had previous sea experience with a bonus of five points on the competitive scholastic test and, in addition, a waiver in age is granted up to age 23 for men who have been in the merchant marine and in the Armed Forces. It has been suggested that this allowance be increased. Our problem here, however, is the danger of accepting a young man who does not have the ability to complete the program. It would be quite unfair to a young man if we accepted him for appointment, knowing ourselves that his standing in the examination indicated his inability to keep up with the course of study.

It is our hope that a good percentage of the young men serving aboard ships of the American merchant marine today will set Kings Point as their goal. We hope they will continue to study at sea, prepare themselves for the competitive examination as well as in those subjects that constitute the courses of study at the Academy. The United States Maritime Service Institute formerly conducted courses for men at sea, but it is our understanding that they are now being successfully handled by the Maritime Studies Institute in New York City, a private organization.

Reverting to our curricula and training procedures, I should like to say that in keeping with postwar trends, extensive use is made of training aids, both audio and visual, but mention of the practical aspects of the curriculum is hardly complete unless reference is made to the conventional laboratories, such as the drafting room, navigational chartroom, physics, chemistry, thermodynamics, strength of materials, and hydraulic laboratories. Certain special laboratories, however, are also provided: the gyro lab, the planetarium, the steam and diesel laboratories, the engine repair laboratory, and the electrical laboratory. The electronics laboratory deserves particular mention. Here the deck cadet-midshipmen are taught theory and practical use of radiotelephones, depth finders or "fathometers," radar, and loran.

At the Academy we are alert to changes within the industry which indicate the desirability of changes in our curriculum. For example, indicative of a new marine trend, there will be a gas-turbine powered converted Liberty ship operating next summer. We have offered gas turbine instruction for some time, and this ship the *John Sargent*, will have a Kings Pointer, Mr. William Van Cott, as her chief engineer.

Our preparations for nuclear training are further illustrative. On November 11, 1955, addressing the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers at its annual meeting in New York, the Honorable Clarence G. Morse, the Maritime Administrator, said: "This very week we have invited proposals and prices from manufacturers covering a nuclear propulsion plant for a merchant ship. We are asking them, contingent on congressional approval and funds, to furnish us with a nuclear propulsion plant to be fitted in a tanker-type vessel by June 1959. We are also asking them to submit other proposals for design studies and developments for a nuclear propulsion plant which may offer greater technical and economic advantages for the purpose of having a second ship in operation by June 1961."

Anticipating developments such as these, we at Kings Point have long been planning the program which will be required to train the officers of the future for the ships of the future. Our first task was to determine the qualifications required of the engineering officers of these nuclear ships-to-be. Fundamentally, the marine nuclear engineer will need to be a well-qualified steam engineer with "something plus," and this something plus will involve additional education in nuclear physics, nuclear engineering, and practical experience in the operation of a reactor. The responsibility of the Academy then is to produce engineers with a sound knowledge of marine steam propulsion plants, a background in nuclear physics, and study in nuclear engineering.

For the past 14 years we have been in the business of training marine engineers, and the competency of our graduates is a matter of record. As early as 1949, we undertook to develop in our cadet-midshipmen an interest in nuclear energy, and at that time we sponsored at the Academy a public forum, the Citizen in the Atomic Age, with Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves as the principal speaker. Since that time, we have arranged for a number of exhibits on atomic energy, including a permanent panel display showing the schematic flow of nuclear power from the point of its generation in the reactor, through the heat exchangers, to the turbine, to the generator, constructed by Westinghouse and given to us by the Hayden Planetarium; a model of a nuclear-powered merchant ship, provided through the courtesy of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.; a model of the *Nautilus* loaned by the General Dynamics Corp.; a power reactor exhibit loaned by Babcock & Wilcox; and a research reactor model provided by the American Machine & Foundry Corp.

In 1950 we gave our first course in the fundamentals of nuclear energy to a selected group of cadet-midshipmen. Since that time there has been an increasing demand on the part of the young men for this course which as it is now given, includes a detailed study of the atomic structure and atomic particles, of electrons, protons, and neutrons, of radiation instrumentation, of nuclear reactions, and of that most important of all known reactions—the fission of uranium—235.

As I said previously, our courses must be geared to the needs of the industry. It now seems that a nuclear-powered merchant ship may be authorized. We are now prepared to undertake the nuclear engineering phase of our program. In preparation for this day, several members of our engineering faculty have been doing graduate study in the field of nuclear engineering. With the beginning of the new term, in March, we hope to offer a course which will treat with nuclear theory, reactor types and construction features; fuel and fuel elements, shielding problems; types and characteristics of coolants and coolant pumps; heat exchangers; radiation control; radiation detectors and permissible dosages; safety devices and instrumentation; shielding and insulation; radio-active waste disposal; operation, maintenance, and permissible repair procedures as applied to shipboard operation of a marine nuclear powerplant.

Ultimately, the training in reactor operation will need be a part of the engineering program at the United States Merchant Marine Academy. As more and more atomic reactors power our merchant fleet, the number of engineers trained in their operation must be expanded. At that time, the Academy should have its own training reactor in operation. While that day is still far in the future, we must continue to look ahead and plan in order that we may have ready "the officers of the future to man the ships of the future."

A year or two ago, Mr. Jimmy Jemail, the inquiring photographer of the New York Daily News, asked me what I thought about flying saucers. I managed to get around that one by telling him that if and when flying saucers came into general use Kings Pointers would navigate them. I should like to say now, but in a more serious vein, that when atomic ships make their appearance, Kings Pointers will definitely operate them—not exclusively—but certainly well in the van.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the third in a series of articles on mental health. This series was prepared for the Amarillo Globe-Times by two of the paper's fine writers, Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco. The articles deal with a problem that is not peculiar to one State, but is of national concern.

The article is as follows:

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—KANSAS LEADS WAY IN REHABILITATION

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

You are ill. Not unconscious from an automobile wreck, not in delirium from a high fever. Just ill. Too sick to go to work.

Your family or your friends take you to the police station where uniformed police surround you. Strangers on a jury decide whether you are entitled to go the hospital. Maybe you spend a few nights in the jail while you wait to go to some faraway town.

When you reach this hospital, no doctor or nurse bothers to see you or even asks what hurts. You are assigned a place in a ward so crowded that the beds are standing edge to edge—even the attendants have to crawl over them. Maybe you only get a mattress on the floor. There are 3,000 persons into an area built for 1,800.

In the daytime you can join the rocking-chair brigade, lined up along ahe corridor, where you rock and look at the wall. Or you can sit on the floor with your head bent to your knees, hoping to shut out the sights around you.

Perhaps the nights are worse. Others much sicker than you are in that ward, and their frightening actions make a thought pound like a pulse in your head, "I'll be like that soon—I'll be like that soon."

You have nothing of your own. If you're a woman, you have a shapeless dress exactly like those on every woman patient you see. If you're a man, you can't even have a pencil or paper, nor pictures of your children in a wallet, nothing to comfort and remind you what it was to be well.

Bath day comes once a week, maybe. There are 3 kinds of food—1 for the doctors, 1 for the attendants, 1 for you. You know which one is the worst.

Sometimes you get some medicine or a treatment, but no one explains how it will help you, so you sweat out in terror the new sensations.

Would you get well? Or would you quit trying—and dutifully die to make way for another patient?

Or if you are mentally ill—for it is only in the United States hospitals for the mentally ill that such a way of life can be found today—would you close your mind to all reality and eventually forget even the feel of freedom, the look of your child's face, the warmth of a friend's hand?

ATTENDANTS UNTRAINED

When Gov. FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, appointed a special committee to look into the Kansas State hospital program after the exposure of the shocking conditions in 1948, it reported some interesting facts:

More Kansans had been committed to State hospitals for the insane than had graduated from the State university and teachers colleges between 1866, when the first hospital was opened, and 1946. Approximately 45,000 Kansans had been committed. Of this number, slightly more than one-third, 17,000, had been discharged as improved; 15,000 had died and the remaining 23,000 were either in the institutions, had been transferred elsewhere, discharged as unimproved, or had run away. (A like study of Texas long-term statistics might be just as interesting.)

In 1948, as 1 doctor describes: "There was 1 nurse (in Topeka Hospital) and she was dying of cancer. There were 120 attendants, none of whom were particularly trained for his job. The attendants worked 12 to 14 hours a day, many slept in the same wards

in which they worked. Naturally they had to use penal colony techniques to care for the 1,800 patients here. On one day, there were 100 patients under restraint (straitjackets), screaming in pain and fear.

"There was no occupational therapy, no recreational therapy except a movie once a week and an occasional square dance for some of the improved patients. Patients got ice cream once in a year—on the Fourth of July. Later, when the first outdoor picnic was held for some of the patients, they seemed reluctant to eat the sandwiches. Finally one asked the question that seemed to be pervasive: 'If we eat these now, does that mean we won't get any supper?'

"If a patient assigned to a job around the hospital made the mistake of doing a job particularly well, he might remain in the hospital for a long time because it was cheaper to keep him there than to hire someone from the outside to do the job. At least one patient was in the hospital 23 years, long after he was cured, because he could take excellent care of the powerplant."

(The same plan for patient labor is used in Texas today.)

Yet by 1955, the Topeka Hospital was a model training hospital for workers in mental health, and along with the other State hospitals of Kansas was racking up a record—the only State system in the United States where hospital population had steadily gone down for 5 years.

BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY

Let's take a look at the hospital where this remarkable recovery of the mentally ill has been established.

The Topeka State Hospital, not far from the downtown business area, is formed of a group of beatup, red brick buildings, some of them more than 75 years old. Screens are in need of repair, doors sag, floors are rotted. Kansas has voted a half-mill property tax to renovate and modernize its buildings in the next decade, but it didn't build in 1949, when the new program was started.

Instead the money went into salaries for personnel and into treatment of the patients. In 1949 Kansas stood at the foot of the class—48th—in salaries for staff personnel. It has brought such payments steadily upward, but frankly, as pointed out by Dr. Alfred Bay, superintendent of the Topeka Hospital, even today salaries for trained personnel is not far above the average paid in other States, some of whom have only untrained personnel.

So high salaries alone won't account for the high morale one sees here. There is a feeling of pride. These Kansans are winning the battle against mental illness, and like soldiers in battle they are giving services beyond the call of duty.

A second reason for the high morale comes from the training which the workers are receiving under the research program of the three-way plan participated in by the Menninger Foundation, Winter Hospital (Veteran's Administration), and the State hospital system. (We will tell you of this joint training program later.)

TRAINING FUNDS VOTED

Kansans had a choice to make in 1949. It could build more beds for mental patients—the Topeka hospital had 1,800 individuals crowded into accommodations for 1,400.

(Texas has 16,500 patients in accommodations built for 10,500.)

It could tackle the problem of the rising rate of mental patients in the population by voting bond issue after bond issue, erecting human warehouse after human warehouse. During 5 years, it would have taken almost 2,500 more beds to hold the patients who came for treatment had there not been a high dismissal rate.

Kansas chose instead to forget the warehousing method and get into the business of rehabilitating its mentally ill.

First move was to vote a million dollars for the training of personnel. In Topeka the Menninger Foundation hospitals and the Veterans' Administration hospital, Winter, were examples of what could be done if one had trained personnel instead of custodians in charge of psychiatric hospitals.

The Topeka unit was turned into a training hospital, and slowly the men and women trained there sifted out to the other hospitals. It is notable that in the year after the first psychiatrist was sent to Larned Hospital, the cost per patient released began to drop and decreased steadily.

In fact, the Topeka hospital is the pilot program for the State hospital system. Techniques tried there are polished to perfection and transferred to the other units. The only out-patient clinic where patients are treated by psychiatric teams in outer offices in the State hospital system is here, and it is estimated it saved the State 33,000 days of hospitalization in 1954.

The newly established Children's Unit is a center for experiments in techniques, while its young patients are being led into normal channels of activity. Neurological diagnosis and surgery are conducted in Topeka.

From this hospital, located in the State capital, it is hoped to springboard the first traveling clinics, staffed by psychiatric teams that will go into other Kansas communities to inaugurate and support preventive mental health programs—to stave off eventual hospitalization of that 1 in 10 Americans predicted by the National Association for Mental Health.

FAMILIARITY HELPS

Since 1949, basic changes have been made in the organization of State hospital work. Today there are four sections in the hospital, each headed by a psychiatrist. A patient who enters Topeka State Hospital stays in one section until released; the familiarity of the same faces and the same rooms has treatment value. No longer are there "back wards" to which the more seriously ill can be banished and the threat of which once hung over each frightened, tense patient.

The hospital staff applies the bit of knowledge that too few of us recognize: even the incurable psychotic is rarely "violent," and, if so, the periods of violence are infrequent. Topeka personnel are trained to watch for the always-present signs of approaching disorder. Only then is the patient led off to the "closed" rooms of the ward.

Patients in a mental hospital have the usual physical ailments, too. Physical medical work therefore plays a big part in the hospital routine. The county medical society furnishes consultants for these ailments. In Topeka, the mental patients who have tuberculosis are housed in a cottage on the grounds.

IMMEDIATE ENTRANCE

There has been one definite pattern established in the Topeka hospital—as the number of employees has gone up, patient discharges have increased. After five years, the Kansas State hospitals have managed to reach the level of 1 staff member equal 2.11 patients. In hospitals of 8 surrounding States, the employee-patient ratio is 1 to 3.71. Hospital populations are increasing in those States, falling in Kansas.

Probably the most heartening news from Kansas is that emergency patients can be accepted immediately. Such waiting lists as exist on any given day are those which are in process of being examined. (A lot of mentally ill Texans are being held in jails because Texas State hospitals are so overcrowded that waiting lists are lengthy.)

Now, this successful Kansas program has cost money in operating budgets. In Osawatomie, the per patient cost went from $1.29 in 1949 to $3.50 in 1954; in Larned, from $1.40 to $3.20; and in Topeka—the training hospital—it has increased to $4.99. But in that same period, the rate of dismissals at the hospitals have increased 3 to 1.

In spite of all those figures you see on the costs of illness to industry through lost working days, on the economic waste of incapacitated manpower, no one has ever been able to establish the worth of a human being. What statistic is one going to balance against the increased cost of care which results in men and women being returned to active life, and children given a second chance after a false start?

Something to Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden rendered a great service to freedom's cause when, in their Declaration of Washington, they pinpointed, for the benefit of uncommitted nations, the difference between communism and liberty under law. I am one who believes, by and large, that we in the West place far too much emphasis on what the Reds have to offer, and far too little on what freedom has to offer. Any neutral nation which really cannot make up its mind between communism and freedom does not need foreign aid so much as it needs a psychiatrist. The President and the Prime Minister pointed out why.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an excellent editorial on this point from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier Express of February 3, 1956:

DECLARATION OF WASHINGTON WARNS AGAINST RED WILES

Whether or not the Declaration of Washington will go down in history with the 14 points, the Atlantic Charter, and other famous statements of international policy, this must be said for it: President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden, and their advisers gave the so-called uncommitted nations—specifically the recently colonial and newly sovereign countries of Asia and Africa—something to think about.

The something was a balance sheet setting forth the comparative records of the Western democracies and the Communist dictatorships in the matter of making good their promises of independence and self-determination. These quotations from the Declaration of Washington tell much of the story:

"During the past 10 and more years 600 million men and women in nearly a score of lands have, with our support and assistance, attained nationhood. Many millions more are being helped surely and steadily toward self-government. Thus, the reality and effectiveness of what we have done is a proof of our sincerity. * * *

"During this period of notable cooperative progress in the free world those who assert the supremacy of the state and deny the inherent rights of man have also been active. Millions of people of different blood, religions, and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union, and many millions more have in fact, although not always in form, been absorbed into the Soviet Communist bloc. * * *

"Any free nation that may be persuaded, by whatever threat, promise, or enticement, to embrace communism will lose its independence and its people will forfeit their rights and liberties."

Real Bread Is Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have come across an article in the Catholic Digest for February 1956 which I, as a father, as an American and as a Member of Congress, recommend that everyone in this country should read. The article, entitled "Real Bread Is Back," discusses the plans being carried out to return to the white bread we eat the most nutritious element in wheat, the wheat germ.

Nature has supplied us with all of the food elements essential to the human body. Too often the food industries of our country, in attempting to produce greater volume and more dollars, cast out these essential elements and bring in substitutes. When are we going to learn that in spite of the progress that has been made in chemistry in this country, we can never duplicate nature in its entirety? The man-made product might be close or similar; it might resemble the natural product in many respects, but it can never achieve the end of completely duplicating all the primary and secondary elements of nutrition that nature has produced. We need not wonder why we as Americans have finally taken a back seat to Russia at the winter Olympic games; the Russians do not know what chemically treated white flour is.

It is gratifying to note that after all these years our bakers and nutrition experts have rediscovered the element which made bread the staff of life.

I believe that the article, which I quote below, illustrates quite vividly that what we in this country need is a more complete diet and less concentration on volume and dollars.

The article is as follows:

REAL BREAD IS BACK

(By James C. G. Conniff)

Your grocery store will soon have a white bread more nourishing than whole wheat. In vitamin E alone, which helps prevent heart disease and is essential to its rapid cure, the new bread is seven times richer than anything now on the market.

It is made from wheat-germ flour, and it will cost no more than your present loaf. Bakers once said that such a flour could not be stored. They now call it the most revolutionary breadmaking development in 2,000 years.

In a blindfold test made by 270 Chicago women, 2 out of 3 found the new bread better tasting. At Ann Arbor, Mich., a baker changed over to wheat-germ flour without advertising the switch. His sales jumped 280 percent in 3 years. An Evanston, Ill., baker says that wheat-germ flour is so rich that he needs less milk in baking with it. When a big national bakery test-marketed wheat-germ bread in Macon, Ga., sales gained 30 percent in 90 days.

Delighted bakers officials are testing it further in Texas and Florida. Plans for nationwide marketing are now being made.

Biochemical experts at the University of Chicago and the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation have found that wheat-germ flour has more protein, and fewer calories and carbohydrates than its nearest rival, enriched white flour. That should prove good news to everyone who must watch his weight.

Its vitamin content (including niacin, thiamine, riboflavin, needed to help build stronger bodies) is far higher. The new flour has heavier concentrations of the mysterious "trace elements" (traces of other minerals and acids that aid vitality). The wheat germ itself, a mere 2 percent or 3 percent of the flour's total volume, seems also to account for its creamy texture.

Not all nutritionists agree that wheat-germ bread really tastes better. Some of them are of the opinion that some additional tinkering must be done with the flour formula. But Dr. Philip H. Derse, of the Wisconsin Alumni Research foundation, thinks that if the slightly yellow wheat-germ flour were baked in a smaller, less airy loaf, the bread would become as attractive to the palate as it now is to the eye. In short, good baking is all that is necessary to make the new bread taste good.

The lasting quality of wheat-germ flour is another matter that positively invites the baker to do right by it. It can be stored for more than a year in temperatures ranging from 55° to 90° F. Fresh, tasty loaves have been baked from flour 4 years old.

The wheat germ itself looks like a dark pinhead at the base of each grain. In it is packed all the nourishment that has made wheat the staff of life since biblical times. Yet for nearly a century this vital speck has been extracted from commercial white flour. That is standard practice both in this country and most of Europe.

An oil in the wheat germ, heated by the high-speed steel rollers of modern milling, softens the germ, so that it mills flat rather than crumbled. If left in, these oily flecks soon make the flour rancid, so millers sift them out. Farmers used them to fatten livestock. Health faddist sprinkle them on their breakfast cereal.

Hogs and faddists thrived. Ordinary citizens were left with a loaf of white bread attractive in appearance but lacking in nourishment. Laboratory animals fed on it died. Since about 1940, there have been various moves to put back into white flour the good things God put into the wheat kernel. Bakers in most States are now required by law to restore artificially to their bread the vitamins and minerals the millers sift out. But this "enrichment" program puts back only a small proportion of the vitamins that were in the wheat kernel.

Besides, "enrichment" has done almost nothing to slow the decline in bread consumption. Half a century ago, our forefathers ate 210 pounds of bread a year. We eat less than 150.

But because of two seemingly unconnected events, this unhealthy trend may be reversed. The first event was a Sioux City, Iowa, banker's $500,000 gamble that a wheat-germ flour could be milled to make a bread like the kind he ate as a boy. Millers laughed at the idea, but the banker, Dan T. Hedges, went ahead with the experiment anyway in mills he owned himself. It was a magnificent try, but it failed.

About all the banker got for his money was a fat pile of reports showing that no matter how you prepared it, wheat-germ flour always spoiled too fast to be marketable. Sadly, the banker wrote off his half-million-dollar fizzle. That was more than 50 years ago.

Our story jumps now to the prohibition era and Morris, Ill., where a miller had taken over a padlocked brewery. The massive aeration system there was ideal for making beer, but too powerful for cleaning wheat. The great gusts the machine produced would simply blow the wheat away. In converting, therefore, the miller hooked up only part of it.

Then, one day in 1930, the mill superintendent decided that he could clean the wheat better by using the whole aeration system and providing controls. He was overhauling the plant anyway, so why not try it? The controls kept the wheat from blowing away, all right, but those giant gusts of air also cooled the steel rollers. When the superintendent checked the grist for the usual flattened wheat germs, he found none.

Thereupon, he did a bit of research with a microscope, and discovered that the air-cooled rollers had kept the wheat germ from softening; it had crumbled like the rest of the grain. To the superintendent, this meant pure disaster. Since he couldn't sift out the pulverized wheat germ, he was sure that the flour would spoil. The owner had already put too much money into the overhaul to make another change, so he stored the unusable flour and closed the mill.

Months passed, and a casual check revealed that the stored flour had somehow not gone bad. So the miller reopened his plant and tried to market the strange product, wheat-germ flour. But bakers refused to handle it because of its reputation for spoiling. Disgusted, the miller packed his flour off to a warehouse, shut down his mill, and steered clear of old breweries from then on.

In 1935, a newspaper-circulation man in Chicago ran across the peculiar story and felt his pulse rate leap. He at once got samples of the stored flour. When tests showed that the stuff was really wheat-germ flour and that good bread could still be made from it, he moved fast.

First, he bought up the miller's interest in the process. Then he leased the converted brewery in Morris. Last, he went to an attic in Sioux City, Iowa, and got the dust-covered bundle of wheat-germ-experiment reports his grandfather had stored there long ago. (Yes, he was the grandson of Dan Hedges.)

Having come from a banking family, he knew where to lay hands on needed money. Over the last 20 years, Dan Hedges Brown, named after the wheat-germ pioneer, has poured $2½ million into that abandoned brewery to perfect the process the superintendent stumbled onto. Now that wheat-germ flour seems to be on the brink of being accepted nationally, Dan expects to raise production from 800 to 1,600 hundredweight sacks a day. That should be enough to at least prime the pump for national demand.

Dan Brown found pretty much the flour he was after within the first year, but that does not mean that he found a smooth path ahead. The years just before the Second World War were heartbreaking. Though he is still vigorous at 57, his face shows the strain of getting wheat-germ flour patented in 29 countries while at the same time fending off undesirable customers. He had to cope with Nazi agents, quietly curious emissaries from a fast-arming Japan, and the bully boys of Benito Mussolini, all of whom were ready to pay a high price for his fabulous toughener of troops.

But Washington had asked Dan not to do business with a possible enemy. Our Government, though slow in taking action, was enormously interested in the process. It was just about to undertake the long, delicate job of winning bakers over to making the new bread for our own Armed Forces when

war came. Pearl Harbor shelved the whole project.

And when the war ended, the big baking chains and their supply mills showed no enthusiasm for the new flour. Although Brown proved to them long ago that they could convert standard milling equipment to wheat-germ manufacture in a single swing shift, without loss of production, the mills hung back.

However, there are hopeful signs of a change of heart. The powerful trade publication, Northwestern Miller, for example, had fought Dan Brown for years. Then last October it published an enthusiastic article about the new flour, citing the number of mills being licensed to produce it. Other publications are following suit. National advertising will do the rest.

Russian efforts to get control of Dan's formula have put a cloak-and-dagger note into the story and added gray hairs to his head. Not long ago, some engineers from Amtorg, the Soviet trade commission, began phoning him at odd hours. Finally, they laid their cards on the table: $5 million held available in a New York bank as a down payment on the secret of wheat-germ flour.

Dan rejected the offer. Of course, he did not want the Russians to starve, but he knew that our Government doesn't like to see vital discoveries handed over to a possible enemy. Much of the Red Army's endurance comes from the highly nutritious black bread the Russians have been eating for generations. Their desire for this new capitalistic white bread was natural enough. But why help strengthen the Russian Army?

Dan knew perfectly well that the Communist leaders would probably use the wheat-germ bread to boost their own prestige among the Russian people. And he could imagine the propaganda victory the Reds could score by handing it out among undernourished people in the free world. It made better sense to Dan that our surplus wheat, properly milled, should reach those who need it under United States and United Nations rather than Soviet auspices.

And then there is the matter of our own national health. Recent disclosures about the shocking state of American muscles have caused President Eisenhower to emphasize publicly the need for more participation in sports and exercise. But there is a nutrional aspect to the matter too, which wheat-germ bread can do much to remedy.

Through Dan's friend Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, the wheat-germ discovery has been brought directly to the attention of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson. Long talks between Dan and the Secretary have helped put the prestige of Mr. Benson's Department behind wheat-germ-flour promotion.

L'Osservatore Romano, the Vatican newspaper, recently ran a glowing article about wheat-germ flour. The paper hailed its discovery as good news for humanity. Monsignor Ligutti, the Holy Father's permanent representative for agriculture in the United States as well as director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, saw to it that the story went out over Vatican radio, too. He had copies sent to every pastor in Italy's 25,000 parishes and to all bishops throughout the world. "I've been trying to help Dan sell this wheat-germ idea," he says, "for many a long year."

Dan Brown hopes that a big byproduct of his better bread will be a better understanding among people everywhere.

With this thought in mind, through a trust named in memory of his grandfather, he is giving away all but 10 percent or 12 percent of the royalties on his process. Groups like the 4-H clubs, the American Legion, Dan's college fraternity Psi Upsilon, and Chicago's Shrine hospital will eventually share millions. The Archdiocese of Chicago and Franciscan missionaries will divide 7½ percent of Dan's income in perpetuum.

Future of Women in Business and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a speech delivered by Mrs. Lucile M. Wright, of Jamestown, N. Y., before the American Association of University Women of Jamestown:

I have been asked to speak to you tonight on the future of women in business and politics.

I have no crystal ball into which I can gaze and foretell what the future will bring to women in general. I can, however, say to you that each new year brings more and more qualified and capable women into positions of prominence in every field of endeavor. The number, however, is far too small for us to do more than be considered a rare bird when we invade the world outside our homes.

Leave us face it, men are here to stay. You have all heard the story—viva la difference.

My point is, men will continue to make their contributions to the workings of this world, but women have their own great and wonderful contributions to offer side by side with the men and if we can put these contributions to their fullest use we will have fulfilled our duty to ourselves and to our country.

I am reminded of an insurance advertisement which states, "The future belongs to those who prepare for it." I would like to add, "The rosy future for women in business and politics is here today if we would avail ourselves of the opportunities made possible for us by fearless women pioneers."

The same characteristics and qualities that make a woman valuable in the home, make her valuable in active community work or in the business and professional world or in politics. She is conscientious, she wants to get at the truth, she wants to do a good job. She approaches problems with sympathetic understanding, she is tireless in her efforts when an ideal is to be preserved. When a woman offers these qualities, she complements the talents and abilities which men bring to any task. We need not argue which is superior—it is enough to emphasize that women have invaluable contributions to make and a woman should be given every opportunity to prove her worth; a great loss is suffered when she is denied that opportunity. A woman will attack a problem with honesty, integrity, and unselfishness. She has great courage, unswerving persistence, and dogged determination.

Considering the fact that women control the wealth of this country, they have not asserted themselves as much as they should, nor have they demanded the representation in local, State, and Federal Government to which they are entitled, and which they could have if they so chose.

Few of us are represented by our own sex on boards of directors of corporations. Of all the railroads in this country, only one, and that one very recently, has placed a woman on the board of directors. I am referring to the New York Central Railroad and Mr. Young who selected Mrs. Lila Wallace, editor of Readers Digest, to lend the "woman's touch" in railroading. Mr. Young explains that he did not select Mrs. Wallace because he wanted a woman who could run a railroad—he states—"I wanted an intelligent woman who could make top decisions—not only about the housekeeping of a railroad, but corporate decisions where a woman's intuitive sense would make a valuable contribution."

Only a comparatively few years ago women were forced to fight for the many rights we take for granted today—the right to assemble—the right to vote—to serve on juries—even to be able to work with dignity. The right to work and have respect given her as a worker, we owe to those who have paved the way for us, a sincere vote of thanks.

Even today in this wonderful country of ours where freedom such as is enjoyed no place else in the world there are many laws which are highly discriminatory against women and children and until women are ready to assume their rightful place in the political life of their community and shoulder their obligations to their community and to their Government these sad conditions will continue.

We all know about scores of women who have been highly successful in the business world.

We have come to expect to read of outstanding women in the professions of law and medicine, science, and the arts. We all know many, many women who have that built-in radar system better known as sixth sense, a quality absolutely necessary in a top-flight secretary. These are the girls on whom the great and the near great depend so completely.

A friend of mine in personnel work was interviewing women for the position of secretary to a very exacting executive. The salary was excellent but the work exhausting. The girl who got the job gave this for her answer when she was asked what she considered her special qualifications for the job—"I can look like a woman, and think like a man, act like a lady and work like a dog."

The remarkable courage displayed by MARGARET CHASE SMITH, our beloved Senator from Maine, who is respected and admired by men and women alike throughout the Nation is without precedent in the annals of American Government. Her statement to the Senate on June 1, 1950, entitled "Declaration of Conscience" came from the heart. Mrs. Smith spoke as a woman, as a United States Senator, as an American. Senator SMITH was deeply concerned about the serious national condition prevalent at that time. That she would dare to openly criticize her colleagues in the United States Senate would have meant political suicide to a more timid soul. MARGARET SMITH hit the nail on the head when she stated, "I would like to speak briefly and simply about a serious national condition. It is a national feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything that we Americans hold dear. It is a condition that comes from the lack of effective leadership in either the legislative branch or the executive branch of our Government. Today our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and the suspicions that are bred in the United States Senate to spread like cancerous tentacles of 'know nothing, suspect everything' attitudes." Pursuing her declaration further, Senator SMITH offers this suggestion, "I think that it is high time for the United States Senate and its Members to do some soul searching—for us to weigh our consciences—on the manner in which we are performing our duty to the people of America—on the manner in which we are using or abusing our individual powers and privileges." That display of 20th-century courage, as MARGARET CHASE SMITH stood, the lone woman Senator surrounded by her male colleagues, will go down in the annals of history. The high and the mighty, the great and the near great listened, were momentarily stunned but broke into tumultuous applause which had

its reverberations around the world. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the woman, has done much to immortalize the female of the species.

The women of the world and more particularly the United States, who have attained the coveted high positions in the business world, those who are serving as legislators in the States, in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, as judges, as ambassadors, as Cabinet members, as officers in our Armed Forces, to mention a few categories, have earned the respect and admiration of the men with whom they work.

The Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, made the recent remark concerning the sympathetic understanding of women, "A man never gets so far down nor so high up in the world that some woman does not love and comfort and usually sustain him."

It was Walt Whitman who said, "A man is a great thing upon the earth, and through eternity—but every jot of the greatness of man is unfolded out of woman." Woodrow Wilson stated the same thing in a different way when he said, "No man ever amounted to a snap of the finger who was not constantly surrounded by a bevy of admiring females." Surely we need no greater proof than this—that women deserve the support of women.

Women by their very nature shy away from the old-time ward healing, barroom type of political controversies. They are however more of a crusader than their brothers. Why aren't we doing so well politically?

Women have had the vote for 35 years yet they have barely scratched the surface of effective political activity. To be sure, women are doing precinct work by the millions, but their record in public office, however heartening outstanding examples make it, is still slight. Perhaps this is because women are just beginning to realize that politics isn't a sordid activity, its the science and art of government. The successful housewife or homemaker can be the successful politician. The practical principles you apply in your home management can be applied to any of the public service jobs which you choose to do. A woman usually can better afford to assume jobs in community service than a man. They can work on commissions, serve on boards, serve as mayor and councilwoman without salary, jobs which are so desperately needed in small communities. Running a city is much like running a house. As mayor of a city, you call in an expert if you must build a sewer system, as a housewife you call the plumber if the kitchen sink needs fixing. It is the woman who has the personal and first hand knowledge of such important issues as the pay of schoolteachers, safety standards in stores and industrial plants. Sanitary standards, health laws, the legislation that governs what sort of water, meat, milk, and ideas flow into our homes are problems which the women are much more aware of than men. They buy the family's pot roast and veal cutlets, they flutter over the children's health. Kitchen and refrigerator have been their domain for generations, why not apply it to the public good.

Last but by no means the least, I will touch on the spiritual qualities of women. In doing so I must pay tribute to the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, Representative from Ohio. This respected woman legislator explains the philosophy that has guided her for more than 15 years in the House of Representatives. Quote—"Just as the individual must examine his own soul before he assumes duties which involve others, so must we who are women go deep into our hearts and minds to ascertain what it is that we have which is so vital to the full purposes of the Infinite. Once weare convinced and aware that only as we take upon ourselves these broad aspects of our womanhood can we hope to see the dawn of peace, the day of light; only then shall we give richer meaning to citizenship in this free land of ours." Unquote.

I could not think of a more fitting credo for any woman planning to enter the field of politics.

The future of women in business and politics is here today—it is up to you to accept the challenge. What are you going to do about it?

In order to try to keep my own feet on the ground and remaiff calm when pressure builds up and the situations become tense I quietly murmur to myself this prayer: God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference.

The Radioactive Fallout and Radioactive Strontium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit a speech delivered by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, which was delivered at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., January 19, 1956. I feel that these remarks will be of great value to the public in general and particularly to the membership of this House.

The speech follows:

THE RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT AND RADIOACTIVE STRONTIUM

(Remarks delivered by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., January 19, 1956)

The radioactivity which falls out of the atmosphere after the explosion of a nuclear weapon is called the radioactive fallout. In the ordinary atomic bomb, for example, for each 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent of explosive energy about 2 pounds of radioactive materials are produced. In these 2 pounds are some 90 different radioactive species varying in lifetime from a fraction of a second to many years. This mixture of radioactivity decreases in radioactivity in such a way that for every sevenfold increase in age the total radioactivity is decreased tenfold. Thus the radioactivity by 7 hours after the explosion has decreased to one-tenth the radioactivity of 1 hour, and in 49 hours to one one-hundredth, and at 2 weeks to one one-thousandth, and in 3 months to one ten-thousandth, and so forth.

The conditions of fallout are largely determined by the amount and type of material vaporized into the fireball of the bomb itself. A bomb fired in the air contributes such a relatively small amount of matter to the cloud that the particles formed after dissipation of the enormous energy released are of necessity very tiny and therefore very slow in settling. The result is that most of the radioactivities are expended in the air and the area over which the fallout occurs is rendered very large indeed, extending to the ends of the earth in minute although detectable amounts.

A bomb fired on the surface of the earth, however, may have an appreciable portion of its radioactivity reprecipitated within relatively short distances, while bombs fired beneath the surface of the earth may place essentially no fallout radioactivity in the atmosphere. Therefore, the question of the area of contamination to be expected from nuclear weapons cannot be answered categorically without specifying the degree of contact of the fireball with the surface of the earth and probably also specifying the characteristics of this surface. Obviously water would differ considerably from soil in its ability to precipitate radioactive fallout. The coral in the southern Pacific islands used for the larger United States weapons tests will under the great heat decompose to form calcium oxide which will then rehydrate to form calcium hydroxide, which in turn will absorb carbon dioxide to form a crust of calcium carbonate. Obviously such a complicated series of chemical reactions will make the fallout particles from the great tests at Eniwetok differ from what would be observed if the same weapons had been fired over ordinary sand or granite rock. We cannot imagine all of the details in which the nature of the soil will affect the local fallout, but it is clear that the effects will be substantial.

In the weapon test operations great care is taken to insure that no danger results from fallout. Criteria are used which are meant to insure that this be so. However, it is well to note that it is from the test operations that we have learned what we do know about the problem of civilian defense against fallout. We must speak of test experience for it is the only source of experimental information about the phenomena of radioactive fallout.

The radioactivities resulting from the burst of a nuclear weapon can be classified as follows: (a) Radioactivities induced in the environment, and (b) products dependent directly on the nature of the weapon. The environment can be made radioactive only by neutrons, but all nuclear weapons involve large numbers of neutrons, some of which are certain to escape into the surroundings.

Taking air bursts first, our problem is—what do neutrons do to air? The answer is simple, they make radioactive carbon, C^{14}, half-life 5,600 years. Fortunately, this radioactivity is essentially safe because of its long lifetime and the enormous amount of diluting carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The cosmic rays themselves make neutrons, which, of course, make radiocarbon. In fact, the earth has on its surface a total of 80 tons of radiocarbon from the cosmic radiation. Now, since each neutron forms 1 C^{14} atom of mass 14 times the neutrons mass, this corresponds to 5.2 tons of neutrons, and we see that this enormous number of neutrons would have to be produced and escape in order that nuclear weapons would just double the feeble natural radioactivity of living matter due to radiocarbon. Such an increase would have no significance from the standpoint of health. The atmosphere itself contains only 1½ percent of the total carbon with which the cosmic ray produced radiocarbon is mixed, the main part being dissolved in the sea, so we expect that nuclear weapons could produce a short-range rise in the radiocarbon content of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which later would decrease as the atmospheric carbon dioxide mixed with the sea. Therefore, only 1½ percent as many neutrons would be required to double the natural radiocarbon content of atmospheric carbon dioxide for this time before mixing with the sea could occur, or about 78 kilograms, or 170 pounds of neutrons. To orient ourselves, the 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent atomic weapon involves the fission of 1 kilogram of uranium or plutonium and the liberation of about 10 grams of neutrons. If all of these neutrons escaped into the atmosphere it would obviously require 7,800 such weapons to double the radiocarbon content of the atmospheric carbon dioxide even with no mixing with the sea, and

about 520,000 with complete mixing. These correspond to explosive energies of 156 and 10,400 metagons of TNT, respectively, if all neutrons formed escaped. A reasonable escape figure might be 15 percent so we can expect that nearly 1,000 megatons of fission would be necessary just to double the atmospheric radiocarbon content, and that about 66,000 megatons would be necessary for the same effect on a long-term basis.

The interchange between the atmosphere and the sea water, which is constantly taking place, would deplete and remove the excess radioactive carbon dioxide. Now it is known from measurements of the radioactive hydrogen-tritium—which also is made in the atmosphere by the cosmic rays—that this interchange is slow. In fact, we learn that the radioactive water which is formed by the burning of the tritium made by the cosmic rays is not diluted by more than the top 100 meters or so of sea water in its lifetime of about 18 years. The carbon dioxide dissolved in this water is about equal to the total in the air. In other words, a dilution by more than the twofold which corresponds to the dissolved carbon dioxide in the top 100 meters of ocean water would take longer than 18 years. However, the dilution by this factor of two would occur essentially immediately within a matter of weeks or months. Therefore, we would have to double our estimates for even the short time scale activation of the atmosphere to reach the enormous figure of 2,000 megatons of fission required. Thermonuclear weapons, of course, also involve neutrons. For a given energy release they produce somewhat more neutrons than fission weapons; however, the order of magnitude of atmospheric activation would not be greatly different. So our estimates apply to all nuclear weapons. The essential point is that the atmosphere is difficult to activate and the activities produced are safe. In addition to carbon-14 there are a few others produced in low yield—they include tritium and very short-lived products but none is produced in sufficient amounts to be hazardous.

For weapons fired on the surface the activation of the surface materials is a possibility, but in general it appears that most of the neutrons form stable isotopes and that the amount of radioactivity produced, at least with ordinary surface materials, is relatively small. The principal radioactivities produced by nuclear weapons are produced in the weapons themselves, and not in the environment.

Turning now to the radioactivities naturally produced in nuclear weapons themselves, probably the most important is radioactive strontium, 28 years half-life. The reasons that this is so important are that strontium is chemically similar to calcium, which is one of the main mineral constituents of the body. Bone consists principally of calcium phosphate, and for this reason radiostrontium, like calcium, is deposited in the bone. The amounts of ordinary nonradioactive strontium naturally present are so small that the radioactive strontium will follow ordinary calcium into the body. The second reason that radioactive strontium, Sr^{90}, is an important fallout radioactivity is that it has a long but finite lifetime—28 years half-life, 40 years average life—and thus has a persistent effect. Third, because of its bone seeking property it stays in the body a long time, and fourth, the probabilities of body ingestion can be high. Finally, the fifth reason for its importance is that Sr^{90} is produced in high yield in the fission reaction—about 4 or 5 percent of all fissioning atoms yield this isotope.

In order to orient ourselves about this, let us consider the maximum permissible concentration recommended by the National Committee on Radiation Protection for AEC workers for radiostrontium—one microcurie for the standard man—whose body is taken to contain 1,000 grams of calcium in total. The maximum permissible concentration is of course well below any level at which one would expect any damaging effects to appear. On the basis of experiments with animals, statistically observable increases in the number of bone tumors should not be expected to appear at less than 10 times this level. As we go above this figure the chance for bone tumors occurring increases rapidly so that the likelihood of bone cancer with 30 to 40 times that figure is appreciable.

Let us consider in some detail the mechanism by which this most important fallout radioactivity produced in nuclear weapons might be expected to enter the human body. The first point is that from the point of view of fallout there are two essential classes of nuclear weapons—the high-yield megaton weapons, and the lower yield kiloton weapons. All nuclear weapons produce atomic clouds which rise to heights dependent upon the energy released, and the clouds from the megaton class of weapons rise rapidly up through the tropopause and pass into the top layer of the atmosphere which we know as the stratosphere. This part of the atmosphere is essentially isolated from the lower layer in which we live, the troposphere, and where all of our normal winds and storms, etc., occur. Therefore, radioactivity produced in megaton weapons is placed largely immediately in the stratosphere while the smaller kiloton weapons produce clouds which in general do not reach into the stratosphere, but stop near the tropopause—the imaginary boundary between the stratosphere and troposphere—and have the bulk of their radioactivity left in the troposphere.

In the troposphere where rain occurs any particulate matter will be washed down in a period of days or weeks. It is easy to show, for example, that one-tenth inch of ordinary rainfall will probably remove essentially completely all particulate matter except for that which is so small as to be almost of molecular dimensions. In other words, for one-tenth of an inch of rainfall one can be quite certain that the air between the layer in which the rain originates and the ground is washed clean of fallout activity, except for the minute fraction which may be so small as to move with the air out of the way of the falling raindrops as they make their way toward the earth; and even this tiniest fallout material is likely to be precipitated also for it will migrate rapidly by molecular-type motion and in this manner is likely to absorb itself on other particulate material and so be rained out. For these reasons, tropospheric radioactive fallout does not stay in the atmosphere for more than a matter of weeks. It may make 2 or 3 trips around the earth in a given latitude before being entirely removed, but its lifetime in the atmosphere will be a matter of weeks.

This is in very sharp contrast to the material which is placed in the stratosphere by megaton weapons which appears to stay there for a matter of years. Perhaps 10 years is a good average, at least for the weapons fired to date. It is well to bear in mind that this conclusion may be dependent upon the nature of the material carried up in the cloud, but our present experience indicates that the fallout from megaton weapons which does not occur essentially in the first few hours or days, and is therefore deposited mainly locally, is deposited only at a very slow rate corresponding to an average time in the stratosphere of about 10 years. As a result of this long residence time in the highest layers of the atmosphere, the winds mix and distribute the radioactive material broadly over the earth and one finds when the fallout does finally find its way down into the troposphere where the rain and snow wash it out, that the rates of precipitation are relatively uniform over the entire earth's surface.

Returning now to radiostrontium—at the rate of 1 kilogram of fission for 20 kilotons of TNT equivalent, 2 megatons of fission energy would be equivalent to very nearly 1 millicurie of strontium-90 per square mile of the earth's surface, or about 79 disintegrations per minute per square foot of the earth's surface. The average soil of the earth has about 20 grams of calcium, which is in form available for plant metabolism in the top two and a half inches for each square foot of area. Now recalling the maximum permissible concentration level of one microcurie per standard man and noting, as we will show later, that in order that this concentration not be exceeded, the top soil of the earth should not contain any more radiostrontium than would correspond to ten times the concentration in the human body which is just permissible, i. e., one microcurie per 1,000 grams of calcium, or 2,200 disintegrations per minute per gram of calcium, we find that 11,000 megatons of fission energy would produce this average level of radioactivity. Actually, as I will indicate later, there can be a concentration of strontium-190 in the soil about ten times greater than the recommended maximum permissible concentration before one would expect man living in such an environment to accumulate a maximum permission concentration. Referring to my remarks of a few moments ago, the 11,000 megatons would yield a Sr^{90} content in humans just equal to the Maximum Permissible Concentration (MPC); at less than ten times this value, or below 110,000 megatons energy equivalent, statistically observable incidence of bone tumor should not appear; but at 30 to 40 times the MPC, or 330,000 to 440,000 megatons, the likelihood of untoward effects would be appreciable. Even the lowest of these figures is very far in excess of the total energy released to date.

High yield weapons fired near the surface have a portion of their activity deposited in and on particles large enough to fall out in the first few hours or days. Thus we have three kinds of fallout from high-yield weapons: The first, or local, which is due mainly to large sized particles. This may cover a considerable area depending on winds mainly. In the February 15, 1955, release of the Atomic Energy Commission which described the experience in the Marshall Islands in the Castle test series in the spring of 1954, some 7,000 square miles were described as being contaminated by this type of fallout. The second fallout from the high yield weapons is that portion which resides on the small particles, but which never reaches the stratosphere and thus stays in the troposphere until it is carried down by rainfall or settles out. There is thus a band of fallout in the same general latitude as the test site; the material may circle the earth 2 or 3 times before being precipitated, but does fall out within the first few weeks. However, a large part—half or more depending on firing conditions—of the radioactive yield from high yield weapons resides in the third category which is the fallout which occurs from the stratosphere itself. Of course, some of the large local fallout may form particles which were lifted into the stratosphere, but which were so large and so bulky that they fell out rapidly anyhow. The finely divided material which reaches the stratosphere apparently stays there for years in the main. A slow leakage through the tropopause into the troposphere occurs with apparently something like 10 percent per year descending. Measurements of the strontium-90 content of soils, rain and snow, and biological materials on a worldwide basis have all shown that strontium-90 fallout occurs all over the world at rates which are not too dissimilar from one another, except that there is a tendency in the middle latitudes in which the tests are conducted for an extra

fallout presumably of the tropospheric variety described above. Since the completion of the Castle series of tests, this worldwide rate of fallout has approximated one and one-half millicuries of radiostrontium per square mile per year. We thus see that radioactive fallout from the stratosphere is a very slow process. This is very fortunate indeed, since the high-yield weapons thus have a major part of their radioactivity dissipated in the atmosphere in a harmless way if they are fired in the air or on the surface.

The fallout apparently occurs in the final step by a washing down of the tropospheric air by rain together with direct falling. The radiostrontium descends from the stratosphere into the troposphere by the processes of diffusion and falling, and is then caught up by the tropospheric weather and in a matter of a few days is deposited. Reasonable estimates for the middle latitudes give the average life in the troposphere to be about 1 week.

The radiostrontium comes down mainly in raindrops, although fine morning mists and fogs may be particularly effective in this regard also, as well as surface contact and direct falling. It descends on the foliage and on the soil. That fraction of it which falls on plant leaves has a good chance of being absorbed directly into the plant—much in the way the most modern leaf fertilizers operate. The Eniwetok tests were conducted on coral islands and as a result their fallout may be largely water soluble. In any case, direct measurements of the radiostrontium content of alfalfa and other crops show them to be appreciably higher in radioactivity than the soils on which they grew, strongly indicating a leaf assimilation mechanism to be important. The rain falls and carries radioactivity, but when it runs off to the rivers and the seas it is nearly pure due to the action of the soil in absorbing the fallout, so that rivers are essentially free from radiostrontium. Lakes and reservoirs have a content which corresponds approximately to their surface areas only. The radiostrontium is absorbed in the top 2 or 3 inches of soil and held there very tenaciously. Plowing, of course, buries it more deeply, but it appears that in unplowed soil the radiostrontium does not move in a matter of 2 or 3 years.

The researches on radiostrontium conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission have been extensive. They have consisted of sampling soils on a worldwide basis. The actual sampling was done by Dr. Lyle Alexander of the United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md. Dr. Alexander with great skill and care has repeatedly collected series of soil samples for study, analyzed them chemically and submitted them for measurement of radiostrontium content to the Health and Safety Laboratory of the New York Operations Office of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Lamont Geological Observatory of Columbia University, and the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago. Direct fallout collected on gummed papers, milk and cheese, alfalfa, animal meat and bone, and even human bodies has been extensively studied. On the basis of the information so obtained, it is possible to say unequivocally that nuclear weapons tests as carried out at the present time do not constitute a health hazard to the human population—insofar as radiostrontium is concerned and it is believed with good reason that radiostrontium is likely to be the most important of the radioactivities produced. It is well to note that since radiostrontium is assimilated in the bones it constitutes essentially no genetic hazard, because its radiations do not reach the reproductive organs.

The milk and cheese radiostrontium content is not as high, relative to that of the grass which the cows eat, as one might expect. There appears to be a discrimination against the fallout material such that the calcium in milk and cheese is roughly one-fifth to one-tenth as radioactive with radiostrontium as the grass that the animals eat. There are various possible physiological explanations of this and the conclusion itself may not be completely certain, but the data available to date indicate this to be true. In addition, the plant uptake of radiostrontium from soil does discriminate somewhat against radiostrontium as compared to calcium. The calcium taken up from the soil into the plant has in general about one-half the radiostrontium content that the soil calcium has. These two results protect the human population against ingestion of radiostrontium, since milk and cheese are the principal sources of calcium in the human diet. We find, therefore, the the radiostrontium content of human bodies is the lowest of all animals measured and is lower than the average soil and the average foliage by ten-fold. The Sr^{90} to calcium ratio in young people—whose bones are still forming—corresponds to about one one-thousandth of the maximum permissible concentration recommended for adults: one microcurie per standard man containing 1,000 grams of calcium. The average soil in the United States is about ten-fold higher, whereas abroad the radiostrontium content in other areas of the world not subject to the local test fallout is about one-third of that for the United States.

The surface air itself contains radiostrontium due to the fallout from the stratosphere and corresponding to the average time between rainstorms in which it can collect. Filtration of air at sea level discloses radiostrontium on filters if the filters are fine enough, even in periods when bombs are not being tested so the only fallout is from the stratosphere reservoir from the high yield weapons. Measurements in the Antarctic on snow samples collected there show that the fallout rate there in January and February 1955 was comparable with that observed in the middle latitudes.

Finally, though the main part of the radioactivity from high yield weapons fortunately dissipates in the stratosphere, the small but very significant part which falls out within a few hundred miles of the site of the explosion for weapons fired on the surface constitutes a very real hazard and nothing I have said this evening should be interpreted otherwise. The weapons tests are conducted with great attention to this and the other dangers and every effort made to protect against misadventure. What we have learned from the studies I have described—which by the way have been conducted under the name Project Sunshine—is that these local precautions should be entirely adequate and the worldwide health hazards from the present rate of testing are insignificant.

Conjuring a Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks, spokesmen for southern California interests, trying to steal water which belongs to the 4 States of the upper Colorado River Basin, have created a new bogie man. Despite overwhelming, expert evidence to the contrary, these spokesmen are challenging the engineering soundness of Glen Canyon Dam. This, despite the fact that within the past 10 years geologists on the payroll of southern California have recommended building this dam.

For the information of Members, I am submitting an editorial on this subject, published Wednesday, February 1, 1956, in the Deseret News, Utah's leading evening newspaper:

CONJURING A FANTASY

Human gullibility being what it is, the transparent publicity stunt of California's Representative CRAIG HOSMER may well leave many newspaper readers and television viewers with the impression that Glen Canyon Dam and its reservoir could be ruined by the presence of chinle shale in the river canyon walls.

But Congress isn't likely to be impressed. Even the busiest Member of Congress must know by now that southern California is determined to keep all the water of the Colorado River flowing downstream and will stoop to any tactic to prevent its use in the upper basin.

If that had been in doube before, the Hosmer stunt made it perfectly clear.

What Mr. HOSMER attempted to show in most spectacular advertising-agency fashion was that chinle shale tends to crumble in water. He went on from that long-known fact into a spectacular flight of fancy in which he saw canyon walls collapsing "in slides of earthquake proportions," the reservoir turning into a sea of mud, and perhaps even the dam itself falling.

A less honest attack is difficult to imagine. Mr. HOSMER knows, if he listened to or studied the voluminous testimony given to Congress on the matter, how much chinle shale is located in the area in question, and where it is.

He knows that the only significant outcropping of chinle that would be reached by waters of the Glen Canyon Reservoir are in three areas 60 miles upstream from the dam, in country that is flattened out, and could not cause crumbling of canyon walls.

He knows that at the damsite itself, the chinle is covered by 700 feet of solid sandstone.

He knows, or should know, that 15 miles downstream from the damsite, near Lees Ferry, there is an outcrop of chinle at water level. The river has been flowing over it for centuries. Above it tower vertical sandstone cliffs 2,000 feet high. What Mr. HOSMER speculates would happen if lake water touched such shale hasn't happened in untold centuries where the abrasive action of running water has had a chance to dissolve the shale and sweep it away.

Like so much of that previously little-known slick rock country, chinle shale has only recently come to general public attention, mainly because Charley Steen's uranium strike happened to be in that formation. But it has long been known to the geologist and was considered in all the painstaking engineering and planning preparing the way for Glen Canyon Dam.

The rock, made up of limestone, shale, sandstone and the weathered remains of volcanic ash, in varying proportions, was laid down in the earliest mesozoic age. That was the day of dinosaurs and flying reptiles. It was also a day when the desert lands of the Southwest were forested, as witness the fact that the petrified forest remains are found chiefly in that formation.

As the Bureau of Reclamation has pointed out, chinle shale is present in the area of other dams on the San Juan and elsewhere and has never caused any particular trouble.

It has not been many years, as Congressman DAWSON recently observed, since men of dim vision insisted that Hoover Dam could not be built, and if it were built it would

not stand, and if it did stand there would never be a market for its power.

Mr. HOSMER of California is either a very dim-visioned man or one whose vision has been deliberately warped by the selfish interests of his own constituents. Either way, one confidently trusts Congress and the administration will promptly brush away this latest diversionary and delaying tactic.

Cost of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of February 2, 1956:

COST OF CONGRESS—HOUSEKEEPING OUTLAY RISES AS STAFFS GROW AND PROBES MULTIPLY—LAWMAKERS LOOK INTO GRAIN BINS FOR PAKISTAN, LOCAL LAND PROBLEMS IN OKINAWA—CAPITOL'S WORDS ARE COSTLY

(By James A. Reynolds)

WASHINGTON.—A deep hole in the ground here is heralding a significant Washington uptrend: The cost of Congress, like the expense of running the rest of the Government, is heading higher.

The hole, two blocks from the Capitol, marks the basement excavation for the Senate's second office building, to be finished by 1958. Though this new building will bear a $20.6 million price tag, its dollars-and-cents meaning is much more than a matter of big bills for steel and concrete.

Joining the Senate structure will be a 50 percent bigger House office building, for which ground will be broken this year, and an extension of the Capitol itself, on which work has begun. Together these projects will ease a growing office-space strain for lawmakers and their staffs. Legislative experts say the added space may permit a sizable expansion in the number of congressional help. And staff salaries constitute the biggest single item in the legislative budget.

NO ROOM FOR MORE HELP

"There's no room now for any more personnel," says one authority, Dr. George Galloway of the Library of Congress. "Every nook and cranny in the Capitol is filled. But you may see another sharp rise in the cost of Congress after the new office buildings are finished."

The pressure for legislative expansion has already been dramatically evidenced. Congressional staffs grew 60 percent, to a total 3,250, between 1945 and 1955. That's among the most significant sides of a cost climb that also includes pay raises for lawmakers and their aides, more office space and multiplying investigations in this country and abroad.

Past and prospective growth have the same basic stimulator. Congress is broadening its activities in somewhat belated reflection of the widening responsibilities the Government's far bigger executive branch has shouldered in recent years.

Foreign aiders propose to build grain bins in Pakistan—and Senators delve into charges of collusion in awarding the contracts for the bins. The Federal Housing Administration tightens its housing credit curbs—and a House committee jumps to investigate the effects on home builders and buyers. Military men set up bases on Okinowa—and Congressional probers journey there to study local land problems.

A RENEWED DRIVE

Right now, with Federal spending expected to turn upward again after 3 years of decline, there's a renewed Capitol Hill drive to create a joint Congressional committee on the budget to make a closer check on the administration's Budget Bureau. Despite some House Appropriations Committee opposition to such plans, at least one Capitol insider reckons the legislation stands a better chance of passage now than in the past.

And the Senate Rules Committee recently approved a plan to create a new joint Senate-House committee to keep watch on the Government's supersecret Central Intelligence Agency. Both chambers themselves, of course, must still okay the proposal.

The cost of running the Federal Government's legislative branch is, to be sure, relatively mild. It makes up less than one hundredth of 1 percent of the Government's total expenditures. And it figures out to only about 33 cents a year for every man, woman and child in the land.

But the trend is clearly up. A little over $53 million is budgeted for direct costs of running the Senate and House for the fiscal year starting next July. That's only a tiny rise from the $52.9 million expectation for this fiscal year, but it is more than double the $24.2 million of a decade ago. Even in the New Deal era of Government growth, the costs hovered around $12 million a year. Back in 1900, the amount was only $4.4 million.

Of the direct costs, 1 dollar out of every 4 goes for such items as travel, postage, telephone and telegraph bills and stationery, and even these are on the rise. The House has just voted to raise each Congressman's present free allowance of 2,700 minutes per year in long-distance calls to 3,000 minutes, and to boost the 12,000-word annual limit on Government-paid telegrams to 20,000 words.

MORE PAY PER PERSON

The other $3 of every $4 in direct costs are taken by salaries. And while Congress has more and more people to pay, fatter pay per person also accounts for a big part of the cost climb.

This year Representatives who envy Senators their high-paid administrative assistants will try again to get similar treatment. A Representative's clerk now draws a maximum of $12,131 a year, while a Senator has three top aides, one of whom can make $14,800. Representatives want one assistant who may get that same $14,800. The change would tack over $1.1 million a year onto the $14.6 million provided in the fiscal 1957 budget for help for Representatives.

The lawmakers themselves are faring much more handsomely in the salary department than they did some years back. A Representative now is paid $22,500 a year, up from $10,000 a decade ago.

There's been a sharp uptrend, too, in the pay needed to attract higher-caliber congressional committee staffs to handle the increasing complexities of big Government.

"Committees now hire specialists, where a decade ago they merely hired clerks," says Dr. Galloway.

Congressional investigations also reflect the Government's multifarious activities, though pure politics, of course, sets the lawmakers digging into some subjects. Already this year the Senate has been asked to approve probes into such diverse fields as world disarmament, Federal penitentiaries, juvenile delinquency, patents and trademarks. These and other Senate investigations will cost more than $2 million.

In last year's session Congress authorized nearly $5.6 million for probes, and during the session one authority counted 116 Congressional inquiries. In 1955 hearings, a House committee found out the Navy in 1954 had a 60-year supply of canned hamburger. Other investigations covered the effect of atomic blasts on the weather, baby adoption practices and Communist infiltration in half a dozen areas.

From 1789 until the Teapot Dome scandal in the 1920's, says one authority, there had been only some 300 congressional investigations all told, while "now there are almost that many in each Congress."

The urge or need to investigate is generally sending more and more lawmakers overseas. While this election year will surely bring a lull in the tide, close to 200 Senators and Representatives traveled abroad last year. Some of these went on purely personal trips—at their own expense—but others went on official business, looking into such things as minimum wages in Puerto Rico, civil defense in Europe and point 4 aid in the Middle East, South Asia and Central America.

Not all this travel money, to be sure, comes out of the legislative budget. Some expenses are paid out of lawmakers' own pockets, from State Department or other agency funds, or from counterpart funds that are put up by foreign lands to match United States aid dollars.

BIG AND LITTLE ITEMS

The direct costs of running Congress cover myriad big and little items.

Fifteen skilled machine stenographers take down every word uttered on the floor or in committee hearings, and black-jacketed motorcycle messengers rush the notes to transcribers. Cost of this reporting service is nearly $2 million a year. Outside help is often called in when the regular reporters can't handle the load.

Purchase and maintenance of long, black, chauffeur-driven limousines for such bigwigs as the Speaker, Senate President pro tempore, and floor leaders will cost $79,780 next fiscal year. This is $8,240 more than was allotted in fiscal 1956.

Congressmen may record speeches for rebroadcast back home. This so-called joint recording facility will cost $50,900 in fiscal 1957.

Senate stationery will cost $184,600; in the House, the stationery will be $525,000.

The so-called indirect costs of Congress are even bigger and even more diverse. Besides the $53 million fiscal 1957 budget for direct operating expenses, nearly $70 million more is allotted for such indirect essentials as new construction, maintenance of buildings and grounds and printing Congressional documents. Lumped into this category are nearly $11 million for the Government Printing Office, $10.6 million for the Library of Congress and $253,000 for the Botanic Garden, just west of the Capitol Grounds.

THE SENATE'S RAILROAD

There's $3,500 allotted for the little monorail railroad which shuttles between the Capitol and the Senate Office Building. This subway is designed primarily to help Senators at work in their offices get quickly to Senate rollcalls. Representatives, who are younger and presumably more vigorous, must walk to the Capitol. Besides, it takes much longer to call the roll in the 435-Member House, so speed isn't as important.

By far the largest indirect sum, $47.8 million next fiscal year, goes to the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart. He'll use most of the money for the new congressional buildings, including $20 million to start adding a 40-foot extension to the front of the Capitol—a change under consideration for more than 50 years.

Of the Architect's remaining money, "repairs, works of art" will cost $2,000. That goes for work of the kind required this fiscal year when a vandal tossed a book through the 83-year-old Capitol painting of the Battle of Lake Erie.

The architect must also pay his 1,000-member staff to clean the Capitol's 65 crystal chandeliers, dust the billboard-size paintings, and bathe the bronze and marble statues of such historical figures as Huey Long, Jefferson Davis—and the bust of one-time Vice President Adlai Stevenson, grandfather of the Democratic Presidential hopeful.

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING

Congressional printing is a sizable item at $9.3 million in the new budget. Printing hearing transcripts normally cost about $2 million a year, with costs of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD close behind. Each page of the RECORD costs about $84, and last session the RECORD carried 11,329 pages of congressional proceedings and 6,314 pages of Appendix, plus index and daily digest.

The RECORD of a typical day's proceedings may include names of hundreds of people up for Senate confirmation as Foreign Service officers, Coast Guard officers, and postmasters. And on one recent day the Appendix contained such entries as a 4-page reprint of a magazine article titled, "Bette Davis—Her First Quarter Century on the Screen Demonstrates the Power of Her Will." The article lists all 68 of the films in which Miss Davis has appeared, along with their other leading players, release dates and plot summaries.

Printing bills, resolutions and amendments costs about $750,000 a year. Congressmen last year offered 11,908 measures, but this year's total should be about half that, since 1955's bills are still "alive." Some of those bills would repeal the income tax, designate the rose as the national flower, and depict the Mt. Rushmore Memorial on the dollar bill.

SOME ECONOMY MOVES

The cost of Congress isn't going up without sparking some moves to hold it down. Two congressional groups are studying ways to cut the printing bill. One, the Joint Committee on Printing, expects to have a report ready soon. The other, a House Administration Subcommittee, aims to eliminate what a spokesman calls "overproduction, waste, and duplication."

Says a staff member: "Some of the suggested methods of cutting costs include reducing inventories in House and Senate documents rooms, changing House rules to permit joint sponsorship of bills, a practice now permitted in the Senate; and reducing the number of documents printed per Congressman if study indicates he won't need them anyway."

Chairman BURLESON (Democrat, Texas), of the parent House Administration Committee, now trying to pin down amounts spent by individual world-traveling lawmakers, says his committee tries to do its part in holding down the cost of Congress: "I'm like the comptroller in a big corporation. It's not exactly the way to be popular."

Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York, for the year 1956. This program was adopted by the organization on January 3 at a meeting at its State headquarters in New York.

This organization is doing splendid work under the able leadership of its State president, my good friend Harold R. Moscovit. Mr. Moscovit is a great organizer and has done a successful job in building up the Affiliated Young Democrats into a solid organization working for better government and civic responsibility.

The legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats is as follows:

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC. OF NEW YORK FOR 1956

The inauguration of Governor Harriman at Albany last January marked a return of the government of our State to the traditional democratic ideals which characterized previous Democratic administrations of our State under the leadership of such great Democratic governors as Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman.

A year ago we predicted that Governor Harriman would give our State courageous leadership toward the enactment of a program commensurate with the needs of the people. The first year of his administration has proven his great abilities for leadership and administration, and his devotion and dedication to the larger public interest. It is no surprise that his success as governor of this State, and the versatility of his talents should have drawn such national attention for his elevation to the Presidency of the United States. Our party is fortunate in the number of highly able and experienced men from which it may choose a candidate to present to the American people next fall as the next President of the United States.

Governor Harriman's administration at Albany has been hampered by the Republican control of both houses of the Legislature, and by the obstructionist tactics of the Old Guard Republican legislative leadership. Despite their knowledge that such control comes only from gerrymandering legislation enacted in an attempt to prevent the people of the State from attaining the democratic concept of majority rule which underlies our American way of life and our constitutional system, Republican leaders have attempted at every stage of the game to thwart and obstruct the enactment of the Governor's program. Their failure in accomplishing this has been due to the courageous insistence of the Governor to take the major issues to the people in order to expose these Republican leaders; and to the effective roles which have been played by the Democratic minority leadership of the Senate and the Assembly.

Much still remains to be accomplished, and we pledge ourselves, however, to devote our every effort to the enactment of the following program, which we proudly submit.

1. Reapportionment: A major objective of our program is the enactment of legislation reapportioning both congressional and legislative seats in fair proportion to population, so that all segments of our State may be fairly represented both in Albany and in Washington. Only by such reapportionment can the popular will ever be effected.

2. Presidential primaries: We urge the amendment of the election law to permit the members of the major political parties to indicate their preferences for President and Vice President, and to elect delegates committed to such candidates. In order to achieve an equitable reflection of the vote in this State for President and Vice President, we also urge the enactment of legislation permitting the allocation of the State's vote in the electoral college between the different candidates for President and Vice President in direct proportion to their respective shares of the popular vote.

3. Primary elections: As Democrats, we are irrevocably committed to the proposition that government belongs to the people, and that people should have the fullest possible participation in the selection of those who fill high public office. We favor the direct primary in the selection of candidates for statewide office as well as in the selection of national candidates. We again advocate that the candidates of the major political parties for United States Senator, governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, and comptroller be selected in statewide primaries.

4. Voting machines in primary elections: We advocate again the mandatory use of voting machines in primary elections.

5. Help the aging: We commend Governor Harriman for having convened a statewide conference to consider the problems of the aging. We recommend that the legislature take advantage of what has been learned in the new science of geriatics to give our older fellow citizens the opportunities for the full, happy, and useful enjoyment of the years that lie ahead of them.

6. State housing and building commission: Enactment of a law creating a State housing and building commission, by combining the Joint Legislative Committee on Housing and Multiple Dwellings with the State Building Code Commission, thereby eliminating duplication, reducing cost of promulgation, simplifying interpretation and clarifying enforcement of the housing and building construction laws.

7. Dairy industry: A major concern of our State is the economic health of our great dairy industry. We urge the adoption of measures, fair to processors, distributors, and consumers to insure the continued stability of that industry.

8. Rent control: The recent Republican administration whittled away the rent-control laws, and succeeded in exacting from tenants of both commercial and residential buildings excessive rent increases. The Republican majorities in the legislature succeeded in preventing Governor Harriman from enacting his full rent-control program. The rent-control law enacted at the last legislative session was an unsatisfactory compromise. We urge that the legislature enact measures to recontrol and roll back rentals which have been so increased. We also recommend that the rent control laws be strengthened and be extended so as to include garages and other presently decontrolled space, to prevent further unjustified increases in rents, and to restore services in apartment and tenement houses which have been curtailed or suspended.

9. Housing: 10 years after the end of World War II, housing throughout the State continues to be inadequate. The approval by the electorate of the new bond issue for low-cost housing was a much needed measure, and we urge a speedy execution of the program approved by the voters; also, action in the middle-income housing. We urge a greatly expanded slum-clearance program.

10. Discrimination: The activities of the State Commission Against Discrimination require a more vigorous administration, and the powers and jurisdiction of the commission should be permitted to investigate all violations of the law, and its jurisdiction should be extended to all phases of discrimination.

11. Labor: We advocate immediate repeal of merit-rating in the Unemployment Insurance Fund, a practice which discriminates small business and seasonal industries through unfair rebates to large corporations. We also favor amendment of the unemployment insurance law to make its benefits available to firms employing one or more workers, to extend its benefits to wives and dependent children, and to reduce the

minimum period of employment required to qualify for its benefits to 16 weeks. We also advocate an expansion of the benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Law by increasing the maximum benefits to $36 a week, and by extending the duration of its benefits to 26 weeks.

12. Communism: We abhor communism in all its manifestations, and approve all action necessary to root it out and expel it from our State. We are opposed to the employment of Communists in our National, State, and local governments. The danger to our democratic way of life does not come only from abroad, but from those misguided citizens and resident aliens who call themselves Americans but who have lent themselves and their energies to the Communist aggressors who seek to undermine our democratic system and make our country another Soviet. We must take all possible steps to meet this danger from within, but we must apply traditional American methods in doing so.

13. Civil service: The recent Republican administration, with the full cooperation of the Republican legislature, made many raids on the civil-service system of the State and took many positions out of the protection of the civil-service laws. We urge the immediate extension of the civil-service laws to repair the incursions of the Republican political raids. We also urge a reexamination of the State salary system to insure that civil-service salaries will keep pace with the cost of living, and to improve the working conditions of State employees.

14. Family court: The administration and enforcement of our laws relating to the family are scattered throughout the courts of the State in a meaningless and wasteful patchwork. Divorce, separation, and annulment are in the supreme court; adoption proceedings are in the surrogate's court; parternity cases are in the court of special sessions; support cases and children's court problems are in the domestic relations court; other matters going to the core of family life, are in various criminal courts. A proper consideration for the problems of the family, and a better utilization of community resources, require that all of these matters relating to the family be placed within the jurisdiction of an integrated family court, to be established within the supreme court, and having adequate resources of an investigating, counseling, and psychological character to permit such family court to cope with the family problems that have intensified under the stress of modern living, and to strengthen the family as the solid foundation of our way of life.

15. Temporary commission on the courts: We strongly support the recommendations of the temporary commission on the courts for the modernization and more efficient administration of our court structure, and urge the continuance of the commission until the completion of its work.

16. Education: A comprehensive school construction program, with the support of the State and the utilization of State resources, should be developed so as to relieve the present overcrowding in our schools and to modernize the school system. Local communities should be given greater freedom to make greater improvements in the development of their educational systems. Additional State aid is required, and should be given, to meet the requirements of an overburdened school system.

17. State aid to municipalities: The sympathetic approach of the administration of Governor Harriman has already resulted in a new approach and a reevaluation of the fiscal relationships between the State and local communities. We favor speedy resolution of this problem of equalization. We also urge that the spirit of home rule be reflected in determining the taxing powers of local communities, and that the Republican policy of requiring the imposition of nuisance taxes by municipalities be replaced by sound and honest approach to the problems of municipal finance.

18. Motorist: We support the enactment of a compulsory automobile insurance law; the exclusive allocation of funds collected in gasoline taxes and motor-vehicle licenses to to the development of the State highway system; extension of the gasoline tax to industrial users of gasoline to the same extent that it is now imposed on motorists; requirement of annual safety inspections of motor vehicles by State agencies, and annual examinations of motor-vehicle operators.

19. Bingo: We strongly favor a referendum to determine whether bingo, off-track betting, and lotteries shall be permitted in the State on a local-option basis.

20. Eighteen-year-old vote: We again urge, as its original sponsor, the extension of the right to vote to 18-year-olds. Now a law in Georgia and Kentucky.

21. Public health: We advocate encouragement of prepayment plans for meeting the cost of medical care by giving aid to sound voluntary plans now in existence and stimulating the development of new plans; development of centers for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped; a program of State aid for the training of medical and nursing personnel to meet the present critical shortage of physicians, nurses, and technicians; establishment of State programs for the care of the chronically ill; expansion of State's facilities for the mentally ill to correct the overcrowding and present inadequate facilities in our State mental hospitals.

22. Securities dealers: We believe that persons engaged in the investment of other people's money should demonstrate their qualifications for such responsibility by examination, and to this we advocate the establishment of a licensing system for securities dealers and investment advisers.

23. Conduct of political campaigns: We favor the establishment of a commission to adopt a code of ethics for the conduct of political campaigns.

24. Narcotics: We favor the taking of such legislative action as will effect, in cooperation with Federal authorities, as will stamp out the narcotics traffic, and will be aimed at those who traffic in narcotics. We favor greatly increased facilities for the cure and correction of narcotic addicts.

25. Juvenile delinquency: We favor the programs to combat juvenile delinquency, which have been activated under the leadership of Lieutenant-Governor De Luca and Commissioner McCloskey. Our greatest asset is our youth, and we must spare nothing to protect our young people and to combat juvenile delinquency. The State's facilities for delinquent boys and girls must be expanded, and additional funds must be made available for the probation bureaus of the criminal courts which have been so successful in coping with the problem under their hitherto limited appropriations. We also favor an expanded rehabilitation program for those young people in correctional institutions. We also urge an intensification of the drive upon those, who, through their traffic in pornography and narcotics, have a primary responsibility for juvenile delinquency.

26. Permanent personal registration: We favor a mandatory statewide system of permanent personal registration at once.

27. Public power: We strongly advocate, in connection with the development of St. Lawrence and Niagara power, safeguards in the marketing of such power, with preferences to municipalities and public utility districts over the public utility companies, and with State ownership of transmission lines.

28. Civilian defense: We recommend that the Civilian Defense of New York State be placed under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, with the cost to be borne by the Federal Government, and that the program be coordinated through the State government.

29. Minimum wage law: We favor the enactment of a statewide minimum wage law of $1.25 an hour.

30. State taxes: We favor a reduction of State taxes to the greatest extent compatable with a solvent State government.

31. Legislative sessions: We urge that a printed record be published and made available to the public of the full proceedings of both houses of the Legislature, so that the public may be fully informed of what goes on in Albany.

Reserve Roadblocks in the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I called the attention of the House to the unexplained delay in the adoption of the Air Reserve technician plan.

In the Air Force magazine for February 1956, there is a further discussion of what are appropriately called Reserve Roadblocks. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this article for the information of all concerned. Evidence is mounting on all sides that our Department of Defense is not giving to the Reserve program the attention it urgently needs, for the security of our country.

RESERVE ROADBLOCKS

In the 9 months since the National Reserve Act became law, millions of words have been written about the posture of the reserve components of the armed services. Almost everyone who has made an evaluation of this posture in public print has concluded that the Reserve program is "lagging." The word may be descriptive of the Army Reserve program, but it is a far cry from what actually has been transpiring in the Reserve program of the Air Force. For, far from lagging, the Air Force Reserve program has been making excellent progress. And yet strange things are happening in the Department of Defense which could cause the Air Force Reserve program to slip—and badly.

The Reserve program of the Air Force contemplates a total of 349,000 officers and airmen. Of this number, some 114,000 are individuals earmarked for specific slots in the active establishment. Progress toward the goal has been noteworthy, particularly since last August when the Air Force initiated procedures to assure that all reservists would be in a "ready" category, instantly available in the event of mobilization.

The heart of the Air Force Reserve program is combat capability—not months after M-Day, but on M-Day. To help achieve this capability, six pilot training wings of the Air Force Reserve were converted to combat wings. A program was launched to produce 3,000 skilled reserve navigators. Seventeen Air Guard wings, which had a dual bomber and interceptor mission, were relieved of the bomber responsibility and assigned exclusively to Continental Air Defense Command for employment on M-Day. The mission of the guard was enlarged to include 4 air resupply groups and 4 air transport squadrons.

In the Pentagon, studies were made of the Air Force requirement on M-Day for individuals by occupational specialty and grade. Recently Continental Air Command was given this M-Day requirement for both officers and airmen—by grade and skill. Thus, the Air Force knows now, based on the current war plan, what its individual needs will be in the event of mobilization.

Another important step taken was the development of a selective assignment program. Under this program, airmen released from the active establishment, who have an obligation to serve in the Reserve are assigned selectively to the Reserve units nearest their homes. These men, while not required to join the units, are urged to do so both to increase the combat capability of the units and to reduce their remaining service obligation. One year with an active reserve unit will finish their total military service obligation. One year with an active Reserve unit they are carried in the Ready or Standby Reserve—subject to call—for 2 years. It is estimated that by next June 30, some 29,000 of these airmen finishing 4-year active-duty tours will have been selectively assigned. The majority are expected to join Reserve units.

The Reserve program of the Air Force has made such good progress, in fact, that last month a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee complimented the Air Force for what it had done these last 9 months. And this progress seems to have been made in spite of, rather than because of, the Department of Defense.

Take, for example, the matter of facilities. Beginning with fiscal year 1951, the Congress appropriated certain sums to be spent for the construction of Reserve facilities. No single aspect of the Reserve program is more important than facilities. Without a place where training can be given, or without airfields from which to fly, it is almost impossible to attract participants.

For the current fiscal year, Congress authorized the expenditure of $32,049,500 for the construction of flying centers and Reserve centers. But those who control the money in the Defense Department have thus far released only $2,078,000 of these funds. The amount released was for the construction of flying locations, although the sum directed by Congress for this purpose was $26,558,500. So far, Defense has not released any money for the Reserve centers, although $5,491,000 was earmarked for this project.

Recently, Assistant Defense Secretary Carter L. Burgess notified the Air Force that Defense had developed certain guidelines it wanted the Air Force to follow in its Reserve training program.

The first guideline directed that the number of prior servicemen in pay-drill status, who had just joined the Reserve following active-duty tours, be substantially reduced.

This would hit directly at the selective assignment facet of the program. It would mean asking the units to forego, in large measure, upgrading combat capability built around these technicians whose highly developed skills are still fresh.

It is an acknowledged fact that Air Force skills become rusty after a man is separated from active duty, unless he works at them on a fairly regular basis. The weekly and monthly Reserve training assemblies were designed for just such a purpose—to prevent skills from becoming rusty. To achieve an acceptable degree of combat capability requires frequent training periods both for units and individuals. If the Defense guideline prevails, the end result will be a lowering of combat effectiveness.

Another guideline called for eliminating the week-night drills from all elements of the Reserve, except for school periods for certain technicians.

This would hit squarely at the specialized training program. This is the program that trains reservists in the skills need to satisfy almost all of the mobilization requirement for individuals. More than 5 years of effort have gone into building this night-time specialized training of individuals. A conversion of the program to the 1- or 2-day per month concept, which Burgess asked, could have a damaging effect on the willingness of individuals to take training.

The Burgess document went beyond merely directing that certain procedures be adopted in the Reserve training program. It put the Defense Department squarely in the operating business. For it set forth to the last man the numbers of officers and airmen who could participate in pay-training status, how many drills and days of active duty they could have, average number of days allowable for transition of newly assigned pilots, etc.

The document established a ceiling of 52 Air Guard officers who might serve on active duty under section 5 of the National Defense Act and section 252 of Public Law 476. And it further directed that these officers should be included within the active Air Force approved strength and paid from active Air Force funds.

The officers referred to are called to active duty and assigned within the Air Force as specialists in matters involving the Air Guard. While neither law provides specifically the source of pay for these officers, Public Law 476 did state that while on active duty under section 252 these Air Guard officers should be considered as additional members of the staff they were assigned to.

If the Burgess document is peculiar in that it would serve to reduce combat capability, it is made more peculiar by the fact that it is directed to the Reserve program of this fiscal year. In 5 more months this fiscal year will have ended. Further, it was issued months after Congress had appropriated for the support of this fiscal year's Reserve program and almost 18 months after the program had been submitted by Air Force to the Defense Department for approval.

There are other indications that Defense is placing roadblocks in the way of the Air Force Reserve program.

The Air Force has hoped for more than a year to institute an air technician program in its Reserve, similar to that in effect in the Air Guard for years. The Civil Service Commission has approved the plan, subject to approval of Defense. The program, which provides that key members of the unit are hired for full-time duty on a civilian employee basis to substitute for assigned active-duty people, would save millions of dollars annually and return to the Air Force for assignment against worldwide commitments hundreds of officers and airmen. Almost everyone concerned with the Reserve program believes in the air technician plan implicitly. The Defense Department's own Reserve Forces Policy Board has approved the plan. But the Department itself has not given its blessing.

As long ago as last April the Air Force asked Defense for approval of 36 additional drills for rated people in the Reserve and Air Guard in order that they might better meet their minimum annual flying time requirements. Defense has kicked this request around for months, and its most recent suggestion was that 10 additional days of active duty be given to all members of both Reserve components.

There is an old saying to the effect that "what you do speaks so loud, I cannot hear what you say."

If this is true the actions of the Defense Department with respect to the Air Force Reserve program would appear to belie the Department's announced public policy that it is striving for a truly Ready Reserve.

Integration at Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Judith Crist, which appeared in the February 5, 1956, issue of the New York Herald Tribune. The author describes the successful practicing-democracy project, begun in 1952 by Manhattan school districts 12, 13, and 14, under the leadership of Assistant Superintendent Truda T. Weil:

INTEGRATION AT GRASSROOTS—SCHOOL FILM TELLS INTERVISIT STORY

(By Judith Crist)

Among the many proposals and projects to end the residential segregation which is reflected in the city schools, one has been tried and, after 4 years, found so successful that its participants are now ready to tell their story to the Nation.

On Wednesday the film story of the intervisitation project of school districts 12, 13, and 14, entitled "Let Us Break Bread Together," will be shown and plans made for its national distribution by interested organizations. The 16-millimeter 30-minute color movie is a documentary of the answer that educators, parents, and children have found to one of the Nation's most pressing social problems.

FOR "TOGETHERNESS"

The project began in 1952 under the leadership of Assistant Superintendent Truda T. Weil, who is in charge of the three Manhattan districts, which extend through the Harlem, Inwood, and Washington Heights areas of the borough. Some of the schools in the area have all-white or all-Negro enrollments because of the residential segregations and on the periphery of both white and Negro areas there has been a growing Puerto Rican population.

Because segregation, isloation, rejection, and acceptance all play a part in human relations, Miss Weil set as the motto of her districts, Neighbors Working Together, and, in keeping with the motto, as a phase of "togetherness" the intervisitaton project was begun.

The program, Miss Weil explained, is designed to help children rid themselves of prejudices and untruths about superiority or inferiority of any group. The community, supervisors, parents, teachers and pupils confer, work and intervisit so that they may better plan for the interaction of peoples of all races and religions in the building of a district, a city, and a nation.

There are two things the program was not. It did not involve taking busloads of children from one neighborhod into another simply to get an interracial atmosphere—a recent proposal, incidentally, that some officials regard as a quick and easy road to integration. Above all, it was not a matter of children from different backgrounds making expeditions to see how others live—as some field trips seem to be.

A basic tenet in the project is that by knowing each other, through work and play, that people understand each other.

It started out with one class in each of two schools visiting. This year there are classes from 14 schools and for the first time first-graders, at public school 98, on West 212th Street, and at public school 133, on

East 130th Street, are joining fifth- and sixth-graders in the exchange of visits.

CHRISTMAS AND ALADDIN

The principals planned the program with the teachers, and parents joined in carrying it out. In each case a school in a predominantly white neighborhood was paired with one from a predominantly Negro one and the classes went to work on a specific project.

Sixth graders from public school 132, on Wadsworth Avenue, and from 186, on West 145th Street, which has a Negro and Puerto Rican population, decided to study various aspects of Spanish customs, life, and history. Parents and teachers accompanied the classes to the Hispanic Museum and to the Puerto Rican food market. The youngsters celebrated a Mexican Christmas at public school 186 and enjoyed Aladdin and His Wonderful Lamp at public school 132.

Another pair chose to study the music and dances of Latin America. A third, of fifth graders, took as their theme Music Is Fun, going to concerts together, taking up instruments, giving joint musical programs.

There were hesitations on both sides. "I believe every one is all right," a white mother said, "but what about the social implications of all this mixing children together?" And from a Negro parent, "Why should I make my child believe that he is going to be accepted when I know that when he grows up he is going to be hurt? I might as well spare his feelings by letting him live with his own now and help him later not to be hurt too much." Some children too were hesitant.

IT IS WITH PRIDE

But teachers planned carefully, the communities considered the problems, and the program evolved. The youngsters learned to know each other's communities. Beyond the school-sponsored project, there have grown friendships, not only between children but between parents. It is with pride that the story has been put on film.

"In these districts," Miss Weil said, "integration begins at the grassroots with proper human behavior. The stereotype patterns of common beliefs that have grown up through the years being dissipated by knowledge and understanding rather than through verbiage. In this way, we believe, the idea will be fostered that America is a blend of cultures and that it is our differences as well as our common desires and ambitions which will make this Nation strong. In planning, working, and sharing experiences, our children are practicing democracy."

Prayer in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1955, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 23 to bring about the open expression of prayer in the United Nations at their Assembly gatherings. I have continued pressing for action on this resolution and hope that it will be reported out early in this session.

I was very happy to learn through an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, December 30, 1955, that our representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., through the various delegations of the United Nations, is taking action to bring about prayer in the United Nations Assembly. Under unanimous consent, I insert this newspaper article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point together with my copy of letter complimenting the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.:

LODGE CALLS FOR PRAYER TO START U. N. ASSEMBLY

(By John Molleson)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., December 29.—Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., today made public his proposal that each meeting of the U. N. General Assembly open with an audible prayer, to be offered by a priest from any of the faiths which have believers in the U. N.

The chief American delegate said he had sent letters urging an Assembly invocation to each of the 75 other member states, including 16 newly admitted nations. "The fact that many new members have been admitted to the U. N. prompts me to propose afresh that future meetings of the General Assembly be opened with prayer," he said.

A United States spokesman said that more than a dozen replies had been received to the letter, which was mailed December 21. Most of the replies favor the invocation, a small number are noncommital, and none is opposed to the idea, he said. The names of the responding nations were not released.

Assembly meetings now open with a moment of silence which can be used for prayer or mediation. In his letter Mr. Lodge urged "that God be openly and audibly invoked in the conviction that we cannot make the U. N. into a successful instrument for God's peace without God's help—and that with His help we cannot fail."

The American delegate proposed an invocation in accordance with any one of the religious faiths represented here. There is probably no single thing that the U. N. can do which will so move and touch millions of people around the world, and will give them such confidence in the United Nations," he said.

With its wide representation of different beliefs and degrees of belief, the U. N. has avoided appeals to a specific God and has confined its show of devotion to a carefully nondenominational mediation room, an enclosure in the main lobby of the General Assembly hall, now chiefly visited by tourists.

JANUARY 11, 1956.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Representative, United States Mission to the United Nations, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I, together with many people, congratulate you on taking some forward steps to bring about the expression of audible prayer at the sessions of the United Nations, and your statement made on December 29 spells out the reasons in no uncertain terms.

I have felt very keenly about this ever since the United Nations came into being and have used every method at my command to bring this about, including the introduction of a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 23, copy of which is enclosed. I have felt that it would be an excellent expression if the Congress adopted this resolution, and I firmly believe that it would add additional strength to the position you have already taken.

The argument that has been advanced that there are many different types of religion represented at the United Nations can be easily answered by a prayer properly drawn that could well represent the thinking of all God-fearing people regardless of their manner of worship.

It is my sincere hope that this resolution will receive favorable action at this session, and I know the American people are taking and will continue to take every possible means to assist you in bringing into the United Nations the Prince of Peace because, without His help, I fear there is little hope of the United Nations accomplishing the results we all desire.

Sincerely yours,

———.

Mr. Speaker, I am positive that the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 23 by both Houses of Congress will certainly lend great weight to the efforts of our Ambassador to the United Nations.

Statement of Hon. Timothy J. Murphy, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of my valued friend, Hon. Timothy J. Murphy, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Tuesday, February 7, 1956:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I should like, first, to tell you how much I appreciate the meeting today, especially when we remember that the work of a conscientious Member of the Congress is endless. The fact that you are giving up some of your valuable time to receive me indicates both courtesy and a very real interest in the work of this committee. It is a fine compliment to our organization.

You will note I am accompanied this morning by a large group of my comrades. We are meeting in a conference of national and department officers which is an annual event in Washington. Department commanders and other officers from every State are here to represent the membership of their departments. Our national officers, national council of administration, and major national committees made up of leaders from all parts of the United States, are also here meeting with our department leaders. It is a real privilege for our folks to visit this committee in session. I am proud of our leaders and am sure they reflect credit upon our organization. I hope before this day is over you will have an opportunity to meet many, if not all, of them.

May I take the liberty of pointing out, as many of my predecessors have, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was founded in 1899 by returning overseas veterans of the Spanish-American War. Our membership is now composed of approximately a million and a quarter members in nearly 10,000 posts in every State and Territory and some foreign countries. Membership is restricted to men who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on foreign soil and in hostile waters during a war, campaign or expedition for which a campaign medal has been issued and are either native or naturalized American citizens.

Many national leaders have held high office in our organization and I am pleased to acknowledge one of our able past commanders in chief, Gen. B. W. (PAT KEARNEY), as a distinguished and longtime member of this committee. A former member of the com-

mittee, and one of your able colleagues in the House, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, is also a past commander in chief of our organization. Our common purpose, "To honor the dead by helping the living," is well expressed through our home for widows and orphans in Eaton Rapids, Mich., and in our national rehabilitation service, which offers free representation and counsel in the presentation of claims by any veteran or dependent regardless of membership in the VFW.

One of our day to day contributions toward making America a better place to live is an extensive community service program which had the active participation last year of more than 8,000 Posts and 4,000 Auxiliaries involving approximately 500,000 separate projects. This is only one phase of a service-to-others program which is continually conducted on a nationwide basis by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have taken the liberty to point this out in order to establish an understanding of the nature and purposes of our organization and because I take pardonable pride in these achievements.

One of the most important problems that always confronts your committee is the question of cost. In recent years some of my distinguished predecessors, in appearing before this committee, have presented in detail some significant aspects of costs with respect to the veterans benefits program in relation to other activities and programs of the Federal Government. I shall not attempt to burden the record today with a repetition of all this pertinent information. I should like to remind you of a most comprehensive discussion of costs of veteran benefits which was made by Past Commander in Chief James W. Cothran, of South Carolina, when he was commander and appeared before this committee on February 17, 1953. I am sure the record of that hearing is still available to members of your committee.

Indicative of the undue concern over the cost of veteran benefits has been the recent studies and investigations of programs and spending for veterans. The Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization devoted a substantial share of its investigation to the hospitalization and medical treatment program for veterans and the operation of the Veterans Administration. If the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in this field should be adopted by the executive and legislative branches of our Government the results would be a limited hospital program for only those veterans who can establish proof—beyond a doubt—of service-connected disabilities for which they are in need of medical treatment. We think it can be assumed that if this objective is reached the next step would be to abolish special medical treatment for veterans and deal with them on the same basis as other citizens in need of treatment.

Inasmuch as the Hoover Commission went over the veterans hospital and medical treatment program with a fine toothed comb, a decision apparently was reached to set up and authorize another investigating body to delve in other pertinent aspects of the veterans benefits program. Consequently, the President's Commission on Pensions was created and directed to make a searching study of compensation and pensions to ascertain whether the existing benefit payments are in line with the present-day policies and trends, and particularly in relation to Social Security and other forms of old age and retirement benefits. This Commission was initially asked to report not later than November 1, 1955, but because of the complex nature of the studies the authority has been extended and it is expected that the Commission's report and recommendations may be forthcoming some time this spring.

It is distressing to those of us particularly concerned with the welfare of our veterans and their dependents that the executive branch of the Government should consider it necessary to make special studies and investigations of the veterans benefit program, when the Congress is so well equipped by experience and tradition to make such investigations as may be deemed necessary in the operation of government and the expenditure of public funds. This committee, or its subcommittees have, from time to time, conducted inquiries into aspects of the veterans benefit program and the operation of the Veterans' Administration that have been of great value and have resulted in improvement of the benefit program and the operation of the agency.

Before discussing new legislation I should like to express the appreciation of my organization for the accomplishments of this committee in the first session. You held hearings on 111 separate bills which resulted in 18 new public laws. That in itself is an enviable record but, in addition thereto, you made invaluable studies and investigations of various phases of the veterans program. Your committee print No. 31 is the best factual record in existence on operation of the VA hospital program. Your committee print No. 27 entitled "Nonbed Betterments," revealed a startling condition which had been overlooked or ignored and which resulted in an immediate repair and renovation program, together with a long-range replacement program. The urgency of this matter was clearly revealed when the House Appropriations Committee increased by $16 million the budget request for repairs and renovation in fiscal 1956. I am sure you will not accuse me of having a faulty memory when I say that I cannot recall many instances in which the Appropriations Committee has forced additional money on the Veterans' Administration. Your inquiry into the home loan program has revealed hidden dangers to veterans in the nature of possible deficiency judgments and has exposed flagrant abuses of the program by unscrupulous builders and real estate brokers. All this would not have been possible, Mr. Chairman, without the services of your excellent staff, which I am told does not have a superior in any committee in either branch of the Congress.

Our national legislative committee, together with our national security and American sovereignty committees, met and established a five-point program of top priority objectives taken from some 400 resolutions approved by our 56th national encampment. At this point, with the permission of the chairman, I should like to insert for the record a copy of this five-point program.

In this program first consideration has been given to the security of the United States. I am sure that it is also the first concern of the members of the committee and every patriotic citizen. Concern for our security also requires a concern for those who are called upon to bear arms in defense of that security. It is for this reason, and because of the very purpose of our organization, that we maintain a continuing interest in the veteran-benefit program. I want to pledge to your committee the assistance and cooperation of our organization in all efforts to improve that program.

I know that our viewpoints are not always the same, Mr. Chairman, but I am not discouraged by that fact. Honest disagreement contributes to complete analysis and sound conclusion and whatever our differences we have always had a fair and impartial hearing before this committee. I shall not attempt to discuss our 5-point program in detail. I shall devote most of the legislative aspect of my remarks to the subject of a separate and liberalized pension program for the aging group of World War I veterans. However, there are 2 or 3 legislative proposals which I find to be of grave concern to veterans as I travel about the country and I shall take time to briefly discuss these matters.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

There seems to be a continuing nationwide interest among World War II veterans on the question of reinstating national service life insurance. Thousands upon thousands of our World War II veterans dropped their national service life insurance because of a financial inability to bear the cost of something for which they did not have a present need. After several years have gone by and their family life and economic situation changed, many of them realize it was a mistake to drop this insurance and believe that they should be given an opportunity to reinstate. There is considerable misunderstanding about the cost of reinstatement if it should be authorized by legislation. I think many of these veterans believe they could, if permitted to reinstate term insurance, continue it with the same premiums that prevailed when the policy lapsed.

Nevertheless, it is my recommendation that legislation be enacted at an early date which would give World War II veterans an opportunity for a period of at least 1 year to reinstate national service life insurance. Otherwise, I think, the demand will continue and may be granted by the Congress at a time when increased age will jump the cost to the point that it will not be advantageous to many veterans. If such legislation is enacted, widespread publicity should be given by the Government to the fact that until a given date, World War II veterans could reinstate national service life insurance, providing they meet the requirements for reinstatement. Those requirements and the terms of reinstatement should be fully explained. This legislative proposal has the support of a Veterans of Foreign Wars national encampment resolution.

EDUCATIONAL AID FOR ORPHANS

Another legislative proposal—endorsed by our national encampment—is educational aid for the orphans of servicemen who lost their lives during service in World War II and Korea. It seems only reasonable and fair that where the serviceman made the supreme sacrifice for his country and was, therefore, denied the opportunity to take advantage of educational aid to better provide for his dependents, his orphans should be given consideration in his place. There is legislation already pending before your committee on this subject, which was introduced by your chairman. I hope the committee will give favorable consideration to this legislation in the near future.

CONTINUANCE OF EDUCATIONAL AID

Another matter of concern among veterans and the parents of teenagers which I am finding in my travels is the question of whether young men inducted into military service on or after February 1, 1955, should be denied educational aid and assistance from their Government after release from active duty. The Veterans of Foreign Wars in national encampment has gone on record advocating the continuance of educational aid for veterans who are inducted into the service on or after February 1, 1955, as long as authority to draft remains on the statute books. In other words, the Veterans of Foreign Wars believe that regardless of whether service is in peacetime or wartime, if young men are to be subject to Selective Service, provision should be made for educational aid at Government expense. I would like to point out that one of the compelling arguments behind this decision of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the fact that under our present discriminatory Selective Service Act, with its exemptions and the limited demand for recruits, not more than 1 out of 8 young men are inducted into service. Those drafted

have no greater obligation to the country than those who are excused from service, and, therefore, should be given some special consideration.

GRAVES VISITATION PROGRAM

I realize the Veterans' Affairs Committee does not have jurisdiction over legislation which would authorize gold-star mothers and wives of servicemen buried in American cemeteries on foreign soil to visit those cemeteries at Government expense. However, I should like to enlist the active support of all members of your committee in helping to obtain favorable action on legislation pending before the Armed Services Committee which would accomplish this objective. A Defense Department report on this legislation recommended it should be delayed pending further improvements and landscaping of said cemeteries. It was my privilege to visit many of those American cemeteries in Europe last November and I found them to be in excellent condition. I urge prompt and favorable action on this legislation during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried up to the present time to be mostly pleasant and I have been sincere in what I have said. It is necessary, however, to say some things that are not quite so pleasant. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has been disturbed by the increasing frequency and ferocity of the attacks on the veteran-benefit program. An often hostile press echoes and reechoes distorted and half-true statements. It was Nazi Propaganda Minister Paul Goebels who said that by constant repetition that which is false is accepted as true, and that which is misleading is accepted as accurate. With no intent to draw a parallel with Herr Goebel's philosophy, let me cite as an example, the following quotation from the 1957 budget message:

"The number of patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals is expected to increase 1.4 percent over 1956 to a daily average of 111,500. Almost two-thirds of these hospital patients and most of the 17,000 veterans in Veterans' Administration homes are receiving treatment for conditions which are not related to their military service."

This statement is technically correct, but is more expressive for what it omits than for what it contains.

It suggests to uninformed persons that two-thirds of the Veterans' Administration hospital facilities are occupied by persons who may not be deserving of Government hospital care. What are the facts behind this terse budget message statement?

Of the present average daily patient load of 113,585 veterans (of which 38 percent are service connected) the Veterans' Administration reveals that 62,386 are neuropsychiatric, and 14,385 are tubercular patients. Regardless of the humanitarian aspect of this problem it is clear that the public health and safety requires their isolation and treatment. Even the American Medical Association has conceded this point and I cannot help wondering why more details were withheld from the budget message.

I am inclined to think the tendency to deny, or begrudge, assistance to veterans because of the absence of a proven service-connected disability is overdrawn and not in keeping with reality. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that members of your committee can agree that thousands upon thousands of veterans successfully rendered a full measure of duty in training and in combat without making any effort to establish for future use a record of disabilities incurred in service. It is reasonable to believe that many veterans today are suffering from residuals of conditions which actually had inception in the service. Hundreds of thousands of veterans served long periods—many of them for years—in strenuous basic training and maneuvers, plus long, deadly periods of combat in the various theaters of operations without acquiring a proven service-connected disability. Consider the fact that some 827,000 World War II veterans, in the absence of service-connected disabilities, were given the privilege of also serving in the Korean police action.

Let us take a look at the 1957 budget request for old-age assistance under the Social Security Administration. The request estimates the average number of recipients per month will be 2,516,000; the average monthly payment $51.79 and the total expenditures, including State and local contributions, $1,563,600,000. The Federal share is estimated at $802,500,000. The budget message reveals a kindly attitude toward this program as shown by the following excerpt:

"For a large group of needy people not receiving OASI benefits, public assistance remains the only public resource. * * * To avoid hardship to present public-assistance recipients, I propose that the present formula for determining the Federal share of assistance payments be temporarily extended."

In contrast, it is interesting to note that the budget message reflects a deep-seated fear about the high cost, both present and future, of the veterans compensation and pension program, even though the total amount requested for pensions for all veterans and all dependents of all wars in 16 different categories is only $975,357,471. This includes pensions to dependents of veterans of the Indian Wars, Mexican War, and even those paid on account of the yellow-fever experiments. This total request for veterans pensions is one-half billion dollars less than will be paid to nonveterans under the old age assistance program and only slightly more than the Federal contribution to that program. In making this comparison, Mr. Chairman, I did not include the cost of compensation because even our sharpest critics frequently concede that the Government should reward disabilities incurred in service—although some would attach an income limitation.

However, a comparison of all payments to veterans, their widows, orphans, and dependent parents under both the compensation and pension programs, with payments to nonveterans under the public-assistance program, is most interesting. The budget request for veterans compensation and pension, both disability and death, is $2,907,000,000. Total estimated expenditures for public assistance is $2,641,400,000. The latter figure includes Federal, State, and local funds for assistance and administration. The Federal share is $1,344,500,000. May I indulge in a little humor, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that perhaps what is needed is a constitutional amendment to provide that no person shall be discriminated against on account of having served in the Armed Forces in time of war.

PENSIONS

This brings me to a discussion of veterans' pensions. There are those who advocate repeal of the pension program, others who think it should be continued in its present form or with greater restrictions, and those who feel the program should be liberalized and expanded. In considering these viewpoints I believe it would be helpful to again make a comparison with the old-age assistance program. In that program payments are made on the basis of need. The amount of the payment varies according to the needs of the individual and the maximums established by the various States. In the calendar year 1954, average monthly payments in six States were more than the $66.15 paid veterans in pensions under part III. The high was $90.50 per month in Colorado and the low $28.04 per month in Mississippi.

To qualify for a part III pension, veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea must be permanently and totally disabled, unemployable and must meet strict income limitations. It is, therefore, obvious that if veterans' pensions were repealed, the result in many cases would merely be to transfer the cost from one agency of the Government to another. The minimum pension rate under part III is only $14.36 per month more than the estimated average payment for old-age assistance. Therefore, veterans who could qualify for old-age assistance if they were not receiving a veteran's pension are only receiving an average of $14.36 per month on account of their wartime service. Certainly this does not justify extravagant charges that the veterans' pension program threatens the solvency of the Nation.

World War I pensions

Everything that has been said on the general subject of pensions is applicable to the aging World War I group. In addition, we feel that the World War I group, because of age and economic factors, is entitled to special consideration. For this reason we have called for a separate World War I pension program as a top priority objective of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In support of that position I should like to call the attention of your committee to changes that have occurred in the economic and social life of the Nation in the past 25 years.

In 1930 there were 720 company pension plans in the United States covering less than 2½ million workers. Prior to 1938 most of these plans did not guarantee anything to the worker since the company could use the pension fund for emergency purposes. The Revenue Act of 1938 provided that amounts paid by the company into the pension fund could not be deducted as business expenses unless irrevocably committed to pension purposes. For this reason it was 20 years after World War I before any real progress was made in establishing company pension plans in American industry. Later, in 1949, the United States Supreme Court held in the Inland Steel case that pensions were deferred wages and a proper subject of collective bargaining. This accelerated the formation of company pension plans until they now number more than 17,000 and cover more than 12 million workers.

Company pensions, estimate

Year	Number of company plans	Number of workers covered
1930	720	2,400,000
1935	1,090	2,600,000
1940	1,965	3,700,000
1945	7,425	5,600,000
1950	14,330	8,600,000
1951	14,000	9,600,000
1953	17,000	12,000,000

Source: Social Security Administration.

It seems fairly certain that our younger veterans of World War II and Korea will enjoy participation in these private pension plans while benefits to World War I veterans will be insignificant by comparison.

Paralleling the growth of the company pension plans has been the old-age and survivors insurance program. The Social Security Act of 1935 was revised in 1939 to establish the present OASI system. Major revisions were also made by amendments in 1950, 1952, and 1954. About 69 million people are now insured. Approximately 9 out of 10 jobs are now covered. The amendments of 1954 included 10 million additional persons in occupations that were formerly excluded. It seems clear, however, that this latest expansion of OASI is of no benefit to some 544,000 World War I veterans who have already passed the age of 65.

It seems equally clear that World War I veterans in general will receive from OASI only a fraction of the benefit that will accrue to World War II and Korean veterans. This is borne out by a recent study con-

ducted by the Public Affairs Institute under a grant from the E. G. Shinner Foundation of Chicago. The report of that study, published in 1955, states that by 1980, 75 percent of retired, aged persons will be receiving benefits under the OASI program. It seems probable that 452,000 surviving World War I veterans, whose average age will then be 84.4 years, will mostly be in the group of 25 percent not receiving benefits.

Further evidence that today's aged persons are in tragic financial circumstances is provided by a survey of the Bureau of OASI in 1951. According to the survey, 25.7 percent of men retired under the program and 31.2 of the women had no assets.

A report entitled "Economic Needs of Older People" may be of interest to the committee. The 533-page report, released by the 20th Century Fund only a few days ago, reveals that 20 percent of persons 65 or older receive public assistance, 33 percent receive benefit from OASI or similar public or private retirement programs, 30 percent have jobs or are wives of wage earners; 5 percent are in homes or hospitals, and the remaining 12 percent have income from personal savings, insurance, investments, relatives, or, and this is the shocker, veterans' benefits.

It is quite apparent that very few aged persons in our present day society have resources of their own. It is equally apparent that various programs which provide old-age security will create an entirely different situation by the time World War II and Korean veterans reach old age. The evidence of this is clear and convincing. I hope it will serve to reduce the circulation of cost projections based on Spanish-War or World War I experience.

RECOMMENDATION

I strongly recommend that your committee give careful consideration to legislation which would set up a separate and liberalized pension program for the aging group of World War I veterans. I suggest a separate pension program for this older group of veterans on the basis of careful study and consideration which has been given this problem by our national staff and our national and department leadership in all parts of the Nation. World War I veterans represent a few more than 3 million of the presently estimated 22 million veterans in the United States.

The President, in his budget message, attempted to project the present part III pension program into the future and estimated an annual outlay of $6 billion by the year 2000. Consequently, any attempt to liberalize the pension program for the older group of World War I veterans which would, at the same time, include the other groups, would raise a hue and cry in the public press and among the commentators that would pale into insignificance the attacks heretofore made against veterans' benefits.

Our 1955 national encampment held last August, adopted a resolution calling for a separate and liberalized pension program for the aging group of World War I veterans. Our national council of administration, in meeting last September, adopted a motion authorizing and directing our national legislative committee and national legislative director to proceed forthwith in reaching a decision and causing to be drafted a specific separate and liberalized pension program for World War I veterans and that said objective should be given a high ranking priority. Our legislative committee, assisted by some other national committees, have been working out an agreement as to the type of pension program which the VFW should recommend to the Congress. In preparing my statement in advance I did not have the benefit of the discussion and action of our national committees but I am sure that our national legislative director either is prepared, or will be prepared in a few days, to offer for introduction a separate pension bill for World War I veterans behind which we hope to mobilize the weight and prestige of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I think I can say, without fear of successful contradiction, and I believe that statistics submitted in this statement will support my contention, that our aging group of World War I veterans will be the last group of veterans that will need or expect a general pension program in their declining years. I have sufficient faith and confidence in our people and in the growth and future prosperity of the United States to believe that our younger veterans in the World War II and Korean groups will, in the great majority of cases, be cared for in their declining years through increased earnings, social security, and public- and private-pension programs. It seems to me that if a grateful nation has been willing and able to provide a modest pension program for the aging and ailing veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, it should be willing and able to do no less for our comrades of World War I.

That illustrious and revered General of the Armies John J. Pershing was credited with saying that Sgt. Alvin C. York, of Wolf River, Tenn., was the greatest soldier in World War I. The exploits of Sergeant York were so fantastic that Hollywood made a feature picture of his life and war experiences. York has become a legend among veterans. I should like to point out to this committee that notwithstanding all of Sergeant York's achievements, heroism, and decorations, he did not acquire a proven service-connected disability. Consequently, Alvin York would only be entitled to assistance from his Government in time of need through a non-service-connected pension or hospitalization and medical treatment on a non-service-connected basis if and when a hospital bed is available.

It may be of interest to point out that Alvin York found it necessary to apply for and was granted a non-service-connected disability pension in 1938. He was awarded a pension of $30 per month on the basis of permanent and total disability, unemployability, and under an income limitation. His pension was withdrawn when his income improved. Sergeant York is still disabled and unemployable and without appreciable income and, consequently, again applied for a non-service-connected disability pension in 1954, but was denied because of a dispute over income. Recently he has filed a new application for a non-service-connected pension and I am hopeful the skill and ability of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in handling claims for veterans will be fully utilized in favorably presenting Sergeant York's case to the Veterans' Administration for adjudication. It might be of interest to this committee and the American people to know what one of America's great war heroes thinks of a separate and liberal pension for World War I veterans. Here is a statement to which Sergeant York recently affixed his signature:

"I believe in the traditional and historical policy of the payment of pensions to aging and disabled veterans which has been followed by the United States Government since the days of the Plymouth colony. It is more honorable to provide modest pensions for our war veterans who are in need of a helping hand rather than to put them on the public-assistance rolls. It costs little, if any more, to pay these old veterans a pension than it would to take care of them under some form of public aid. The aging group of World War I veterans should have a separate and liberalized pension program to take care of those who will not be adequately cared for by some other type of income. No doubt there are many World War I veterans, like myself, who are today suffering from conditions which actually started in the service but which are not subject to unquestionable proof. I hope the Veterans of Foreign Wars will be successful in convincing the Congress and the Administration that there should be a separate and generous pension program for veterans of World War I that will closely approximate the same consideration which has been given to veterans of the Civil War and veterans of the Spanish-American War.

"Sgt. ALVIN C. YORK.

"This January 26, 1956."

We recognize that all veterans of World War I did not render unique and outstanding service comparable to Sergeant York. We do maintain, however, that in World War I, as well as in other wars, there were thousands upon thousands of unsung heroes who rendered a full measure of effort and devotion without eyewitnesses paying particular attention to their sacrifices and heroism. We do not believe that the absence of a proven service-connected disability should deny a helping hand to a disabled or old veteran from his Government in his hour of need. Consideration has been given by many of our leaders and our national staff as to whether length and type of service should be a more important factor in the award of pensions. I am sure that their decision in this matter will be reflected in the bill which we expect to offer for introduction.

I want to apologize to your committee and to my comrades for the length of my statement, and, at the same time, may I commend you for your patience in hearing me out. Our able legislative director, Comrade Omar B. Ketchum, who is always at our right hand, may wish to mention some other phases of our program which I have neglected. I know he will want to place in the record a more comprehensive outline of our complete legislative program. I am sure it is unnecessary for me to sing the praises of Comrade Ketchum to your committee, but I do want you to know that we have faith in his judgment and integrity. The services of Comrade Ketchum and our Washington office are available, if we can be of assistance to you.

In conclusion, may I remind you that our annual dinner honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces is scheduled for tonight in the big Sheraton Hall dining room of the Sheraton-Park Hotel, beginning with a hospitality hour in the same location at 6:30 p. m. We are arranging a beautiful background, a good steak dinner, wholesome entertainment, and a minimum of speeches, with our usual early adjournment. I shall look forward to seeing you as honored guests at our dinner, and I want to take this opportunity to again express my sincere appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to each member of the committee, as well as your fine committee staff, for the splendid cooperation we have enjoyed in the past and the privilege of coming before you personally with this statement.

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, 1955–56

The following legislative objectives are based on resolutions adopted by the 56th national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and recommendations of the VFW national legislative committee:

RESOLUTIONS

Compensation program

1. To provide $200 per month for total disability, $180 for 90 percent, $160 for 80 percent, $140 for 70 percent, $120 for 60 percent, $100 for 50 percent, $80 for 40 percent, $60 for 30 percent, $40 for 20 percent, and $20 for 10 percent in wartime cases, with 80 percent thereof in peacetime cases (Res. 17).

2. To increase the rates of compensation for disability due to combat by 25 percent of the existing rates (Res. 341, 216).

3. To provide that any combination involving the loss or loss of use of any 2 members or the loss or loss of use of a hand or a foot together with the loss or loss of use of an eye shall be rated as 100 percent disability, and to permit the statutory award for each disability and for combinations (Res. 267).

4. To provide that the disability steps of 40, 30, 20, and 10 percent shall entitle the individual so rated to a proportionate amount of allowance for dependents (Res. 194).

5. To provide that where adequate medical evidence is shown of residual disability from tuberculosis that the veteran be rated on this in addition to the statutory award of $67 (Res. 234).

6. To provide that except for fraud service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years shall not be severed (Res. 1–g).

7. To provide that any physical disability, including dental disabilities, or any neuropsychiatric or psychiatric disabilities having been found within 5 years from date of discharge shall be presumed to have been incurred in service unless rebutted by affirmative evidence of prior existence where it is shown that claimant was at any time held prisoner by an enemy nation during military service in a period of hostilities (Res. 270).

8. To provide that a person not dishonorably separated from active service in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be considered to have remained on active duty for benefit purposes during the interval between the technical time of discharge and up to the point when such individual, under normal and customary travel conditions, has had time to arrive home, in the absence of clear evidence of misconduct of such service person (Res. 191).

9. To provide that in any instance where the Service Department fails to certify that death was due to willful misconduct, the VA shall be bound by the certification of the Service Department (Res. 1–h).

10. To provide compensation for unemployability due to inability when official records show superimposition of neuropsychiatric disability due to combat (Resolution 1–d).

11. To provide that psychosis developing within 5 years after separation of a wartime overseas veteran from active service be deemed to have been incurred in active service for the purpose of hospitalization, medical treatment and disability compensation (Resolution 199).

12. To provide that diseases of the central nervous system shall have a statutory period of 3 years to manifest themselves to a 10 percent degree (Resolution 343).

13. To include chronic bronchitis as service connected if shown within 1 year following wartime service, provided that the veteran concerned served overseas (Resolution 335).

14. To provide that when a woman lives with a veteran for a continuous period of years up to the time of his death, or bears children by him, such woman shall be recognized by the VA as the widow of the veteran (Resolution 1–f).

15. To provide compensation for fourth child in lieu of wife when satisfactory evidence of divorce or death is received, through amendments to Public Law 877 and Public Law 339 (Resolution 170).

Pension program

1. To provide a separate and distinct pension program applicable to veterans of World War I and that said program be consistent with their attained age, disabilities, employment opportunities and with pension history (Resolution 7–51–167).

2. To provide pension for veterans of all wars who are permanently and totally disabled at the rate of $90 per month, or $105 at age 65, and $150 where the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance (Resolution 271).

3. To place individuals (and their survivors) who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar, between July 4, 1902 and December 31, 1913, in the same status for pension purposes as those who served during the Philippine Insurrection (Resolution 56).

4. To provide equal benefits to World War II and Korean conflict widows, on the same basis as benefits now being granted to the widows of World War I veterans (Resolution 215).

5. To increase pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor from $10 a month to $100 a month (Resolution 43).

6. To provide that for VA purposes any disability with which the holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor is afflicted shall be presumed to have been incurred in service (Resolution 2–b).

7. To authorize pension upon the basis of campaign service (Resolution 2–c).

8. To make eligible for pension the widows and children of veterans who served in combat, or had campaign service (Resolution 2–d).

9. To amend extension 5, 1945 schedule, to provide that total and permanent disability shall be taken to exist regardless of degree of disability when a veteran otherwise entitled can show that he is unable to obtain employment by reason of attained age (Resolution 253).

10. To provide pension to any veteran who had campaign medal service if permanently and totally disabled, regardless of finding of willful misconduct (Resolution 2–f).

11. To grant non-service-connected pension to all veterans who have, or have had, syphilis, if otherwise qualified (Resolution 342).

12. To provide that disability incurred during active service as the result of the unauthorized handling of duds shall not be deemed for pension purposes to have resulted from willful misconduct (Resolution 2–e).

13. To provide that a veteran otherwise entitled to compensation or pension shall not be considered to be following a substantially gainful occupation if and when his income derived from employment does not exceed the Federal minimum wage (Resolution 2–g).

14. To strike from pension laws the word "employability" (Resolution 60).

15. To increase the income limitations applicable to non-service-connected disability and death pensions from $1,400 to $2,000 for a claimant without dependents and from $2,700 to $3,000 with dependents; and to exclude from this consideration all returns from insurance whether Government or commercial insurance (Resolution 252).

16. To provide the proceeds from life insurance policies used to pay medical or hospital expenses shall not be considered to be income for VA pension purposes (Resolution 255).

17. To provide that all income exemptions flowing from applicable State laws shall be honored by the VA for pension income purposes (Resolution 433).

18. To permit a veteran to waive a portion of any type of retirement benefit so as to meet the VA income limitations governing non-service-connected pension (Resolution 2–h–136).

19. To authorize retroactive pension for waiting period applicable to rating of pulmonary tuberculosis cases (Resolution 138).

Hospital, medical, and domiciliary care, and facilities program

1. Advocating maximum use of VA hospitals (Resolution 3a).

2. To make available monthly reports showing the number of veterans who have applied for hospitalization and been found eligible but who have not been physically admitted (Resolution 3–c, 24).

3. To give combat veterans and overseas war veterans, who are unable to pay for hospitalization priority for admission to VA hospitals in the order named, next only to veterans who are in need of hospitalization for service-connected disabilities (Resolution 3–d).

4. To expedite construction of all authorized hospital units and to authorize construction of additional hospital units in areas of the country where the veteran population indicates the greatest need (Resolution 3–e).

5. To construct intermediate hospitals for the treatment of chronic diseases adjacent to existing hospital units so that they may be operated under one management and with one staff of physicians (Resolution 3–f).

6. Opposing the attitude of the American Medical Association and the Hoover Commission toward veterans' affairs, and all groups, who seek to limit the medical, hospital, or domiciliary programs of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 3–g; 6).

7. To provide a 1-year presumption of service incurrence of dental defects as to those who served overseas in time of war (Resolution 3–h).

8. Recommending:

(a) That veterans suffering from nonservice connected tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, and chronic long-term disabilities, as well as those suffering from emergency conditions be eligible for hospitalization.

(b) That in relation to contract hospitalization for non-service-connected cases, the VA be given the authority to negotiate a contract with private institutions to the end that veterans suffering from tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric and chronic conditions be hospitalized in private hospitals or a State or county hospital at VA expense if there are no VA beds available; and further, that the Congress give serious consideration to authorizing the VA to give contract hospital beds to those cases deemed by the VA to be in danger of life or health or are considered medical emergencies when there are no VA beds available.

(c) That the definition of a war veteran as presently defined be amended to include any veteran with active service under honorable conditions for which a campaign or expedition medal was authorized.

(d) That the possession of a private hospital insurance contract, entitling the veteran to treatment in a private hospital should not preclude the veteran to hospitalization by the VA.

(e) That VA form 10–P–10 be changed to give greater prominence to the affidavit of inability to pay for hospital and medical care and that all veterans who execute the affidavit be informed of the significance thereof, and that such affidavit shall be accepted as sufficient proof of applicant's inability to pay (Resolution 62).

9. To provide legislation that states simply and clearly the conditions under which a veteran, unable to prove service connection for his illness or disability may obtain hospitalization in a VA hospital (Resolution 264).

10. To provide chiropractic services to veterans (Resolution 143–428).

11. To provide outpatient treatment for part III pensions (Resolution 207).

12. To eliminate addendum VA form 10–P–10a to application for hospitalization (Resolution 286).

13. To provide appropriate care of veteran NP patients (Resolution 417).

14. To provide Congressional Medal of Honor veterans with complete medical, surgical, and dental care, regardless of any other requirements (Resolution 195).

15. To require sending emergency cases to nearest VA or service hospital (Resolution 314).

16. To establish an arthritic center at Hot Springs, Ark. (Resolution 42).

17. To open domiciliary medical beds at Camp White (Resolution 263).

18. To increase number of beds at Davis Park VA hospital (Resolution 302).

19. To provide Federal aid for capital expenditures at State veterans' homes (Resolution 46–162).

20. Opposing any plan of organization which seeks to take the hospitals, the medical service, or any other essential function of the Veterans' Administration from the jurisdiction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the placing of this function under the jurisdiction of any other Federal agency (Resolution 250).

Education and training program

1. To provide educational benefits for children of war veterans whose death was due to service or who have a service-connected disability of such severity so as to preclude their participation in any of the training programs provided by existing laws (Resolution 5–a).

2. To make it mandatory that additional service connection be granted any veteran who, while training under the provisions of Public Law 16 or Public Law 894 suffers additional disability as a result of carrying out the recommendations of a training instructor or a training officer, and with the further provision that any veteran qualifying under this law whose disability was incurred prior thereto shall be entitled to consideration under this act if claim is filed within 2 years from date of enactment (Resolution 5–b).

3. To extend educational and vocational rehabilitation benefits to veterans who have been denied on the basis that they have received discharges under other than honorable conditions and later have their discharges corrected to read "under honorable conditions," but have passed their delimiting date under applicable laws, with the further provision that these veterans have 2 years from enactment of such legislation or 2 years from correction of discharge, whichever is later, in which to make application for such benefits (Resolution 5–c).

4. To extend the educational benefits of Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, Public Law 550, during the period of time the Selective Service Act is effective, and to make eligibility to these benefits retroactive so as to cover those members of the armed service terminated after January 31, 1955 (Resolution 285).

5. Endorsing S. 533, a bill to increase the education and training allowances under Public Law 550 and Public Law 894 (Resolution 345).

GI insurance program

1. To provide that any veteran who has been granted a national service life insurance contract shall not be denied the privilege of reinstating any lapsed contract or contracts because of the condition for which service connection has been granted (Resolution 8–a).

2. To amend Public Law 23 so that veterans whose term periods have expired would have the same right to obtain new insurance as they had before the passage of Public Law 23 (Resolution 8–b).

3. To amend Public Law 148, 83d Congress, to provide reinstatement privileges within 3 months after the expiration of the insurance (Resolution 8–c).

4. To provide that a veteran adjudged incompetent at time of separation from service, or within 120 days thereafter, shall have indemnity protection until adjudged competent (Resolution 8–d).

5. To authorize national service life insurance protection to those who can meet good health requirement and who, prior to April 25, 1951, had sought to obtain such protection but were denied same because of noninsurable health (Resolution 8–e).

6. To provide that if a veteran has been declared permanent and total for insurance purposes for a period of 5 years or more and has attained the age of 60 years, he shall be presumed to have remained so disabled for insurance purposes and no longer subject to automatic review by the Veterans' Administration to determine whether he has regained his ability to follow a substantially gainful occupation (Resolution 266).

7. To permit reinstatement of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance (Resolution 287).

GI loan program

1. To continue the direct home-loan program with increased appropriations to insure the availability of mortgage credit in rural areas (Resolution 14–a).

2. Opposing any increase in the present 4¼ percent interest rate on GI home loans and urge a return to the 4-percent rate as soon as the fiscal policy of the Federal Government and the availability of mortgage money insure adequate financing at the reduced rate (Resolution 14–c).

3. Opposing any transfer of functions of the VA loan program to the FHA or any other Federal agency, either by legislation or administrative action (Resolution 14–d).

4. To extend the home-loan guaranty provisions of Public Law 346, 78th Congress (Resolution 74).

5. To require that builders give enforceable written guaranty in the form of insurance, bond, or escrow money to protect veterans with respect to roofs, foundations, plumbing and heating systems, and structural defects in houses on which the VA guarantees loans (Resolution 222).

6. To amend Public Law 702, 80th Congress, as amended, to eliminate the 50-percent requirements in the act and provide for a grant to be made to eligible veterans for the total cost of the construction, remodeling, etc., including the cost of the land, of specially adapted housing, said grant not to exceed $10,000 (Resolution 232).

7. To provide adequate loan funds to enable a greater number of worthy and qualified veterans to become established on farms on a sound basis (Resolution 333).

8. To amend title III, Public Law 346, 78th Congress, as amended, so as to extend filing dates in cases where veterans affected by termination date need new homes due to being forcibly evicted by reason of eminent domain (Resolution 410).

Protection of veterans' benefit program

1. Declaring state of emergency with respect to veterans' benefit program and directing vigorous action to meet and terminate the emergency (Resolution 400).

2. Opposing Hoover Commission recommendations relating to VA hospitals and veteran preference in Federal employment, and other attacks on pension and compensation program (Resolutions 37, 48, 55, 115, 217, 311, 313, 347, 349).

3. Opposing any program which has for its purpose the combining of social-security benefits with VA benefits, and the abolition of the Veterans' Administration as an independent establishment of the Government (Resolution 153).

4. Opposing the extension of rights, benefits, and privileges granted World War II veterans to citizens of the United States who entered the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II and to their dependents (Resolution 85).

5. To investigate the American Medical Association to determine whether the stand taken by the association on the veterans' hospital program is motivated by selfish interest (Resolution 213).

6. To reestablish the Federal board of hospitalization (Resolution 258).

7. To establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the United States Senate (Resolution 57).

Veterans' Administration affairs

1. To advise the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that improved administration of the VA would obviate demands for further studies of veterans' benefits and investigation of VA procedures (Resolution 4–a).

2. Calling on the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to speak more forcibly on behalf of veterans and their dependents concerning beneficial legislation pending before the Congress, this being an obligation of the sacred trust inherent in his high office (Resolution 4–b).

3. Recommending that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs organize within the VA a board answerable only to his office for the purpose of hearing complaints and making decisions on the legality and justness (or unjustness) of VA regulations (Resolution 4–c).

4. Recommending that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take affirmative action to correct noncompliance with the spirit of Public Law 361, 77th Congress (Resolution 4–d).

5. Recommending cancellation of VA regulation 1028 (A) since it is diametrically in conflict with the avowed intent of section 3, Public Law 144, 78th Congress (Resolution 4–e).

6. Recommending that since the schedule of disability ratings employed by the VA, 1945 edition, has been amended, supplemented, and explained by so many miscellaneous VA directives that its present application creates untold, unnecessary confusion, this schedule should be brought up to date, immediately (Resolution 6–f).

7. Recommending that since the VA has been directed by Public Law 311, 83d Congress, that ratings of total and permanent, and total disability, in effect for 20 years shall not be disturbed, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs notify each veteran entitled to this benefit that his claim has been so adjudicated (Resolution 4–g).

8. Opposing recommendations that the degrees 10 percent and 20 percent be stricken from the VA's schedule of disability ratings, 1945 edition (Resolution 4–h).

9. To amend VA general regulation 525, section B, paragraph 4, so as to permit inspection of any outpatient treatment file by the accredited representative holding the appropriate power of attorney (Resolution 38).

10. Endorsing the continuance of the guardianship program of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 165).

11. Recommending that R. & P. No. 1228 be amended in such manner that no penalty be assessed for any period prior to July 22, 1954, and that the Veterans' Administration be required to include a warning notice with each pension check sent to a veteran or dependent (Resolution 201).

12. To establish a sufficient number of intermediate beds for aging and chronically ill veterans (Resolution 238).

13. Recommending additional facilities and hospitals to shorten the travel distance for those needing hospitalization and treatment which would help to speed up their recovery by enabling them to have more prompt attention (Resolution 241).

14. Recommending issuance of identification cards to veterans receiving shock-producing drugs (Resolution 242).

15. Urging the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to immediately initiate and carry to its logical conclusion a comprehensive study of the relation of amputations to subsequently developed circulatory disturbances (Resolution 247).

16. Urging the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to direct all hospital managers to provide private rooms for the use of the

clerks in interviewing individuals during the preparation of forms 10–P–10 and 10–P–10a (Resolution 256).

17. Recommending elimination of VA Deans' committees (Resolution 259).

18. Recommending that training of residents in VA hospitals be limited to the training of qualified doctors who are permanent employees of the VA, who intend to make a career of service in VA hospitals, and who will engage to serve a reasonable number of years in VA hospitals subsequent to the completion of such training; and that the number of such trainees be expressly limited to those whose services can be utilized by the VA when training shall have been completed (Resolution 260).

19. Recommending to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that doctors' qualifications be based upon State license laws and that doctors who are not specialists be utilized in all places where their services can be accepted; and that such licensed doctors as may be employed under this recommendation by the VA be not required to serve as resident surgeons (Resolution 261).

20. To provide that hypertrophic arthritis found anywhere in the body shall be considered as merely a progression of the arthritis started by trauma where service connection has been granted for traumatic arthritis (Resolution 268).

21. To have the VA administratively modify the provisions of Extension 2a 1945 Rating Schedule so that a veteran shall be rated totally disabled effective as of the day on which he enters a hospital for treatment of service-connected disability; and provide that periods during which a veteran is on furlough from a hospital where he has been admitted for service incurred disability shall be considered for rating purposes the same as though the veteran actually had remained in the hospital (Resolution 269).

22. To establish uniform effective dates under veterans' regulation No. 1148 (a) and VA regulation 1213 (a) (Resolution 272).

23. Protesting combining of outpatient clinic with VA hospital, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. (Resolution 284).

24. To pay salaries of the medical members of the VA in accordance with, and on the same basis as, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the United States Public Health Service, and be given the same consideration in regard to quarters, subsistence and retirement pay (Resolution 344).

25. To implement circular No. 19 by issuing clarification in concrete form setting forth the extent that circular No. 19 will be placed into effect as pertaining to particular offices or committee assignments within a service organization (Resolution 401).

26. To supplement circular No. 19 by specifically prohibiting both medical and dental employees of the VA from holding any elective or appointive office in the American Medical Association or Dental Association (Resolution 405).

27. To provide sufficient funds with which the VA may and shall put to work an adequate staff of experts, especially nonmedical specialists experienced in industry, whose job it shall be to develop a more satisfactory, comprehensive and realistic disability rating schedule (Resolution 409).

28. Urging the VA to institute a change in procedure in their present training program of doctors so that as a result of such a change those physicians receiving specialized instructions will be required to serve at least 2 years in VA hospitals in part payment for training received at VA expense (Resolution 418).

29. Opposing consolidation of VA regional offices (Resolution 426).

30. Requesting the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish the director of national rehabilitation service, VFW, quarterly, a report on the results of the general review of disability claims, containing the following items: (1) Number of cases reviewed; (2) number of physical examinations ordered; (3) number of claims confirmed and continued; (4) number of claims wherein there was an increase or decrease in disability benefits; (5) number of service connections severed; and, (6) number of cases wherein disability benefits were terminated, according to the respective regional office jurisdictions (Resolution 434).

Charley Beneman, Newspaper Man, Makes His Last Deadline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an item taken from Army Times regarding the recent death of Charley Beneman, an associate editor for that publication:

THIRTY

(By Les Honeycutt)

Charley Beneman would have yelled long and loud about being put to rest on deadline day.

Charley was a newspaperman, accustomed to making deadlines. He died last Saturday and was buried this Tuesday, our deadline day. The pain that was his partner could make Charley miss a deadline only by putting him flat on his back. Otherwise Charley would—and did—get to his desk. This week he did not make it.

For the record, Charles H. Beneman, 35, was an associate editor of Army Times since the Washington Times-Herald was purchased by the Washington Post 18 month ago. At the Herald, he was known as Charles Henry Beneman. He made sure the name Charles Henry did not stick when he came with us.

"Charley's the name here," he emphatically told other ex-Herald staffers who came to work with us. But except for the modification in surname and middle name, Charley had not changed.

Afflicted by pain as he was, Charley was still a hustler; a newspaperman who edited sometimes-rough copy into a flowing, vivid picture that told a story better than any halftone could; an imaginative makeup and picture editor; above all, a man who worried more about other people's pains than he did his own.

And his own pains were beauts. In honesty, he didn't always smile through them. But he never quit. Witness a week ago Tuesday:

Charley called in and said he'd be a little late. He was hurting. But it was deadline day and the hurt couldn't keep him from coming in to make up our front page and worry whether we had enough space for page one story jumps. He came in and finished the job. And then apologized that he didn't feel up to sticking around any longer.

It was his last day in the office. We visited him a few days later when the doctor gave the go-ahead signal. His first words: "I'm sorry to put you to this extra trouble. I wish there was something I could do." He spoke of a friend of his—a woman who was momentarily expecting a baby. "I hope her labor pains aren't too severe."

He was being fed intravenously when he said it.

Well, Charley won't be at his desk across from us anymore eating his prized cheesecake with morning coffee that had to be steaming hot; he won't be talking about the Cincinnati Reds, a baseball team he adopted many years ago even though he never got close to the city, but they were underdogs, Charley's friends; he won't be challenging reporters to start writing English, and then telling them how to; he won't be calling our stockroom for the 1956 calendars which, it turned out, he didn't need because his time was up; he won't be sympathizing with others whose temporary miseries were mere colds or hangovers, while the perpetual knife in his cutup stomach was slashing everything to pieces except his heart; he won't be doing any of these things.

But, even after a replacement is at his desk, that littered piece of mahogany will stand as a monument to him.

Things won't be the same down here without him.

Operation Canned Goods Huge Success at Alameda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the employees at the Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif., are always looking for the opportunity of serving the less fortunate.

They have done it again.

While most people were too stunned to recognize the plight of the Christmas flood victims the NAS group had gone into action.

The best way to tell the story is to make available to you the article that appeared in the January issue of the Bulletin, organ of the Naval Air Station Association edited by Jack Griffith.

OPERATION CANNED GOODS HUGE SUCCESS AT ALAMEDA

(By Betty Godzinski)

You load 10½ tons and what do you get? Well, in this case you get the warm feeling of knowing that you did something more constructive than just expressing sympathy for the plight of the Christmas week flood victims. You sent them 10½ tons of canned goods to prove that you cared. NAS Alameda's canned foods drive, sponsored by the Naval Air Station Association, was spontaneous but notable for its enthusiasm, efficiency, and dispatch.

It all began on Tuesday morning when everyone had returned from the New Year weekend. "Joe," said Art Thurston, "what do you think of the idea of the association sponsoring a canned foods drive on the station for the flood victims?"

Joseph Manfre was all for it. "Sounds like a good idea to me," he said. "Let's get on with it." President Thurston then telephoned Mr. Harold LaJeunesse to get the approval of the station command. In less time than it takes to tell it, the green light was given.

Things happened fast after that. After obtaining Captain French's approval of the project, board meetings were called and the motion passed. Details of the drive were ironed out quickly and efficiently by people who knew that the hungry cannot wait. By quitting time that afternoon, thousands of pamphlets announcing the drive had been

handed out to both civilian and military personnel urging all hands to participate. On Wednesday large bins to hold the food were set up at strategic spots all over the station and further plans were made for the Salvation Army to accept the food for distribution in the Yuba City-Marysville area. Thursday morning the food started to pour in and the contributions were collected and packed. Shortly before noon on Friday, the 16 flats piled high with cartons of food were formally accepted for the Salvation Army's distribution by Senior Capt. Lawrence R. Smith, secretary of the northern California and Nevada division. By 3 o'clock Friday afternoon all the food was in Marysville ready for distribution. Even for an organization which never has believed in letting grass grow under its feet, that was fast moving.

For a little while on Friday it looked like the shipment might be delayed because the planes which the Salvation Army had at its disposal were busy flying bedding to the flood areas and could not take the food that day. Then Comdr. R. C. Corlett, who was acting commanding officer of the station, assigned two Navy cargo planes to fly the food so that it was a station project from start to finish. It was an operation shared by both civilian and military personnel and the cooperation of everyone was outstanding and heartwarming.

Senior Captain Smith was very pleased at the amount of food contributed. He said that it was quite evident that such response could only come from the hearts of those deeply concerned with the sufferings of others. Since food was a high priority item it would be distributed immediately. Just that morning Captain Smith received word from Marysville that the Salvation Army had to buy canned peas and corn to feed the people so our gift could not have come at a more opportune time. The food was distributed in several ways. In Marysville there is a swank night club which, in happier times, was filled with music and laughter. Now it is filled with mothers trying to soothe hungry, frightened children and old people bewildered by the terrible torrents which have swept away the homes of a lifetime. Here the Salvation Army has set up a kitchen for mass feeding. To those who have some means of cooking for themselves, food parcels will be issued. One thing is certain; the food went directly from its source to its destination and when we sat down to our own dinners on Friday night we knew that some of the food which we had contributed only that morning was being served in Marysville that night.

No Iron Britches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, every so often in the voluminous mail which we receive we find a letter which in its content and expression warms the cockles of our heart.

Today we have heard prolonged debate on the new mechanical stamp-vending machine which is equipped to express thanks to those making use of it.

It seems to me that much of the debate which we heard is set forth succinctly and with appropriate seriousness in the letter from a constituent which reads as follows:

DEAR GOVERNMENT: I've read and heard about the proposed $4,000 robot stamp sales thing, which promises to say "thank you."

Need I say, Government, that the idea leaves me cold, unless the gadget may be rigged to tip its silly top and add, "Sir," "Madam," "Miss," or "buster," as the case may be, to its vocabulary.

I am unable to imagine myself hipping about, all titillated because a machine spoofed me, nor can I visualize people making polite replies to an iron smart-aleck.

For 4-cent first-class postage, I vote "yes," if needed to defeat deficit, but for mechanical amenities to glorify a deficit—Omigosh.

I still love you, Government, so long as you are Republican, and I'll not despise you when and if you become mildly Democratic, but iron britches and iron curtains supply no need so far as I know.

Respectfully,

EDWIN BARGER.

A Little Patience Is Needed Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the January 9 issue of the Fairfield (Iowa) Daily Ledger suggests the exercise of patience in solving the matter of farm surpluses. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues who would expect miracles in the change from a wartime economy to production for peacetime needs. Progress is being made in the working out this problem and certainly patience will be rewarded through the sound program designed to reduce the surpluses still further.

The editorial is as follows:

A LITTLE PATIENCE IS NEEDED HERE

Administration leaders say that in the last year and a half they have moved five and a half times as much of the surplus crops from Government warehouses as had been moved in a similar period by the previous administration.

The announcement of the fact seems to indicate that the farm policy is going to be built around reducing the surpluses rather than increasing subsidies which would only pyramid them.

It is our guess that the soil-bank plan will be adopted in some form. But it will go farther than that. It is rather clear that Secretary Benson is warming up to the plan suggested by Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation of paying farmers rental for land that is put into soil building crops. But, more important, he is insisting that it be tied to some plan to use up the surplus now in Government warehouses.

The plan which was first suggested by Dave Livington of Washington, Iowa, of paying farmers in stored grains at a reduced price is gaining a lot of acceptance in administration circles. However, we suspect that many farmers will regard this as too slow, even though they may admit that it is sound.

We've been living in a world where every individual with a problem has been looking to the Government to solve it for him before sunrise day after tomorrow. There's not much disposition to work our way out of difficulties. A little patience and more general acceptance of the principle that what's good for all is good for each would help.

State of the Nation—January 1956 and the Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I herewith call to your attention and that of all the distinguished Members of this legislative body a front-page article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, February 3, 1956, by the distinguished correspondent Joseph C. Harsch.

It follows:

STATE OF THE NATION—JANUARY 1956 AND THE DEMOCRATS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

The month of January was a cold and bleak one for the Democratic Party of the United States.

The Democrats had expected some poaching on their old New Deal preserves.

They had not expected what actually happened.

When the various proposals President Eisenhower sent to the Congress during the fabulous month of January are added up they total an Eisenhower-proposed legislative program for election year 1956 which gets into almost all the areas of the Truman-proposed legislative program of 1948.

Here are the items of similarity:

1. In 1948 President Truman proposed new laws to halt rising prices. In January of this year Mr. Eisenhower raised the subject of standby controls over installment credit for the purpose of keeping prices from rising.

2. In 1948 Mr. Truman proposed a Federal health program. In January Mr. Eisenhower proposed expanded action in the field of Federal health.

3. In 1948 Mr. Truman proposed new Federal aid to education. In January Mr. Eisenhower proposed extended Federal aid for school construction.

4. In 1948 Mr. Truman proposed new civil-rights legislation. In January Mr. Eisenhower proposed an investigation into alleged denials of civil rights.

5. In 1948 Mr. Truman proposed an increase in the minimum wage. Mr. Eisenhower proposed an increase last year, and Congress acted upon it.

6. In 1948 Mr. Truman proposed a revision of the immigration laws. This is a standing Eisenhower proposal, repeated in January.

7. In 1948 Mr. Truman favored extension of Federal grain-storage facilities—the thing the farmers thought they needed most at that time. In January Mr. Eisenhower proposed a list of various benefits for farmers.

These are the overlaps of the Truman 1948 and Eisenhower 1956 programs. There is, of course, a vitally important difference of degree. The areas coincide. The programs, for the most part, do not.

There is only one item on the 1948 Truman list which does not appear on the current Eisenhower list. That is housing. In 1948 Mr. Truman wanted Federal housing aid to overcome what he called the housing crisis. This January Mr. Eisenhower proposed a slowdown in the housing program as a protection against inflation. In the meantime, of course, there has ceased to be what could be called a housing crisis.

In 1948 the Truman proposals were tossed into a special session of the Congress, summoned after the conventions, which, of course, refused to act on them and adjourned. Mr. Truman stumped the country

on this issue of nonperformance by the Congress, and won the election.

Mr. Eisenhower has sent his proposals to the Congress in January of election year, giving it plenty of time to act and supporting the proposals by a budget which would provide more money for these projects than was allocated to them under the last Truman budget. The Republican candidate this year may well be able to run on enactment of many of the Eisenhower proposals.

The sum total of all this is what the Democratic Party strategists had not anticipated. They knew that some of the old Truman program areas would be expropriated by the Republicans of 1956, but they never anticipated that all of them (except for the obsolete housing issue) would be taken over.

What the Democrats are to do about it is not an easy question for them to answer. They can't be "against" projects which have been Democratic stock in trade for nearly 8 years. The Stevensonians are so committed to a middle-road program in the image of Eisenhower that they dare not try to move further to the left.

In effect, the leading Democratic candidate, Adlai E. Stevenson, appears to have little choice except to promise to carry out something like the Eisenhower program—more efficiently and more effectively than Republicans can carry it out.

Of course, in both parties the extreme positions are open for exploitation. There are Democrats to both left and right of Stevenson, just as there are Republicans to both left and right of Eisenhower (although more to right than to left). But the professional politicians doubt that there is much profitable picking to be done in those far areas when the majority of the voters appear to be fairly contented with things as they are.

More and more, it looks as though Mr. Stevenson and the still-unnamed Republican candidate will vie with each other over who can best execute programs in agreed areas of concern.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the following editorial that appeared in the New York Journal-American of February 3, 1956. It accurately portrays the sentiments of the majority of Americans:

POSTAL RATES

The disposition of the Congress, as interpreted by Chairman TOM MURRAY of the Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives, is to reject a proposed increase in postal rates.

We think this would clearly and properly serve the public interest in the matter.

It is true that President Eisenhower drew his recent picture of a balanced Federal budget largely on the presumption that Congress would go along with his recommendation for higher postal rates.

It would now appear that the presumption was not soundly based, and the same thing goes in some degree for the recommendation.

The idea that the postal service must of necessity be rendered at a profit does not fit any part of the pattern of our national experience. It makes its real and better profits in other vital ways. One of the reasons, and a very big one, that America has been progressive and prosperous to a degree without precedent in the history of the world is that the postal service draws the far corners of the country together swiftly, accurately and at small cost.

This has put life into the vast resources of the nation for information and instruction. It has put energy and sinew into business and industry. It has quickened the whole pace of our national life. If it is a subsidy, it has been in the good interests of all the people.

Imports of Frozen Tuna From Abroad Threaten Domestic Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a most timely article by one of my constituents, Mr. Charles F. A. Mann, was published in the February issue of the magazine Diesel Progress. The article points up the tremendous damage done to the American industry by the increasing imports of frozen tuna from abroad. It shows the need for immediate remedial action by Congress.

The article follows:

DIESEL AND EQUIPMENT INDUSTRY FACE LARGE LOSS IN MARINE SALES UNLESS EXISTING FISH IMPORT SITUATION CORRECTED

(By Chas. F. A. Mann)

Due to the strange workings of our foreign policy laid down after the end of World War II, one of the unique shipbuilding industries of the United States faces virtual extinction. The Pudget Sound yards, particularly the highly specialized wood and diesel yards at Tacoma, that have turned out in the past 15 years nearly 1,000 ships of every size from the smallest landing craft and midget minesweepers, to trollers, purse seiners, the largest and most complex tuna clippers ever built, and lastly the largest fleet of nonmagnetic minesweepers ever built in one city, $34 million worth, face a crisis due to the Department of State's insistence we lean over backward and give North Pacific Ocean fisheries over to Japan and let them dump their frozen whole fish into our west coast canneries by the boatload.

In a nutshell, to placate Japan and keep them leaning in the proper direction at the conference table, the huge Pacific coast fisheries centered at Los Angeles, San Diego, the Columbia River, and Puget Sound, are being squeezed out of existence. The past year wound up with about 70 percent of the total poundage of all species of tuna used by southern California canneries coming from Japan in the form of frozen whole fish by the boatload. This, despite the fact that the tuna clipper fleet has spent a year of limping production, with weeks' and months' delays at the docks waiting to be unloaded; four price cuts for the raw frozen fish, and frantic efforts to alarm the Eisenhower Government that the huge investment of tuna clippers, the large payroll of fishermen, and the financial structure under which these $350,000 clippers are put together deteriorates daily.

And no new tuna clipper construction in Tacoma yards, long the major building center for the southern California fleet, for the past 4 years. The whole tuna fleet is aging rapidly; no new construction and normal losses by accidents and retirements is causing a steady shrinkage. Tacoma at the peak prior to World War II's ending, had 11 boatyards employing around 800 of the highest skilled shipbuilders in the Nation. Today there are 4 yards in active operation with a force of 350 skilled workers, which faces further reduction to 150 within the next 4 months unless their major peacetime customer, the fishing industry, can be gotten back on its feet.

To make matters worse, the tuna fisheries are not the only branch of the fishing industry that sustained the wood and diesel yards. The same attitude toward throwing open the Pacific fishing industry to Japan, with its low labor costs and huge army of eager fishermen, has also struck the once vast north Pacific salmon industry square in the face. Japan, with huge fleets of mother ships and smaller net boats, is roaming the whole North Pacific Ocean, as far as the Gulf of Alaska, and a great drop in all salmon runs in western Alaska streams has suddenly taken place, with the inevitable result in great losses to the trollers and purse seiner fleets, and consequent vanishing of this branch of work for the boatyards, and reduction in the market for diesels and equipment.

Because of the peculiar and potent tie between the Tacoma boatyards which have turned out the majority of the southern California tuna clipper ships, and the California tuna industry, and the fact that a great many of the California clippers are owned in part or totally by Tacomans, the coastwise aspect of the case, coupled with the great financial ramifications involved, have already alerted Congress, and several hearings of its committees have been held last fall and winter, to lay down the policies necessary to give speedy relief to this situation. Never before in west coast history has competition of foreign raw fish been the cause of a situation that prevails today. Excerpts from the testimony given by the American Tuna Boat Association before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearing in November tell the glaring realities that bring on this crisis:

1. In 1948 approximately 9 million pounds of frozen tuna were imported from Japan. In 1955 it will almost hit 170 million pounds or more than 70 percent of all tuna canned in southern California canneries.

The domestic tuna fishing industry cannot exist one more season on a mere 30 percent of the total raw fish market.

2. These figures are more striking in the face of an actual decline in imports of Japanese canned tuna that bypasses American canneries as well as American tuna fishermen.

3. The picture grows more complex when one considers the tremendous annual increase in canned tuna consumption by the United States market. The present rate of growth indicates that if all Japanese tuna, both canned and frozen raw for processing in California plants were stopped, the wood aid diesel shipbuilding industry would have to construct over 100 giant-size clippers with from 3 to 6 diesel engines each, and costing an average of $400,000 a piece at today's market prices for materials, equipment, and labor—just to catch up with delayed replacements and added capacity of the fleet to produce raw fish enough to supply today's high and constantly rising demand for canned tuna products.

4. Employment in the tuna fleet is down to an even 2,000. When one considers that the average annual income of every tuna fisherman and officer, under the complex share system, exceeds $12,000 per man, the magnitude of the effect on the economy of the west coast grows more striking.

5. Profits on sales of American-caught tuna are down to one-tenth of what they were in 1948. So they buy no new diesels or no new ships.

Basically it is a simple question of our do-good global foreign policy already wrecking

one of America's and the world's unique and highly mechanized industries. All it takes is a drastic percentage limit on imports of Japanese frozen tuna—a limit to the gross annual consumption in the United States of America that can be imported from Japan or anywhere else, on a fixed percentage basis, so our own complex tuna fisheries and shipbuilding industry can survive and maintain its pool of skilled talent, the finest on earth, and the outlets for the fantastic line of equipment and engines it uses, open.

Forty million dollars worth of shipyard and equipment orders can go on the books in 90 days if Congress will shut off Japanese raw-tuna imports. Another $15 million of the same type of shipyards orders will go on the books in 4 months if Japanese fisheries are pushed back 700 miles from the Alaska coastal waters. Meanwhile, the Tacoma Shipyard Association, the solid core of the building industry of the Northwest, has banded together and launched a campaign to alert all components of the complex fishing, shipyard, diesel engine and equipment industries to unite and tell Congress this month they will not sit idly by and let international politics ruin a great industry with national ramifications in 300 industries, besides the basic shipyard and fishermen's own payrolls which have helped build the whole west coast.

Here is a call to the diesel and allied industries to save a portion of its great market by direct appeal to every Congressman and Senator.

It Is Necessary to Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Messrs. Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 5, 1956. In it is described a recent talk with Dr. Arnhost Heidrich, former Secretary General of the Czech Foreign Office:

IT IS NECESSARY TO HOPE

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In the Eisenhower-Eden joint declaration there is a single reference to the "hundred million people in what were once 10 independent nations" who are "compelled to work for the glorification of the Soviet Communist State." But the reference is purely formal. No one thinks any more that any serious attempt will be made to loosen the Soviet grip on the satellite states. Even so, it may be worth describing a recent talk with Dr. Arnhost Heidrich, former Secretary General of the Czech Foreign Office. One of these reporters first interviewed Dr. Heidrich in the gilded Czernin Palace, in Prague, in the spring of 1948, a few weeks after the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia. The interview was a memorable one. Dr. Heidrich was quite astonishingly frank, warning the reporter that the Soviet appetite would by no means be satisfied with Czechoslovakia. Then, toward the end, he turned the interview around. Would there soon be war between the Soviet Union and the United States? The reporter replied that he thought not—a long period of armed tension seemed more likely.

"Then," said Dr. Heidrich, "there is nothing left. I must escape."

Escape he did. He now lives, with his wife (who escaped also) in a small house in the Washington suburbs, where he leads the strange dusty life of a political refugee. Perhaps once or twice a year, Dr. Heidrich and the reporter who interviewed him in the Czernin Palace meet again to chat about the world. It is always a rewarding experience, since Dr. Heidrich has a remarkable insight into the world situation. But it is also, somehow, rather sad.

Dr. Heidrich, a chunky, stout man with an odd resemblance to the late W. C. Fields, tends to judge the present by the past. He often reverts to the time when he went to Moscow with the Czech delegation which was brusquely warned by Stalin against joining the Marshall plan. As secretary of the delegation, Dr. Heidrich took notes of the conversation in the Kremlin. He recalls how, in a moment of expansiveness after delivering his ultimatum, Stalin told the cowed Czechs a good deal about his plans for the world.

"Our first task," Stalin said to the Czechs, "is to tear down the power positions of the United States, both in Europe and Asia. Once this is done, England and France will be too weak to resist the pressure."

Dr. Heidrich is convinced that the Soviets have never wavered an inch from their purpose of dominating all Europe and Asia, however much their methods may have changed. He sees last summer's summit conference at Geneva as just another means to the same end.

"Geneva—a catastrophe, a disaster," he says, with a sharp, chopping gesture of both arms. "Every year they gain something, but now is much worse. Before, you had something. They feared your bombs. But now, nothing. They know since Geneva you will not use your bombs. They have nothing to fear."

He pauses a moment, placing his fingers together in a judicial gesture.

"Always before I am wondering, how can the West win this cold war? So many advantages on the Soviet side. Flexible. They decide—they act. No public opinion. If the people must sacrifice, the people sacrifice. But at least they were afraid of you, and now no longer. Now I do not see at all how the cold war can be won."

How about the "liberation" policy for winning the cold war, about which so much was heard in 1952? Dr. Heidrich smiles thinly, and picks his words carefully. "Mr. Dulles has said that the time will come when Soviets realize control of satellites is more anxious than advantageous. I am very pessimistic. Skeptical." But, he adds quickly, the President's Christmas message to the satellite people was good. "People who live under such conditions are always happy to have occasion to hope."

Yet, surely by now, the more intelligent Czechs must realize that Czechoslovakia will not be freed? Dr. Heidrich's short arms fall heavily into his lap, and for the first time his round, oddly merry face looks drained and old. He shrugs again. "To live it is necessary to hope," he says. Then he gets heavily to his feet, says farewell with elaborate courtesy, and starts off on the long walk to the small house where his wife bakes delicious little cakes, and where hope lives stubbornly and illogically on.

Imports of Frozen Tuna Threaten Domestic Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Diesel Progress carries some striking figures relative to imports of frozen tuna and the impact thereof upon domestic industry. These imports have done great damage to American fishing and shipbuilding industries, and threaten to destroy important segments of them. I place these figures in the RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress:

ONE OF AMERICA'S UNIQUE INDUSTRIES FACES DESTRUCTION—UNLIMITED IMPORTS OF FROZEN TUNA HAS STOPPED TUNA CLIPPER CONSTRUCTION, IDLED THE GREAT PACIFIC TUNA FLEET AND STOPPED PURCHASES FROM 300 SUPPLIERS SCATTERED OVER ALL PARTS OF THE NATION

HERE ARE THE FACTS

1. Imports of frozen tuna: 1948, 9,143,000 pounds; 1955, 172 million pounds.

2. Percentage of United States consumption imported: 1948, 2.8; 1955, 72.4.

3. Imports of canned tuna: 1948, 8,302,000 pounds; 1955, 32,162,400 pounds.

4. Domestic producers' share of the United States market: 1948, 91.4; 1955, 46.1.

5. Index of fishermen's earnings: 1948, 100; 1955, 60.

6. Index of prices paid for fish to American producers: 1948, 100; 1955, 69.4.

7. Index of profit on sales to processors: 1948, 100; 1955, minus 44.2.

8. Decline in the bait boat fleet: 1952, 210 vessels; 1955, 165 vessels, a decline of 21 percent and 14 percent in capacity in just 3 years.

9. Japanese high seas tuna fleet: 1951, 272 vessels; 1955, 436 vessels, an increase of 60 percent and 151 percent in capacity in just 4 years.

10. Only four United States tuna clippers commissioned from 1953–55.

A GRIM PICTURE FOR A GREAT INDUSTRY

With per-vessel production off 30 percent; our share of the market down to less than 50 percent of consumption; vessel employment down 20 percent; share earnings down 40 percent and profits changed to losses.

Imports of tuna are up 1,300 percent and the foreign share of our market is now past 50 percent. All while consumption of tuna in the United States of America has grown rapidly.

The great Pacific fleet, the most efficient and highly mechanized fishing vessels ever created, involves not only the operating and owning personnel, all of whom work on shares, but the north Pacific shipyards that produce these magnificent diesel ships; diesel engine builders and supply and equipment industries scattered in 35 States all face a total loss of their great market in the fishing industry.

Immediate action by Congress and the administration is necessary to save the industry from ruin.

Ills of the tuna industry are already pressing hard on the great salmon, crab, halibut, and herring fisheries of the Nation.

Farmers Reply to the Question, Will Soil Bank Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, this House voted by a substantial majority last year to discontinue the sliding scale of parity price supports and return to 90 percent on the basic commodities. Had the Senate taken similar action, much of the suffering and loss of income on the farms of this country that has taken place during the past year would have been avoided. It is to be hoped that when the Agricultural Committee of the Senate reports out the measure it is presently considering, they will concur with the action the House took last year.

The soil-bank plan proposed by this administration, if taken in conjunction with 90-percent price supports for our basic commodities, with a production payment covering meat, milk, eggs, poultry, fruit, and vegetables equal to the difference between the price at which these commodities sell on the market and 90 percent of parity, this difference to be determined by the Department of Agriculture, such a program would relieve the agricultural situation and put the farming industry back again on its feet. The farmer has always demonstrated that he was willing to accept production controls, if it would give him an income that would permit him to meet his fixed overhead, and have enough left over to feed, clothe, and educate his family. The vote last year on wheat-acreage allotments demonstrated that fact quite clearly. No matter what such a program costs, it will be cheap compared to what will happen if this situation is permitted to continue until it breeds a depression such as we had in the early thirties.

The American farmer is honest, industrious, and patriotic. He has always answered the call of his country when he was asked to produce food and more food. He was told not so long ago that food would win the war and that it would also write the peace. At his country's call, he expanded his production and although his sons were drafted into the army; with the aid of his wife and daughters, he kept the food and fiber coming in from the American farms in the volume required to feed and clothe our military forces, our factory workers and our allies, who were engaged in the conflict.

When the war had been won and the peace had been written, the farmer received no reconversion payment such as industry received; no depletion allowance of 27½ percent as has been allowed and is still being allowed the oil, gas and mining industry. But he was told by those whose duty it was to protect him that he "had been living in a dream world" and that nobody expected it to last. Someone in the Department of Agriculture, over the signature of Secretary Benson, wrote a letter praising a magazine article that branded the farmer as an undesirable citizen and compared him to a hog with its jowls in a trough. If accepting a Government subsidy brands the farmer as a hog, then business and transportation should share the disgrace along with him, because for every subsidy dollar the farmer has received, business and transportation has received 39 subsidy dollars during the same period.

The farmer has always fed and clothed this Nation better than any nation was ever fed and clothed in the history of the world; and the only charge brought against the farmer today is that he is doing his job just a little too well.

Industry and business responded nobly to its country's call, producing the steel and the armament that their country needed. But check the difference in the way this country rewarded the patriotism shown by industry and the way it has rewarded the same patriotism evidenced by the American farmer. It is true that between October 17, 1933 and November 30, 1953, the Federal Government has taken up a tab for losses on agricultural products amounting to $1,194,800,000. But during that same period, the Government picked up a tab for business in reconversion payments amounting to $40,787,864,000; with subsidies to shipping and airlines amounting to $5 billion more. So it is evident from these figures that business, transportation, and industry received 39 times the amount in post-war adjustment than has gone to agriculture. These figures are taken from Government Subsidy Historical Review, under date of June 3, 1954, obtainable from the House Committee on Agriculture. The foreword is written by the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, who was chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture at the time these figures were compiled.

There is no valid reason why the farmers of the United States should not be paid parity prices for the food and fiber that feeds and clothes this Nation. Every other segment of our industry is receiving cost of production, plus a profit—a profit that is sometimes more than a reasonable profit. It would be to the interest of the entire economy to have a prosperous agriculture in this Nation.

The farmer is not only a producer, he is a consumer; and the best market in the world today for the products of American business and industry; and why anyone would seek to force him to accept the role of an inferior citizen is beyond my comprehension.

I am appending hereto, statements by a number of farmers in my home State which will give the reader an idea how farmers in Missouri feel about the present plight of the American farmer, and what they think should be done about it. These men are good, solid, reasonsible farmers and are good citizens. They are not radicals by any stretch of the imagination. I hope my colleagues will read their views on this situation. I think we can all do so with profit to ourselves and our country.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that regardless of what the farm program turns out to be, unless we have 90 percent of parity price supports for all farm products, the program, however good it might otherwise be, will fail to correct this situation. Prices are of the utmost importance.

Four hundred thousand farmers have already been forced off of their farms. The need is imperative and must be met now, not in 1957 or 1958, but now, or thousands more will share the same fate before 1956 becomes history.

The statements referred to follow:

FARMERS' REPLY TO THE QUESTION: WILL SOIL BANK WORK?

Last month we ran results on a questionnaire sent out to a number of farmers. It created so much interest that we include here the results and comments of a second such survey. The 19 questions listed below all pertain to the soil-bank plan. They were sent to about 150 farmers. Returns were amazing. The fact that most every set of questions was returned, gave evidence that farmers were fully aware of the much ado about farm affairs. Their answers also indicated that they are considerably more alert on the problems of low agricultural income than some given them credit for. Below is a sample questionnaire with a tabulation of the answers.

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Should soil bank be voluntary? Voluntary, 68; compulsory, 18.

2. Should grazing be allowed of acres diverted to soil bank? Yes, 39; no, 46.

3. Should farmers be allowed to harvest grass seed from acres diverted to soil bank? Yes, 42; no, 43.

4. Should farmers be allowed to harvest hay crop from acres diverted to soil bank? Yes, 31; no, 54.

5. Should farmers be required to mow acres diverted to soil bank? Yes, 48; no, 32.

6. Should farmers spend all the money received from Government under soil bank agreement on soil building practices on these diverted acres? Yes, 11; no, 71.

7. In normal years approximately half a million acres of Missouri cropland lies idle. Should these acres be included among those receiving payment under the soil-bank proposals? Yes, 22; no, 64.

8. Some farmers feel that they need more acres to profitably utilize their machinery and time. Do you have acres that you can afford to keep out of production? Yes, 38; no, 48.

9. Have you acres that you would plant in grass under such an agreement? Yes, 58; no, 24.

10. Have you acres that you would plant in trees under such a proposal? Yes, 8; no, 81.

11. In your opinion what would be desirable number of years for duration of such soil-bank agreements with farmers? Thirty-four answered 3 years and under; 34 answered 5 years; 6 answered 10 years; 1 answered 10 to 15 years.

12. Should soil-bank proposal include your best land? Yes, 3. Your poorest land? Yes, 23. Both? Yes, 59.

13. Should a limit be placed on the number of acres farmers could lease to Government? For example a farmer might desire to lease his entire farm to Government. Favor limit, 50; no limit, 37.

14. You have fixed costs such as interest, insurance, taxes, etc. What, in your opinion, would be a fair payment per acre for keeping cropland idle under a soil-bank agreement? Twenty-eight answered $15 per

acre of cropland or less; 11 answered $16 to $26 per acre of cropland; 26 answered $26 to $35 per acre of cropland; and 7 answered $35 to $100 per acre of cropland.

15. Do you consider the soil-bank proposals as a farm program with the idea of the Government leasing enough land to cut production to the point that farm prices will rise as a result of farm commodities becoming scarce on the market (yes, 18), or do you consider it merely as a conservation measure that is only a part of an overall farm program? Yes, 56. Both? Yes, 7.

16. How much would the Government be required to pay you per acre before you would be willing to lease them your entire farm? Eight answered $10 per acre or less; 26 answered $11 to $25 per acre; 19 answered $25 to $40 per acre; 16 answered $40 to $100 per acre.

17. In your opinion, will the soil-bank payments be adequate to compensate for low prices farm commodities are bringing at the market? Yes, 11; no, 75.

18. Do you feel that the soil bank is the answer to the farm problem? Yes, 10; no, 72; partially, 7.

19. You do not know exactly what type of a soil-bank proposal will be considered by the next Congress. In view of what you do know about the soil-bank proposals, how do you think it would fit into your own personal farm operation? Fill in oyur remarks in the space below.

Included are typical answers to this question.

Phil M. Smith, Williamsburg, former State director of the PMA, stated: "Don't think the soil-bank plan will answer the farmers problem. Most family-size farms need every acre of their productive land now to make a living and won't be interested in renting any good land to the Government. Plenty of marginal land can be rented but that will not cut production or be much of a soil-conservation measure. The soil-bank plan will not fit my personal farm operation. On 640-acre farm I have 320 acres of cropland and need it all to furnish feed for my livestock. From past experience would say that the soil-bank plan is impossible to administer so it will achieve the desired results."

Senator George Spencer, of Columbia, chairman of the Missouri Senate Agriculture Committee, asks, "How is a reduction in grain acreage going to help hog and beef cattle prices?" Senator Spencer pointed out that the soil-bank prospects have not increased grain-future prices.

Lawrence Laney, Pleasant Hope, has a dairy and poultry farm. He explained: "I doubt if it would help me as I buy more grain than I produce. I do think it would help the grain farmer if enough acres are taken out of production. It could hurt the dairy farmer if idle acres are allowed to be grazed or mowed for hay."

AVERAGE PAYMENT TOO SMALL

Frank Rea, of Branson, raises beef cattle and hogs. He remarked: "I think the soil bank would have very little direct effect on my operation as I pasture my entire acreage. If the acres diverted to grass are pastured and hay mowed off them, there would be a tendency to increase cattle numbers. If $750 million was the annual cost of the soil bank and each of 6 million farmers took part, the average would be $125, a magnificent sum for the easing of the price squeeze we are getting now. Even two or three billion dollars were put into it, the average payment to each farm would be too small to be of material assistance in itself. If the reduced production resulted in something near a shortage, then the increased price for the smaller production might materially increase the farm income. A big enough drought might do the same thing, and if both came together, some people might long for some surplus."

State Senator James P. Kelly, of Trenton, writes: "My own operation is mostly grass so it wouldn't be of much help to me personally. If it works, or is to work, it must be considered only a segment of a many-sided operation."

Raymond Roberts, Moberly, said, "I would be in favor of a try for any program that would tend to bring the production and demand into closer balance. I believe that there would be a better chance of the soil-bank proposal doing permanent good if the payments were made in surplus commodities instead of cash."

W. F. and Donald E. Rages, of Smithton, are partners. Donald said, "I don't think any such plan will be adequate to alleviate the present plight of the average farmer caught in a 'vicious high cost-low farm price-squeeze.' It seems to me that any farm leader, farm organization, or Agriculture Department official advocating the soil-bank plan as the solution to the present farm problem is either unacquainted with the situation as it exists and affects the average farmer or is completely indifferent to the welfare of the farmer and to the welfare of the whole American agricultural economic structure."

LOOK TO THE BIBLE

Dalton Brown, of Walnut Grove, believes something must be done to check surplus and to rest and save soils. He said, "I believe the farm plan as found in Leviticus, chapter 25, verses 1 through 7, would be the solution to the surplus problem." This is the Bible story where the Lord told Moses that for 6 years they should sow their fields, prune their vineyard, and gather in the fruit but during the seventh year they should rest the land.

Leslie L. West, of Elvins, comments, "I don't believe the soil-bank plan will work to much of an advantage on smaller farms. It may work on farms of several acres. Farmers will have to have 100 percent parity on livestock as well as crops to operate and stay in business."

Jim H. Witten, Trenton, remarks, "I am against governmental controls in general. However, the farm-price situation being what it is, will draw a farm program of some sort out of Washington. I think the soil-bank plan would have less controls attached to it than any other program."

FIRST NEED IS FAIR PRICE

Paul S. Schenk, Memphis, said: "What the farmer needs is a fair price for his products to enable him to carry on his own soil bank. To demand this price it appears we must accept some sort of production control. What in agricultural vocabulary is termed 'surplus' in industry and defense is termed 'stock piling'."

Edwin Brunner of Argyle explained, "It would help the big farmer and not the little farmer."

HOW WILL SMALL FARM EXIST?

Cyrus Crowder, of Sweet Springs, writes: "I could use a few acres in permanent grass but no trees. I have enough trouble with brush now. What I want to know is: How is the acreage going to be based? If it is on crop acres, how is the small farmer going to exist? I don't believe in cutting a small farm to where farmer must have another income to live decently."

Virgil Hitt, Greenwood, remarks, "I think now is the time to take some of it (land) out of production."

T. C. Howard, Elsberry, said: "I think the soil bank program is a fine thing for the future generations." He explains that what is needed now is a plan where we can live, pay taxes, and interest, and plan for the future.

Hilton Bracey, Portageville, writes: "This is the silliest proposal to come up in recent history—but we will probably get it anyway."

Forrest T. Lilley, Elsberry, is a livestock and grain farmer. He remarked: "The soil bank might replace the tenant farmer. One hundred percent of a Government payment might well be more attractive (to landlords) than 50 percent of a crop and the risks involved. The basic need in Missouri is for help for the livestock producer."

J. Roy Jeffress, Shakelford, comments: "The farmer needs help now, not next year. The young farmer could be out by that time."

L. W. DeMoss, Louisiana, explained, "I think soil bank O. K. for long-range program but farmers are in need of something to bring in cash immediately to prevent bankruptcy."

NO HOPE FOR REAL SOLUTION

Morris Horn, Labadie, writes, "What we are concerned about now is how we can get enough for our production to meet current expenses and keep from losing a life's work. It's the price of hogs, cattle, eggs, and cream that we are worried about. It seems to us that Benson and company should have been more concerned about prices farmers were getting, instead of accusing far-thinking farm leaders of being 'prophets of doom and gloom' when these leaders were pointing out the fact we were headed for trouble; instead of talking about the 'mess' they had inherited; instead of telling the farmer he was 'pricing himself out of the market.' Had they wholeheartedly supported and administered existing law and authority we would not now be in this extreme condition. Now, all of a sudden in an election year and like a bolt out of the blue sky 'no problem is more urgent.' It is this hypocrisy that has caused us to lose all faith that anything will be done for the family-type farmer in time."

Ed Derks, Stanberry, writes, "I believe the soil bank program will soon cut surplus if they (farmers) are paid enough for taking land out of production."

W. P. Hunter of Sikeston grows cotton, corn, beans, wheat, and cattle. He said, "If this soil bank land is to be grazed it would bankrupt the cattle man." He feels there should be no limit to the amount of payment to any individual farm or to any individual landowner or tenant.

Bernard Leonhard of Portage Des Sioux writes, "I am in a little different position than most grain farmers because I grow seed corn and I have an irrigation system on my farm. Due to the fact I have irrigation I have been growing single cross corn, also inbreds for the seed corn company. My gross income from my corn acres this year was $137 per acre. Since I have only 100 acres of cropland and a family of six children to support I certainly cannot afford to leave any of my acres in a soil bank unless I will be paid very well for it. I do not think the soil bank will solve the farmer's problem any more than acreage allotments have solved them. Farmers will naturally try to grow more on the acres they have left to farm so probably we will produce nearly as much as we are producing now."

Chriss J. Koening, Belle, explains, "With the machinery I have I could only afford to have a small percent of my land to rest at a time. It would not cut production much in my case."

S. T. Cooley, Centralia, states: "I do not think the soil bank is the answer to our farm problem but so far it is the only thing that Mr. Benson has come along with. I am in the same fix as every other Missouri farmer so am willing to go along with the soil bank program and hope it will help solve our farm problem."

Elmer Nienhiser, Blackburn, explains: "I am a family-size farmer. The soil bank would not fit in my present operation at all. I have a very small corn allotment. I need all the grassland and feed for my present setup. It seems to me the soil bank pro-

gram would fit in best for large farm operators, or farmers that have been depleting their farms, or part-time farmers. This could also include farmers that are more or less retiring."

Charles D. Miller, Memphis, explains: "The soil bank would not do on my farm as I am a grass farmer and run calves for feeder market." Miller favors production payments as a means of improving farm purchasing power.

Dwight Dodge, Hamilton, said: "The soil bank will help the larger farmers and hurt the small ones."

Hugo Schnakenberg, Cole Camp, points out the danger of some rich landlords renting their farm to the Government for more money than a renter could afford to pay. He describes the proposal as "just something to make the rich richer and the poor poorer."

John B. Ezell, Marshall, comments: "I can see no indication that the idea behind the soil bank is to retire me and eliminate my production. The idea of retiring certain acres about my farm would merely subject me to harassment and added costs; also it would be impossible to use the remaining acres to the best advantage. For instance, who is to build and pay the costs on the fence that will be necessary to keep the cattle from breaking in?"

Charles A. Myers, Brunswick, explains that most farmers do not have more land than is needed for them to get along. "The problem is how to get in enough money to meet necessary expenses," he said.

Elmer W. Haas, Rolla, writes: "I could not profitably keep out of production cropland and still have an economical farm unit whereby machinery and time would be fully utilized."

Don Sparks, Dixon, said "Some large owners who rent their farm might lease them to the Government. In my own case, with a large family of small children, I must increase production and use all available acres to keep up with the rising cost of living."

Everett Jose, Hartsburg, has 473 acres consisting of about 200 acres of Missouri River bottom land. He said, "The bottom land becomes overgrown with willows, cottonwoods and all types of weeds if not cultivated for a year or two. It would have to be kept mowed. I think this should be considered in the compensation allowed."

N. B. Tinnin, Hornerville, remarks, "The soil bank to me is just a political idea to get farmers thinking about something other than the low prices they are receiving for their commodities."

William Marshall of Nelson replied, "The whole soil bank program is a thin political primer to whitewash the United States farm economy."

Why can't Congress solve the farm problem, MFA President Heinkel asked? Any cost of a real plan would be cheap compared to a depression, which is in the making, he warned.

The 10 Commandments of Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the following words by Rabbi Norbert L. Rosenthal, of Temple Israel, Tulsa, Okla., entitled "The 10 Commandments of Maturity":

THE 10 COMMANDMENTS OF MATURITY

To thyself be true.
To thy family, be affectionate.
To thy neighbor, be generous.
To thy community, be serviceable.
To mankind, be just.
To every living creature, be compassionate.
To the world, be courageous.
To the past, be understanding.
To the future, be hopeful.
And to God, be humble.

—*Rabbi Norbert L. Rosenthal.*

TEMPLE ISRAEL, TULSA, OKLA.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*...3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 Oliver 2-3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 Emerson 2-0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 Adams 2-6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 District 7-4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700

Vacancy

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*_____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*___
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*_____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*

Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*

Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*

Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*

Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*

Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*

Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*

Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill.*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*

Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*

Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*

Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*

Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Edison's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, February is a most unusual month in that it is during this month that we celebrate the birthday anniversaries of many of the most outstanding men and women of both this country and the world as a whole.

February 12 is, as we all know, the anniversary of one of the greatest of all Americans—Abraham Lincoln. But I wonder how many of us also realize that February 11 is the birth date of another great American—Thomas Alva Edison. Many citizens of New Jersey are particularly aware of this fact, for Edison was one of the most distinguished men ever to live in New Jersey.

In this connection I was most pleased to learn recently that one of the most leading members of the clergy in Trenton, N. J., Dr. Andrew Christian Braun, had visited at the former Edison home with George E. Stringfellow and that, as a result of the visit and its impression on him, he intended to build his sermon around the life of Edison on Sunday, February 12, 1956.

I have a copy of that sermon, as well as an editorial from the Trenton Times on Edison's anniversary, and I should like to include them as a part of my remarks.

The editorial and the sermon follow:

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Times]

EDISON'S ANNIVERSARY

It is indeed noteworthy that the 109th anniversary of the birth of Thomas A. Edison is to be observed next Sunday in the St. Paul Methodist Church. A sermon especially prepared by the Rev. Andrew Christian Braun, pastor of St. Paul's, ably presents highlights in the career of the distinguished inventor whose life for so many years was associated with that of New Jersey.

Edison's part in the development of applied science was altogether remarkable. But also, like Benjamin Franklin before him, his commonsense philosophy was such as to inspire thousands of his fellow citizens with the ability to face human problems with courage, dignity, and intelligence.

The name of Edison will always loom large in the annals of this State in which he laid the foundations for so many of the miracles of modern life. It is appropriate, therefore, for Jerseyans to recognize his vast contributions and to pay honor where honor is so clearly due.

THE LIGHT BRINGER OF MODERN TIMES

(By Dr. Andrew Christian Braun)

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters. And God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light." (Genesis 1: 1–3 R. S. V.)

Glenmont, in Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N. J., was the beginning. Here on November 14, 1955, through the courtesy of former Gov. Charles Edison and George E. Stringfellow, his faithful associate, my wife and I enjoyed 24 hours of enlightening pilgrimage.

At Glenmont is a 23-room house, a many-gabled mansion, which was the home of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Alva Edison from 1886 until they passed away. While seated in the comfortable second-floor living room, the private retreat of Thomas and Mina Edison, I looked through the broad picture window and this sermon began to take form.

My mind let loose its leash, and I reconstructed the influences which made Edison the light bringer of modern times. I could see the humble beginnings in Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847. Indeed, February is a month of illustrious beginnings, many under humble circumstances. Mendelssohn, Longfellow, Lindbergh, Caruso, Dickens, Charles Lamb, Roger Williams, Susan Anthony, Lincoln, and Washington were all February babies.

When Thomas Edison was born in 1847, the seventh child of Samuel Edison, the father was operating a small lumber mill. At 5 years of age this boy showed the curiosity for which he was later famous, by persisting in sitting on a nest of duck eggs and patiently waiting for them to hatch. At 7, he began one of the shortest school careers in history. Because his teacher called him "addled," his mother, Nancy Edison, took the boy out of school and taught him herself. Before he was 10, he was reading Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Parker's School of Natural Philosophy, and comparable works.

The vicissitudes of his eager quest for knowledge led in adult life to 1,093 patents, including the motion-picture machine, a carbon transmitter for telephone, electric lighting and power, electric railways, the phonograph, improved telegraph and induction wireless telegraphy, improved storage batteries, electric motors, dynamos, modern cement kilns, and the mimeograph, just to name a few.

Space will not permit adequate treatment of his life. However, let us examine our text and illustrate it from Edison's life. This text was suggested by a quotation from the Christian Herald, of November 22, 1916. Here I read, "Mr. Edison does not hesitate to declare his belief in the existence of God as seen in nature and in His providence." He says, "Too many people have a microscopic idea of the Creator. If they would only study His wonderful works shown in the natural laws of the universe and in nature herself, they would have a much broader idea of the Great Engineer and His divine power. Indeed, I can almost prove His existence by chemistry. The true man of science finds what the first verse of the Bible declares, that 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.'"

Let us consider this text under three heads:

I. THE FOUNDATION—"IN THE BEGINNING GOD"

The revised standard version suggests that the universe was created ex nihilo. Here we behold the priority of God. The Hebrew puts it "bereshith," in the beginning—God. The Bible makes plain that life began in goodness. Therefore, we can move forward with calm courage and confidence. The Hebrew word "bara"—to create—proves for me that no mechanistic, evolutionary theory can make sense. In all this I must say that the Bible is not intended to be a textbook on science. Those who wrote it were not scientists in the modern sense. They were rather poets. As such they saw the answer to the riddle of the universe. They did not ask, "What was the process of creation?" Rather they asked, "What was the purpose?" As consecrated poets they were inspired to declare that God, the Creator, was before all and in all.

God is the first cause. God is Creator, Redeemer, and Sustainer of the universe. God makes and dethrones kings and commoners. James Anthony Froude, in his essay on The Science of History, says, "One lesson, only one, history may be said to repeat with distinctness: That the world is built somehow on moral foundations; that in the long run it is well with the good; in the long run it is ill with the wicked." God is the foundation of the world which He created and we cannot lay any other foundation without ruining our lives. So Edison called God "the Great Engineer."

II. THE ACTIVATION—CREATED

Some words do not have terminal facilities. "Created" is a word which seeks a complete predicate. There is power for and power over something or someone else. The word "created" should lead every child of God to greater vision and vaster victory. I recall a comment of Bishop Arthur J. Moore to the effect that when the early church fathers came together after the resurrection of Jesus, they talked about their powers; but when modern churchmen come together, they talk about their problems.

Let us draw on the power of God by consecrating ourselves to Him. Consecration of self, service, and substance explains the far-reaching results of Edison's efforts. Edison constantly poured his profits back into his experimentation for the world's good. Do we? Are we tithers of self, service, and substance for God and His children?

The Founding Fathers indicated that certain truths are self-evident. One of these truths is that there is a God. Second, that all men are created equal. Now all men are not born equal, only in dignity and rights—before the law. Men are not physicaly or materially born equal. But all men are equal in the sight of God, their Creator. There are individual differences in God's creation but all share equally in His love and care. His concern for us is equal. For this reason we are considered equal, even before the law of the land. Let us enunciate this doctrine, illustrated in the life of Edison, to all our citizens today.

III. THE GENERATION—CREATED THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH AND LIGHT

God created this wonderful atomic world. Back in 1883, Edison discovered these electrons flowing out of the hot filaments of his early lamp. This was later called the Edison effect. It is the basis of electronic tubes found in the telephone, radio, and television.

Certainly Edison has enlarged our conception of light. In Masonic language we say

that man most desires light. In the physical sense, back in 1879 most homes were lit with smelly kerosene lamps or candles. Only a few had gas lights. Streets in the cities were lit by glaring arc lights. But Edison kept saying, "Let there be electric light and there was electric light." In consideration of October 19, 1879, many visitors have stood bareheaded before the memorial tower in Menlo Park. On that date, Edison found a filament which, when enclosed in a vacuum bulb, would give light without being consumed. The original lamp using a carbonized cotton sewing thread burned for 40 hours.

Time and space will not permit a full treatment of the Sunday interview at Glenmont of Bishop William F. Anderson with Thomas A. Edison in which Edison stated, "One thing is certain, the universe is permeated by intelligence. I do believe in a future life and I have so declared." Edison's belief in God, though not the orthodox belief, was nevertheless the result of sustained thought and investigation in the physical realm. Edison always referred to Christ as the Saviour. The Sermon on the Mount was his favorite passage of scripture and he thought its practical truth would be worthy of the emulation of the people of America.

Space does not permit a full treatment of the spiritual life of Edison. But let us close with a true story. Edison on several occasions went fishing off Sandy Hook. On Robbins Reef was a lighthouse tended for many years by Mrs. Katie Walker. She tells how one night her husband, who had been the lighthouse keeper, caught cold which turned to pneumonia. When her husband died she buried him on the mainland. In her own words, she says, "Every morning now when the sun comes up I stand at this porthole and look toward his grave. Sometimes the hills are brown, sometimes they are green, sometimes they are white with snow. But they always bring a message from him. Something I heard him say more often than anything else. Just three words: "Mind the light."

Edison minded the light and so must we. Three days before he died, Edison was still making plans for future experiments. His probing, searching mind was the despair of his doctors. He inquired of this drug and that. The black camel of death never had a more alert victim. Finally, Edison performed his last "great experiment" on October 18, 1931. He was 84 years of age.

I have stood before the large canopied bed from which Edison spoke his last murmured words to Dr. Hubert S. Howe, his physician, "It is very beautiful over there." Across the decades since that day, he speaks through every incandescent bulb to our souls, "Mind the light."

Treasury Rejects Charge Swiss Dodge Watch Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal of Commerce of February 8, 1956:

IMPORTERS GET DECISION—TREASURY REJECTS CHARGE SWISS DODGE WATCH DUTY

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The Treasury today rejected long-standing charges by domestic watch manufacturers that Swiss watchmakers have dodged paying hundreds of millions of dollars in import duties.

The ruling, to be finalized in 30 days after the department hears views of interested parties, is in effect a reaffirmation of a 1940 decision that movements not "adjusted" by special post-manufacturing processes are not subject to addition duties of 50 cents for each "adjustment."

ISSUE UNDER PROBE

Today's ruling also represents an answer to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, which has been looking into the imported watch "adjustment" problem since last summer.

In July, domestic watch manufacturers told the investigating subcommittee that importers had evaded payment of an estimated $238 million in special "adjustment" duties over the years.

The contention was that perfected production machinery has permitted the Swiss to "build in" the special adjustment process in mass-production manufacturing. This, it was charged, permitted a watch to come in marked "unadjusted" when in fact it was "adjusted." As proof, it was pointed out that the same watch was designated, "adjusted" when the Swiss sold it in third markets.

Importers and Swiss manufacturers maintained that third-market shipments were marked "adjusted" as an advertising technique only. When the same type unit was exported to the United States it was marked "unadjusted" to conform with United States law, they argued.

SENT TEAM ABROAD

The McClellan subcommittee took the allegations of the domestic industry under advisement. In its annual report released last month the subcommittee said it would hold up action pending a Treasury report on the situation. A team of Treasury experts went to Switzerland last fall to investigate the charges first hand.

A subcommittee spokesman, informed of Treasury's tentative finding in the dispute, said the panel's finding on the matter may not necessarily conform to the Treasury's decision. He said the subcommittee report on the adjustment case "should be ready in about a month."

The Department's decision today, published in the Federal Register, said it was reaffirming the 1940 finding after "extensively" reviewing "all pertinent considerations."

The ruling also clarified ambiguities in the present law, but distinguished between "adjusting" processes made after assembly and the normal timing and regulating techniques all watch movements receive.

Myths and Realities in Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Kranz, the able legislative director of the New Jersey State council, CIO, has kindly sent me the following article Myths and Realities in Unemployment Insurance which appeared in the December 1955, issue of the Employment Security Review. The author of the article, Mr. Philip Booth, is Chief of the Division of Program and Legislation, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor. Mr. Booth furnishes the true facts about the unemployment insurance program which has been the subject of so many misstatements. I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading the enlightening article which follows:

MYTHS AND REALITIES IN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

During the 20 years of unemployment insurance history in this country, various public impressions of the way the program operates have been widely circulated and widely accepted. While some of these are reasonably accurate, others have little, if any, factual support. Many of the latter are concerned with the extent to which benefits are paid to "chiselers" and "work dodgers." In a program protecting more than 40 million workers, some "chiselers" are bound to show up. But if we take account of benefit payments equaling as much as $2 billion a year, the amount of money going out in improper payments in comparison with proper payments is remarkably small. Neither the weekly amount of benefits nor the methods of administration make the system particularly inviting to chiselers.

This article describes some of the myths that have grown up about the way the unemployment insurance program operates and comments on them with facts and figures obtained through actual operations of the State employment security systems.

Myth 1. People prefer benefits to jobs.

Facts: Many jobless workers do not take advantage of their benefit rights, at least not immediately, even when they are unquestionably eligible. Our experience provides little support for the notion that when layoffs take place, all the workers hurry down to the employment office to file benefit claims, the ink on their layoff notices still wet. All studies which have been made show a consistent lapse of time between the last day of work and the date of filing a first claim. Figures from California, Florida, Michigan, and New York, for example, show that almost half the workers filing their first claim in a benefit year have waited more than a week after their job ended, a third waited more than 2 weeks, and a fifth more than a month. When claimants were asked why they waited before filing a claim, they answered most frequently that they expected to get a new job quickly or to be called back soon to their old job.

The amount of money in each benefit check compared with a claimant's regular earnings is itself a strong stimulus to find work. Everywhere, weekly benefits have been set well below the average weekly earnings to provide this incentive.

As of September 1, 1955, only 1 of every 8 workers lived in a State where the maximum weekly benefit he could receive (excluding dependents allowances) was as high as half of statewide average weekly wages. The nationwide average weekly benefit of about $25 in 1954 was only one-third of nationwide average weekly wages.

When loss of work causes people to cut down on their living standards or to use up their savings, or both, chances are they would rather go back to jobs in which they would get considerably more in wages than they can in benefits. In fact, American workers have billions of dollars of obligations for the purchase of homes, cars, furniture, and other consumers' good which provide compelling incentives for them to find work quickly when laid off, if for no other reason than to keep up their mortgage and installment payments.

Myth 2. Claimants collect the maximum number of benefit checks and then promptly

go back to work or retire from the labor market.

Facts: A few years ago Michigan surveyed the experience of a number of people some time after they had collected all the benefits to which they were entitled. Many of these former claimants—33 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women—had no employment after their last benefit check, but relatively few—4 percent of the men and 13 percent of the women—reported that they were no longer in the labor market. Two-fifths of the claimants who were still in the labor market were without work for more than 6 months after they stopped collecting benefits. The majority of the people in the survey were supported by their family or other relatives after their benefit checks stopped. Many lived on savings. Some had to accept public relief.

Comparatively few claimants, as a matter of fact, collect the maximum number of checks payable under the law. There is a considerable turnover in the benefit file. In recent years, 4 out of every 10 New York workers who were registered for unemployment benefits in 1 month did not claim benefits in the next month. About 10 percent of all claimants dropped out without receiving even one check. Only 1 out of every 6 beneficiaries in 1954, a year of moderately heavy unemployment, received 26 weekly checks, the State's maximum. The average number of benefit checks per beneficiary in 1954 was 14.

Throughout the country, while about 9½ million individuals filed initial claims in the recession year of 1954, nearly 3 million of these did not receive even one benefit check and almost an additional 5 million returned to work before they had exhautsed their benefit rigths. Thus, only 1 out of every 5 beneficiaries drew all the benefits to which he was entitled. For those drawing benefits, the average number of weekly payments was slightly less than 13.

It is almost axiomatic that the number of workers exhausting benefits rises and falls with changes in economic conditions. In 1953, a year of full employment, only three-fourths million exhaustions occurred, while the following year, when unemployment was much heavier, the figure increased by a full million to 1¾ million.

Myth 3. The same people collect benefits year after year.

Facts. Many States periodically make studies of the benefit experience of a sample of workers representing all industries. Consistently they find that in a 2-year period, from one-eighth to one-fourth of the beneficiaries in the first year are repeaters in the second year. These figures include persons who collect as few as 2, 3, or 4 checks in the 2-year period as well as those who receive the maximum in both years.

Persons who collect the maximum duration in each of 2 successive years are extremely few. A New York study showed that in the benefit years 1947–48 and 1948–49, fewer than 2 percent of the beneficiaries in both years did so. In Arizona, only one-tenth of 1 percent of all claimants between 1948 and 1953 exhausted all benefit rights in each year of this period. In most States, people who exhaust their rights in 1 year often cannot qualify for the maximum duration in the next year.

New York recently studied the benefit experience of a group of workers for 5 successive years. In 14 seasonal industries in which there is considerable underemployment each year, few workers filed benefit claims in each year of the 5 in which they had some covered employment—3 percent or less in 10 industries and between 5 and 10 percent in 4 industries. The percentages of repeaters ranged from 14 to 31 in another group of 4 industries—men's and women's coats and suits, dresses, and millinery—which had the largest proportion of steady repeaters.

These repeater figures are low despite the fact that in many industries, workers are laid off annually as part of a regular pattern of shutdowns for inventory, retooling, or model changes as well as seasonally slack business. Many such workers draw benefits each year during these periods.

Myth 4. Many people collect benefits illegally by lying.

Facts: One dramatic instance of claimant fraud makes a deeper impression on the public than a ream of statistics. Evidence accumulated from an ever-increasing amount of effort by State agencies to detect fraud and determine its extent in the system proves that extremely few claimants deliberately lie to obtain benefits. The figures show that payments made on claims found to be fraudulent during the 1955 fiscal year amounted to $3 out of each $1,000—three-tenths of 1 percent of all benefits. In only 1 of the previous 4 years did this figure exceed $5 and in the other 3 years, it varied from $2 to $3 out of every $1,000 in benefits.

It is important to distinguish between claimants who make an honest mistake in supplying information to local office personnel and those who deliberately misrepresent facts in order to obtain benefits. Frequently, claimants do not realize that certain work constitutes "employment" and may not intend to conceal relevant facts when they do not reveal such work.

Other problems arise due to technical requirements which call for the claimant to report the "gross" amount of pay rather than the take-home pay he has received during the week for which he claims benefits, to report earnings from self-employment (when he may be thinking only of wages from an employer), and to report employment and earnings during a 7-day period ending perhaps on a Tuesday or Wednesday, when he customarily considers that a week ends on Saturday.

Frequent contacts uncover information

Local offices are in a position to find out a good deal about claimants because of their frequent contacts with them. Hours for reporting to unemployment insurance offices are fixed during working hours to discourage "chiseling." Local office personnel are trained to note claimants who have a record of reporting early or late, or on other than their regular reporting days; who appear in work clothes or carry a package which may contain lunch; whose hands indicate recent manual work; who are seen riding to and from the local office in a commercial vehicle suggesting possible employment. Women who appear at a local office with a young child or a baby in a carriage are questioned as to their availability for work.

Local office personnel take other action to detect fraudulent claims. They report suspected fraud cases to a central investigation unit which investigates, decides and, when necessary, recommends court action. Other sources of leads for the investigation unit are anonymous letters and telephone calls, reports from other parts of the agency, and from local law enforcement agencies.

The investigation group also examines payrolls in industries which appear to offer claimants the opportunity to collect benefits while earning—while working intermittently, for instance, or on a piece-work basis, or where the workers "shape up" daily for a job, or where the work is done at home. The industry investigations are generally carried on in this manner: selecting an employer; obtaining the benefit records of all employees on his payroll; checking the record of earnings or employment of these employees with benefits that they received during the same period.

Penalties for fraud range from reduction of the maximum potential weeks of benefits up to a court conviction which carries a fine or imprisonment or both.

Other methods for detecting fraud, which may be even more important in many States than those mentioned here, are discussed in other articles in this issue.

Myth 5. It is easy to collect benefits.

Facts: The unemployment insurance system has controls designed to confine the payment of benefits to persons who are genuinely attached to the labor force and who are unemployed through no fault of their own. These controls are both statutory and administrative.

All State laws require that a worker must have had a minimum period of employment—of at least 14 to 20 different weeks—or have had specified minimum earnings during a year shortly before he files a claim for benefits. This requirement is intended as evidence that the claimant has been recently attached to the labor force as a regular worker.

The laws require that to receive benefits, a worker must be totally or partially unemployed, available for work, and able to work.

He must report in person regularly during working hours to certify to his unemployment.

If there is evidence that a claimant is not interested in obtaining work, he is found ineligible.

A worker places himself temporarily outside the protection of the law (is disqualified) if he refuses employment or has quit his job without good cause or was discharged for misconduct; in other words, if he did not act like a reasonably prudent person who wants to work.

Benefits are also withheld in the event of a strike or lockout at the claimant's place of work.

Experience of nearly 20 years has amply shown that the overwhelming majority of workers who file claims have legitimate rights to benefits. It is, however, necessary to assure that claimants continue to be available for work while they are drawing benefits. The devices described below are used for this purpose.

Claimant interview: The backbone of claims investigation is an interrogation of the claimant, conducted by skilled examiners at the local offices. Statements obtained are put in writing. Claimants are confronted with information received from outside sources, such as employers or other workers, and with facts obtained by the local office.

Employer information: Information from employers is obtained through responses to queries sent them at the time a claim is filed. The employer is asked to furnish the reason for a claimant's separation from employment if he has any question as to the worker's right to benefits. He is also asked for any other facts which may have a bearing on the claim.

Placement office participation: Benefit claimants must register for work with the Employment Service when they file their claims. If a claimant refuses a job to which he is referred by the Employment Service, or declines to accept referral to a job, or if the placement interviewer hears of other circumstances which indicate that the claimant is unprepared to take either temporary or permanent work, the claims section is notified. It makes an investigation and decides whether benefits should be paid or postponed.

Special techniques: A variety of techniques are used to identify claimants whose cases should be investigated. These are discussed in greater detail in other articles in this issue.

In many States, each claimant must list contacts made in his independent search for work, the type and conditions of employment he is seeking, and other data having a bearing on his availability. Other questionnaires are used for special conditions, such as for women claimants who have child-care problems, inquiring into the arrangements made for care of the children

if the claimant goes to work. A statement is obtained from physicians regarding claimants who refuse or quit a job, or restrict the field of their job searches for health reasons.

Claimants whom the placement staff has been unable to place in spite of active demand for labor in their field are interviewed periodically to determine the adequacy of their own job-finding efforts.

The headquarters of most States supply local offices with a comprehensive interpretation of the law in terms of actual cases, including precedent-making decisions, guiding principles and statements of policy on various issues. In addition, a manual of procedures describes steps to be taken in the examination of claims. An investigation section is also used to investigate "mass" situations of possible fraud covering for example, a whole industry or location.

The controls outlined above show that a jobless worker does not automatically receive benefits after meeting the qualifying wage requirements. The claimant must pass other tests which are devised to ascertain his lack of employment and his availability for work when he files a claim for benefits. In 1954, some 370,000 special interviews of Michigan claimants were conducted by experienced claims examiners. Over 130,000 disqualifications were assessed. One-third of the disqualifications were because of unavailability of claimants for work, two-fifths because of voluntary quitting, one-tenth for discharge for misconduct, and one-twenty-fifth because of refusal of employment.

Myth 6. Unemployment insurance helps only those drawing benefits.

Facts: Many people are not aware of the positive role the employment security program plays in bolstering the economy and lessening unemployment. They do not realize the extent to which unemployment insurance keeps purchasing power up by offsetting payroll losses. In the 1954 recession year, covered payrolls were down $2.08 billion from the 1953 total. Benefit payments increased from $1 billion to $2 billion, a rise equaling about half of the decline in payrolls.

It helps conserve the Nation's skills, by giving unemployed workers a chance to look for a job suitable to their training and experience, and some income during the interim.

The program provides a job exchange, and without charging fees helps workers to get jobs and employers to get workers.

It gathers labor market information which is used: to alert responsible governmental officials to the state of the economy; to describe the local labor supply to employers seeking a new plant site or planning expansion; to counsel workers on job opportunities.

It stimulates and helps develop community action to combat unemployment. See, for example, the Utica Story, presented in the December 1953 issue of the Employment Security Review.

Myth 7. Unemployment insurance tax costs are high in proportion to the system's value.

Facts: Unemployment insurance should be regarded as a great bargain for employers, for their tax bill to support this program is quite small compared with the system's benefits discussed earlier. In addition, taxes under unemployment insurance are far lower today than when the program began.

In 1939, for example, Federal and State employer unemployment insurance taxes were 3 percent of wages. Under the original estimates, a 3 percent payroll tax was thought necessary to cover the cost of the program. Amendments to the Federal law in 1939, and similar State amendments in the following 4 or 5 years, limited the tax to the first $3,000 of a worker's earnings during the year. However, in 1939 and 1940, so few workers earned more than $3,000 per year that the limitation exempted only about $2 of each $100 of wages; that is, the tax applied to 98 percent of all wages in covered employment. In those years, experience-rating provisions were not operative, so all employers paid the standard 2.7 percent State tax.

Moving on to the present day, wages have risen so far and employer tax rates have been so greatly reduced that employers' taxes are about one-third of their former level. This is because the $3,000 tax base, unchanged since 1939 (except in a few States since 1953) now covers only about 71 percent of all wages. Besides, experience rating cut employers' State taxes in 1954 to about 1.1 percent of taxable wages on the average, the lowest in the program's history. Applying this 1.4 percent rate (1.1 State + 0.3 Federal tax) to 71 percent of wages gives a cost rate of 1 percent of all wages—or slightly over one-third of the cost rate of 2.9 percent in 1940 (3.0×98 percent).

It would probably be agreed, too, that the Nation's employers are far less heavily burdened by the 1.4 percent tax today—with our high level prosperity and profits—than they were burdened by the much higher taxes in 1940. In that year, businessmen had a more difficult time than today, absorbing or passing on to their customers the higher payroll taxes they were paying.

Looking at other costs which employers have taken on in recent years, unemployment insurance taxes again seem less formidable. According to a recent study published by the United States Chamber of Commerce, pension payments (aside from social security) cost 3.8 percent of payroll in 1953; vacations and bonuses in lieu of vacations, 3.3 percent; holiday pay, 2.1 percent; life insurance, sickness, accident, and hospitalization, 1.8 percent; and workmen's compensation, 0.7 percent. Certainly, the value of these benefits to individual workers and their families, to employers, and the Nation's economy is substantial. Yet, it is widely recognized that the Nation's economy, as well as workers and their families, obtain substantial support from unemployment insurance, especially during recessions.

The Powell Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Bill Frank. This article appeared in the Wilmington Morning News, Tuesday, February 7, 1956:

FRANKLY SPEAKING

The proposed antisegregation amendment to the Federal aid-to-schools bill, now pending in the Congress, is a dangerous mistake.

If it ever materializes into law, it will be a bomb thrown right smack into Delaware and it will make things much worse than they are now.

This antisegregation amendment, introduced by United States Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Democrat of New York, says that Federal aid made available to public schools must not be given to school districts that have racial segregation.

Representative POWELL may think he is helping the cause of integration. He is not; he's hurting it.

He may think he is helping his fellow Negroes who live in segregated school districts. He is not; he's hurting them.

The amendment is an unnecessary irritant. But over and above everything else, the amendment in many ways would contravene the very essence and spirit of the United States Supreme Court decision on integration in the public schools.

It pleases me, and I think should please all of the middle-of-the-road integrationists, to learn that our Delaware Representative in Congress, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, is not at all keen about the Powell amendment; in fact, I have the distinct impression he's against it.

I also see by the New York Times that Adlai Stevenson doesn't think the Powell amendment is necessary.

And while this attitude may generate some feeling against them, let's say on the part of the NAACP, it is hoped that others will keep a correct perspective on the whole issue.

First, a few words about the Powell amendment:

No sooner had the Federal aid-to-schools bill been introduced in Congress when along came Representative POWELL with a proposal for an amendment which in effect would say this:

"Those school districts that keep racial segregation will not get a cent of Federal money for school-building construction."

The amendment would also say that the money available to such districts would be held, under earmark, for them until such time as the local districts (segregated) complied with the Supreme Court decision.

This amendment would be a big legislative club held over the heads of the local districts that have not yet integrated.

The essence of the Supreme Court decision on integration is against such bullying tactics.

As I understand the Supreme Court decision, the States and the districts are given time to adjust, to think through the problem, to move, slowly or quickly, in keeping with their experience and special problems.

There is no timetable for action among the segregated States or school districts. Basically, all that is demanded of them is good faith.

The Supreme Court in its wisdom realized that its decision came as a shock to the Southern States and to hundreds of school districts that maintained segregated systems.

It had in mind that it would take some years before complete adjustment was effected—more years in one area than perhaps in another.

The Supreme Court did not contemplate any move that would suddenly present the segregated States and school districts such a humiliating ultimatum.

Nor did the Supreme Court have in mind a Federal agency dangling food and water in front of school districts that need new buildings, saying to them, "Here it is. You can have this aid but you must do what we say."

In a way, I guess, it was the sort of strategy that Representative POWELL proposes that brought on the worst of the reconstruction era and delayed the healing of the Civil War so long.

Let's look at the possible effect of the Powell amendments in Delaware:

The comparatively little money that the Federal Government would make available here would be denied to such important communities as Laurel, Milford, Georgetown, Seaford, and so on; it would be denied to the smaller districts that need help, too.

You can imagine the intensified hatred that would flare up in those areas.

But you can also imagine how all children would be hurt in those districts—Negro as well as white children.

In fact, the Powell amendment, translated in part of the Federal aid-to-schools law, would virtually bring on an attitude of "The hell with it all. We'll not be badgered into

submission by any such monetary whip nor will we be lured on by any such bribe."

However, it can be safely assumed that the Powell amendment, even if it passes the House of Representatives, will get fouled up in the Senate.

It undoubtedly will generate a filibuster. The end result will be no Federal aid of any kind to the public schools of the Nation.

I think this is primarily the basis of Representative McDOWELL's position—that it would do much more harm than good, that it can and will lead the Federal aid-to-schools program in no other direction than down the drain, and that a possible byproduct of the argument will be more antagonism and an intensification of the sores that are already very raw.

The NAACP may say the attitude—that the Powell amendment is not only unnecessary but harmful and even dangerous—is a surrender to the segregation policy of the Southern States.

The NAACP may go even further and brand such an attitude as appeasement and disgraceful.

I fail to see where the Federal aid-to-schools bill, without the Powell amendment, is either disgraceful or a symbol of appeasement.

It's just plain commonsense and does not force an issue that the Supreme Court wished to avoid.

The acceptance of the United States Supreme Court decision and compliance with the decision cannot come overnight. I'd like to emphasize the two words: acceptance and compliance.

It may very well be that compliance will come first; but acceptance is still another matter and may come years later.

It's very similar to the situation in the 1880's with regard to the Negro vote.

Compliance with the amendments to the United States Constitution was here long before acceptance was a reality.

Today, hardly anyone really questions the right of the Negro to vote. That was not true in the 1880's, particularly in Delaware, even among the Republicans who saw the Negro vote as a boon to them.

In the 1880's, the Negro was reluctantly allowed to vote; today, very few people are disturbed at the thought of the Negro voting—as long as the vote is a free one and unfettered to some side money.

Acceptance in the field of voting came much later than compliance because of the various attempts to whip people into line.

And so it will be in the integration-segregation area. There must be persuasion, open discussion, give-and-take, 2 steps forward and 1 step back until, let's say, the 1960's.

By that time, we'll look back upon the 1950's and wonder what the scrap was all about.

The Railroad Retirement Act Should Be Amended To Increase Benefits and Permit Optional Retirement at Age 60 or With 30 Years' Service, With the Annuity To Be Computed on the 5 Years of Highest Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our colleague OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, is chairman, held hearings on 53 bills designed to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

After taking testimony from the sponsors of the bills, the hearings were recessed temporarily and when resumed representatives of railroad management, railroad labor organizations, and agencies of Government will be heard.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the subcommittee will make recommendations to the full committee which is expected to perfect a bill for House action during the early summer.

As a sponsor of several bills pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was my privilege to appear before the committee on January 24, at which time I testified on behalf of my bills to increase benefits for annuitants, pensioners, and widows, and permit optional retirement at age 60 or after 30 years' service, with the annuity to be computed on the 5 years of highest earnings.

The legislation which I have introduced over a period of years represents the wishes of the active and retired railroad employees and their families in my congressional district.

It is in their interest and at their request that I have been making a determined effort for the past several years to have full consideration given to my bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

My statement before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce follows:

Mr. Chairman, once again I am grateful to you and the members of this committee for according me the privilege of appearing before you to explain the bills I have introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

As all of you know, I represent a large group of active and retired railroad employees and at their request and in their interest I introduced proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Before discussing these amendments I should like to convey to you the attitude of the active and retired railroad employees of my district, as I talked to many of them last fall during the congressional recess.

Not only did I find a lot of dissatisfaction—and may I repeat dissatisfaction—among the retired people because of the failure of Congress to increase benefits, but I also found a general feeling among active railroaders that the Railroad Retirement Act should be revised for the purpose of providing more adequate benefits at the time of retirement.

Mr. Chairman, the basis of the majority of complaints stems from the action of Congress last summer in approving an increase in spouse benefits. The widow and widower are the chief critics of what they call discriminatory action on the part of the Congress.

Frankly, I found it very difficult to answer a widow whose average monthly benefit check is in the neighborhood of $40 when she asked me if I could exist on the scale of benefits paid those in her category.

In addition to the criticism that I received from the widow and widower on my visits to my congressional district last fall, I encountered a concerted and organized drive by actively employed railroaders—especially those in the Altoona, Pa., area where the largest railroad shops in the world are located—in support of amendments to permit retirement after 30 or 35 years of service, or at age 60, with the retirement annuity being computed on the 5 years of highest earnings and not less than one-half of the individual's monthly compensation.

In addition to the personal contacts I had with active railroaders in regard to the new formula of computing annuities, I have received postcards and petitions that contain in excess of 5,000 signatures in support of the proposed change in formula. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this committee has received similar communications urging approval of these proposed amendments.

In all my statements regarding the possibility of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act and increasing benefits, I have stressed the absolute necessity of maintaining the stability of the retirement fund and keeping it in a solvent condition to guarantee the payments of present and future benefits with the highest degree of certainty.

Regardless of the repeated admonition that the solvency of the retirement fund is of paramount consideration, there is an honest difference of opinion in disputing the assertion that benefits cannot be increased without a corresponding increase in payroll taxes.

I called attention to this difference of opinion during the last session of Congress when I pleaded for an across-the-board increase in railroad retirement benefits.

In this connection, the views I voiced the past 2 years that my constituents felt an increase in benefits would not impair the financial stability of the retirement fund are worthy of your close examination.

While there is always room for an honest difference of opinion, in view of the widespread insistence that the Railroad Retirement Act be liberalized and benefits increased, I am certain that this committee will review the entire subject and hold adequate hearings at an early date so that final action can be taken on proposed amendments before the 84th Congress adjourns next summer.

Mr. Chairman, I have pending before this committee 14 bills designed to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and I should like at this time to briefly describe them:

H. R. 856, which provides full annuities at compensation of half salary or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60.

H. R. 857 repealing the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to widows which I introduced January 1955 was incorporated in the committee bill H. R. 4744, which became law last year and is now known as the 1955 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

H. R. 858 provides retirement on a full annuity at age 60 or after 30 years of service and that such annuity for any month shall not be less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings.

H. R. 859 provides for an acros-the-board increase of 25 percent in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees or their survivors. This bill has been revised since its introduction because of changes made in the Railroad Retirement Act by the 1955 amendments. The bill superseding H. R. 859 is H. R. 7984, which I introduced January 1956.

H. R. 2443 provides that an annuitant may be eligible for his retirement annuity even though he renders compensated service for an employer other than railroads by whom he was last employed before his annuity became effective. This bill covers the situation where a retired employee is denied the opportunity to serve as a clerical employee of a church, civic, fraternal, or social organization.

In regard to the series of bills which I have introduced during the present session of Congress, they are as follows:

H. R. 7982 provides that the present dual benefit restrictions on spouses' annuities shall be eliminated.. If this bill becomes a law some 6,000 spouses who have earned social-security benefits in their own right

will be entitled to receive such benefits without having the amount deducted from their railroad retirement benefits as is being done at the present time.

H. R. 7984 supersedes H. R. 859 and provides for a 25 percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows, or other survivors. This bill is a revision of H. R. 859 and is necessary because of changes made by the 1955 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

H. R. 7990 provides a 10-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows, or other survivors.

H. R. 7988 provides a 15-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows or other survivors.

H. R. 7986 provides a 20-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows or other survivors.

H. R. 7983 is a bill designed to provide a 25-percent increase in widows' annuities.

H. R. 7989 provides a 10-percent increase in widows' annuities.

H. R. 7987 provides a 15-percent increase in widows' annuities.

H. R. 7985 provides a 20-percent increase in widows' annuities.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the opportunity to appear before this committee is a means of affording members of Congress a chance to explain as briefly as possible the bills they have pending before this committee with respect to amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. Chairman, in accordance with information you furnished me I am pleased that you plan to hold public hearings at a later date at which time I hope it will be possible to have a more general and detailed discussion of the proposed legislation.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for the opportunity to present the views of my constituents who reside in a heavily populated railroad district.

I have translated the wishes of my constituents into legislative amendments and I assure you that I appreciate your intention to consider these proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley, Chairman of the Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Annual Brotherhood Banquet, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., Wilmington, Del., February 7, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, once again I had the honor and the pleasure to listen to the remarks of the Honorable James A. Farley as he addressed the Wilmington Conference of Christians and Jews at their annnual banquet in the Gold Ballroom at the Hotel du Pont, Wilmington, Del., last evening. Mr. Farley is truly a great American. His leadership of the Democratic Party has endured and grown throughout the years in its profound influence.

I was glad to find Mr. Farley in his usual good health, and in extending his remarks in the RECORD I do so in full recognition of my opportunty to bring his views on this subject to my fellow citizens.

The address by Mr. Farley follows:

It is always a pleasure to come back to Wilmington and renew old friendships, and I want to thank your committee for inviting me. It would have been hard to refuse Bill Duffy in any case but, frankly, I consider it a real privilege to address a brotherhood meeting in a city which has so often demonstrated its firm adherence to the principles of brotherhood.

Speaking for the national conference is hardly a new experience for me. I have been active in conference work for over 15 years and have served as its New York State chairman for over 10 years. I have helped to the best of my ability to secure leadership for local and industrial groups in and out of the State, so that the conference could obtain some of the money it needs to carry on its work and I have had the honor of working with our present national chairman, Harvey Firestone, as cochairman of the religious commission.

I tell you these things because I want you to know that I am here not as your guest speaker but as your co-worker, one who believes deeply and sincerely as you do in what the conference is doing.

Perhaps it may seem strange to some of you that I should come here to speak to you about the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Surely, you will say, the very fact that you are here should be ample indication of your interest in this work. But I have found on a number of occasions that there is a sort of general but somewhat fuzzy idea even in the minds of substantial contributors and ardent workers of what the conference is really trying to do. The words are commonly used—interfaith and tolerance—and there is an idea that the conference has been organized to spread tolerance throughout the Nation. As I see it, tolerance in the field of human relations is hardly the aim of the conference. In fact, it is a word I do not like and one I know the conference never uses. I do not want you to tolerate me and I am sure you do not want me to tolerate you. Toleration somehow suggests a number of isolated groups each going its own way and all looking over their shoulders to see that there is no attack or other interference by other groups. The national conference does not ask for tolerance. It asks for justice and understanding. It declares that we are all one family here on God's footstool. If providence has willed that the world be peopled by men and women of many races and many religions then surely it is not too much to ask that we give to each race and to each faith the respect and the recognition it has earned.

What the conference is doing today has not changed basically from the concepts of its founders 28 years ago. True, its field has been broadened, its influence has expanded and its stature in the community, the Nation, and the world has been enhanced immeasurably. But basically, it still seeks through a process of well-planned, continuing education to translate its charter into a living thing and to establish justice, amity, cooperation, and understanding among peoples of differing religious loyalties—these same people who have built this great Nation. It holds that we are, all of us, brothers—children of the same father. It believes, as did the men who founded this Republic, that democracy cannot long survive if it abandons the great moral and spiritual precepts which are the keystones of all religion. It holds that an attack on one religion almost inevitably leads to an attack on all religions. Surely all of us remember how rapidly Hitler's persecution of the Jews was followed by the persecution of Catholics and Protestants.

Of course, it the dictatorship, whether of the right or the left continues for any extended period, if it thinks that its campain of persecution, calumny, ridicule, and abuse has succeeded in alienating its youth from the church of its fathers, then the party feels the time has come to set up its own gods.

Perhaps some of you have read Alsop's articles which appeared recently in the Saturday Evening Post. He tells of his experiences in his guided tour through Soviet Russia. He makes the point that no longer do the Soviet leaders feel it necessary to make a frontal attack on the churches. If the old folks want to go to the few churches still functioning, why let them. For by now the youth and those who have reached maturity under Soviet rule have been given a new religion—man worship. Instead of the ancient icons, the faithful carry pictures of the current boss and of course the founding father Lenin. Alsop goes on to tell of his visit to the so-called Lenin museum in the city of Kiev. Here he saw what was labelled the room in which Lenin lived during his exile, the clothes he wore and the books and tools he used. Then when Alsop went to other cities he saw the same room, alike in minutest detail. The tear in the bedspread was exactly the same length and at the same angle as the tears in all the other bedspreads. All the rakes were missing the same teeth. All the books were opened at the same page. Frauds? Obviously. But schoolchildren are taken on pilgrimages to these shrines and they bow the head and bend the knee to their god. Yes, in the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin is god and Khrushchev is currently his prophet. A sorry prospect, indeed, but one that has been deeply ingrained in the minds of the young people of the Soviet.

Happily we have a different concept here, and it is the one under which the national conference operates. Feeling as it does that only a people dedicated to the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God can be a peaceful and happy people, the conference has developed a sound and workable program keyed to this noble thought.

Its foundation is the idea that men are inherently decent, that all they ask is the right to enjoy those inalienable rights with which their Creator has endowed them. To the degree that we acknowledge that these rights are inalienable, to that degree we shall achieve democracy. To our shame we are compelled to admit that we have denied these rights at times to our neighbors. Perhaps it is only an indication that man has not yet achieved perfection and that the virus of prejudice still infects many of our people.

Prejudice is a fearsome thing. It is often vicious and often blind and its blindness makes it all the more vicious, because in its blindness it strikes out indiscriminately. While it is true that no child is born a bigot, bigotry is sometimes a product of the home.

Prejudice is often nurtured in clubs and societies under the mantle of exclusiveness, or perhaps more correctly the cloak of smugness. It is sometimes found in the schools, where teachers and pupils continue the antagonisms they have picked up elsewhere. And, I am sorry to say, it is sometimes found even in the churches.

The conference recognizes these facts. It tries to analyze them, to discover their origins and then works tirelessly and continuously to counteract them. It does not use the denuciations or invectives that some other well-meaning groups favor nor does it seek to organize dissident blocs to bedevil legislatures. It feels that brotherhood by fiat is not a sound or wholesome thing. It believes people can be taught brotherhood in

its noblest sense as surely as they can be taught hate, and we have had plenty of evidence of hate mongers and their evil work right here at home. It feels that the stuff hate feeds on is ignorance and that a program of education through schools, theaters, periodicals, radio television, all avenues of communication, can do much to neutralize the acids of racial and religious animosities.

It says, in effect, "Mister, if you have a gripe, if you dislike another man or his church or the group he belongs to, let's sit down, all of us, and talk it over. Tell us why you are sore and maybe you'll convince us, or maybe we'll convince you. Experience over the years has shown that invariably these round-table talks prove that there are far more areas of agreement than of disagreement. It may come as a surprise to you, Mister, but the people you disliked mainly because your father before you disliked them generally turn out to be pretty decent citizens after all. But the principal thing to remember is this—don't keep your prejudices, real or imaginary, within you. Don't let them fester and rot your soul".

I repeat because I believe it is important for you to bear in mind—the program of the conference is first and last one of education.

The conference approaches its problems as a well-staffed medical center approaches its problems. Simply saying that cancer is a deadly disease will not eliminate cancer. Trained and dedicated scientists work everlastingly to find its cause, knowing that only after discovering its cause can they effect a cure. Research which will lead not only to cure but to prevention is the modern way in medicine.

So, the conference feels, should it be in human relations. Therefore, it establishes university centers, summer workshops for teachers, seminars in factories, discussion sessions in schools—constantly asking why? why? and over the years coming up with some of the answers. What it learns, it tries to implement through its various commissions, nationally and locally. It is not my intention to enlarge upon the work of these commissions. These are technical details and many of you participate actively in their work here in Wilmington and probably know more about them than I do.

It has often occurred to me that there is a certain similiarity between law and education. Just as there are two kinds of law—lex tradita and lex scripta, the handed-down law and the written law—what we call common and statute law, so there are two similar kinds of knowledge, the spoken and the written. The spoken is the knowledge a father imparts to his children or a pastor to his flock or a teacher to his pupils. The written is the kind we find in books, newspapers, and other printed matter and which is often accepted as gospel just because it is written.

Your problem and my problem is to seek out the truth in the spoken and written word and separate this truth from the half-truths, the twisted documentation and the out-and-out fabrications.

Because if we do not we are apt to go out and repeat these tales, and those who hear us enlarge upon the original and add their own embroidery until the poisonous stories we have absorbed wittingly or unwittingly have been instilled in the minds of others. Bad news somehow travels much faster than good news and there are so many people who are willing to speed it on its way.

But there is another kind of education that, to my mind, is becoming more and more important today. Let us call it education by example. For what we do and say as individuals determines in the final analysis what we do and say as a nation.

Furthermore, what we do and say today is of the utmost concern not only to us but to the world itself, a world whose boundaries are narrowing day by day.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message to Congress, said that the Kremlin has changed its policy from one of active aggression to one which seeks to divide those who differ with it. That is not exactly a new policy. It is an enlargement on an international scale of what we have seen the Communists doing all over the world for years, yes, even in our own country. For what other reasons would they infiltrate a defense plant, a labor union, a school or a governmental agency? I doubt they are trying to improve work standards or departmental efficiency. They know there are always some weaklings, some malcontents and some dreamers in whom the seeds of discord can be sown. They will find some who will listen to their siren songs, and who will swallow their stories of the golden apples just over the horizon. After all, the oak was once an acorn and big things may grow from small beginnings.

In the 18th century when our country was in its birth throes, Benjamin Franklin said, "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately." Today, when in our full manhood, we are facing another threat, the words are different but the thought remains the same. Today we say "brotherhood or chaos."

Brotherhood is no longer merely a phrase. It is no longer a part of the name of a labor union, a social group, or a religious sect. It is a word which has been hammered into the conscience of America over many years. It is a word that appears more and more often in the speeches of presidents and prime ministers. It is the beacon lighting the road to lasting peace. It is the one last hope of a tense and fearful world trembling before the awesome vision of the H-bomb and the transatlantic guided missile. Brotherhood has become synonymous with survival. Make no mistake about that and to a great measure the choice between brotherhood and chaos lies with us.

Yes, the example we in these United States set will go far toward determining whether we shall live in a free world under God or a slave world under the hammer and sickle.

My work as head of an export company takes me all over the world. I have seen many things and heard many things both in Europe and Asia. Some of the things I have seen and heard have left an indelible impression on my mind. There is so much to say but I realize the time allotted to me here must of necessity be limited, and I therefore suggest that we pass over the many menacing things now happening in Europe.

As I see it, it is in the East, the Near East, and Africa that the cauldrons are really boiling. It is in these so-called backward areas that the greatest threats to world peace exist. It is here that waves of nationalism are sweeping over the lands. People who lived for centuries under alien banners are now writing their own declarations of independence modeled, I understand, for the most part after our own great document. We have been quick to give these people substantial material help, but somehow or other we have failed to gain their confidence. We shall never have their confidence unless we learn to treat them as brothers and political equals. We must not appear to be lords and ladies bountiful distributing largesse to the peasantry. Otherwise, I am afraid the traveling team of Khrushchev and Bulganin will add them to their troupe.

America has always been generous to those in need. We have given financial and material help to many peoples. They were necessary measures and as an initial deterrent to the spread of kremlinism they have served their purpose well. But they are not enough in themselves and are already beginning to react against us. Dollar diplomacy can go just so far. I doubt it can buy lasting friendship. Perhaps nations are no different than individuals. The man to whom you keep giving help at first is grateful, then usually resentful, and finally sometimes ends up by really hating you. Only in this way can he salvage the only thing he has, his pride. It is of course a false pride but he cherishes it and nurses it and feeds upon it.

And so let me repeat—the example we set the world will be, in my opinion, an incalculably important factor in determining the fate of the world.

It boils down to this—if we cannot continue to live together in peace and harmony in these United States, respecting the other fellow's right to differ with us in all lawful ways, if we cannot learn to give to the other fellow the same rights and dignities that we reserve to ourselves—then we have failed as citizens of this Republic.

If we cannot learn to project these same ideas overseas, particularly in our dealings with the people of Asia and Africa, then we have failed in our missions as the acknowledged leader of the free world.

I do not believe that we have failed nor that we will fail. We may bungle things a bit; we will make mistakes. But when the chips are down one great American characteristic will carry us through and that is our faith; faith in ourselves; faith in our destiny, and faith in our God.

Why Not the Minnesota?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the development of river transportation on the Minnesota River, the flood-control problems, and all matters pertaining to the area affected by the Minnesota River has long been one of my very deep interests.

I have taken no position, and intend to take none, upon the so-called upper Minneapolis Harbor development, as I feel that each river development must stand on its own separate state of facts.

The development of the Minnesota River for both transportation and harbor facilities has a tremendous and important future for Minnesota and the entire Northwest. I enclose an editorial from the Shakopee (Minn.) Argus-Tribune of January 12, 1956, which indicates the deep interest in the present development and the future possibilities of the available facilities on the Minnesota.

The editorial follows:

WHY NOT THE MINNESOTA?

River transportation in Minnesota will come in for another going over Friday, January 20, when Army engineers will hold a public hearing on the upper Minneapolis Harbor project which, it has been estimated, would cost $33 million.

To date $10 million has been spent on the Mississippi River job and it cannot be completed for at least another 6 years.

It has also been authoritatively ascertained that the Minnesota River could more speedily and more cheaply be put to more universal use for water transportation opening up vast new acreages for industrial development from Mendota to Shakopee.

Port Cargill and Port Richards at Savage and the Northern States Power Co. Blackdog plant on the Minnesota River are already responsible for water transportation tonnage

that already equals or exceeds the tonnage in the Minneapolis Harbor—and that record with a minimum expenditure of public funds. The companies utilizing the stream maintain it at their expense.

It seems only logical that with the Minneapolis Harbor issue again coming up for review, the question of the practicality of the Minnesota River project could not be ignored at the January 20 hearing.

It seems only logical, too, that civic groups, existing industries, landowners, and communities generally on the Minnesota River west of its junction with the Mississippi would be vitally interested in what transpires at the hearing.

There can be no doubt that there will be no lack of effort to encourage the completion of the Minneapolis Harbor regardless of its cost to the taxpayer in proportion to the questionable economic value the project may hold.

Army engineers have already reported that the expected benefits from the completion of the Minneapolis Harbor do not justify the expenditure of the estimated $33 million required to finish the job.

What more is necessary? Who should know more about it than the governmental agency within whose province the Nation's waterways lie?

There seems to be no question about the value of inland waterways—present use of the Minnesota as far as Savage is ample proof. With just a small fraction of what it would cost to complete the Minneapolis Harbor, the Minnesota could be opened to greater use, and tremendous acreages of submarginal and practically wastelands could become the sites for vast industrial growth which the State so sorely needs.

It isn't too late for the voice of small communities and residents of the Minnesota Valley to be heard. The voice should be raised at the hearing January 20.

This Is the Enemy—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the extract of interim historical report, Korea War Crimes Division, has never been placed in the RECORD. To correct this oversight, I am introducing that portion of the report which deals with war crimes committed against Americans.

Through bestial atrocities such as those recorded here, 6,000 American servicemen were murdered and additional thousands maimed while prisoners of the Communists.

As executive trial counsel for the United States at the Nuremberg war crimes trials, I took part in the historic legal process by which the chief authors of the Nazi criminal conspiracy against mankind were brought to justice.

Those of us who labored in that soul-sickening probe of human infamy, were sustained by the hope that a new concept of man's responsibility to the moral law would emerge, and that future wartime atrocities would be mitigated by fear of retribution.

This has not come to pass, for the precedents of Nuremberg and Tokyo were reversed at Panmunjon. In Korea, criminal barbarism in all its stark horror was loosed against our sons, who went to Korea to save the cause of justice and decency in the world.

In the beginning the punishment of all war criminals was the declared aim of the United Nations Command. A War Crimes Division was established. Hundreds of cases were investigated and many of the guilty were uncovered and held for future trial. But as a consequence of our failure to achieve victory in Korea, those Communist-war criminals in United Nations custody were freed. Thousands of missing American prisoners who were not repatriated were declared dead and the matter was closed.

But they must not be forgotten. For their ordeal was the sacrifice required by a national policy of unpreparedness in peace and vacillation in war.

Nor can it be forgotten that the Communist authors of these unspeakable brutalities are the leaders of Communist China, North Korea, and Outer Mongolia, who now knock for admittance into the family of civilized nations.

I hope that those who now toy with "package deals" and thoughts of diplomatic recognition will read this record. In it they will see in naked truth the mortal and implacable enemy of everything in the world worth preserving, an enemy which must not be appeased or recognized by freemen.

EXCERPTS FROM EXTRACT OF INTERIM HISTORICAL REPORT, KOREA WAR CRIMES DIVISION

SCOPE OF REFERABLES

To date, 34 cases are referable to higher headquarters as being ready for trial. It seems apparent that in making such referrals primary importance was placed upon whether or not one or more of the suspected perpetrators were in United Nations custody. If such was the fact, and the evidence appeared adequate to obtain a conviction, the case was then forwarded. Brief summaries of these cases follow, categorized into those involving American personnel, and those which do not.

SELECTED REFERABLE CASES INVOLVING AMERICANS

The following referred cases are those in which American soldiers were the atrocity victims:

KWC No. 16, Hill 303: Before dawn on the morning of August 15, 1950, a mortar platoon leader of the 5th Cavalry Regiment called for reinforcements to defend his forward position, and was informed that a platoon of 60 South Koreans was being sent, under a Lieutenant ———. About daybreak, the soldiers saw a group of Koreans approaching, the commander identifying himself as Lieutenant ——— and the Americans were overrun before they found out that their reinforcements were actually the enemy. The captives were then escorted to a nearby orchard where their boots and dogtags were removed and all their personal property confiscated. The prisoners' hands were tied behind them with either wire or their own bootlaces.

For 2 days they were kept hidden in ravines during the day and forced to march at night. Suddenly, on the afternoon of August 17, 1950, without warning, their North Korean guards opened fire upon these bound victims and then left the scene.

Thirty-four American soldiers were slaughtered in this massacre. However, there were four survivors. Later the same day, these men were rescued by a United Nations patrol, who also recovered the bodies, took photographs and captured two enemy soldiers. Since this time, confessions have been obtained from Communist prisoners admitting participation in the crime, and the incident is now referable.

KWC No. 67, Maedae murders: Photographs clearly reveal that the six American soldiers detained as prisoners in a Korean house near Maedae were shot in cold blood and probably bayonetted. Ironically, this slaughter took place in front of a Communist propaganda bulletin board. However, there were five survivors, wounded in the massacre, who escaped by feigning death. In addition a captive North Korean sergeant has admitted participation in the murders. Close examination of the evidence leaves some doubt as to whether this case was properly referred, since there seems to be discrepancies between the confession and the survivors' statements.

KWC No. 75, Seoul-Pyongyang death march: The Seoul-Pyongyang death march has not been referred because no known perpetrators have been located in custody. However, since it leads up to KWC No. 76, it is included here for purposes of continuity.

On September 26, 1950, Korea added its counterpart to the infamous Bataan death march involving approximately 376 American prisoners of war. Only 296 survivors completed this 2-week horror hike.

In August, 1950, these prisoners were being held in Seoul, awaiting movement northward. Nearly half of the group was wounded, many seriously, but despite this they received practically no medical care. Instead, they were beaten often, and on at least one occasion were subjected to the humiliation of being forced to parade down the main street of the city. Their personal belongings were all stolen, and in addition, their combat boots were confiscated, many being left barefoot, and a few receiving ill-fitting Korean shoes in return.

During the ordeal of the march to Pyongyang, many of the sick and wounded were unable to maintain the pace. At this time the Communists demonstrated a policy that runs like a connecting thread through all the reported atrocity cases. That policy was the summary execution of any prisoner whose physical condition would burden their operations. These bodies were always left unburied along the roadside.

Beatings from the guards were commonplace throughout the ordeal. No medical care was provided and the only food was 1 or 2 rice balls per day. For water, the unfortunate survivors had to shift for themselves, drinking from roadside ditches and adjoining rice paddies. As a result, most of them suffered from attacks of diarrhea and dysentery.

Some of the wounded managed to ride on an ox cart, but with no medical care, their wounds became infected and maggot-laden. The senior office among the prisoners, a major, constantly pleaded with the captors for medicine, water, and more food. For his efforts, this officer received only additional abuse and beatings. At one time, when an opportunity to escape afforded itself, he refused to accompany those leaving, stating that he felt his duty required him to remain and do what he could to alleviate the suffering of the men.

Once an American plane flew over the hapless column and dropped supplies for them. However, the North Korean captors immediately and methodically collected these items, appropriating them to their own use. Some 33 soldiers managed to escape during the march and were rescued by friendly forces. In all cases, these individuals were undernourished and suffering from severe malnutrition. Others were in dire need of medical care for neglected wounds.

KWC No. 76, Sunchon Tunnel massacre: When the fall of the North Korean capital of Pyongyang to United Nations forces seemed imminent, all prisoners of war were entrained by the Communists for movement

northward. The men were herded into open gondolas, packed to overflowing, and forced to ride unprotected in the raw October weather. Pneumonia and exposure then started taking its daily toll from the weakened survivors, and their buddies conducted burial parties for them whenever an adequate halt was made. After they had suffered such inhuman treatment for a period of 9 days, their train arrived at a railroad tunnel approximately 4½ miles northwest of Sunchon, and remained inside the mountain all day to avoid the United Nations air activity taking place in the area.

During the early afternoon of October 20, 1950, the starving men were promised their first meal in several days, having eaten only hard crackers distributed intermittently during the journey. Their North Korean tormentors took the American major, together with a group of selected prisoners, purportedly as a detail to go to a nearby village to prepare the food. They were never seen nor heard from again. Hours later, the men remaining in the tunnel were informed that food had been prepared for them, and that they were to be conducted to a Korean house to eat, but due to the limited space they must go in small units, alternately.

Accordingly, the first group of 30 men was removed from the tunnel, escorted down the tracks, and told to hide in an erosion ditch until food was brought to them. As soon as they had relaxed on the ground, their guards opened pointblank fire in cold blood with Russian-made burp guns and rifles. Those living through the initial massacre and still showing signs of life were dispatched by shooting or bludgeoning. Some of the victims survived by feigning death.

Remaining groups were then brought out and treated in a like manner, in each case, the men being slaughtered while sitting on the ground, or standing around helplessly with empty rice bowls in their hands.

United Nations forces overran the Sunchon area on the following day, recovering the bodies of 68 murdered Americans, and, in addition, discovering 7 more inside the tunnel who had apparently died of malnutrition. Among the corpses were found some seriously wounded survivors who were evacuated. In addition, others who had escaped the atrocity found their way back to friendly troops.

Summation of this diabolical movement and massacre reveals that at least 138 American soldiers lost their lives in this war crime. The evidence is convincing and confirmed. An actual perpetrator is in custody in the case of the death march, but the entire happening should be scored against the Red leaders who condone and encourage such activity.

This Is the Enemy—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the second section of a series of excerpts from the extract of interim historical report, Korea War Crimes Division.

The documented criminal atrocities recorded below were committed against American soldiers and marines and soldiers of our South Korean ally by the Communists during the Korean war.

The perpetrators of these heinous acts of barbarism were once in the hands of the United Nations command, awaiting trial in the tradition of the Nuremberg and Tokyo proceedings. However, our failure to achieve an honorable armistice in Korea resulted in the freeing of these criminals.

Though we failed to bring to justice the guilty individuals, there was still open to us the course of placing the Communist regimes responsible on trial before the bar of world public opinion. To that end in 1955 I urged Secretary Dulles to attempt the establishment of a United Nations tribunal, before which these Red regimes would be placed on trial for war crimes against the United Nations; in absentia if necessary.

This course was rejected by the administration on the grounds that it would endanger the friendly relations that were supposed to be emerging from the Geneva Summit Conference.

The myth of the "spirit of Geneva" has been exploded. It is hoped that the sorry spectacle of our leaders engaging in camaraderie and mutual admiration with the Soviet tyrants is at an end. Much was done at the summit to raise the prestige of communism and they have effectively used their new prestige against us in every part of the globe.

Today more than ever before the people of the world need a true picture of communism in action. It is not too late to revive our own moral position. It is not too late to arouse the wrathful indignation of the decent people of the world against those responsible for the hideous brutalities inflicted on the forces of the United Nations.

EXCERPTS FROM EXTRACT OF INTERIM HISTORICAL REPORT, KOREAN WAR CRIMES DIVISION

KWC No. 125: On or about July 20, 1950, two American soldiers were killed in combat with North Korean soldiers and their bodies were recovered in November 1950 upon information supplied by a South Korean civilian. He confessed that he had seen the Americans hiding in a cave and had reported this fact to the North Korean soldiers, who went to the site and apparently shot them. This statement is corroborated by that of another civilian who assisted in the burial of the bodies. It is doubtful that this case should be considered as an atrocity, but appears at best to be a case of collaboration with the enemy.

KWC No. 143, 27th I. and R. Platoon: Personnel of the I. and R. platoon of the 27th Infantry Regiment, consisting of 2 officers, 11 enlisted men, and 3 Republic of Korea Army soldiers were ambushed and captured by North Koreans on November 6, 1950, in the vicinity of Togan-ni. The captives were stripped naked, even their shoes and dogtags being removed, and then marched about 5 miles to the headquarters of a Communist unit for interrogation. One of the officers was singled out for questioning and subjected to particularly brutal beatings for having warned the men to withhold all information other than that required by the rules of warfare. Soon thereafter, having been promised a warm meal, the prisoners were led to the vicinity of Yultong-ni. Their captors held a conference and, laughing among themselves, started shooting their victims in cold blood.

There was one survivor of this atrocity, who managed to return to friendly lines and tell the story. In addition, the bodies were recovered later at the scene and all of them identified. The following day, a captured North Korean confessed to participation in the crime, completing the chain of evidence.

KWC No. 185, marine patrol: Ten marines from the 1st Marine Division went on a reconnaissance patrol near Nakchon Dong on January 29, 1951. They never returned from this mission. In March 1951, checking on a National Police report, a patrol from the 2d ROK Division found their bodies, together with those of 10 Republic of Korea Army soldiers, 4 National Police, and 1 Korean civilian. These corpses were stripped naked with their hands bound behind them, and the physical appearance of the remains revealed that the decedents had either been bayoneted in the back and chest or had their skulls crushed with clubs.

Interrogation of native villagers indicated that these Americans were captured about January 30 and held prisoners until their murder on February 5, 1951.

Two North Korean lieutenants, discovered among captured Communist prisoners, have confessed to participation in this crime. Although their statements were recorded at different times and places, the factual data is the same. They relate that their commanding officer told them to prepare to execute the prisoners secretly. For this purpose, they decided to use bayonets. Accordingly, the graves were dug in advance, then the victims were led forth individually, stripped, bound and ordered to sit on the ground. In this position, each man was used for bayonet practice, and if death came too slowly or resistance was offered, his head was smashed with a rifle butt. Blood stains were swept from the ground and the bodies buried.

KWC No. 123, KWC No. 154, and KWC No. 184: These cases are all similar in that each involves the murder of a wounded American prisoner by civilians. In each, the perpetrator has confessed, and the confession is corrobrated by the recovery of the body of the victim at the sites pointed out. Two of the cases had additional statements from eyewitnesses.

KWC No. 1409: A North Korean prisoner of war has confessed to the murder of 10 United States soldiers and 9 ROK's who were prisoners of suspect's unit at the time. Suspect states that he personally killed 3 Americans and 4 ROK's and that 2 other NK's killed the remainder. A ROK check at the area mentioned by the accused proved positive; and a field trip resulted in the recovery of approximately 18 skeletal remains. Remains of 3 Americans and 4 ROK's were found in 1 hole, and the remainder nearby. This case is considered referable for trial. Also in the case file are pictures of the war crimes team discovering the bones.

SELECTED REFERABLE CASES INVOLVING KOREANS

Although a jurisdiction question may exist as to whether these cases should be tried by Republic of Korea or United Nations tribunal, there is no doubt that they are atrocities within the scope of war crimes division activities.

KWC No. 29, Chonju: During this same period of time, September 27–28, 1950, Chonju suffered a similar experience to that of Mokpo and Kongju, apparently indicating a fixed plan of extermination by the Communists. Two North Korean officer prisoners have confessed to killing as many as 2,000 anti-Communists, but check with natives indicate that approximately 80 were slain. Two survivors state that 16 were in the group with them, and that death in each case was by beating at the hands of a mob.

KWC No. 90, Kongju: Kongju received its demonstration of Red ruthlessness on December 27, 1950, when the 35 men and 1 woman political prisoners confined in the city jail were eliminated. In the late afternoon, these people were told that they were to be given a lecture by an officer of the North Korean Peoples' Army, and were led into the open and there seated in a semicircle. As soon as they were settled as comfortably as possible, the officer ordered the guards to open fire upon them and the slaughter commenced. Fortunately there were 2 survivors and most of the bodies

have been recovered from the place of execution. In addition, 2 prisoners of war, in separate confessions, have admitted participation in this crime, and each has implicated the other.

KWC No. 92, Hamyang: Another common policy which the enemy seemed to follow was that of executing captured Republic of Korea Army soldiers. In this case, on September 1, 1950, 269 such prisoners, plus 1 reported American, were marched to the base of a mountain about 8 miles northwest of Hamyang after being told that they were to be evacuated to the north. At this point they were divided into groups of 10, bound together, led off into the hills, and summarily shot. Several suspects now confined as prisoners of war have confessed to this atrocity, and have been identified by the six victims who managed to survive.

KWC No. 102, Kwanju: Obligingly cooperative, 1 North Korean prisoner stated that he was a member of the Education and Cultural Section in the village of Kwanju, and that in his capacity, together with 2 accomplices, on September 16, 1950, he took 10 anti-Communist prisoners about 8 kilometers in the country and there executed them. He adds that he used a carbine and did not bury the bodies. He desired to point out the situs, so accompanied by a war crimes investigator and a Korean detective from Kwangju, he directed them to the spot. Three badly decomposed bodies were found, and the suspect insisted that these were 3 of the 10 victims he had helped to murder. The case was probably submitted to accommodate the confessor.

KWC No. 117, Mokpo murders: Approximately 282 South Korean political prisoners were confined in the Mokpo peoples prison on September 28, 1950 when United Nations forces were approaching the city. Realizing that defeat was imminent, their North Korean jailers held an emergency conference and decided to follow the usual pattern of executing these persons for the crime of being reactionaries. The victims were taken from the jail and had their hands handcuffed or tied behind them. They were then loaded onto four trucks and taken to different murder sites. Although most of these unfortunates were shot to death, a few managed to escape when one of the trucks broke down. When the liberating forces overran the city, they took many prisoners, six of whom confessed to participation in the mass killing. This added to the statements of survivors and recovery of bodies completes the evidence against them.

KWC No. 122, Myong Duk San: This case involved the beheading of a Korean civilian prisoner by a North Korean lieutenant acting under orders from his commanding officer, a lieutenant colonel, and assisted by a junior lieutenant. In addition, there were two eyewitnesses to the murder. The crime was referred because all three suspects are in confinement and have made corroborating confessions. In addition, the witnesses' statements make the evidence conclusive.

KWC No. 141, Changhyon massacre: Three North Korean prisoners of war have confessed to the killing of some 1,800 South Korean civilian prisoners on October 8, 1950. The victims were residents of Seoul and Kaesong who were alleged to have been friendly with the U. N. forces. The victims were forced to march to Pyongyang with their hands bound, little food, and scanty clothing. After reaching Pyongyang, they were confined in the military academy building. Later they were divided into smaller groups and taken out and shot. The bodies were buried by nearby villagers. Two American officers investigating the atrocity have made sworn statements concerning their observations of the mass graves. They stated that the stench of death was everywhere, the ground was sunken and that upon digging they turned up a human skull. There was also a grave marker which stated in Korean "to our comrades from South Korea."

KWC No. 180, Naju: Also on September 28, 1950, at Naju, a junior lieutenant in the political security police unit took six political prisoners from the jail, and as usual, without trial, shot and bayoneted them. This lieutenant has confessed to the atrocity but maintains that he acted under orders of his superior. The hands of the victims were tied behind them, they were shot, and the bayonet used for the coup de grace where deemed necessary. Despite this treatment, 5 persons survived, although 1 died shortly thereafter. All identify the confessor as the perpetrator.

CASES INVOLVING AMERICANS

The following cases, selected from the files, are those in which there is sufficient evidence to prove that the crime has been committed, but which have not been referred, primarily because no perpetrators are in custody. Victims were Americans except in the case of the Catholic priests, and in the Taejon massacre, thousands of Korean civilians were also included.

KWC No. 2: Soldiers from the 24th Infantry Division, engaged in a fire fight near Chonui on July 10, 1950, witnessed the capture of 4 American soldiers, and then looked on helplessly while 2 of them were murdered. Later on, all 4 bodies were recovered, hands bound behind their backs, 3 shot in the back of the head and the other with the skull crushed by a blunt instrument.

KWC No. 10, medic and chaplain: No respectors of the Red Cross or the Christian cross, the Communists in July 1950 overran a group of 18 to 20 wounded American prisoners being ministered to by the regimental surgeon, wearing the Red Cross brassard, and an Army chaplain, none of whom was armed. The enemy immediately opened fire, wantonly executing the group with Russian rifles and burp guns. The surgeon, although wounded, managed to survive and escape. Later, remains of three victims of this atrocity were recovered. The chaplain was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously.

KWC No. 63, Ku-jang-dong train massacre: Thirty American prisoners were shot and bayoneted to death about 4 miles north of Ku-jang-dong, on December 21, 1950. They were being moved north by train, when it was strafed and disabled by United Nations planes. Their North Korean captors decided to murder all those who were wounded, before continuing the evacuation. Shortly thereafter, a friendly patrol moved into the area and discovered their bodies, seven of which had been covered with oil and set afire.

While searching the area, three survivors were discovered, one hiding under a straw mat with half his face shot away and the bone of his left leg exposed. The other two had sought refuge in a nearby Korean home and were seriously wounded, as well as being weak from malnutrition. They all agree that the person who gave the massacre order was a South Korean traitor. To date no perpetrators have been discovered, but this incident adds to the accumulation of evidence proving the Communist policy of killing wounded captives.

This Is the Enemy—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the third and final section of a series of excerpts from the extract of interim historical report, Korea War Crimes Division.

Historians of Korea war crimes regard Chinese and North Korean Communists as equally guilty of the incredible program of criminal atrocities against helpless prisoners of war, which the following extract bears out.

These atrocities were a part of the Communist war against the United Nations, a war which still technically continues.

Yet astute observers of the United Nations Assembly report that the United Nations admittance of Red China is inevitable, and is being delayed until next year only to prevent election year embarrassment to the present administration.

Indeed, by accepting the shameful "package deal," which called for the admission of five Communist statellites whose governments satisfied none of the requirements of the United Nations Charter, including the Communist puppet province of Outer Mongolia, the administration seems to have embarked upon the gradual destruction of the moral position against admittance of Red China.

But I am confident that this Nation, after reflecting upon the history and character of the Communist Chinese regime, will remain steadfast in its opposition to United Nations acceptance. For such acceptance would make a mockery of the heroic sacrifices made in Korea, and would reduce the San Francisco Charter to a worthless scrap of paper.

This is one stand from which there can be no retreat or with which there can be no compromise.

EXCERPTS FROM EXTRACT OF INTERIM HISTORICAL REPORT, KOREAN WAR CRIMES DIVISION

KWC No. 113, Chinese torture: This case illustrates one method of handling wounded American prisoners by Chinese captors. A lieutenant survivor of a patrol ambushed on November 8, 1950, stated in his affidavit, "I saw my men that were wounded in action taken by the Chinese and hung up by their hands and then their clothes set afire, and the men that were dead and unconscious, they would push sticks in their eyes, and bayonet. They took most of the dead men's clothes off." This has been corroborated by a medical officer who examined the condition of the recovered bodies.

KWC No. 164, bamboo-spear case: During December 1950, a South Korean patrol discovered the bodies of five American airmen near Muju. It was apparent from the condition of the remains that the victims had been subjected to fiendish torture, the flesh being perforated with multiple punctures, apparently inflicted by sharpened sticks or bamboo spears. An investigation of the incident disclosed that the men were members of a truck convoy that had been ambushed by guerrillas.

KWC No. 279, slaughter of 1,250 American prisoners: One thousand two hundred and fifty American prisoners were slaughtered in cold blood by their Communist captors if the confession of a North Korean prisoner is true. Unfortunately, that is all the evidence contained in the file. However, after several days of questioning, during which the suspect gave very detailed information, it was the belief of the interrogators that the facts contained therein were well founded and reliable.

This North Korean stated that in his assignment as a truckdriver, on September 10,

1950, he was driving from Namchon to Pyongyang and passed a group of 24 warehouses surrounded by barbed wire and noticed that many American prisoners were confined therein. Five days later, his unit was ordered to prepare for a long trip. He added that about 30 Russian-made trucks were in his battalion, and that they loaded approximately 650 prisoners on them and commenced their journey about midnight. At their first stop, they were joined by an additional 24 trucks loaded to capacity with United States prisoners of war. During the next stop, which was for a meal and rest for the cargo, he noticed that 50 trucks were in the convoy. At the final halt, the men were unloaded and led into a mountain valley where they were fed rice and wine, but, upon a blue flare signal, the guards and drivers began firing into the group and continued for about 40 minutes, completing the slaughter of the estimated 1,250 prisoners. They then uncovered three large pits which had been excavated earlier, but found them insufficient to hold all the bodies, and so were required to dig another.

Following this macabre execution, the trucks returned and later transported all the remaining prisoners from the warehouses to a new camp further north. The Confessor was unable to explain why the one convoy load was murdered but the others were spared. To the extent that it has been possible to check, such as locations and units, this confession appears accurate. Every effort should be expended to discover corroborating evidence for this reported atrocity.

KWC No. 1670, Artillery FO team torture: Proving that the Communists still persist in committing atrocities, this recent case occurred on September 21, 1952. At that time an American forward observer team and a squad of South Koreans occupied Hill 854 near Samchi-yong. Their position was overrun by the enemy, but was recovered the following day in a counterattack. The bodies of two United States soldiers, horribly mutilated, together with those of several South Koreans were discovered by a friendly patrol. The lieutenant who found them made the following affidavit:

"One of the boys had no head. It seemed to have been mashed or beaten and was laying all over the road. Both of his feet had been cut off about half way between the knee and the ankle. It appeared as though they had been chopped off with a dull instrument. He had no means of identification on him. I searched him for dogtags, clothing markings, belt markings, shoes, ID tags, and personal effects in his pockets but nothing was to be found.

"The other GI had his eyes gouged out, and nothing remained where his eyes were except holes. He had been bayonetted all over the body with the upper part of his legs completely layed open to the bone. He also had no marks of identification on him."

Bodies of the Republic of Korea soldiers had received a like treatment, one of them having had the genitals severed with a sharp instrument and lying alongside the corpse. One can only imagine the horrible suffering to which these victims were subjected.

KWC No. 1512, Catholic priest murder: An Irish priest was the victim of KWC No. 1512. He was accosted by an enemy officer while walking down the street with a Korean friend. Their assailant accused them both of being spies for the Americans and took them to his superior officer, who told him to dispose of the prisoners in any way he desired. Accordingly, they were escorted a short distance and then shot in cold blood. The priest was slain, but his friend survived. The body has been recovered and identified, but since the perpetrators are unknown, the case has not been referred for trial.

KWC No. 28, Taejon massacre: For murderous barbarism, the Taejon massacre will be recorded in the annals of history along with the Rape of Nanking, the Warsaw ghetto, and other similar mass exterminations. Unnumbered civilians, estimated variously from 500 to 7,500, as well as 42 Americans and 17 Republic of Korea Army prisoners were slaughtered in cold blood for political expediency.

During the summer of 1950, following the capture of the city by the enemy, the North Korean Home Affairs Department was established with the express purpose of apprehending all persons unsympathetic to the Communist cause. This security force then proceeded to arrest prominent business and professional men together with all persons in the area who had been employees of the Republic of Korea. Each unfortunate person who was arrested was subsequently brought to the headquarters located in the Catholic mission for inquisition, and those who survived were then incarcerated in the city prison. This jail consisted of 150 cells, each of which was packed with from 40 to 70 of these victims. When it was impossible to squeeze more into these blocks, the overflow was retained within the confines of the mission. The military prisoners were not segregated from the others.

During the imprisonment, North Korean soldiers were granted access to the hapless, defenseless individuals for the sport of tormenting them and confiscating any personal possession that might have been overlooked. Favorite pasttimes were the twisting of prisoners' fingers, kicking and beating them without provocation.

When the recapture of Taejon by United Nations forces appeared imminent in late September 1950, the occupying conquerors determined that, prior to withdrawal, they would liquidate all these victims.

Commencing September 23, 1950, several groups, numbering from 100 to 200 each, were quietly removed from their cells each night, their hands tied behind their backs, and each person bound to the others. They were then transported to previously selected sites, placed in open trenches or ditches dug expressly for this purpose, and summarily shot. A check was made to locate survivors, and where found, their skulls were crushed. The bodies were then covered lightly with dirt.

By September 26, 1950, the Security Police decided that they must accelerate the rate of murder if they were to accomplish their fiendish purpose prior to departure. Therefore, they dug additional trenches in the courtyard of the police station and called in a North Korean Army unit to assist in completing their bloody work. The able military prisoners were led out in small groups and promptly dispatched. Those remaining, several wounded American soldiers, were carried out on litters, unceremoniously dumped into the trenches and shot or beaten to death. As time ran out on the murder-gorged aggressors, the remaining South Koreans were dragged from the prison into the already filled trenches and killed. At the same time, those who had been retained in the Catholic mission interrogation center were executed as rapidly as possible. When these trenches were filled with bodies, others were slain in the churchyard and basement, and many bodies thrown down the well until it was completely stuffed. The perpetrators then fled without burying their latest victims.

Examination of the bodies revealed that most of them had been beaten and mutilated before execution. Of these thousands of unfortunates, there were only 6 survivors, 3 civilians, 1 Republic of Korea Army soldier, and 2 Americans. Thousands of bodies were recovered by the liberating United Nations forces who occupied the city. Those responsible for the horror of this crime must be brought to judgment before the tribunal of civilized peoples.

CASES INVOLVING KOREANS

These cases, selected more or less at random, illustrate the manner in which the Communist North Koreans and Chinese have dealt with persons whom they considered bad political risks. In no instance has there been any indication that the victims were given any semblance of trial prior to execution. The incidents related are but a sampling of the hundreds of inhumane atrocities recorded in the case files of the War Crimes Division.

KWC No. 32, Suchon jail: Demonstrating ingenuity in means of torture, the North Korean Communists decided to dispose of the landowners and government officials they had confined in the Suchon jail. So, prior to their withdrawal on September 23, 1950, they piled wood, packing cases, and other combustibles around the outside walls of the brick building in which the prisoners were held. They then drenched it in gasoline and set it afire, roasting alive the unfortunate victims secured inside. Several days later United Nations forces recovered 32 charred bodies from the hideous crematory. Local civilians say that altogether more than 280 persons were murdered.

KWC No. 36, Seoul Hospital murders: When the North Korean Peoples Army invaded Seoul on June 28, 1950, they immediately occupied the university hospital, wherein were confined around 150 wounded Republic of Korea soldiers. Upon orders of the commanding officer, these patients were all executed in their beds and rooms, following which their bodies were buried behind the hospital.

KWC No. 41 and KWC No. 727, Chonju: When the estimated 600 to 2,000 political prisoners (317 bodies recovered after relatives had been removing them for several days) were murdered in Chonju, the blood bath was accomplished by beatings wherein the bound victims were killed with clubs, picks, swords, and similar weapons.

KWC No. 53, Yongchong: For diabolical mass murder, Yongchong has few equals. Approximately 500 South Korean prisoners, survivors of 800 who originally left Seoul on this final march, were led into an apple orchard, lined up in four ranks, and shot. Survivors were bludgeoned, and all bodies were piled together, drenched with gasoline and ignited. Another group of 90 had been shot and deposited in a coal mine about 15 miles away, en route to Yongchong.

KWC No. 56, forcible conscription at Tong Tang-Ni: Many of our enemy prisoners of war are discovered to be South Koreans who were conscripted into the Communist armies against their wishes. The procedure followed at Tong Tang-ni demonstrates one manner in which this was accomplished. On October 2, 1950, all the young men of the village were assembled by the North Korean Security Police and given the choice of entering the North Korean Army or being imprisoned. Approximately 40 men refused to volunteer and were jailed. Soon thereafter, the prisoners' hands were tied behind their backs and they were divided into two groups. One group was taken to the river bank and shot to death by their five guards. The other suffered a like fate after being lined up on the edge of a large pit.

KWC No. 733, Chonju: Agents of the 25th CIC team counted 315 bodies on the afternoon of September 30, 1950, 2 days after the families of victims had begun removing the bodies. Estimates of the number of victims range from 600 to 2,000. All the victims had their hands wired behind their backs and most of the bodies bore evidence of having been shot. A number of the victims evidently had been stabbed or bayonetted in the stomach and a few appeared to have had their heads split by an ax or similar implement.

Federal Aid For School Construction

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is still hearing witnesses on H. R. 7535, the Kelley bill for Federal aid for school construction.

President Eisenhower presented his views on this legislation in the special message he sent to the Congress on January 12. The President submitted a revised and broadened program which in most respects is similar to that proposed by the Kelley bill. Except for a formula to encourage the States to greater local effort, every one of the President's proposals was considered by the House Committee and accepted or rejected or modified in the bill finally voted out and now pending in the Rules Committee.

The awareness of the need for more classrooms, the action at the White House Conference on Education, the strong bipartisan support for the Kelley bill in the committee added to the President's request for legislation now, gave hope that some school construction legislation would be enacted soon. There is, however, one great obstacle in the way of enactment. That is the so-called Powell amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

A similar amendment was proposed, in committee last year by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. At that time the House had already considered a similar amendment in the military reserve bill. When the vote came upon the amendment in committee, I voted against it because I was convinced that its adoption would kill the bill and that the amendment added nothing to the present law. I still take that position. However, the gentleman from New York the other day addressed the House and told us of the need for his amendment. In the course of his speech he raised some questions that should be discussed in more detail.

The gentleman from New York inserted into the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mr. Parke M. Banta, general counsel for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which Mr. Banta declared that further congressional action was needed before the Surgeon General could withhold public funds where a hospital, to be built under a Hill-Burton grant, does not allow colored doctors to use its facilities for treatment of their patients.

In view of the legislative history of the Hill-Burton Act and because of the fact that there has been no decision of the Supreme Court of the United States specifically respecting hospitals the opinion may have some basis.

Then Mr. Powell calls attention to a letter from Dr. Harold Hunt, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "that any decision to withold grants because of the continuation of some degree of segregated education should necessarily be based on a court determination that the particular State or school district in question was not proceeding to make a prompt and reasonable start toward good faith compliance with the pronouncement of the Supreme Court."

The United States Supreme Court has acted. It has declared that—

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate, educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.
>
> We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws.

Subsequently the Supreme Court said:

> The courts will require that the defendants make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance with our May 17, 1954, ruling. Once such a start has been made, the courts may find that additional time is necessary to carry out the ruling in an effective manner. * * * During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases * * * to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases. * * *

Then in the case of Bolling against Sharpe the Supreme Court said:

> In view of our decision that the Constitution would prohibit the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.

These decisions make it clear that the constitutional provision is a positive and affirmative one.

The equal protection clause is not a negative one. The Supreme Court has made it clear that the courts will enforce the constitutional requirement of nonsegregation without the necessity of further legislation. This provision is a self-executing one soundly based on constitutional doctrine and cannot be circumvented by inaction on the part of Congress. The later case of Bolling v. Sharpe also decided that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia was a denial of due process in violation of due process of law guaranteed by the 5th amendment.

What is the situation today? There are three categories of States. In the first category are States such as mine where segregation is not a problem and where it is illegal by State law and for all practical purposes is nonexistent. For such States the Supreme Court decision has made no material change.

The other two categories are the ones with which I propose to deal in the remainder of this discussion.

The second category is composed of States in which segregation has been practiced and in which schools were maintained under the separate but equal doctrine but who are now making genuine and realistic efforts toward compliance with the Court's decision. Border States of West Virginia and Missouri are examples of this second category.

The Supreme Court recognized that the process of desegregation would be a long one and directed that the process be undertaken with "deliberate speed," taking into consideration "problems related to administration, arising from the physical conditions of the school plants, the school transportation system, personnel revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis."

These and other problems caused the Court to recognize that desegregation would not take place in a month or a year.

But note that the Supreme Court said that there must be a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance. After such a prompt and reasonable start the districts were to proceed with deliberate speed.

In the third category are the States who have openly, notoriously, and publicly declared that they are not going to comply with the Supreme Court's decision. In these States official proclamations by the governor, regularly enacted acts of the legislatures, or official elections under the auspices of public officials and in accordance with the laws of the State have laid down a policy of open defiance of the Supreme Court decision. These are not acts of isolated local officials nor of groups of citizens but these are such public and official acts which have the force of State law and courts in most jurisdictions would take judicial notice.

Now Mr. POWELL'S proposed amendment would apply to each of these categories. As outlined in his speech on January 24 the gentleman from New York would add an eighth requirement to the contents of the State plan for any State desiring to accept the benefits of Federal aid for school construction. The amendment proposes that the State plan "provide that school facilities of the State are open to all children without regard to race, in conformity with the requirements of the United States Supreme Court decisions: Except that if a State plan does not so provide, it shall not prevent payment of funds authorized under this act to such States for use in counties or other political subdivisions within the State that are operating their schools in conformity with the Supreme Court decisions" and shall add to the contents of the statement that must be filed with the Commissioner of Education by the State educational agency the following language: "and shall state that the county or other subdivision in which each project is located is operating its schools without regard to race in conformity with the requirements of the United States Supreme Court decision. A State plan which meets the requirements of the Commissioner in every other way shall be permitted to be put into effect in those school districts which comply with the Supreme Court decisions."

As I read the amendment it will force the States to accelerate the process of desegregation. Those States in the sec-

ond category that I have mentioned, who are honestly, sincerely, and realistically attempting with deliberate speed to bring about integration of their schools would be forced to bring this desegregation about immediately.

Mr. Walter Lippmann in a recent column took a comparable position. The States that are making an effort to desegrate need the patient cooperation and the understanding of the rest of the Nation. At its best the Powell amendment would do nothing more than the Supreme Court decision is now doing. But giving it the interpretation above, and it is open to such interpretation, would be a deterrent to the very gradualism that the Supreme Court desires.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has introduced H. R. 6803 which is much sounder in its approach to this problem of aiding States in this second category to integrate their schools. Instead of saying to these States, you will have to get your schools desegregated immediately or you will not get any Federal funds, H. R. 6803 would adopt a positive approach. In effect, the Udall bill says that the Federal Government is responsible for the change in the doctrine of separate but equal to the doctrine of complete integration. Many States have made genuine efforts to provide Negro students with schools that were separate but equal. Now these States must readjust their school systems, close some of their schools, build others and undergo additional expense. This is in effect as surely a Federal impact on the districts affected as if a defense industry or an army post had moved in and disrupted the ordinary operations of the district. The Federal Government would build the schools or help to build them in districts where the impact was greatest. All of the people of America would be extending a helping hand in solving a problem that is national in scope.

The third category is different. In this category are the few States that by a system of calculated disobedience have taken legal and official steps to defy the Supreme Court's decision. The Supreme Court directed that there be a prompt and reasonablye start. By no rationalization can these States be deemed in compliance with the decree of the Court.

The decree of May 31, 1955, said "all provisions of Federal, State, or local law permitting such discrimination must yield to this principle," that is, the principle that segregation is a denial of equal protection of the laws and a violation of the Constitution.

Laying aside for the moment the pending legislation for Federal aid for school construction the question arises as to what is the effect of the Supreme Court decision on other school legislation. Can the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certify that vocational educational money to be sent into these recalcitrant States is to be expended in accordance with the Federal law? Are these defiant States entitled to school lunch money for segregated schools? Are they entitled to money under Public Law 815 and 874 for construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas?

According to Under Secretary Hunt's letter the administrative agency in charge of distributing can close its eyes to open defiance of the Constitution of the United States and continue to pay out money to States who are in open and flagrant defiance until directed to do otherwise by Congress.

I shall never agree with such a doctrine until there is a definite court decision declaring that I am wrong.

In a recent letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Clarence Mitchell, director of the NAACP, says that here is involved a deep principle and that "the NAACP has never retreated on principle and we shall not do so now."

For me, too, there is a principle here that is fundamental in constitutional doctrine, that goes back to the separation of powers. I shall never concede that the enforcement of the great provisions of the Constitution, the liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, and the 14th amendment are not effective until there is a specific legislative enactment by the Congress. The legislative branch of Government cannot by refusal or failure to act, deprive citizens of rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution. It is the duty of the executive branch to enforce these provisions of the Constitution in every law. These self-executing provisions of the Constitution are implicit in every law enacted by Congress and it is unnecessary to specially mention them in legislation affecting the subjects in which these constitutional principles are involved. Without further congressional action it becomes the duty of the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Attorney General of the United States to enforce the equal protection and due process clauses of the Constitution as soon as clarified by the United States Supreme Court.

Therefore, when a State, by official proclamation of its Governor, by regular act of its legislature, by a duly called referendum of its voters or by any other official means, takes action circumventing the Constitution of the United States, then it is the duty of the executive department to enforce the Constitution. There is a great deal of difference between unofficial local resistance and failure to comply and public official acts of duly authorized officeholders.

To insert the Powell amendment into the school-construction bill would mean that Congress does believe that specific legislation is necessary to enforce the 5th and 14th amendments and that the rights and freedoms guaranteed by those amendments are not enforcible by the executive department until Congress has directed the Executive to carry them out.

Applied to the instant case, it means that the Commissioner of Education can sit idly by while States are in open defiance of the Constitution and violating the equal-protection and due-process clauses of that Constitution by official action and continue to send money to aid vocational education, school lunches, and other federally assisted educational services in segregated schools. I do not believe that is the law and I will not vote for an amendment that concedes that to be the law.

President Eisenhower has said that, in his opinion, the Powell amendment was unnecessary. He can clarify the whole question by getting a decision from the Attorney General as to whether the Commissioner has a right to withhold Federal funds from schools in the third category. Such a decision and a forthright declaration of intention to carry out the provisions of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court should be made before debate on the Kelley bill begins in this House.

I include as a part of my remarks the following editorials and the text of the letter from Mr. Mitchell mentioned above:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 2, 1956]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE POWELL AMENDMENT

The Kelley bill to appropriate Federal money in aid of the construction of schools has run into the conflict—which is still unresolved in the Southern States—over the Supreme Court's decision on segregation. Representative ADAM C. POWELL of New York is proposing an amendment to the bill which would deny Federal funds to States or local school districts which continue to maintain segregated schools. The money which is denied them would be held in escrow and paid out whenever a local district complied with the decision of the Supreme Court.

This amendment, which has the support of Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the Republican leader in the House, might well, if adopted, bring about the defeat of the bill and the hope of Federal aid for the schools. It would be expecting too much that the southern Senators and Congressmen would vote for the bill with this amendment in it.

The southerners, plus many northerners who are really opposed to Federal aid on principle or on grounds of economy, would be a formidable opposition. But even if the bill could be passed over their opposition, it would complicate and obstruct, rather than assist and promote, the movement to end segregation in the schools.

"I think I shall vote for the Powell amendment" said Representative MARTIN the other day, "because of the position of the Supreme Court, I don't think you can do otherwise." Mr. MARTIN is entirely mistaken. The truth of the matter is that because of the position of the Supreme Court, Congress ought to reject the Powell amendment. For that amendment, far from upholding the Supreme Court's decision, would subvert it.

The position taken by the Supreme Court is that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, being a denial of the equal protection of the laws, and that the Court will pass upon "the adequacy of any plans" that State and school authorities may propose "to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases."

The Supreme Court, recognizing that the changeover from segregated schools is a difficult and complex matter, has refrained from demanding immediate and unconditional application of its ruling. It has recognized that there must be a period of transition—a period of persuasion and accommodation—and the Supreme Court has accepted the burden of presiding over this transition.

The Powell amendment runs counter to the letter and the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision. For the amendment proposes to have Congress take over from the Court the burden of getting the rule against segregation observed. It proposes to punish the localities which are slow about or opposed to complying, and to give to admin-

istrative officials, rather than to the Supreme Court, the power to determine whether the law is being observed. No one, I submit, who understands and believes in the Supreme Court's decision, can vote for the Powell amendment.

If the amendment is adopted and the school-aid bill is defeated, the cause of integration will suffer. Federal aid for school construction will be withheld from precisely those States and school districts where it is most needed. Integration, since it means that Negro children will have the same education as white children, requires much money. In the segregated school systems the Negro children are for the most part less well provided for. One of the necessary means to the integration of the schools is to build more schools. Otherwise, under integration the education of the white children will be pulled down toward the standards now prevailing for the Negro children.

Any true and understanding friend of integration in the Southern States should realize that when he proposes to starve the southern schools, he is making it more difficult to bring about integration. The South now has a dual school system, the white one better than the Negro. It will take money to bring about one school system at the level of the schools for white children. The worse the two systems are allowed to become, being deprived of money that is indispensable, the harder it will be in fact to integrate them. And the more acute will be the passions aroused.

Mr. POWELL is a Democrat and Mr. MARTIN is a Republican. They would do well not to play politics with the public schools.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 3, 1956]

CART BEFORE THE HORSE

Those who believe that the bill for Federal aid to education ought to be saddled with an antisegregation rider need to give sober and realistic thought to the amount of weight they are asking it to carry. The bill will fall with that burden. And its falling will be a blow to integration as well as to education.

If Representative ADAM POWELL insists upon attaching his antisegregation amendment to the school bill, there is no doubt that many Members of the House of Representatives will support him—not because they think the amendment useful or constructive or in anyway likely to achieve its purpose but because they think opposition to it politically inexpedient. They may have the votes to adopt the rider, but it is by no means sure that they will then have the votes to adopt the bill—or that some who vote to encumber the bill will not turn around and vote to defeat it. Moreover, if the bill passes the House with Mr. POWELL's amendment tacked to it, the chances of getting it through the Senate will be very slim indeed.

This is not to suggest by any means that Mr. POWELL and others who advocate an antisegregation amendment to the education bill are cynical or indifferent to the welfare of the schools. Many of them are deeply convinced that Federal funds ought not to go in any circumstances to States or localities which are acting in violation of the United States Constitution. This newspaper has always shared that conviction. The trouble with trying to apply it in connection with a school grant-in-aid bill is that the Supreme Court has not said that the Constitution requires immediate and unconditional school integration; it has said, rather, that integration should be accomplished as speedily as practicable in conformity with local conditions, and it has designated the Federal District Courts not the Office of Education or any other executive agency, to determine whether the pace of compliance is satisfactory.

On the pretext of supporting the Supreme Court, the Powell rider would require the executive branch of the Government to discharge a function that is essentially judicial—and to impose a rigid standard where the Supreme Court has fixed a flexible one. The effect would be to give plausibility to opponents of Federal aid to education who argue that Federal aid would mean Federal interference in local affairs. And it would be to deny Federal aid to the very areas most in need of it. Thus education and integration alike would be retarded. For it is precisely where poverty is most prevalent that prejudice is most rampant. The States and localities most committed to segregation are the ones most in need of Federal aid—most in need of school improvement as an indispensable basis for the integration which they must sooner or later embrace.

Integration will come as education progresses. It cannot be promoted by withholding aid to education. Those who would be responsible for denying aid to all the Nation's public schools because segregation persists in a few of them threaten to push apart the pillars of the democratic process. The United States now has a historic opportunity to rejuvenate its public-school system. It would be tragic to lose that opportunity by confusing it with a different cause.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 3, 1956]

NO TIME FOR A RIDER

President Eisenhower has done well to throw his weight against any amendment to the school-aid bill denying Federal funds to districts where racial segregation persists.

To mix up the issues of Federal aid for school construction and racial segregation in the schools would be especially pointless in view of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision against segregation and its order for gradual implementation of the decision.

If it is unconstitutional for school districts to use their own funds in support of segregation, it is obviously unconstitutional for them to use Federal funds for that purpose. Hence, if a school-aid bill is passed without an antisegregation rider, and if some States undertake to use funds received under this bill in support of segregation, they can be enjoined in the courts.

So long as the courts obeyed the Supreme Court decision on segregation, they would surely have to rule against the use of Federal funds to support practices which have been declared in violation of the Constitution.

It is true that bitter-enders in the South are fighting the execution of the Supreme Court school decision. But an antisegregation rider to a school-construction bill will not settle that controversy. In the end, the courts must settle it. This will take time. But the time will not be shortened by unnecessarily injecting the segregation issue into the school-bill debate.

As the President said, let's get a bill passed first. School districts the country over face immediate building needs. The chances of Federal aid in meeting those needs ought not to be jeopardized by a pointless legislative fight over segregation.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 3, 1956]

POWELL AMENDMENT

Your editorial of January 26 on the school construction bill reiterates your oft-repeated opposition to the Powell amendment to the pending school-construction bill. This amendment was introduced by Mr. POWELL at the urging of the NAACP. It is supported by sincere and honest people throughout the country. A great many of these people, including the writer of this letter, have children who attend public schools.

After spending approximately $250,000 to win the school-segregation cases, private citizens should not be asked to spend additional money to obtain court decrees preventing the use of Federal money in the underwriting and extension of racial segregation. This is exactly what they will be called upon to do if the pending school-construction bill passes without the Powell amendment.

At present, the 5 most recalcitrant States receive over $75 million a year from the Federal Treasury for education. All of this money is spent under the illegal pattern of racial segregation and most of it goes to schools and colleges for white only.

The Department of Agriculture, the Comptroller General, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have all refused to halt this misuse of tax money. The States that do not practice segregation in public schools are also the biggest sources of Federal revenue. This means that their money is being used to help finance segregation.

It is a cause for deep regret that you and the President direct your fire at those of us who are seeking to obtain obedience to the law, but do not criticize the obstructionists, who are expected to fight our amendment. The President and most of the supporters of the school-construction bill are willing to include the very worthwhile Bacon-Davis provision in the proposal because those who support the Bacon-Davis regulations have sufficient political power to get what they want. On the other hand, those who do not have such political strength are asked to step aside and bow to lawlessness.

The NAACP has never retreated on principle and we shall not do so now.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe before the gentleman came to the Congress from Montana he was a member of the Montana Supreme Court, was he not?

Mr. METCALF. That is right.

Mr. LANDRUM. If I interpreted the statement of the gentleman correctly, it is his belief that if this Congress passes legislation authorizing an appropriation of Federal money for the construction of public schools, that money, or money that might be appropriated later under an appropriation measure, can be withheld from any State without any further action by this body or by the Supreme Court, if the State in question should disagree with the principle of integrated public schools.

Is that what the gentleman says?

Mr. METCALF. With one addition. That one addition is that Federal funds can be withheld from those States where there has been such a public and official action by the legislature, by referendum such as was had in Virginia, or by official proclamation of the governor, such an official action that a court would be able to take judicial notice of their failure to start and their open disobedience of the constitutional provision.

Mr. LANDRUM. Do I understand by that the gentleman means that when any State has announced its opposition to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, or any State which has now or might later adopt measures to prevent the integration of its public schools, the administrative, or executive, branch of

our Government would be authorized to withhold from that State any appropriations which might have become available for public schools through the action of this Congress?

Mr. METCALF. Again I have to qualify the gentleman's question. A mere announcement of disagreement with the Supreme Court decision is, to my mind, not enough. It takes a regular official act of the legislature or an official proclamation of the governor, or some regular act that of which a court of competent jurisdiction could take judicial notice, rather than these things we would have to prove in a regular court proceeding. I might say we would take judicial notice of the official election in Virginia, a referendum held under the laws of Virginia, by the regularly constituted voters of Virginia, that is a different kind of an act than a mere pronouncement that a State is or is not going to comply.

As I understand, there is a resolution of interposition pending in the Mississippi legislature. The fact that a resolution was introduced or that some members of the legislature announced that they were going to introduce such a resolution would not, to my mind, justify the withholding of Federal funds, but if the legislature passes that resolution and it is enacted into law in a regularly constituted form and fashion, then I say the only thing the Federal Government can do is to take cognizance of that official action and withhold funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There is no interposition resolution pending at this time in the Mississippi State Legislature.

Mr. METCALF. I am sorry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. However, the State of Alabama has already interposed by declaring the decision null and void, and the State of Virginia has interposed its sovereignty, and I am certain that the State of Mississippi within the next 2 or 3 weeks will certainly not let its sister States down in their defense of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. METCALF. I have been misinformed. But I would say if a resolution is passed by Alabama, if the gentleman's information is correct, that would put them in the official category that I have designated in my opening remarks, the third category, that would warrant and require the Commissioner of Education to withhold all Federal funds.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. Then, what the gentleman is saying is that any State which has put itself in that position would be supporting an appropriation for the construction of public schools throughout the United States and yet have that State's share withheld from it because the State refuses to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954, barring segregation in our public schools?

Mr. METCALF. That is exactly correct. The gentleman from Georgia knows that I understand that I have not the awareness he has of the emotional and sociological conditions that exist in some areas of the South. I do not have a segregation or desegregation problem in my district. I am merely talking about what I believe to be sound constitutional doctrine.

Before I yield further to the gentleman, let me give him an example. The right to trial by jury is guaranteed by the Constitution. Let us supose the Congress of the United States failed to pass any act providing for trial by jury. Does the gentleman think that any court would say, "Well, Congress has failed to act and, therefore, because of the inaction of Congress, because there is no legislation on the matter, we cannot have a trial by jury." The courts, of course, would provide it under court rules.

I appreciate some of the difficulties. I have tried to be sympathetic and understanding concerning the problems of the South, as the gentleman knows. I say, as a matter of constitutional principle, that this amendment is completely useless; and that it is the duty of the Federal Government, the executive department, to enforce these self-executing provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. Of course, I yield further.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman is a very able, studious, and devoted member of the House Committee on Education and Labor and I am sure the legal opinions he expresses here have come only after long and careful study.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Montana on his presentation today. It seems to me that this is an issue that should be discussed in advance of the voting on the school bill. I know there are many advocates of the Kelley bill who have said that this issue ought not to be discussed, that it would endanger the bill because some of our southern colleagues might realize that if the argument presented by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is right, then in that event they would be opposed to any Federal aid bill. There have been speeches placed in the RECORD in recent days which lead me to believe that there are some of our colleagues who grasp that this may be the actual status if the Kelley bill passes. But I certainly think the gentleman has performed a very important service in bringing this matter to the floor where it can be discussed now, because I know there are enough keen lawyers in this body so that this question is going to be thoroughly considered before a vote is taken. I think the gentleman from Montana, whom I consider one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in the body—not necessarily because he served on the Montana Supreme Court, but because of the inherent qualities of his mind—has performed a service in discussing this particular aspect of the problem. As long ago as last summer, some of us were discussing these ramifications of the general problem.

Am I correct in understanding that the gentleman feels there should be a pronouncement by the Attorney General of the United States on this matter in order to clarify the issue before the Kelley bill comes to the floor?

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman from Arizona is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I also appreciate the mention the gentleman made in his discussion of the legislation that I have introduced. I have been one of those very much troubled by the problem presented by this bill, and by the amendment proposed by our colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL]. To me, this is not an easy question. I am unable to see it as a simple moral issue. Nor do I see it as a simple referendum on the segregation issue. I think the issue raised as far as any conscientious Member is concerned, is whether any amendment that is offered to the bill will effectuate or obstruct the law pronounced by the Supreme Court.

I think we have to keep that uppermost in mind.

May I say to the gentleman that it is my present intention to offer my proposal as an amendment to the Kelley bill. Thereby we would say to our southern colleagues that there would be a program of direct assistance to those districts in the South which are prepared to carry out integration programs. May I ask the gentleman if he would vote for and support that bill as an amendment attached to the Kelley bill?

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for asking that question. I believe that is the way we should approach this very difficult situation. I believe we should say to our friends in the South, who are confronted with a problem of whose complexities I am aware, that we are going to extend the hand of helpfulness and friendship to help them solve a difficulty that has arisen as a result of the changed decision of the Supreme Court. The gentleman's approach, which would make it a Federal impact and say all of the people of the United States must join in and help our southern colleagues, is the kind of thing I would like to see done, and I would like to participate in it.

Mr. UDALL. I appreciate very much the gentleman's statement on this issue.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the gentleman will yield further, of course we, from the South, are delighted to have the hand of friendship extended to us from any Member or any section, but let me say to the gentleman that the greatest assistance that can be rendered to my State or, for that matter, in my opinion, to America, is to accept the responsibility at home for public education. If we are going to justify the further existence of the States making up this great Union, then let us accept our responsibilities at home. That is the kind of help we can extend to America. Let us solve these problems at home and carry on our public school functions at home. We have built ours into a pretty strong country that way.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I am very much interested in the comments being made here this afternoon about our Southern States. We did not bring this discussion up. Our distinguished friend from the West brought it up, and he does not have any problem in his part of the country about integration, I understand.

Mr. METCALF. It is not quite accurate to say I do not have any problem in my State. There are small areas in which an integration problem is a difficult one, especially one which involves the Indians in my area rather than the Negroes you have in your area.

Mr. PRESTON. If they ever bring up this Indian question on the proposition of integration and segregation, I am afraid the whole country will be put to shame. There was never any such great concern shown about the Indians in this country as has been expressed about the colored population in the South.

I just want to make this observation to my warm friend from Montana. The people of Georgia will never accept 1 cent of Federal aid for education if it is conditioned upon placing into effect integration in our public schools. It matters not how badly we need it, the issue is too great, the principle too important for us to be tempted or baited in the least by $1 of Federal money.

Something comes to my mind constantly as I think about this decision of May 17, 1954. Shortly after it happened, a distinguished Senator from Virginia was carrying a Justice of the Supreme Court on a weekend jaunt down through his State. As they approached an old house, there was an obvious eruption of the ground there, an uneven contour of the land.

The Justice of the Supreme Court said to his distinguished friend who was in attendance on the journey, "What is that unusual eruption on the hillside over there?" The Senator said, "Why, my dear judge, that is where John Marshall turned over in his grave when the Supreme Court handed down its antisegregation decision." I am sure not only John Marshall turned over in his grave after that decision, but George Mason, Madison, Jefferson, and a lot of others of those great men who wrote into the Constitution so plainly and so clearly the proposition that all rights not given to the Federal Government were reserved unto the States. I repeat that we are undertaking to place a new interpretation on the Constitution. You know, I would much prefer and I am sure my distinguished colleague who is a jurist of great and fine reputation in his State must agree, that it would be better and we, in the South, could take this decision better if the Congress of the United States had met this proposition head on and voted on this issue through the people's representatives rather than for the Supreme Court to do something that the Congress steadfastly through the years has refused to do.

Mr. METCALF. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, that there is a way in which the Congress of the United States can vote on this issue, and that is for the Commissioner of Education to deny these States which I have included in my third category, these States who have passed legislation in defiance of the decision, to deny them vocational education funds. Then the law says that an appeal shall be made to the Congress of the United States as to whether those funds will be given for vocational education or not. That appeal would bring the issue squarely before the Congress if the administration, the executive department, would act, as I contend it is its duty to act.

Mr. PRESTON. There again, you are dealing with the proposition only of education. There is a broader picture involved here as to whether the 10th amendment means what it says. Does it really mean that all of the rights not granted to the Federal Government are reserved unto the States? Does it really mean that? The Supreme Court apparently says it does not mean what it says at all. That is the thing the Congress ought to face. Is Congress going to reaffirm the meaning and the intention of the 10th amendment or is Congress going to say that times have changed and the situation in this country has now socially developed to the point where the intention of the framers of the Constitution, however wonderful those intentions were at the time, cannot properly apply now. That is something, in my judgment, that Congress ought to face up to and not have the Supreme Court change the effect of the Constitution and then have the Congress docilely falling into line because of the Court decision. What do we do in other cases? When the Supreme Court makes a decision affecting gas in Texas or Louisiana or Arkansas or makes some decision affecting the pay of some disloyal employee of the Government of the United States, Congress promptly—promptly steps in and takes action to nullify the decision. But, the Congress has done nothing to nullify this decision of May 17, 1954. I think it is proper that the Congress should do it. Let us put it right out in the open with every Member speaking for the people he represents in the Congress and taking a position on this question of what the 10th amendment means.

Mr. METCALF. Of course, may I say to the gentleman before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi who is on his feet, he recognizes the great differences between the Supreme Court passing upon the validity or the effect of a statute and the validity or the effect of an article or section of the Constitution of the United States. It takes different legislative action and different congressional action when the question of due process or equal protection of the laws is involved than is required when the question of ownership and title of tidelands oil or some other question arises which is a purely legislative matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In that respect, does the gentleman feel that the people of the United States and the States themselves are helpless in the face of any arbitrary action that the Supreme Court might take in any case?

Mr. METCALF. No, I do not feel they are helpless.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Surely the gentleman knows that the decision rendered by the Supreme Court in this case was not based on law. The gentleman knows it was based on sociology and politics; does he not?

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman from Mississippi and I disagree, as many other lawyers disagree, on the validity of the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They did not find one single legal premise on which to base their decision.

Mr. METCALF. I cannot agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let us get down to the point of what you were talking about in your remarks. Is it my understanding that this is the basic point of your argument this afternoon—that the Powell amendment is not necessary in order to accomplish the purposes of denying funds to States who do not comply with this illegal Court decision?

Mr. METCALF. That is a very clear and succinct way of stating what I was trying to say, not nearly so ably.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I say that I had not intended to vote for that legislation in the beginning. If there had been any doubt in my mind, though, it would have been removed this afternoon.

Mr. METCALF. I will say to the gentleman that one of the purposes for which I came to the well of the House today is to bring out some of the issues in this controversy that others feel should be smoothed over until the bill is passed, and find out on this floor and find out from the administration just what kind of enforcement we are going to get on this and other laws, so that the people from Mississippi and the people from Montana and the Representatives of all of the other great States of the Union can vote with intelligence on this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will just help us get that word around among our fellow southern Members, we will not be bothered by any such thing as Federal aid to education as presented in this bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. Our southern colleagues have been asking questions and I have an inquiry to direct to these gentlemen. I ask it in all sincerity, because it bears particularly on the approach that my amendment to this legislation would take.

Mr. METCALF. I will be glad to yield to any of them to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. UDALL. Let me propound it. I may have to make a short speech before propounding it, because I come from a State that carried out desegregation 2

years in advance of the Supreme Court decision. Admittedly we do not have the problem that some southern States have. I recognize that where the Negro population in some of the States is 30 or 40 or 50 percent, that is one problem. Where it is 5 or 10 or 15 percent, in my opinion, that is another problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In the gentleman's State of Montana the ratio of Negroes is two-tenths of 1 percent. The total population of the State in 1950 was 591,024 of which 1,232 were Negroes. The population of the State of Mississippi is 47 percent colored. We feel that we know better than those who do not have the problem how to attend to our business down there.

Mr. METCALF. Let me say to the gentleman I had no idea there were that many Negroes in the State of Montana.

Mr. UDALL. May I say to my colleague that in my State of Arizona the population is about 5 percent Negro, plus the fact that we have more American Indians than any other State in the Union. However, the point I want to ask, and I ask it with all sincerity, is that these border States who feel as Arizona did—and I refer to such States as Oklahoma, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia—and who do not want to prolong the constitutional argument with the Supreme Court and are prepared to go ahead with integration, should not these States have assistance by Congress and by the country, in carrying out their programs? What is the answer of the gentlemen to that question?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia for his answer.

Mr. PRESTON. I cannot speak for other southern States, but I can speak for what is being done in Georgia. We do conceed that it has been overdue, but Georgia has moved to correct the deficient school facilities for the Negro population of our State.

We are at this time engaged in a program known as the minimum foundation program for education throughout the State, and we are constructing facilities just as good and in many cases better for the Negro population of the State.

I am not speaking for the others, but I think that those who are familiar with the situation in Georgia will agree that without the facilities of Federal aid we are moving rapidly to a point where we could in good conscience say that we have met squarely the problem as far as the Negro population is concerned.

Mr. UDALL. I think it is fair to state that those familiar with the situation know the efforts the State of Georgia has made—as a member of the House committee that held hearings on the subject I know that Georgia has done possibly more than most other States—but the question still remains as to the gentleman's convictions, and his attitude, as far as these other States and school districts are concerned that do not resist the decision of the Supreme Court, but say, "Very well; we disagree with the Supreme Court's interpretation, but we are willing to comply." Should those communities in the so-called border States have the assistance of Congress if they are prepared to carry out integration of schools?

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. In answering the last question put by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], I would say first that I speak as did my colleague from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] from the standpoint of a Georgian: We believe fundamentally in the right of the State to run its internal affairs. To the extent that we believe in that, and that is our conviction, we do not propose to interfere with what other States do in their own affairs, except that if in our national effort it becomes obvious that some are being misled by what some others have said as to their rights, we want to do what we can to help them be saved from themselves.

Mr. UDALL. In other words, taking the State of Oklahoma as an example, if the people of Oklahoma are prepared to carry out integration programs, the gentleman will not put any obstacle in the way of that State or its school districts?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to explain what I said we believed was the position of the people of Mississippi in regard to the question that he asked.

We do not care what they do in Oklahoma; we do not care what they do in Arizona; and as far as your receiving tax money to help integrate your schools or build your schools, we do not mind so long as we are permitted to operate our schools without Federal interference. But if you are going to get it and we are not, then do not tax us to pay you. I believe the gentleman will agree with me in this.

I think that each State should be permitted to run its own internal affairs, and that includes the operation of the public school systems under the Constitution of the United States which leaves that exclusively to the States, in the manner that they deem best suited to the needs and circumstances of each local community and within the State itself.

I do not think that the Supreme Court—and I say this honestly—had a right to interfere by their decision in the operation of our local public school systems, and I think that the States are on solid ground and are defending the Constitution of the United States when they interpose their sovereignty between the evil of that decision and their citizens.

Mr. METCALF. Much as I respect the learning, the erudition, and the legal opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi, I could not disagree with him more. I still respect his right to quarrel with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. The real tragedy of this classroom shortage situation—the dilemma in which Congress finds itself at the moment—as I see it, is that the States that need help the most are the States where this problem is particularly acute and where opposition to the Supreme Court decision has been strongest.

I would like to state my concept of the highest form of patriotism. I think the highest test of the patriotism of a citizen of our country is his ability to ultimately accept the laws and our Supreme Court decisions when he profoundly disagrees with them. I quite understand the present attitude of some of our colleagues here. Perhaps if I were a native of and grew up in the States they represent, I would be making the same statements they have made here today. But I still feel—and I say this with all sincerity—that the ultimate act of patriotism is to finally accept what the United States Supreme Court says about the Constitution of our land. I have confidence in our friends. I believe that ultimately their patriotism will prevail, and we will solve this problem.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no intention of asking any controversial questions because there have been enough raised already. At present I see a three-sided argument that by the time this legislation reaches the floor may be a five-sided argument. My purpose will be to see to it that the meaning and the action of the Congress are directed toward the welfare of our boys and girls in this country. I am for classroms—we have to have them—and I do not propose, if it is in my power to prevent it, to allow some side issue to be dragged into this legislation that is going to defeat it. We must not lose sight of the objective of it, and that is the boys and girls of our country.

Mr. METCALF. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia. This is a practical situation, and we are not operating in a vacuum. If the Attorney General should hand down a formal opinion that these funds should not be made available to certain States, as suggested by the gentleman, or if the House should adopt an amendment containing such a prohibition, the schoolchildren of America will be the ones who will suffer, and not the proponents or opponents of this particular amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. If the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Montana is true, that the executive authority has the right to withhold funds, would that not apply to any other fund in the field of welfare? Would it not also apply to our decision to send $4.7 billion of foreign aid abroad?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I would merely like to make this comment. I would like to thank the gentleman from Montana and all the others who have participated in this most interesting discussion for all the light they have spread upon this subject, a subject which generally generates much more heat than light. But even as I compliment the gentleman and all who participated in this excellent debate, I must in all frankness and honesty state that I cannot say you have helped my thinking. You have just given me more to think about.

Mr. METCALF. I would like to make a comment to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Majority Whip. It seems to me that now that the Supreme Court has acted, now that there is a Supreme Court decision, it is not only within the power but it becomes the actual duty of the Attorney General of the United States, the President of the United States, the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to decide not only on school construction but on all these other matters relating to education what is going to be done with those school funds. When vocational education is certified by the Commissioner of Education, when he says "I certify that these funds are going to be paid in accordance with Federal law" he will have to make a determination in his own mind that those States in the South that have officially decided that they will not abide by the Supreme Court decision are either in violation of Federal law or that they are complying with Federal law.

When he makes that decision he is making a decision on a self-executing provision of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. I wanted to find out if the gentleman's motives and his point of view were not the same as mine on this aspects of the issue, and I daresay there are no Members of the House who want a Federal aid to education building program more than the gentleman and I do. But, the thing that has troubled me is that if this bill were brought to the floor without discussion—although at one time I thought perhaps it would be better if it were brought to the floor under those circumstances—and if we did not discuss this in advance, we might find some of our friends from Georgia, Mississippi, and these other States voting for the bill and then subsequently to have the decision and determination made that the gentleman suggests should be made now, and that they then, if the gentleman's constitutional argument is correct, find that they are deprived of aid when they voted for aid thinking that they would receive aid. It seems to me that they could conscientiously say to the gentleman and to myself and to others that we had misled them and that they would not have voted for the bill if those circumstances had been fully explained prior to the time it was brought to the floor. Is that the gentleman's purpose?

Mr. METCALF. That is exactly the purpose which I am trying to serve by raising this discussion at this time.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. Let me say to the gentleman from Arizona that the gentleman from Georgia has not been fooled. From the beginning of this controversy about Federal aid to schools I have known, and I believe the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor has known, that I believe that this legislation, if passed, means the surrender of the public schools to Federal direction, supervision, and control.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a good argument. He has based his conclusions on legal reasoning and matters of constitutional construction. But, following what he has said, it would seem to me that, if the gentleman is correct, then an opinion from the Attorney General is no more necessary than an antisegregation amendment to the Kelley bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand that the chief point made by the gentleman is that the Supreme Court of the United States has ordered desegregation, that is now the law of the land.

Mr. METCALF. It is an accomplished fact.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, now, if the Supreme Court should change its decision, as it has been accused of from time to time, then what position would this legislation be in if it did not have the Powell amendment?

Mr. METCALF. It is the same as any other self-executing provision of the Constitution.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then the question is, if the Supreme Court should, by any chance, change its position, as it has been accused of constantly on the floor of this House, and say "We were mistaken when we made that decision as it deals with segregation" and then withdraw its opinion and we do not have the Powell amendment in the school bill, then what would the Attorney General of the United States say to any of these States who may practice segregation when they make application for funds? Does the gentleman think that the Attorney General then has any legal authority to say to them that they cannot receive the funds?

Mr. METCALF. I think that the Attorney General under the present decision of the Supreme Court has the legal duty to say that States not in compliance with the Court's decision cannot receive the funds. In the hypothetical case submitted by the former attorney general of Colorado and my good friend, of course, there should not be any withholding of funds because the law of the land would have been changed by that decision.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If that is true, what is wrong with placing into legislation the law of the land not only in this bill but in all the others?

Mr. METCALF. The thing that is wrong about it is that we, the Congress, will concede that the Constitution of the United States is not a self-executing document, that it needs congressional authority to put into effect certain very precious and basic liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, the Fourteenth Amendment, and even the body of the Constitution itself.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. Surely, I yield further.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I direct the gentleman's attention to the situation he developed a moment ago when he stated that the gentleman from New York produced a letter from the Surgeon General stating that he could not withhold funds from certain hospitals entitled to money under the Hill-Burton Act. If that provision had been in the Hill-Burton Act, would the Surgeon General then have been in a position to withhold funds?

Mr. METCALF. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the provision that they tried to put in the Hill-Burton Act was the provision that was the law of the land at that time under the then interpretation of the Constitution, a separate but equal provision.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But as a result of the failure to have anything in the act, the Surgeon General said he was helpless. Let us go one step further. The gentleman made reference to the so-called Vocational Training Fund. Does the gentleman feel, knowing that those funds and other educational funds were made available years ago before the Supreme Court did their flip-flop, so to speak—does the gentleman feel that the Surgeon General prior to the time that the Supreme Court rendered its decision, would be justified in saying that he could spend money in those areas where they have vocational training in segregated schools?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana be permitted to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I now yield to him.

Mr. POWELL. I should first like to say that I apologize for not being here when the gentleman began his address.

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman told me in advance that he might not be here.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; I told him I might not be here. I tried to get here, but the planes were blocked out, and that is why I am late.

I want to compliment the gentleman on what I have heard, and on the years of excellent service he has rendered here.

There are 1 or 2 items that may be repetitious. As I got the drift of the gentleman's talk, he said that the Commissioner of Education has the power or should be instructed to have the power to deny funds to those school districts not abiding by the Supreme Court decision. Am I right or wrong on that?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct; districts which demonstrate their position by official acts, acts of sufficient stature so that a court would take judicial knowledge of the act. Therefore, the Commissioner of Education would have to take cognizance of that to come in the State and deny funds for failure to comply with Federal law.

Mr. POWELL. Our hope for such an action by the Commissioner of Education would be predicated upon one of two different things: Past action or a new director. Is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. If my premise is sound, of course, even an adverse opinion of the Attorney General would be overthrown by the first court action that would institute it. But I cited the letter the gentleman received from Dr. Hunt as demonstrating the attitude of the administration and its failure to carry out what I believe to be its constitutional duty.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman therefore believes for one reason or the other that at present the Commissioner of Education has no directive nor any precedent with which to follow the gentleman's own philosophy. Is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. No. The letter from the Under Secretary, Dr. Hunt, is entirely foreign to my interpretation of the Constitution.

Mr. POWELL. Nevertheless, the gentleman is a colleague of mine in the legislative branch. Whatever the gentleman's interpretation may be, as a colleague of mine, as much as I may respect him, nevertheless it is confined to the legislative branch. What the gentleman is asking is that the executive do something which the executive has said it cannot do. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. METCALF. Yes, the gentleman is right. I am saying that I will never concede this basic constitutional principle, that the great rights protected by the first amendment, for instance, need legislative action for their enforcement; that the great rights protected by the fifth amendment need specific legislative action for their enforcement. I contend that it is the primary duty of the executive department to carry out the provisions of these self-executing sections of the Constitution, and that in enacting legislation such as your amendment there is a tacit admission by the Members of this Congress that we do need very specific legislative direction.

Mr. POWELL. That is exactly my position. It is an admission that we do need specific legislation, because the Comptroller General of the United States in the letter which the gentleman possesses, witten to me; Dr. Hunt, in his letter which the gentleman has; Parke Banta, the general counsel of the Health, Education and Welfare Department, and Mr. Folsom in public statements, all have indicated that there is no directive, and precedent also is against our position, our meaning, the gentleman's and mine, because right now there is flowing into States in open defiance of the Supreme Court, as of this moment, about $75 million per year. How then does the gentleman propose to change the mind of the executive branch of the Government?

To show you that the Negro people are completely in favor of my amendment, I call your attention to the following three editorials from the Pittsburgh Courier of January 28, 1956; the Afro American of January 28, 1956, and the Chicago Defender of February 4, 1956:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of January 28, 1956]

SUBSIDIZING SEGREGATION

It would be an outrageous circumvention of the United States Supreme Court's directive to desegregate public schools if Congress should now pass a law providing a quarter billion dollars annually for 5 years to aid in the construction of segregated schools.

This is in line with the President's proposal to solve the serious problem of scarcity of schools, which also includes a provision of $750 million in Federal credits to stimulate construction, and such bills have accordingly been introduced.

Congressman POWELL and others quite properly want to make sure that none of this huge sum of tax money goes to States which are in revolt against the Supreme Court's desegregation decree, and they plan to attach a rider to the bill to insure that school segregationists are not aided.

President Eisenhower and Welfare Secretary Marion B. Folsom, along with various educational organizations, who are pressing for the passage of such a law, have taken the position that the issue of segregation is "extraneous" to the building of schools.

Like all American citizens, colored Americans are deeply concerned over the apparent inability of States and local communities to provide adequate public educational facilities, but they cannot see, in view of the Supreme Court's decision and directive, how the issue of segregation can be regarded as "extraneous."

The contemplated voting of such a huge sum to build public schools means that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of schools will be constructed and furnished out of Federal taxes collected from all of the people, with many scores of buildings being in the very Southern States which are now defying the decision of the highest court in the land.

If any Washington legislator should introduce a bill to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to aid public education in Russia or South Africa, a tremendous outcry would come from all over this land, and properly so; but the Southern States revolting against the decision of the Supreme Court (which determines what the Constitution means) are no less subversive of American society than Soviets or Boers.

Those Southern States that have elected to disobey the directive of the Supreme Court in an effort to maintain what they say is their way of life, must not be encouraged in their disobedience by having Federal funds lavished upon them, the better to evade the law.

Southern Senators have admitted that this appropriation cannot be passed if there is a no-segregation rider attached to the bill, while several prominent Representatives insist that such a rider will certainly be tacked on to assure that none of these millions is used to aid racially segregated school systems.

It is depressing to note that spokesmen of the National Education Association, the Association of State School Officers, and the American Association of School Administrators are all plunking for the bill without the proposed rider, prepared to sacrifice principle for pelf, disdainful of the Supreme Court's decree.

If this no-segregation rider is defeated, it will demonstrate to the entire world that a little minority of Negrophobes can thumb noses at justice, fair play, and constitutional procedure with impunity; that unreconstructed Dixie can eat its Jim Crow cake and have it, too.

[From the Afro-American of January 28, 1956]

CHILDREN AND EISENHOWER

Former President Truman has said if he were in Congress he would not vote to grant Federal money to schools in Southern States which are not integrated.

President Eisenhower, urging the Government to appropriate money to schools, carefully refrained from making any mention of antisegregation safeguards.

The difference could lie in the fact that Mr. Truman was a Member of the Congress before he became President.

He clearly sees the need for the White House and Congress to support the decisions of the judiciary in order to give the Government a unified policy where the Constitution of the United States is involved.

President Eisenhower has had no such experience in Congress. All of his career has been with the executive branch of Government.

On this issue, we are convinced that Mr. Truman is right and Mr. Eisenhower disappointingly wrong.

It would be a great mistake for an otherwise fine administrator not to place himself solidly behind the decision of the highest court of the land.

[From the Chicago Defender of February 4, 1956]

OUR OPINIONS—DEMOCRATS ON THE SPOT

A. CLAYTON POWELL'S forthcoming amendment to the Federal school-aid bill is expected to show the world—not only the United States—who in Congress believes in the basic tenets of our Government.

POWELL wants to deny any part of the proposed vast cash bounty for education to any State that is not willing to abide by the decision of the United States Supreme Court ordering integration of all public schools.

Normally this would be a thorny problem for our Congressmen, but this being an election year makes it—to put it mildly—explosive to an atomic degree.

Wiley JOE MARTIN, GOP leader in the House, has challenged the Democrats on the issue.

Last week, he announced with no reluctance that he favors the Powell amendment and predicted its passage in the House.

It seems to us that he made a point of the fact that he was making the statement after conferring with the President.

It would seem that the strategy is to let the Democrats kill the amendment and possibly the whole bill if either or both fail to pass.

With the presidential and and congressional elections at stake, the GOP could then point out to the Negro voter that the Democrats killed the Powell amendment, and to those favoring Federal aid to education that it was the same Democrats who likewise blocked its passage.

What the Democrats will do to offset this most tactical move has yet to be seen. But one thing is certain: The Democrats are on the spot.

Further, to show you that one of the best constitutional lawyers in the United States, Mr. Thurgood Marshall, also an expert on the legal aspects of integration,

is in favor of my amendment, I offer his brief on the question:

From: Thurgood Marshall, special counsel, NAACP.

Subject: Proposed amendment to pending grant-in-aid legislation for construction forbidding payments to segregating States.

This is in reference to the report that certain individuals and organizations are circulating information purporting to show that the Powell amendment to the school-construction bill is not necessary.

1. Last year I submitted a memorandum which was incorporated into the report of the committee's hearings dealing with certain legal objections expressed by the NEA to a proposed amendment to pending grant-in-aid legislation which would forbid payment under this legislation for the use of segregated schools.

2. All of the points made then are still valid now, and may be incorporated by reference into this memorandum. In summary, these points are:

(a) It is objected that no limitation such as that proposed in this amendment appears in other legislation. But, none of the other legislation referred to was passed in the face of a clear Supreme Court decision; and, at any rate, wrongful action in the past does not condone such action in the future.

(b) It was urged by the NEA that it would be inadvisable to legislate on a pending judicial issue. This objection is now clearly without force.

(c) It was urged by the NEA that the proposed limitation would be inconsistent with the position taken by the Attorney General in his amicus brief before the court. But even assuming, arguendo, that this brief has legal effect it has been superseded by the May 1, 1955, decision of the United States Supreme Court.

(d) It was objected that the United States Commissioner of Education would become an agent of the Supreme Court under the proposed limitation. But the Commissioner of Education is asked to enforce nothing. He would merely be required to administer an easily administrable requirements of the law.

(e) It was objected that even a State which is in the process of voluntarily desegregating should be denied such funds. But, the amendment could easily provide that such funds could be used only in school districts which comply with the Constitution of the United States.

(f) In addition, it was urged by me that to invest money in segregated school systems would be to invest it in economically inefficient schools which are also educationally harmful. This investment, moreover, would create an economic vested interest in segregation which would tend to perpetuate it.

(g) I pointed out that all the branches of Government are obliged by oath to obey and follow the Constitution. This is required by article VI of the Constitution. In passing this the Congress would be working in concert with the courts in support of the Constitution.

(h) I wrote that it is wise policy to make it attractive to school districts to comply with the Constitution rather than tell them that they may disobey and enjoy Federal funds nevertheless.

(i) The proposed amendment places in the bill a standard no more extraneous than that imposed upon the bill in the Davis-Bacon Act with which we, of course, agree.

3. Since that time certain events have occurred to which reference ought to be made.

(a) On May 31, 1955, the United States Supreme Court handed down its final decision in the School Segregation Cases. This decision sets down Constitutional standards which courts are to employ in entering final decrees against school districts which have been sued to compel desegregation. These are:

(1) A prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance of the May 17, 1954, ruling of the Supreme Court must be made.

(2) The burden is upon the school district to establish that time is necessary to effect the change.

(3) The school district must proceed in good faith.

(4) On time for delay it may find justification in problems relating to school administration arising from the physical condition of the school, the school transportation system, personnel and revision of school districts and attendance areas. But, as noted before, the burden is on the school system to prove that their considerations warrant delay.

(5) The Court held that "It should go without saying that the vitality of these Constitutional principles canont be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

These standards are clear and easy to follow. In fact they have been followed in a very large number of school districts in many States throughout the South. In the North they present very little, if any, problem. Certainly, districts which are proceeding in good faith to obey the Constitution, or which are obeying it, as is true of the overwhelming majority of school districts throughout the Nation, should not be denied Federal aid and it is not the intention of the proponents of this amendment that they should be denied Federal aid.

However, in a small minority of the States there is intransigent objection to the United States Constitution. In some of these States, as in Georgia, where a school district desires to follow the Constitution, State authorities have attempted to enjoin it. This has occurred in Valdosta, Ga., where the State has filed a suit to prevent the school board to even consider desegregating. States or districts which persist in disobeying the law should not obtain money from all of us to be applied to an illegal end.

It is the intention of the proponents of the amendment that school districts north and south which obey the Constitution may obtain these moneys. The subversive, defiant minority, which is making no move toward compliance, but is in many instances actively opposing compliance, deserves no such funds.

We were sent here to be Members of the Legislature. We took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States here in this Chamber. We cannot shift the burden of our responsibility as legislators to the shoulders of the Executive or the judiciary. If they do what you would like them to do, all well and good. If they do not, I do not see how that excuses us. Therefore, lacking a philosophy or a directive or an order in the executive department along the lines which you and I agree on, I cannot fail my personal responsibility and I do not feel you, or others, can fail your personal responsibility as a member of the legislative branch to sustain the law of the land which we swore to uphold. I am not a former member of the Supreme Court of Montana and I am not a lawyer, but I am an American and I know the Constitution and I know the oath I took. That is my feeling. If you can give me an argument to the contrary, I would be the first one to be convinced.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not true that if the gentleman's statement is correct, the decisions of the Supreme Court are nullified in all instances in which implementing legislation does not follow?

Mr. POWELL. If any decision of the Supreme Court needs implementation, you are right.

Mr. METCALF. If I may answer the gentleman. The opinion of the gentleman from New York is correct if his position is that these various provisions of the Constitution need special implementing legislation. Surely he does not contend that by inaction or by failure to act or refusal to act that we can deprive people of basic freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution; that it is necessary for the legislative body to act before the executive body must enforce basic Constitutional provisions. He does not make that contention and neither do I. The contention he makes is that in the history of this administration there has been failure to carry out the duty to enforce the provisions of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court. Therefore, it is the duty of this body to pass legislation to enforce the Constitution and I say to him that under the doctrine of the separation of powers, the way to require the executive department to carry out its constitutional duty is to go into the courts and force it to do it just the same as we would go into court to force the Executive to carry out every one of these self-executing provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I think that your discussion is a discussion that has perplexed not only a great many lawyers but oftentimes perplexes the Supreme Court of the United States itself, and that is the differentiation between what is a right and what is a remedy. Certainly, the constitutional right, is enunciated in our Constitution and interpreted by the Supreme Court. But, we also have a constitutional provision that requires a remedy for every wrong. Is it the gentleman's position that this legislation or the Supreme Court decision in enunciating the right also provides the remedy?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. It is my position that in the case of Bolling against Sharpe, which is the last case, the Supreme Court made it clear that there was no need for specific legislative enactments to enforce the particular decision in the case of Brown against Board of Education.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Is there an adequate, sufficient remedy against any wrong that might be perpetrated by reason of our legislation?

The United States Supreme Court has held in recent years that the right to counsel for an accused in a capital case is a right protected by the Federal Constitution. Obviously, that right is ineffectual unless a State had some legislation insuring that every accused has counsel in a capital case. Is there a remedy in this case for a denial by the State of the right recently clarified by the Supreme Court in Bolling against Sharpe and the other cases referred to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In the instance of denial of counsel, does not the gentleman agree that a writ of habeas corpus would lie to secure that Federal right, even if the State had denied it or had made no provision to secure it?

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. The Federal right of habeas corpus applies to Federal constitutional rights. It does not apply to the States. But in the case of a capital case, if a State would deny counsel for a criminal in a capital case, the party after exhaustion of State remedies would have a right to go into the Federal district court and obtain relief. But, this remedy is not effective in insuring that counsel will be given an accused. Are not other measures necessary to insure that a State will give them the right if we are going to have enforcement of criminal law consistent with the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If I followed the reasoning of the gentleman from Montana, it is in substance this, that the executive is now under constitutional direction to follow a particular course as defined by the Supreme Court; that if the executive will not obey the Constitution of the United States in carrying out its administrative functions, how are we to expect the executive to obey a statute passed by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. METCALF. Exactly.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Now as to remedy which may be available to a person aggrieved by the failure of the executive to perform a constitutional duty, or by the executive's performance of duty in an illegal way, would there not be available a suit in the Federal court in the way of an injunction?

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Are we not to have a remedy for every right?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to see that, yes. I question whether or not the right of injunction be present to forbid the sending of Federal funds in defiance of the Constitution?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. On the question of an injunction against public officials, which you and I recognize as lawyers is a very difficult proposition, especially if he has no statute to guide him, on segregation, the questions I wanted to ask the gentleman, under those laws that have been in force and effect that do not mention segregation, would a public official who has the control of those funds, such as vocational training or welfare matching funds, is he in a position to say to that State, "Because you are not now complying with the Supreme Court decision we are going to withhold funds as it relates to vocational training and welfare funds," because those States are not living up to the Supreme Court decision?

As a Federal official he has authority to make such rules. In insist that he is not going to send it down because that State is not living up to the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. METCALF. May I answer the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as a member of the minority side in a Democratic Congress I am willing to stay here as long as necessary if we can accomplish something constructive, but it seems to me we are doing nothing except to have a very general discussion here this afternoon which can perhaps be just as well carried on elsewhere as here. May I ask the gentleman how much more time he might be asking for before this thing is brought to a close?

Mr. METCALF. I would merely like to answer the gentleman's question which he propounded just before my time expired previously and which he propounded a second time just now.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. METCALF. If the gentleman will leave me enough time to answer the question, I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I just wanted to make the observation that the crowd that is trying to put the Powell amendment across is the same crowd that has been crying such bitter tears over what they allege to be economic pressures being used by certain prosegregation organizations in the Southern States. It looks to me as if they are trying, by the Powell amendment, to give legal sanction to economic pressure against the South. They are a bit inconsistent, it appears to me.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Now, let me answer the gentleman from Colorado.

As I see it, I believe that it is not only within the power but it is also the duty of the Commissioner of Education when he finds that vocational education funds, for instance, are going into these States which I designated as States of the third category, it is the duty of the Commissioner of Education to deny funds to those districts.

The Supreme Court has spoken only on the 5th and the 14th amendments with respect to education as I outlined it before. I do not know what happens to welfare funds. I think there is a great field of contention.

Where is the remedy? I am sure what kind of remedy there is in the Federal courts. There is a remedy in the State courts under a taxpayer's suit for an injunction. But I can assure you that this thing can be definitely settled in 1 lawsuit, in 1 test case, and that is in the procedure that is outlined in the law. If the Commisisoner of Education or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will deny funds once then there is a procedure for appeal, there is a procedure for the State thus affected to go into Federal court and ask why those funds were denied and we can have a definite decision of this matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman recognize that under the law when we vest an executive officer with the right to do certain things we vest him also with discretion and that the only ground on which you can get a review of his actions in court is on the ground of abuse of that discretion.

Mr. METCALF. But I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado that in every one of these laws there is specific provision for appeal on the part of the State against any act of the administrative agency.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; but will not the gentleman agrees as a general proposition of law that you do not upset the actions of any board or bureau or executive department on the question of the discretion that is used?

Mr. METCALF. I agree.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That being true, if it is specifically in the law as to what he should and should not do, would it not be easier for the court to determine whether he was following the law that the Congress of the United States had passed?

Mr. METCALF. It is specifically in the law now, just as plain as it can be made by decisions of the Supreme Court that surround this provision of the Constitution.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am glad the gentleman gave that answer. But let us go a step further. I pointed out the question in reference to vocational education. Let us go to the question of funds under the Old Age Assistance Act. The gentleman agrees that that decision is the law of the land. Now, does he think that the Administrator of the old age assistance program would be justified in withholding from any State funds if the State was not in compliance with the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. METCALF. He may be justified, he may not; I do not know what the Supreme Court would do with the hypothetical question that the gentleman has presented. But I do know what the Supreme Court has done with the case involving racial discrimination in education. They have made that very plain.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Would not the gentleman say it was an abuse of discretion by an appointive official of the executive branch to fail to deny funds in compliance with the mandate of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. I say they are abusing their discretion right now. They have a constitutional mandate to withhold these funds.

The Second Annual Message of the Honorable Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey, to the Legislature, January 10, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, below is cited the second annual message of the Honorable Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey, to the legislature on January 10, 1956.

Topics covered in the message of Governor Meyner include the following: The State Highway Program; Our Needs In Education; Water is Still a Problem; State Employees; State Office Buildings; The Need for a Police Training Program; Crime Reporting; Statute Revision; Rapid Transit in Our Metropolitan Areas; The Port of New York Authority Program; the Problems of Old Age; Mental Health; Agriculture; Labor and Industry; Tax Equalization.

As of further possible interest to the House, perhaps some enterprising researcher somewhere might yet cause to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each year an outline of each of the annual addresses of the governors of the 48 States, our Territories, trusts, and possessions.

Such a presentation could conveniently lay before the Congress a cross section of the conditions confronting the people and regions of our country. Such a presentation each year could do much to give each State, Territory, trust, and possession a more active sense, perhaps, of participation in the affairs of our Government without in any degree lessening the importance of each Member of Congress of each delegate to the people he is elected to represent.

Governor Meyner's address follows:

GOVERNOR'S ANNUAL MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATURE

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the senate and general assembly, I take pleasure in greeting the members of the 180th Legislature of New Jersey and in reporting to you, in accordance with the constitution the condition of the State and the measures which are deemed desirable in the year to come.

The general theme of this message is that most of the problems that confront the State are products of our growing population and expanding economy. If we were not enjoying a period of progress, we would not need, as we do, more schools, more highways, more recreational facilities and many other things, nor would we be obliged to increase our present services. Fortunately, New Jersey is not stagnating, but it is forging ahead and, in the process, it is up to you and to me to see that State government meets the demands that come with the impact of growth and change.

WHAT NATURE ABHORS

In our classic system of checks and balances, the executive and the legislature each acts in its own sphere, but something like anarchy would result if the spheres were to become separate vacuums. If New Jersey is to have an effective democracy, you and I must work together, putting aside selfish motives and narrow sectional considerations in the interest of the State as a whole.

Rivalry between political parties, at its best, is a sound and wholesome thing, because it is an appeal for the moral and intellectual approval of the people. But, at its worst, it descends to the frustration of the democratic process and to the denial of worthy and badly needed measures.

In an effort to increase cooperation between the executive and the legislature, I established a bipartisan conference. On the morning of every legislative day, I meet with the senate president and the assembly speaker and the majority and minority leaders of the senate and general assembly. At these meetings, I outline the measures which in my opinion are needed, at the same time inviting the views of the conferees. I will continue to do my best to assure that these meetings are not a mere matter of form or ceremony, but that they will serve to promote a constructive exchange of ideas and to arrange for cooperative action between the two branches of government.

AN OPEN-DOOR POLICY

My office door is open not only to the leaders but to any member of the legislature who wishes to consult on State matters. And this holds true for the members of the cabinet, division and bureau chiefs, and all other State officials who have facts at their disposal of value to members of the legislature. I am a firm believer in the sovereign quality of facts as a condition precedent to legislative action, since many of the disputes over measures arise from a lack of knowledge of the underlying problem. The facts as I have them are yours for the asking.

In my 2 years in office, it has been the practice of the legislature to remain in continuous session. If this practice is to continue, I merely request that the senate take prompt action on appointments, either in confirmation or in rejection, in order that the work of the State may proceed in an orderly manner. When an appointment collects dust in a pigeonhole, it often means that important State business is neglected for want of an official to fill the post.

In the past 2 years, I have vetoed measures that would have cost New Jersey millions of dollars, not only in immediate expenditure but also in annual recurring obligations. Many of these bills were of local and special nature and of no value to the State as a whole. There is no magic possible in the operation of the State treasury. All funds come out of the taxpayer's pocket. My policy will continue to be that bills requiring expenditure of public funds must be predicated on the availability of revenue.

A DUTY NEGLECTED

Since proper representation is at the root of the democratic process, I urge you as one of your first tasks in this session to remedy a long-neglected situation, namely, reapportionment of the assembly in accordance with population changes. This is a task enjoined upon you by article 4, section 3, of the State constitution, which provides that "apportionment of the members of the general assembly shall be made by the legislature at the first session folowing the next and every subsequent census."

Though the last census was taken in 1950, five sessions of the legislature have come and gone without action in this vital matter, in marked contrast to the historical pattern. Looking back to the middle of the 19th century, the assembly was reapportioned every decade until the present one, and except in one case the legislature acted promptly in the year after the decennial census. Reapportionment involves some painful choices and some difficult judgments. Even so, it cannot justly be longer deferred.

Similarly, it is incumbent on the legislature to redistrict the State for congressional purposes. Though this also is a duty of the legislature, it has not been done since 1931, a quarter of a century ago. Meanwhile, there have been wide population shifts, with the result that many of our sections are either overrepresented or underrepresented in Congress.

THE INCREDIBLE SEVENTH

One of the districts—the seventh—is a graphic example of the gerrymander, that type of districting designed to keep an individual or a party in office without regard for the basic needs of the constituents. This district begins north of Trenton, comprises all of Hunterdon, all of Warren, all of Sussex, and parts of Passaic and Bergen. It starts on the Delaware and ends up in dog-leg fashion on the banks of the Hackensack.

I hope that the 180th legislature will make itself memorable by assembly reapportionment and congressional redistricting in accordance with the basic philosophy of American democracy.

While the voting machine system is now established in 12 of our counties, 9 are still using the old-fashioned paper ballots. I continue to favor legislation to make the use of voting machines mandatory in all counties as the most accurate, quickest, most convenient and most trusted of all voting methods. The initial cost of the machines is made up in time by economies in the voting process.

THE LIABILITIES OF PROGRESS

We have at this time an increasing and highly mobile population, industrial and residential growth, a minimum of unemployment, large cash incomes and heavy spending.

As I have said, to a large extent the State's problems arise out of these very conditions. When population grows, more schools are needed for the young and more care for the old. When industries and residential areas expand, and when income is high, more cars and trucks congest our highways. The assets of progress are always accompanied by certain liabilities.

THE STATE HIGHWAY PROBLEM

Each year the highway needs of New Jersey grow more critical; indeed, in some sections, we are approaching strangulation. Last year 140,000 new registrations played a part in adding one billion miles of motor vehicle travel within the State—and that figure does not include our expanding interstate traffic. Many of our State highways are already burdened with more than twice their designed capacity.

The cost

It will cost some $2 billion, over a 10-year period, to modernize our State highway system, as estimated by the State Highway Department. It will take $600 million to improve the existing interstate system; $300 million for new interstate routes; and more than $1 billion for new State roads and improvement of existing roads not in the interstate system. In this estimate, provision is made for freeways—that up-to-date form of limited access thoroughfare so vital to the convenience and economic health of our urban areas.

What we are spending now

Against this $2 billion requirement, we will spend only $34 million on construction during the current fiscal year, and of this $12,500,000 represents Federal aid. The State is entitled to an additional $14 million in Federal aid for which no State matching funds have been made available. It is apparent that no real relief of our traffic-choked system is possible unless additional funds are made available.

In the last session of Congress, there was much debate over various proposals for a major national attack upon the Nation's traffic congestion. Congress was unable to agree last year on a national highway measure, but the issue is certain to be given due consideration during the 1956 session of Congress. Unless Federal assistance in generous degree is forthcoming, some means must be found to provide needed funds at the State level, perhaps in the form of a bond issue.

Contributions to safety

Meanwhile, our highway department is stretching the construction dollar to the utmost in its effort to provide new roads, as well as to improve existing roads.

It is making contributions to safety by the erection of center island barriers, building creeper lanes for trucks and painting white strips on the outer edges of pavements. These innovations, we believe, have already paid dividends in accident prevention. New life is being breathed into the highway system by dualizing existing two-lane and three-lane roads; construction of more overpasses; closing islands; removal of thousands of encroachments; banking of curves; designating speed and no-passing zones; improving road signs; and other changes.

Where grass does not grow

I think we should approach our highway problem not in a sense of dismay over its cost but in gratitude for the progress which has created it, and in the sense of the old chestnut that grass does not grow on a busy street. Our job is to adapt the highway system to the affluence that has permitted so many more people to own cars and that has created the vast new commerce by truck and trailer. It is a liability of expansion. And that theme, in a far deeper and more meaningful sense, may be applied to our educational needs.

OUR NEEDS IN EDUCATION

Last year, in Harper's magazine, Peter F. Drucker made this striking statement: "The most important economic event of 1954 went almost unreported in the newspapers. It was the announcement that 4,060,000 babies had been born in this country during the past year—the largest baby crop ever." This figure will be approximated, if not exceeded, for 1955. The baby boom is no new thing. It has been going on since the Second World War, and it means, according to the Census Bureau, that this country, with a present population of about 166 million, will increase to 190 million by 1965 and 207 million by 1975.

The increased birth rate has already affected New Jersey schools, and will continue to do so for years to come. It is welcomed as a new mark of national strength and as a source of increased wealth. Since the beginning of the school year 1952–53, enrollments have increased by more than 112,000. It has been necessary to add nearly 5,000 to the teaching staff and in the past 2 years the citizens of the local school districts have approved the expenditure of $131 million for capital purposes—a sum, as it happens, greater than the total of all such expenditures for the entire decade 1940 to 1950. It is estimated that an additional $100 million will be approved by local districts for school construction during the present school year.

New State aid

As we all know, and as the State government has already recognized, the burden of increased educational costs upon local districts has become most difficult. That is why the new State-aid formula went into effect this current school year, by which $63,500,000 in State funds was distributed to the schools. This is more than twice the sum distributed during the last year of operation under the old formulas. And, as a footnote, about $1 of every $3 collected in taxes by the State goes for educational purposes of all types.

Construction needs

But the floodtide of needs continues to pour in upon us. In spite of the large sums recently spent for school construction, more than 50,000 pupils are on a part-time basis or are housed in temporary or substandard quarters, while many classes are too large. And these conditions will increase in intensity as time goes on. It was this subject which inspired the eighth report of the State tax policy commission, submitted to the Governor and the legislature in May 1955.

After an awesome array of facts and figures about school needs and growing school populations, the commission proposed a school construction aid program. Estimates have been made that the cost to the State could run as high as $15 million for the first year, and increased amounts thereafter as the school population increases. The commission said that adoption of the program will require additional revenue, but it did not recommend a means for raising it. No action has as yet been taken by the legislature on the proposal of the State tax policy commission, but it continues to hold a high claim on your deliberations.

At the upper level

Many of the boys and girls who yesterday, so to speak, entered the elementary and secondary schools in such phenomenal numbers, tomorrow will be seeking admission to colleges.

New Jersey presently sends more than half of its college-bound youth out of the State. Already, institutions in other States, faced with the on-coming wave of applicants for admission, are beginning to sound warnings that future limits will be set on the numbers from New Jersey who can be accommodated.

The State board of educaton has authorized an extensive investigation in this area and, by June, expects to publish a study which will give us some idea of the problem we shall have to face in higher education.

The board of trustees of Rutgers has drawn a plan for reorganization of the State university which will doubtless be submitted to you at this session.

As in the case of the highways, the Federal Government last year gave some evidence of awareness of its responsibilities in the field of education. The concrete measure offered by the administration, however, fell so far short of the Nation's needs that it gathered little support either in Congress or from the States. It would have benefited New Jersey not at all. But the impetus for Federal aid without impairing State and local control of schools will continue to grow. It was the overwhelming decision of the recent White House Conference on Education in Washington, attended by citizen delegates from all the States, that Federal aid should be granted for school construction.

But Federal aid or no Federal aid, New Jersey cannot shirk what is at once its duty and its opportunity to provide adequately for its children's education. They are the State's true wealth—its greatest resource—whether estimated in sentimental and spiritual values or in stark economic terms as the producers and consumers of tomorrow. Education is the life blood of democracy.

WATER IS STILL A PROBLEM

In turning to the subject of water, here again is a need brought about by an expanding economy, for if the State were not growing in population and industrially, we would not be too concerned about the assurance of future water supply. Last November, the people rejected at the polls the proposal of a $100 million bond issue to build a reservoir at Chimney Rock in Somerset County and to provide water storage elsewhere in the State, particularly in south Jersey.

The people's verdict was not against the solution of the water problem. It only ruled out Chimney Rock as a site. The lesson to be learned from the Chimney Rock proposal is that there are human values involved in setting aside land for water storage that cannot be calculated by the slide rule or the mathematics of an engineer. And, while any site that is eventually chosen is bound to affect the lives of some people, the cost in those terms should be fully considered.

A fresh approach

It is up to you, the legislature, and to me, the Governor, to make a new approach to the water problem and to find a solution which will be acceptable to the people. If I may state the situation again in simple terms, it is that New Jersey, with an average rainfall of about 45 inches a year, receives all the water it needs; the only question is storage that it may be used as required. We have the resources. We need only to store them.

It is my conviction that the State should acquire sites for storage of water before development makes their acquisition prohibitive.

If anything were needed to dramatize the situation, it was last year's weather performance. After a protracted drought in the first part of the year, reaching serious proportions in July, we were visited in a little over 2 months by a series of 4 floods. One of these was by far the most damaging in the State's history. These floods and the series of droughts since 1949 have proved that the storage of water is essential to the welfare and safety of our people.

Tragedy of flood losses

Although insurance of all kinds is almost a fetish with the American people, last year's floods again highlighted a serious hiatus in the insurance picture. Thousands of people suffered tragic losses of property for which there was no possibility of recovery. In many cases homes were lost on which mortgages must still be paid. I suggested then, and I repeat, that if the private insurance companies cannot work out a plan to indemnify citizens against flood losses, the Federal Government should devise means to do so.

I suggest, too, that the United States Weather Bureau should cooperate more closely with State agencies to release flood warnings to the public and to all disaster-relief officials.

A study is in the process by the Department of Conservation and Economic Development to determine whether municipalities should be authorized to mark flood areas and to establish a system of flood zoning, so as to discourage building and development in areas subject to overflow.

Housing needs

A report released by the department of conservation and economic development last month revealed a shortage of housing for certain income groups. There are in the State more than 108,000 substandard dwelling units, a term that means a house lacks toilet or bath or has no piped running water. This is a reminder that the slums are still with us, with their festering sores of misery, crime, and delinquency. The report estimated that 120,000 dwellings are needed for families of moderate income.

At the close of the last session, I signed into law a resolution to create a special study group to investigate the problem of middle-income housing. It is my hope that the special study group wil take advantage of the work done by the department of conservation and economic development and its advisory committee, so that needed legislation can be expedited.

Impact of growth

The face of New Jersey continues to change rapidly with new construction and development everywhere. Outward-thrusting communities, new areas of industrial and commercial enterprise testify to the State's vitality and growth. There are only 3 States

smaller in area than New Jersey, but we rank 8th in population, 6th in per capita income, and 7th in manufacturing production. Our 11,000 industrial firms have an annual output valued at $5 billion. The year 1955 saw much new industry of diversified nature enter the State.

Under the impact of this growth, new problems arise as older formulas for meeting the needs become inadequate, if not obsolete. The need for intelligent planning becomes more and more urgent in order to make full use of our physical resources, to maintain a strong base for our economy and to fulfill demands for housing, education, transportation, and recreation.

Need for planning

The proper use of land cannot be taken for granted and we have revitalized our State planning agency to take a fresh look at this aspect of the State's welfare. The lack of proper planning underlies many of the difficulties encountered in the expansion of our towns and cities. By participating in the Federal program of urban planning assistance, the State will be able for the first time to give technical aid to communities struggling to lay the groundwork for orderly development. The new emphasis on State planning also holds the promise of more efficient use of available physical assets in the operation of State government.

The State has recently acquired three valuable areas: Island Beach, the Worthington tract, and the Wharton tract. All of them possess immense possibilities for the health and welfare of the State. It seems to me, what with these new areas plus our system of parks and forests, we should now be concentrating on the development stage. A statement of policy is needed from the legislature as to the uses to be made of our lands for recreation and other purposes in this most highly urbanized State of the Union.

STATE EMPLOYEES

During the past year, I asked several members of my cabinet to form a personnel committee to study the conditions of State employment as compared to employment in similar positions in private business and other organizations. Based on this study, as well as a recognition of specific needs indicated by our experiences in State government, I will make specific recommendations in my forthcoming budget message.

STATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

I have repeatedly called attention to the need of more space for State offices. You need only to make a tour of Trenton to find out how badly we are crowded and in how many different and inconvenient places the State's functions are discharged. Some of the quarters would be condemned by our own inspectors if they followed the rules applicable to private buildings. And we are paying more than $1 million in rent in the Trenton area. I have suggested a number of buildings to remedy the condition, but another proposal is for a multistoried type of building on the Statehouse grounds.

While I have no pride of opinion as to the course to be taken, I think we should be careful to choose the right one. A multistoried building on West State Street would create difficult traffic and parking problems. As for a building for the department of labor and industry, funds for such a building are already available from fines and penalties under the Unemployment Compensation Act. I am sure the Federal Government, which has a stake in these funds, would contribute liberally to a separate building for the department, making payments in lieu of rent. I do not know what financial responsibility Washington would assume if the department were housed in a general office building. A relevant factor, also, is the position that Federal defense officials have taken with respect to encouraging dispersal and decentralization policies in urban areas.

To help me in arriving at my own ultimate decision, I have asked some experts in private business, who have had much experience in constructing office buildings, to advise me of their conclusions on cost and location. This information will be made available to the legislature when it is forthcoming.

THE NEED FOR A POLICE TRAINING PROGRAM

It seems to me unsound to give a man a badge, a club, and a gun and send him out for police duty unless he is properly screened and trained.

With increasing population in New Jersey, the burden on local law enforcement officers continues to mount. Modern conditions of travel and improvement in methods of criminal detection make the task of local officers far more complicated than it used to be. Today a criminal can traverse the State from north to south within 3 hours and from east to west in 1 hour.

The job of police officer has lost its traditional concept of being local in nature. I recommend that we inaugurate a police training program, similar in nature to that already employed by the State police and various local training programs, to apply to all municipalities. Such a program would require a potential police officer to receive a thorough course with academic subjects, clinical experience and physical training.

Aside from the State police academy, the Newark Police Academy has maintained a fine standard of compulsory training; in Union County, the chiefs of police training association since 1947 has offered training courses to county agencies; the South Jersey Suburban Police Association, established in 1927, has conducted a series of training courses; the city of Jersey City has a police training school.

What I am proposing is that a movement which has already gained headway and public acceptance be broadened so that all police officers be properly trained before they assume their duties or after they have been appointed for a probationary period and before their appointment becomes permanent. A recent survey shows much sentiment for this action. Of 512 inquiries, 392 were answered. Of these, 128 municipalities said they were participating in a voluntary program, or had too small a staff for training. Two replied that compulsory training was in force. The remaining 262 municipalities replied they would welcome training.

The legislation I request would not be designed to infringe upon local control but is advocated solely to aid the municipality in improving its service to our citizens.

CRIME REPORTING

I should like to repeat a recommendation made in my first annual message for an adequate system of crime reporting. Intelligent law enforcement requires an ability to review accurately past and present criminal experience so that, at any given time, law officers may measure the results of their efforts. I hope you will establish an adequate system of compulsory crime reporting centering in the State police.

STATUTE REVISION

There has been no overall revision of the statutes of New Jersey since 1937, and even in that year much of the work consisted of compilation, rather than thoroughgoing revision. At the time, it was contemplated that the laws would be subjected to a continuing course of revision, year by year, but that expectation has not been fulfilled.

Since 1937, many amendments and exceptions have been made in the laws, which have come to represent a jungle growth rather than an orderly development. As a result, it is often very hard to find out what the law actually is in many areas. A lawyer almost has to be a soothsayer to supply answers to his clients and to prepare his cases.

Among the sections most glaringly in need of revision are title 40, covering counties and municipalities, and title 19, covering election laws, though there are many others also in need of attention. A study is being made of title 19, but no final results have been announced. The Governor and the legislature should work together to bring about revision of our statutes.

Apart from the difficulties encountered by lawyers and judges, it is easier for laws to be obeyed when their intentions are clear. Evasion and violation are most likely to occur when doubt exists.

We also need an administrative procedures act. It should provide for prompt publication of rules and regulations, and provide minimum requirements of fairness of the conduct of hearings by State agencies. The Constitution states: "No rule or regulation made by any Department * * * shall take effect until it is filed with the Secretary of State. * * * The legislature shall provide for the prompt publication of such rules and regulations." We should proceed to carry out the provisions of the Constitution.

RAPID TRANSIT IN OUR METROPOLITAN AREAS

A reconstituted Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission, financed by an $800,000 grant from the Port of New York Authority, is conducting public hearings and making a comprehensive study of traffic conditions in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. Its report, I am sure, will give us a fresh look at the intricate problems surrounding rapid transit in that area, and its findings should likewise prove of value in the Camden-Philadelphia area of south Jersey. The railroads claim that competitive transportation conditions compel them to carry commuters at a loss, yet it is perfectly clear that rail, as well as highway transportation, is needed to carry vast numbers of commuters back and forth. Out of the commission's study should come clear answers to many of the hard questions involved.

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY PROGRAM

You have before you for action legislation authorizing a gigantic construction program to be undertaken by the Port of New York Authority, including the double-decking of George Washington Bridge, and construction of the Narrows Bridge across New York Bay. Almost a year ago, the New York Legislature approved this program, but it still awaits action by New Jersey. I need hardly describe the benefits that will accrue to the whole metropolitan region from this program, nor do I need to labcr the desirability of your prompt action.

THE PROBLEMS OF OLD AGE

The lengthening life span plus the increasing prevalence of public and private pension plans present the Nation with a set of problems concerned with making old age pleasant and useful. Numerous organizations are making studies of these problems. The legislature has established the New Jersey State Old Age Study Commission, which no doubt will make valuable recommendations. The Council of State Governments has issued a most interesting report. There is a veritable ferment of ideas on the subject from one end of the country to the other.

There are in New Jersey some 450,000 persons over 65, comprising nearly one-tenth of our entire population. Since economic factors bulk large in any consideration of old age, it is important to point out that 200,000 are receiving private pensions, are self-supporting, or are being cared for by their families; some 225,000 are receiving Federal old-age and survivors insurance; only 20,000 are receiving State old age assistance.

A good many old people are committed to State hospitals on the ground of senility, and I am afraid that some of them are the victims of family neglect and do not belong

in institutions. The commitment procedure should be reexamined.

Medical care, of course, is an urgent need of the old and the New Jersey Welfare Council deserves praise for its study of this aspect. The council asks for the creation of a State commission to consider how to make adequate medical care available on a statewide basis.

There are many ways in which the State, working cooperatively with private groups, can stimulate interest in life for the aged. For one thing, meeting places can be provided in schools, churches, and other structures unused in the evenings. Adult education programs can be enlarged and geared to the needs and desires of the aged. Private business, which in some cases has done a great deal for the physically handicapped, might discover new types of employment which could capitalize on the skill and wisdom of older people. Facilities in our parks and forests should be increased to provide wholesome outdoor recreation.

MENTAL HEALTH

I can report to you substantial progress in our fresh attack on mental disease.

With additional staff and with increased use of the so-called wonder drugs, we have intensified our treatment programs. Approximately 3,600 patients have been receiving the new forms of treatment. About 45 percent of these patients, many of whom seemed destined to remain for long years in our institutions, have been able to leave. The relief of human suffering and the financial saving justify continued efforts.

During the coming year we shall complete the conversion of the Bordentown plant to its new use as a research and training center for the mentally retarded. This will substantially reduce the waiting list and should begin to find new answers to the many unknowns in this important field.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture remains an important segment of our economy despite the expansion of industry and housing developments in our rural areas.

Improved methods of production and marketing, programs for eliminating infectious plant and animal diseases and harmful insect pests, an adequate milk marketing order, planning for agriculture in terms of our State economy are all the proper concern of our farmers and the agricultural department. Legislative measures will be submitted to you as the need arises.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY

During the past year labor and industry have shown continued capacity for adjusting differences and reaching agreements with a minimum of disturbance of operation. Generally, the scene has been peaceful and gratifying.

To assist in the maintenance of industrial activity, we should have a State labor relations act. The National Labor Relations Board is increasingly divesting itself of jurisdiction, and this circumstance underscores the necessity for State legislation which will provide adequate means for resolving disputes involving representation and unfair labor practices at the intrastate level.

I again urge that there be adopted a realistic minimum wage law of universal application to all employees in this State who are not subject to Federal law. Presently our statute merely authorizes administrative determinations with respect to women and children in specific industries. At its last session, Congress adopted a bill fixing a minimum wage of $1 per hour applicable to all employees engaged in interstate commerce. We should not further delay an appropriate statewide minimum wage.

At the last session, the legislature increased unemployment compensation and temporary disability benefits from $30 to $35 per week. That unquestionably was a step in the right direction, but recent studies indicate that the $35 figure is inadequate to meet the minimum needs of the unemployed. I urge further study and consideration to the end that a more realistic rate will be adopted.

And since the need of the individual and the public interest in his plight are in no sense related to the number of employees within an establishment, the coverage of these laws should be extended to embrace one or more employees.

So also our existing rates with respect to workmen's compensation benefits are out of line with the needs of an injured employee. There should be a review of the benefit schedules and an appropriate increase in the weekly benefit.

TAX EQUALIZATION

There has been progress in the use of equalized real property valuations for apportionment purposes. In 1955, for the first time, the costs of county government were apportioned in five counties after equalization of real property values on substantially a full-true-value basis. Statewide equalization at the county level is expected in 1956 so that the apportionment of the costs of operating county government, now in excess of $95 million annually, will be made on equalized valuations. However, the operating costs of regional, consolidated, and joint school districts are not being apportioned on the basis of equalized valuations. I recommend the enactment of legislation specifically providing that the county boards of taxation shall make such apportionment of these costs.

The 1947 constitution of New Jersey provides that all real property assessed and taxed locally or by the State for allotment to the taxing districts shall be assessed according to the same standard of value and taxed at the general tax rate of the district in which situated. Existing legislation prescribes full true value as the standard for assessment purposes. There is great lack of uniformity in the assessment of such property, resulting in gross inequities in the distribution of the local tax burden. Such property is not uniformly assessed at either full true value or a fixed percentage of true value. Since local property taxes in New Jersey have now passed the half-billion-dollar mark, it is of utmost importance that this heavy burden be apportioned as equitably as possible. Existing law imposing a duty upon the Division of Taxation to require revaluation of the real property of a taxing district where inequities exist is thought to be vague. I recommend legislation clarifying the procedure in such cases and at the same time authorizing municipalities undergoing revaluation to meet the cost by emergency financing, spread over a 5-year period. The legislative needs in this regard should be carefully studied.

Existing laws relating to the taxation of tangible personal property (inventories, machinery, equipment, and household goods) are inappropriate under current economic conditions, for the purpose of fairly apportioning the local tax burden. I believe it desirable that the legislature carefully study this problem in the hope that more suitable legislation for the taxation of this class of property may be devised.

CONCLUSION

I have confined my remarks to the most pressing problems. There are other important matters about which I shall communicate to you or your leadership from time to time.

You will have my full cooperation, as I have given it during my 2 years in office. The legislative and executive branches can make 1956 a notable year in the history of the State of New Jersey.

Segregation in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "Right to the Point," which appeared in the daily newspaper the State, of Columbia, S. C., under date of February 7, 1956.

This editorial highly commends a recent statement and the joint resolution offered by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] calling on Congress to pass a law authorizing the States to operate schools on the basis of either segregation or integration of races.

I was very happy to join the Senator from Virginia as a cosponsor of the greatly needed joint resolution, and am delighted the editorial writers of the State have explained its purpose very adequately to the people of my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT TO THE POINT

Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, has gone right to the heart of the situation, and in a most direct way, in proposing that Congress pass a law authorizing the States to operate schools on a basis of either segregation or integration of races.

To put it another way, he wants our national lawmakers to assert that States must be left alone to attend to their own business as to education, which not only makes sense but is clearly the Constitution's intent.

In a statement announcing his decision to introduce a resolution embodying this thought, Senator ROBERTSON called attention to the fact that he was acting "in accord with section 5 of the 14th amendment (to the Constitution) in which the people reserved the right to determine through their representatives in Congress, how the equal-rights provisions of the amendment should be implemented."

Should Congress respond favorably, the United States Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, would be set aside, but transcending this one issue would be notice to the Court to function in its own sphere of our fundamental of trials and balances. The Constitution grants to Congress the right to regulate the appellate powers of the judiciary, save in certain types of litigation, which are placed under its original jurisdiction.

Readers may recall that we have frequently said in these columns that Congress has the right to set up rules and regulations for the Court, and have urged that action along this line to be taken.

We quote further from Senator ROBERTSON'S statement because it so admirably sums up the situation and so well expresses our own views. He said that when the 14th amendment was adopted "no one in the Congress or in any of the States which ratified the amendment suggested it was intended to take from the States their control over public education.

"The amendment specifically said, however, 'The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article,'" and "it should

be noted that the same Congress which proposed this amendment, while acting as a legislative body for the District of Columbia, established a system of segregated public schools in the district.

"Congress still has the right to say, by legislation, how the civil rights provisions of the 14th amendment shall be enforced. I am proposing that this right be asserted by giving the States the choice of operating either desegregated schools or the separate-but-equal facilities which all previous decisions of the Supreme Court declared were permissible."

Senator ROBERTSON'S remedy is a more direct approach than interposition, but the passage of interposition resolutions, provided they do not extend to cover nullification, go hand in hand with his proposal, in that they demonstrate by official act the determination of States to assert their rights through every legal means. The two do not conflict. Indeed, let's have both.

Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have been impressed and gratified by the press reception of the recent report of the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. Newspapers and magazines in nearly every section of the country have carried reports and editorials on the findings of the panel as delivered to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, January 31, 1956.

The perception of the editorial writers has been usually lucid. Their writings show that they have digested the report and have commented on what they view as the essence of its more important aspects.

In this regard I would like to call attention of Senators to two recent editorials. The first appeared on February 1, 1956, in the San Francisco Chronicle. It was entitled "Hydrogen Power: A New Frontier?" The second was printed in the Philadelphia Bulletin of February 3, 1956. It was headed "Atomic Age Blueprint."

To facilitate reading of these editorials by Senators, I am asking unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 1, 1956]

HYDROGEN POWER: A NEW FRONTIER

The first comprehensive study of the effects of atomic energy may work upon the United States and the rest of the world has been completed by a nonpartison committee of civilians, appointed for the purpose last March by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

As was to be expected, the committee reported those effects are likely to be tremendous. Atomic energy was deemed "a bright promise" for an important new source of electricity which could immeasurably expand the economies of the world.

But it was not the presently used fission, or A-bomb, process that stirred the study committee's strong enthusiasm. That was aroused by the prospects for the fusion, or H-bomb process, the possibility that the reaction of the hydrogen bomb might be controlled to provide a limitless source of power.

The study committee, an extraordinarily able representation of science, education, industry, labor, and the press, regards hydrogen power as "a truly frontier research project" and properly notes its importance to the maintenance of world leadership by the United States.

Such observations are followed by the implication that the project is being hampered and hobbled by Government restrictions. The committee urgently recommends that the Government make public all technological information about atomic reactors, and that it lift the veil that now swathes hydrogen power in deepest secrecy.

Here it runs counter to the position of the Atomic Energy Commission as recently stated by its Chairman, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss. He argued that adequate atomic information has been released and he rejected demands that fusion-for-power developments be fully disclosed.

It is the attitude of Admiral Strauss that such matters must remain secret, aloof from the scrutiny of potential enemies.

Yet Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, has publicly stated that he knows of "no military reason" for secrecy in the Government's program to harness fusion energy. He has urged that colleges and industry be permitted to enter the field.

We stand with him and the study committee in this respect. We fear that American science and American industry and American prestige—and even American defense—are likely to suffer more mischief from a policy of overly tight security than are the potential enemies whose mystification is being sought.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of February 3, 1956]

ATOMIC AGE BLUEPRINT

The Atomic Energy Commission is reputed to have rubber stamps covering every degree of secrecy, but no one has ever alleged that it had one for required reading.

If it hasn't got one, it should hasten to make one and stamp it on the document which has just been released by the citizens' panel named last March by the Joint Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy.

The citizens' panel undertook a task as urgent, and as difficult, as the task that would have faced a royal commission in 1769, if one had been assigned to study and predict all the changes that would be wrought in the world by James Watt's patent for an improved steam engine. It has done a remarkably fine job.

The report is especially useful in separating wishes and dreams from the concrete possibilities of the atomic age. It is equally useful in pointing out that the United States, thus far, is deficient in developing the possibilities already visible.

It finds great opportunities in power, agriculture, medicine and health, and atomic-powered locomotives and ships.

If private enterprise is slow to assume a substantial share of the burden, it is argued, the Federal Government will be under obligation to carry out the necessary development. The world will not wait.

The point is well taken. If private enterprise lags, the atomic age may, by default, become a socialized atomic age. The report draws from this another conclusion: That the Atomic Energy Commission should, while safeguarding defense, relax its secrecy rules to permit the fullest possible cooperation with outside scientists in private fields.

REA Chief Used Blackball Threat To Halt Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Nashville Tennessean of January 29, 1956. The article, by Nat Caldwell, charges that the Rural Electrification Administrator, Mr. Ancher Nelsen, under pressure at the St. Louis convention of REA cooperatives to prevent passage of critical resolutions. The article indicates that directors of one South Dakota cooperative were told to make their manager put his slingshot away or the REA Administrator would not help them get Bureau of Reclamation power.

My attention has been directed to this alleged threat because I am chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which has jurisdiction over legislative matters dealing with the Bureau. Inasmuch as the Rural Electrification Administration is in the Department of Agriculture, and is the more direct concern of other committees, I am requesting consent to place the article by Mr. Caldwell in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA CHIEF USED BLACKBALL THREAT TO HALT CRITICISM—SAID HE'D KILL CHANCES FOR MORE POWER UNLESS CO-OP HEAD SILENCED

(By Nat Caldwell)

ST. LOUIS.—Ancher Nelsen, Republican REA Administrator, threatened the power supply of rural electric cooperatives here last week in an attempt to block criticism of Administration power policies.

Individual leaders of rural power cooperatives said that Nelsen applied pressure in person in an effort to keep critical resolutions off their national convention floor.

His efforts, they insisted, were largely unsuccessful.

He was credited with blocking only a single major resolution. This one was severely critical of Nelsen for allegedly forcing the Colorado-Ute Cooperative into an expensive partnership agreement with private power companies.

Nelsen could not be reached for comment on these charges yesterday. His office staff in Washington said he was in Minnesota for the weekend and his office would try to reach him but doubted he would be prepared to make a statement until he had read charges by the REA board members.

TO SILENCE MANAGER

A South Dakota cooperative president said that Nelsen appeared before his organization's board and warned them to silence its manager, long a critic of Nelsen's REA policies.

"Make Virgil Hanlon keep his slingshot in his pocket, if you want any help from me," the president, Alfred J. Pew, Madison, S. Dak., quoted Nelsen.

Hanlon, manager of the East River Electric Cooperative, has been active on key committees of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association. He was a strong supporter of the Colorado-Ute resolution.

It died in the convention's generation and transmission committee, after Nelsen came before the committee and lectured its members.

Arthur Jones, secretary of the East River Cooperative, said that Nelsen warned their board that if Hanlon took his usual active role in the convention's affairs they might expect no help from REA.

The co-op now is applying to the Bureau of Reclamation for an additional power supply from Fort Randall Dam. "Nelsen said that we had no chance with the Bureau if he refused to help us and he would so refuse, if Hanlan was active," Pew said.

Joe Finnell, North Dakota co-op leader, and W. O. Coleman, Georgia cooperative president, said Nelson's uninvited appearance before the resolution's committee was such as to imply doubt of future loan approvals for cooperatives of committee members who refused to heed him.

"He talked nice, but he saw that we got the idea," said Finnell, who is a board member of Shynne Valley Electric Cooperative, Finley, N. Dak.

Coleman, a member of the resolutions committee for 8 years and its secretary, said Nelsen's appearance before the resolutions committee was unprecedented for an REA administrator.

"He simply told us that if there was any resolution there critical of his department in any way, he would like to discuss it with us and iron out the difficulties so the resolution would not have to go to the floor," said Coleman. He is president of Excelsior Cooperative, Metter, Ga.

"No REA administrator ever before made such a suggestion," said Coleman. "He knew that some of our committee members had loan applications before him and he wanted to argue with us about each issue that might come up. We didn't give him the chance. Nobody before had ever asked such a chance."

Paul Tidwell, Centerville, Tenn., manager of Meriwether Lewis Cooperative and Tennessee Valley representative on the NRECA board of directors for 6 years said he was surprised that Nelsen went that far.

"I have been on the national board and on many committees for years, and no REA Administrator has ever before tried to push himself on us."

A Colorado cooperative board member who served on the generation and transmission committee, which killed the Colorado-Ute resolution, said that Nelsen came into our committee "mad to start with and then he blew up."

"Seven of our ten members folded when he got mad and voted to drop the resolution," McMillan said. "I couldn't say whether you would call it pressure or not. But he sure got mad and stormed around."

McMillan said that he would not have given up his stand for the critical resolution if members of the Colorado-Ute co-op had been present at the convention.

"I would have taken it to the floor, regardless of what Nelsen said," he added. "But I didn't have all the facts I needed. Nelsen threatened to personally fight the resolution on the floor if we brought the matter up. And I needed to be armed with more facts to defeat him."

Clyde Ellis, general manager of the NRECA, said following the convention that never before in the organization's history had "such pressures" been applied.

The resolutions committee submitted and the convention passed one resolution condemning "pressures" on members in an effort to influence State and National organization policy statements. It did not name Nelsen or REA by name.

"It is quite obvious what the resolution meant and what its sponsors intended," Ellis said.

"They were talking about the Rural Electrification Administration as presently constituted, and in particular, its Administrator, Ancher Nelsen."

The Vanishing Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, one of the problems confronting our country today is the disappearance of the family-sized farm. Recently Mr. Eric Severeid made a broadcast over the CBS radio system, and the text of the broadcast was published in the February 9 issue of the Reporter magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the broadcast be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VANISHING FAMILY FARM
(By Eric Sevareid)

The showdown on farm policy seems to be developing faster than expected. A strong congressional push for restoring high, rigid supports is under way, administration conferences are going on in an atmosphere of crisis, and Secretary Benson is reported to be weakening under the intramural pressures of his party's election strategists. Obviously, some sort of financial rescue operation is coming.

Beneath the surface of these policy quarrels over stopgap measures, a profound change is coming over agricultural life in the country. It may be progress, it may just be inevitable, but it does have its tragic aspects, and it is happening with remarkable rapidity. An American way of life as old as our deepest traditions is passing away. The source spring of much of our moral outlook, our conceptions of individualism, our politics, our folklore is drying up. The small family-size farm and farm-family life are vanishing, as fast as the Indian villages vanished a century ago. And America is never going to be quite the same.

Almost everywhere one sees this unstoppable tide of change. Three family farms adjoin the small weekend property this reporter maintains in the foothills of the Virginia Blue Ridge. One, of some 300 acres, has just been inherited by an ex-GI farmer with a large family. He will try to sell, and then rent a much larger farm in order to make ends meet. The next farm, about 100 acres, is still run by the 75-year-old man who has lived there all his life. He still works dawn to dark, owns nothing approaching a luxury; sons in the city support him.

The third farm, about 130 acres, is also operated by an intensely hard-working dirt farmer and his efficient wife; they have no phone, no car, and all expenses are pared to a spartan minimum. His gross cash income last year was $400.

Generations of children grew up on these three farms, but the end has come. No small farmers will buy these places when their owners die out, for no profit is possible. They will all end up, eventually, as part of great properties owned by corporations or by city businessmen who can make farming pay on a very large scale or who will run them for tax-deduction purposes.

Now this is not the best farming land in the country, but the same thing is happening in the best soil regions. You get an idea from a year-long study just published by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, in St. Paul. They studied 4,300 family-run farms in good farming country—Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana.

Here are some of their findings: Net income before taxes in 1954 was $2,500—that means $50 a week. To net this much required, from the family, about 5,000 working hours in the year, more than twice the standard for most city workers. If you figured a 5-percent return on investment, then it would come to $450 for the whole year, earned by the labor alone. While home construction booms around every great city, very few new farm homes have been built in 35 years.

In these 5 farm States, in a 5-year period, 38,000 farm homes have disappeared. That means 1 family in 13 gave up the life they had tried to live. This rate of failure seems to be on the increase.

In that region, as in back-country Virginia, the story is the same: The independent farmer and his family are leaving the land; the home is vanishing and the business office is taking over.

Iowans on Farm Show by Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a great deal of interest was aroused by Edward R. Murrow's See It Now program, on January 26, dealing with the farm problem. Although Secretary of Agriculture Benson had 5 minutes at the end of the show to answer statements which were made by the farm people who appeared, the next day he demanded equal time to reply to the farmers' statements.

Mr. Lauren Soth, editor of the editorial pages of the Des Moines Register, published by the Cowles brothers, who generally support President Eisenhower, has written a review of the Murrow show which appeared on the front page of that newspaper. In his article, Mr. Soth advises Secretary Benson that he might be better off to leave well enough alone, rather than trying to answer Murrow. Soth declares that "It was a good show. It also was a good description of the farm situation. But it was especially good in reflecting the attitudes of farmers—their uncertainties and the confidence as well."

I believe this judgment of an eminent midwestern editor, whose newspaper is sympathetic to the present administration, is a significant contribution to discussion of the farm problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of January 27, 1956]

IOWANS ON FARM SHOW BY MURROW
(By Lauren Soth)

Edward R. Murrow described the American farm problem as a "crisis of abundance" in his See it Now television show Thursday evening.

It was a good show. It also was a good description of the farm situation. But it was especially good in reflecting the attitudes of farmers—their fears and uncertainties and their confidence as well.

The program depended heavily upon Iowa farmers, and much of the narration was by Iowans or former Iowans.

The show was somewhat overdramatized. The showman's approach to the reporting of a complex social problem leads to some errors. Murrow overplayed the distress farm sale theme, and made it appear to be a dominant element of the farm situation today.

CORNING AREA

Murrow opened the program with a sequence of shots taken in southern Iowa, around Corning. This beginning was unfortunate, since it gave a general impression of distress and hardship which, while true enough for some areas, does not reflect the general situation in the country as a whole, or even in Iowa.

But anyone who watched the entire hour-long show would have gained a fairly well rounded picture of the farm problems of today.

The first scenes showed the closing-out sale of Dale E. Peterson, a young Korean war veteran who started farming in 1946. He and his father told of the effects of drought combined with low hog prices which moved the younger Peterson to sell out. He and his family are moving to California.

YOUNG FARMERS

This story reflects both the short crops in southwestern Iowa in the last few years and the sharp impact of low prices on young farmers everywhere.

It is these beginning farmers who have left the price-cost squeeze most severely. They started farming when prices were high, but they had only a few years of good times before drooping livestock prices caught them. They have no reserve of cash and equipment from wartime.

So the Peterson story was a true snapshot of a typical but limited farm problem.

MISLEADING IN PART

But the narration accompanying these scenes gave the somewhat misleading impression that large numbers of Iowa farmers are being forced out of business. Murrow said that 600,000 United States farmers had given up in the last 4 years. That is literally true.

But most of them have gone to higher-income jobs in cities. Any implication that this is tragedy in all cases, or that it is an unsound economic development, is false.

As Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson pointed out in a short talk at the end of the program, this movement of people out of farming in recent years has not meant that family farms are disappearing.

WANTS TO ANSWER

Secretary Benson said he wanted to dispel the impression conveyed by the southwestern Iowa auction that thousands of farm families were being driven off farms. He said fewer farmers had left farms in the last 3 years than in the preceding 3.

Benson expressed concern lest the program give the public the idea that the small American farmer is on his way out. Any such contention is "demagoguery at its worst," he said.

Benson asked CBS for equal time to answer the Murrow program. He said the farm sale scenes distorted the farm picture. He also may be annoyed by the unfavorable comments some of the farmers and Dan Turner made about him.

In total effect, the show seemed fair to Benson and quite sympathetic with his efforts to meet a complicated series of farm problems. He might be better off to leave well enough alone, rather than trying to answer Murrow.

REAL FARMERS HEARD

See It Now described the towering surpluses of wheat and cotton as only the camera can do it. Liberty ships loaded with wheat, and not going anywhere, were shown in harbors on the east and west coasts.

But the real merit of the program was not in its attempt to put facts before the public so much as the interviews with people.

The discussion of agricultural policy between three farmers leaning over a barnyard gate in southwestern Iowa was a priceless documentary of how farmers think and feel and differ in the present economic climate.

If the program included nothing else, this would go far to acquaint city people with the attitudes of farm people.

EXPLAINS PARITY

Dan Turner, former Governor of Iowa, provided an added bit of color. Turner told a story of a young farmer who asked him what parity meant, saying he was ashamed he didn't understand it.

"I told him he shouldn't be ashamed," said Turner. "The Secretary of Agriculture doesn't understand it, either."

Turner then defined parity as equality, justice or "being on a level with the people you buy from." He said neither political party can take pride in what it has done for the farmer.

WHEAT COUNTRY

After showing the hardship and the dissatisfaction among farmers in southwestern Iowa, See It Now switched to one of the farm areas which has been most prosperous in recent years—the great wheat growing section of the State of Washington, the Palouse country.

Here was shown a farmer who said he did not own a Cadillac, but only "as a matter of taste." This big operator had received a loan of $160,000 on his wheat last year. A banker in the same region said farmers had been "practically on a honeymoon" with high price supports and good crops.

But in the same section of the State "small" farmers, including one who farms 1,200 acres, were shown complaining about low prices and high costs of production.

FORMER ISC MEN

In Wisconsin, Murrow picked up interviews with two former Iowans—Ed Syndergaard and Nick Fabricius, both of the Iowa State College staff. Syndergaard is now a dairy farmer, and Fabricius is manager of a dairy plant.

Tom Powell, of the Soil Conservation Service, was interviewed in the Corning sequence of shots. He advocated a food-stamp plan as a means of increasing consumption and raising prices of farm products.

Benson happened to be in Johnstown, Pa., where the Murrow program of filmed sequences originated, and was asked by Murrow to view the program and comment at the end.

The TV time ran out before Benson had a chance to make a formal request for time to answer Murrow, but he said later he would make such a request today.

In New York, N. Y., CBS would not comment on the program or Benson's request.

Southern Culture and Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Southern Culture Has Not Crumbled," published in the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle Herald of February 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOUTHERN CULTURE HAS NOT CRUMBLED

In discussing segregation and the interposition action of the South to avoid compliance with the Supreme Court's unconstitutional decision on integration of the races, the Charlotte Observer coined a phrase that sticks in the mind like a sandspur in a barefoot.

The Observer, owned by northerners, said that the South is grasping at a straw in seeking to interpose the rights of States between the court's decision and compliance with its unacceptable edict.

"The South," the Observer declares in an editorial, "can afford to resurrect its memories, but it can't afford to rely on a wish and a myth to restore a crumbled culture."

It is those two words, crumbled culture, that prick the mind with irritating sharpness.

The truth is that the culture of the South has not crumbled. That is what seems to annoy those who apparently would be glad to witness the South's complete disintegration.

The days of courtly leisure have passed in the South, to be sure. Plantation life is not what it used to be. The debris left by the War Between the States has been cleared away and the scorched earth has been restored to its productive uses. These things are self-evident. But they were only manifestations of exterior adaptation to a changing pattern of life and proof of the South's indestructibility, even by a disaster as grave and as devastating as the war of the sixties.

The culture of the South, however, is something apart from surface manifestations of the cavalier's past approach to easy living. It goes even deeper than the poverty-ridden courage of those who carried out the task of rebuilding the South after it had been destroyed by war and the oppressions of the reconstruction era.

The culture of the South has its roots in the soul of a people whose moral and political concepts have drawn their strength from a never-to-be-destroyed faith in freedom itself. This devotion to liberty and the conviction that compacts entered into either by individuals or political groups, such as the States and the Central Government, must be observed by men of honor, is the force that has bound together the diverse elements of southern life and character.

Webster defined the word "culture" to mean—among other things—the complex of distinctive attainments, belief, traditions, etc., that constitute the background of a racial, religious, or social group.

But this "complex" to which Webster refers has to be held together by some strong, ineradicable force before it attains permanence as a culture. This all-powerful but sometimes almost invisible force shapes the permanent pattern of a culture and prevents its diverse elements from shifting at every turn of events, like the bright bits of glass in a kaleidoscopic color image. With the South, the pattern of its culture has been fixed in the image of liberty, which is safeguarded by the rights that were reserved to the various States specifically at the time the compact of union was ratified.

The Supreme Court, by an unwarranted assumption of authority on the part of nine ordinary men, cannot destroy that pattern overnight without endangering not only the established foundations of southern life, but also the tranquility and guaranteed rights of the people and the States in every section of the Nation.

The manner in which the South has reacted to the Supreme Court's unconstitutional action should prove most clearly to the Charlotte Observer—and to everyone else— that the culture of the South has not crumbled. On the contrary, the adamant

quality of that culture has been demonstrated in a manner that should convey a warning to all who believe that they can reshape the pattern of freedom to the image of totalitarianism.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on January 21 I had the pleasure of attending a commemorative dinner on the occasion of the 38th anniversary observance of the independence of Ukraine.

At that time Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, delivered a brief but significant statement in behalf of the millions of freedom-loving people who have been brought under the yoke of international communism.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM UNITY IN CAPTIVITY TO UNITY FOR LIBERATION AND FREEDOM

(Statement by Dr. Lev E. Dorbriansky, professor at Georgetown University and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at commemorative dinner on 38th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, January 21, 1956, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.)

Reverend clergy, honorable and distinguished guests, friends in the cause of indivisible freedom, my words need be brief. We celebrate this commemoration of the 38th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine in the cause of indivisible freedom. Our hearts, our minds, our mutual efforts are oriented to the future, not the past. History forcefully teaches us that it cannot be otherwise. With exemplary heroism and in glory, the sons and daughters of Ukraine—of all the independent non-Russian nations which fell before the first wave of Red colonialism and imperialism following World War I—left us a legacy of principle, courage and vision to wage today the cause of indivisible freedom in the now global struggle against Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism.

In this critical chapter of history on freedom's fight against Communist totalitarianism we would scarcely pay adequate tribute to the earliest victims of Red colonialism and imperialism unless we constantly bear in heart and mind all of the victims of this reactionary force. As Americans, dedicated by our own tradition to the indivisibility of freedom, we could possess none but this whole outlook—an outlook that alone meets the challenge of the unitary, unfolding reality of Red colonialism and imperialism, an outlook that alone occupies a fitting place in the consciences of morally and politically free men and women everywhere. As Americans, we would be most undeserving of the loyal support of the captive peoples and nations unless we continually and persistently express our loyal support of them in the cause of liberation and freedom.

Thus, on this solemn occasion, our hearts and minds are also with the other non-Russian victims of the first wave of Red colonialism and imperialism—with the nations and peoples of Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, North Caucasia, Idel-Ural and Mongolia. Our hearts and minds are firmly with the non-Russian victims of the second wave of Red colonialism and imperialism in the forties—with the nations and peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Slovakia, Czechia, East Germany, Manchuria and China. In mind and heart we stand with the victims of the third tide of imperialist Moscow aggression—with the nations and peoples of North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet. We bear also in heart and mind the unvested and enslaved masses of the Russian people who for centuries have had to endure the hardships imposed upon them by one autocratic form or another of a traditional imperialist and colonial totalitarianism.

This is the significance of this occasion. We celebrate the anniversary of Ukrainian independence for the independence, freedom and sovereignty of all captive nations, including, in a real sense, the Russian nation. We celebrate it in full tune with the latest pronouncements on the captive peoples by our President and Secretary of State. We celebrate it with the prayer of an earlier American revolutionary for freedom, Benjamin Franklin; "God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set foot anywhere on its surface, and say, "This is my country."

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the fourth in a series of articles on mental illness printed in the Amarillo Globe-Times deals with what goes on behind the scenes in a State hospital. The facts brought out in this article are pertinent to the discussion of care for the mentally ill and I recommend the article to those concerned with this nationwide problem:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times of January 9, 1956]

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—BEHIND THE SCENES IN A STATE HOSPITAL

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

Texas alone of all of the States has a law for the mentally ill straight out of the Middle Ages.

To secure treatment for more than 90 days in a Texas State hospital, you must have a jury trial committing you to the State's care.

The Texas Legislature has passed one merciful law to evade this constitutional command.

Senate bill 218, passed as an emergency measure last spring, allows the county judges to send the mentally ill directly to the hospitals for the 90-day observation and treatment period. The application for admission must be signed by two doctors in the home community.

But if the treatment cannot be completed in 90 days, the patient must submit to the jury trial—an inhumanity that already has pushed many a curable ill person into mental shock as truly devastating as the physical shock that can kill if first aid is delayed.

The voters of the State of Texas must make the decision next November on the compulsory jury trial mandate. (If the patient asks for a jury trial, he can have it.) The legislature has done all that it can do, by passing the emergency legislation and by approving a resolution to submit such a constitutional amendment to the voters.

NOT A JOB FOR JURY

Are citizens "railroaded" into State institutions when there are no jury trials?

The doctors in Topeka laugh at the idea. In fact, as they point out, the average juror is no more competent to diagnose mental illness than he is cancer. A harmless eccentricity can appear as madness; a psychopathic personality can be hidden behind a charming smile and intelligent conversation.

In fact, jury trial helps to "railroad" those who are not mentally ill but suffering from other defects, such as old age and feeblemindedness.

The first step the Kansas State hospitals took toward improvement in the care of the mentally ill was a change in admissions' law: A mentally ill person, or one who thinks he is, can voluntarily enter a hospital on the request of a physician. No mentally ill person is required to have a jury trial, although at the end of 90 days observation he can ask for a court review. A man's right to his day in court is not abrogated.

The patient, or his family, agrees to pay a $12 weekly charge for maintenance and treatment. (Under the Texas cost of $2.13 per patient per day, this sum would nearly cover the weekly cost.) In Kansas, the three hospitals in 1954 showed a per patient daily cost from $3.20 to $4.99, the latter in Topeka State Hospital which is the training and research hospital for personnel and, therefore, has a larger budget. A proportion of the care and treatment is assumed by the State of Kansas, but individuals and families are expected to participate in the cost of care.

FEW COMMITTED NOW

Five years ago in Kansas, 95 percent of all patients who entered the hospitals were committed. Today only 5 percent are committed, and many of those are the criminally insane; 9 percent ask for voluntary commitment on a physician's affidavit; the remaining 86 percent are referred to the hospitals by the judges.

At the end of the 90-day observation and treatment period, if the doctors tell him he needs additional care, the patient can then commit himself voluntarily to the care of the institution. Last year 86 percent of the patients used this method of commitment. The probate judges of the home counties of the remaining 14 percent (excluding those who had been committed as criminally insane, of course) were notified, and court commitment orders were obtained, if the judge and his commissioners felt treatment should go on after advice by the psychiatrists of the hospital.

Naturally, during the treatment period, certain civil rights, such as voting, are held in abeyance. It is likely that there will occur stumbling blocks related to divorce, community property, even handling of bank accounts, while the present legislative program is threshed out. As usual, the legal debate over these details in separate court actions will develop firm legislation for the future. With the new concept of State hospitals as treatment centers and of mental illness as illness, there necessarily must be a new consideration of the civil rights of the hospital population.

FIRST MONTHS VITAL

Admission rates in Kansas hospitals have jumped in the past 5 years. About 82 percent of all admitted go out after only 6

months' treatment, eliminating the custodial care that originally extended for as much as 70 years. These leave room for treating new cases. In other words, Kansans get treatments for their mental illnesses in those first crucial months when rehabilitation and cure is more certain. With the stigma of commitment removed, State hospital physicians see the mentally ill while they can be helped. Hospital staffs are in the business of treating patients, not performing custodial duties, and the very hopefulness of this program attracts the kind of staff workers who in turn can assist with rehabilitation.

Consider the general groups that have been going to the Nation's State hospitals:

The mentally retarded.
The alcoholic.
The senile.
The criminally insane.
The psychopathic personality.
The emotionally disturbed child.
The neurotic.
The psychotic.

Those with physical ailments that reflect in erratic actions and an apparent unsound mind.

And, let's face it, a lot of old folks and even young folks whom no one wants.

Kansas proposed to sort these people into (1) those who could be handled in State hospitals designed primarily for treatment rather than custody, (2) nursing homes, (3) boarding homes, (4) prisons, (5) centers for mentally retarded, (6) alcoholic recovery centers, (7) out-patient clinics, (8) family care, any place the approximate $5,000–$20,000 hospital bed construction cost could be saved. All would receive treatment for mental illness by the State's psychiatric teams.

SOME TYPICAL CASES

Let's look at one session of the Kansas State Hospital staff as it considers admissions. Presided over by Dr. William Simpson, clinical director, the meeting includes the psychiatrists who head the four sections of the hospital as well as social workers and others who know the individual cases. Dr. Simpson, a handsome young man born in Canada, has an appearance of competency and confidence. He began his psychiatric residency at the hospital in 1950. His administrative skill as well as his depth of psychiatric knowledge is apparent at this screening session for those patients who have been referred by physicians or probate judges or from other institutions in the State.

Here are some of the cases and what the staff agreed upon:

Mrs. R. B.: Always active in home and community work; somewhat of a perfectionist; always driving herself. Started having periods of depression. Condition steadily worsened. Had been in private hospital for treatment of mentally ill. Knows she is ill.

Decision: Admitted for observation and treatment.

Mrs. M. T.: Eighty-six-year-old woman of irrascible nature. Believes she has no business in nursing home and that her daughter should be legally forced to keep her.

Decision: Staff reports daughter cannot provide home for her. Case refused. She to stay in nursing home.

Mr. W. B.: Age 21; schizophenic (withdrawal from reality or distortion of reality); obsessional thoughts. Mother has been in mental institution for 20 years.

Decision: Possible hereditary insanity. Needs observation and treatment. Insulin shock treatment indicated.

R. Y.: Age 36; alcoholic; feels Government owes him a living; gives hot checks, veterans' hospital turned down.

Decision: Character disorder rather than insane. Family rather than community problem. Referred back to county.

F. L.: Age 18; poor history since divorce of mother 7 years ago; stealing; planned to kill a girl.

Decision: Probably paranoid, catatonic. Sent to Larned State Hospital where criminally insane are treated.

S. W.: Two years of heavy drinking; anxious.

Decision: Referred to alcoholic recovery Unit in Wichita, operated by State commission on alcoholism.

REALISTIC APPROACH

These cases are indicative of some of the types that come before the admissions' board. Noticeably the merely senile and the nonpsychotic alcoholic who cannot be helped by hospital treatment are diverted to nursing homes and clinics. Alcoholics, who have been responsible citizens for many years and suddenly show psychosomatic symptoms, are admitted immediately * * * such as a farmer who on retirement suddenly began to drink heavily and to act erratically.

Kansans are trying to take realistic action to reduce the long waiting lists that have hitherto plagued their hospitals, just as other States and the Veterans' Administration are being plagued. As hospital population has been permanently reduced, more space is available for treatment. The State law clearly states "that examination of said person (committed for 90-day examination) shall be commenced immediately by the medical and psychiatric physicians of said hospital staff." No person, who comes to the Kansas hospitals either voluntarily or through the probate judge's application, can be held indefinitely without examination.

Insanity is a legal term, not a medical term. The State law provides that this "judicial determination of his—the patients—mental condition" has to fall within that 90-day period.

Humanity—and a sharper eye for the dollar-cost of illness if treatment is delayed—causes the Kansas hospital staffs to study carefully not the mental illness but the individual who is mentally ill.

Interposition by States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Interposition by States Merits Full Test," published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of February 2, 1956. The Nashville Banner is one of the great daily newspapers of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPOSITION BY STATES MERITS FULL TEST

Since May 17, 1954, with its Supreme Court ruling for public-school desegregation, numerous ideas have been advanced for evasion or nullification of that judicial decree. From the outset, this newspaper urged against injudicious action. We have said repeatedly that it calls for calm appraisal, making for order under law.

We believe, however, that the Virginia resolution for interposition by the States deserves respectful study, and that it demands that examination by the courts that can establish its legality; that submission to the States, if held valid, which can determine the wishes of the people anent the issue contained in the amendment it proposes.

The Banner has always been a devout champion of States rights, and led the fight for their preservation. As an uncompromising believer in the Constitution, we have recognized that there are States rights and Federal rights. Neither can safely encroach upon the other.

It was the belief of illustrious American forebears—men who helped write the Constitution, and men who subsequently were recognized as authorities on that document—that the States possessed a right of interposition when in their judgment the Federal Government in any of its parts encroached upon the prerogatives of a State.

Thomas Jefferson believed that. James Madison believed it. Each participated in resolutions setting it forth.

John C. Calhoun believed it, and wrote:

"The great and leading principle is that the general Government emanated from the people of the several States, forming distinct political communities, and acting in their separate and sovereign capacity, and not from all of the people forming one aggregate political community; that the Constitution of the United States is, in fact, a compact, to which each State is a party, in the character already described; and that the several States, or parties, have a right to judge of its infractions; and in the case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of power not delegated, they have the right, in the last resort, to use the language of the Virginia resolutions, 'to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to themselves.' "

Men of stature held that concept of constitutional Government and States rights under it—and until the view is disproven as a premise, authorities with a different view should go slow in calling the interposition idea invalid.

They may quarrel as to the issue evoking such a challenge by the States; disagreeing for example on the merits or demerits of segregation. They may seriously contend that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court from time to time may say it is—and argue accordingly. But they cannot ignore the fact that at the outset the Founding Fathers considered that the States conferred on the Federal Government the powers it possessed, and not vice versa; and that as the creator and antecedent of this compact the State reserved to itself the powers not otherwise expressly delegated.

We would like to see the principle of interposition tested, for several reasons. First, it may be the approach of last resort to blocking encroachment if sometime the Supreme Court should emasculate the line between State and Federal authority. Secondly, the test would slow down the precipitate action whereby eager-beaver elements are pressuring for instant conversion to the integration pattern. The pressure groups pushing for that are in a greater hurry than the court authorized in its declaratory decree.

Actually, important as this test is on the issue evoking it, it is no less important as a general matter. For a number of times in recent years the Supreme Court either overstepped its authority or nearly did.

For example—and still in the matter of States rights—it construed as a judicial prerogative the right of seizing tidelands property and conferring that property on the Federal Government. It did that in the face of numerous rulings to the contrary, and it required finally a law by Congress to estop that encroachment. Suppose no such law had been forthcoming. Would the States have had no right to a method of legal redress of such a grievance?

By testing the principle of interposition, the States are proposing simply to find out if the Federal judiciary can in fact by decree abolish States rights.

Admittedly, and properly, the exercise of the principle is limited to certain grave and extraordinary cases. That is one reason

doubtless that even the proposal of it is relatively a stranger to the present generation. Unless authorities including State authorities now questioning it are acquainted with history they may simply not understand its importance as a principle, or its ancient prominence as a safeguard against the encroachments our Founding Fathers feared.

Supreme Court members are not infallible—so are subject to error. Our constitutional authorities of long ago, knowing that, did not intend to expose a precious government and the principles thereof to the possible caprice of a few. So they bound upon it the inherent right of dissent by the States. Such at least was the theory of Jefferson, Madison, and Calhoun in their discussion of this principle.

How fallible the Court members can be was clearly shown in the steel seizure controversy which Mr. Truman, in his personal political caprice, inflicted just 4 years ago. He claimed inherent powers under the Constitution. He even went so far as to contend that by these inherent powers he could seize the press if in his judgment it was advisable. Finally the case was pushed to the Supreme Court, which ruled (6–3) that he possessed no such inherent powers. They restored the confiscated properties. But, note it, three justices including the then Chief Justice (Fred Vinson) dissented. The late Mr. Vinson deemed it Mr. Truman's privilege, because there was a war on (the Korean affair) and because certain prerogatives attended membership in the United Nations if they did not attend the Constitution of the United States in its express assignment of power.

Somebody has to speak for principle when principle is emasculated, or wrested from its context.

Entirely apart from the desegregation question, we believe that Virginia had the right to make the interposition proposal, and it deserves an adequate test of its legal aspects. If it is not defective legally, it should proceed to establish the wish of the American people through their States concerning the amendment proposed.

The Supreme Court is contending for that change without the amendment—notwithstanding the serious doubt concerning its constitutionality.

Family Life in a Secure America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Harold E. Stassen, special assistant to the President, before the Women's Forum on National Security at their meeting at the Hotel Statler, in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, January 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. HAROLD E. STASSEN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE WOMEN'S FORUM ON NATIONAL SECURITY, JANUARY 18, 1956, AT THE HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

National Commander Kaminsky, National President Bramnick, national commanders and national presidents of these great patriotic organizations; members and guests of the Women's Forum on National Security: Never in all history has peace been as important to every family in the United States and to the families of every nation of the world as it is today. Never in history have weapons existed with the destructive power in relation to the numbers of people living on the globe as the new modern bombs of today.

Thus, I emphasize that everyone can be prayerfully thankful that 1955, from beginning to end, was a year of peace, and we enter 1956 with no wars being waged anywhere on the globe.

You have set the theme for your 1956 Forum as "Family Life in a Secure America." You have asked that I keynote your session. I respond with a salute to you, a salute to the organizations you represent, and to President Bramnick who has given outstanding leadership in this assembly.

Now, I intend to speak to you very frankly tonight, not only because of my deep conviction of the importance of peace but because of my keen realization that the women in this room tonight can do more to advance the cause of a durable peace than any group of citizens of similar number in this country. (Applause.) And, when I speak of what the women in this room can do in relationship to the citizenry, I, of course, recognize and emphasize as you do that the leadership of the President is of the greatest importance in this cause. The President of our country is the pilot of peace, and I know that you will join with the multitude of others at home and abroad in prayerful thanksgiving that our President now has regained his health and that he today carries on in the White House for peace for America.

Now, I said I was going to speak frankly, but let me immediately say that I will not speak in any partisan sense tonight. I am fully aware that this great audience and the leadership in it from across this Nation represent both of our great political parties, patriots all, and the independence of the Nation. I will speak of these things that affect the future of the family and of peace and of security in our country, but not from any standpoint of participating in any current phase or future situation in relationship to the partisanship that must be a part of the decisions that our people reach.

Yes; I am aware that currently on the public scene some magazine articles are the subject of some disagreement. I am aware of articles that Life has published and Saturday Evening Post has published and that, naturally, in a year such as this, there is a sharpness of comment. I have made my views clear on other occasions and other times, and I will not engage in that discussion tonight. I hope that the press here will not endeavor to interpret what I say in relationship to that current front-page controversy, because I see tonight not headlines; I speak in relationship not to deadlines; I seek, rather, an understanding of the leadership within this room in the weeks and months ahead, an understanding to be attained, in plain speaking, without partisanship, in what might be called a horsesense view of the security of America in the objective of peace.

Somebody said a while ago in the Midwest, "What does horsesense mean?"

The best definition I ever heard was by the wag who said, "Horsesense is that peculiar sense which horses have that prevent them from ever betting on men."

Pick your own definition. What I would like to do is speak plainly.

I do not believe that it is adequately realized that peace must be waged by all of the American people if it is to have its best chance of lasting and of living. Unless there is understanding and action by the citizenry, peace may fail when it need not fail.

Thus, I would outline tonight certain major facets and specific things of concern to the families of the Nation, and I do so from the background not only of my current special studies in my assignment from the President, but also on the basis of the total of my experience and observations in war and in peace.

I say, first of all, that there is no indication from anything I have observed anywhere in the world or from any of the studies we have made, reviewing the whole sweep of wars of history and all the attempts to limit arms and what happened under them—there is no indication that any single magic formula will ever be found in the thermonuclear age that automatically guarantees a permanent peace. No indication of that. But neither is there any indication whatsoever that the discovery of thermonuclear weapons means that war is inevitable. No indication of that. In other words, it will take particular and persistent efforts, day after day, month after month, year after year, to produce prolonged peace. By giving these efforts intelligent leadership, there are grounds for hope and measured optimism that there will not be a third world war.

I would present tonight these 11 interrelated conditions as necessary if our country and the world are to enjoy a long-continuing journey on the path of peace. I do not present the points in order of importance, and I will discuss my special field last.

But let me say the first of these 11 points—that restraint and patience must be practiced by every nation, especially the most powerful. We are a tremendously strong Nation. Today 40 percent of all the world's goods and services are produced, mined, manufactured, and fabricated within the shores of the United States of America—40 percent of the world's goods produced by 7 percent or less of the world's people. In the tremendously strong military position that we have, if there is to be a durable peace gradually unfolding, then it is imperative that we exercise that strength with restraint and with patience.

How easy it is, when you feel the great strength of your nation, to be a bit boastful or a bit impetuous. And if this Nation, under future provocations that are sure to arise, starts to give hasty and impetuous answers, if—and I speak plainly—the great veterans' organizations of our country, naturally, reacting to something that makes their blood boil in events that occur in some place of the world, start to respond in a way and affect our Government in a way that action leads to reaction and to counteraction, therein lies one of the dangers of the inflammation of thermonuclear war.

So, I emphasize that humility, that restraint, that care, that caution in the way in which this great Nation acts in the months and years ahead, having within it the tremendous power which the advance of the scientists in the thermonuclear age and the strength of our economy have created.

Second, and I would emphasize this worldwide, no nation shall attempt to take selfish advantage of the desire of another nation to avoid war. It is important to emphasize this immediately following the first point I made, because, if we show restraint and care, and if others endeavor to take advantage of our desire for peace, to see how far they can push, to see what advantages they can take of America, then, as they push in or try to push out, that will multiply the causes of war. Therefore, it is important, if there is to be a future of peace, that we make clear to all nations that their responsibility is not to attempt to take selfish advantage of our desire to avoid war, if they want peace.

Third, the United States must maintain adequate strength for its own defense and to help deter aggression by any other nation.

Here, too, I speak directly. Speaking of families and family life in a secure America, everyone in this room knows there is a very heavy burden of taxes on every family in our country today, but let me emphasize that it is much more important that there be a shield of adequate defense for that family than that the taxes of that family be reduced. [Applause.] And this is the way these issues tend to come up before a great free nation. It tends to be that you say directly, "Shall there be adequate defense?" There is practically unanimity of response. But the issue does not come up in that form. Usually the issue first comes up in the form, "Would you like your taxes reduced?" And everybody then says, "Yes." The relationship of that to the need of adequate defense over that family and over the Nation is not so clear sometimes until it is too late. You have seen the reports from abroad of similar action, where simply the protest of taxes develops tremendous voting power.

Here is one of the places where the vision and the understanding of the need of peace by the citizenry is the real key to the restraint on such urges, and the emphasis on the need of adequate defense.

Let me give you another example of how this matter of adequate defense is not simply standing up and being counted when the slogan is announced. One of the most serious portents in the future adequate defense of our country is the growing shortage of young scientists and engineers in our country. Why is this, as you look into it? Because in the high schools and preparatory schools of this land there are not today adequate numbers of competent teachers of science and mathematics. Here, at the very root of the kind of intelligent and trained and educated skill needed for the future of the Nation, we are showing a weakness. I am confident it is going to be met if it is recognized by men and women, such as you in this room, throughout the Nation, but it needs action. And there are many reasons for it. But one of the things is that in the great expansion of our economy and industry reaching out to hire more scientists, more physicists, more chemists, more mathematicians, they just hired the teachers away from the high schools of the land. And the teachers' salaries have been so inadequate.

I wish you could get every newspaper in this country to print on its front page, in one of these little boxes, just these two facts: "What is the salary of the teacher of science, chemistry, physics, and mathematics in the local high school?" Then, right below it, "What is the salary of the operator of the motion-picture machine in the local theater?" Just put those two facts on the front page of the newspaper. That does not mean I have anything against the motion-picture machine operators. But when you think of the future of America and of the education of the youth, and if you think of the importance of that education, in those early years, of the qualified youth of the Nation in the sciences that will mean so much in the next generation—chemistry, physics, general science, mathematics—then you begin to bring the situation into perspective so that citizens can act and do something about this serious deficiency.

Yes, adequate defense is not just the response to a slogan, as those in this room know so well, but these are the kind of concrete things on which you, through your great organizations across the length and breadth of this land, can make a tremendous change in just a year of time.

Fourth, all peoples should have and know opportunities to advance their standards of living under conditions of peace, including the peaceful civilian uses of atomic energy.

Regardless of adequate strength, regardless of the wisdom of using this military strength, if you have great masses of people in any area of the world who develop a hopelessness about their future, you will never be able to sustain a long-term peace. So, we do need to see that peoples on whatever continent, of whatever color or religion, feel and see and know opportunities to advance their standards of living by their efforts under these conditions of peace which we are endeavoring to establish and to maintain. In that there is the matter of the future possibilities of the peaceful civilian uses of atomic energy.

You know that the scientists of 72 nations of the world assembled at Geneva to begin the interflow of information of the way in which these marvels of science, that have this great destructive power, can be turned, rather, to the benefit of mankind.

I saw the other day a portable X-ray machine, one of these new mysteries in develpments. .Inside was a little capsule of radioactive thulium, not as large as a good-size vitamin pill, but that little pill in the center of a portable X-ray machine, without plugging into any electric current or anything else—all is contained in itself—can take X-ray pictures for about 1 year without reloading.

I saw a little battery, strontium 90, made out of some waste products, not much bigger than a flashlight battery, with a peculiar kind of energy, not the same as flashlight energy but one of the interesting things was that that battery will live over 20 years without reloading.

What are these things going to mean in ways in which people live in future years?

Those are just examples of this expanding perimeter, but the portent of peaceful use and the way in which the peoples of the world can participate in it will have a lot to do with the foundation for a lasting peace.

Fifth, the economy of the United States must be kept sound and strong, with expanding conditions of living for our own people.

There is no need to emphasize that, but it is needed just to mention it when you are speaking of the foundations of lasting peace.

Sixth, we must be true to our ideals of individual dignity, human liberty, and spiritual values under God.

Yes, when we speak of arms, when we speak of economics, it is important to realize the inseparable relationship to these fundamental principles on which America was founded, which have meant so much in the very way in which we live, and to translate those in terms of our policies toward other peoples. This is one of the principles concerned in the explanation of why we can never agree that peoples behind the Iron Curtain, held against their will, should ever be confirmed in that position by any decision of the United States. Because, if we ever act contrary to these very basic and fundamental values, it will not be the road to peace; that will be the beginning of the moral weakening and the deteriorating, slipping down the road that finally leads to war.

Seventh, the exchange of knowledge and of goods, and the understanding of cultures between the peoples of the world must expand.

We could talk all evening on this alone but, if we are to avoid the immediate dangers of war, if we are to think in longer term approaches to "Shall, in behalf of our children, there be peace?" then we do need to expand the trade, the movement of goods, the knowledge, the exchange of education, and then the understanding of cultures between the peoples of the world.

Yesterday there opened at the National Gallery here in Washington one of the unique and most unusual exhibitions ever held because it brought together the artistic ability of outstanding artists of 16 nations of Asia, along with the skill and ingenuity and craftsmanship of some of the great craftsmen of our country in bringing these designs under the beautiful crystal of Steuben glass. It is an open exhibit. I hope many of you, while you are here, take advantage of the opportunity to visit the National Gallery to see it, because you get that sense of a little more understanding of the culture of Asia and of the relationship of it, in turn, to the culture of America. That is just one example. But how much we need—in every walk of life in this country, in our national galleries, in our museums, in our concerts, in our own traveling—to seek to understand the culture, the education, the interests of other peoples.

This is not a matter of being visionary or of dreaming because, when you look back through the many centuries of history, the undestanding between peoples is one of the sure foundations on which wise statesmanship can build a lasting peace.

Eighth, the United Nations should be supported to an increased degree in its second decade.

I recognize that there are some differences of opinion on this. I would be the first to say that the United States is far from perfect, that it has serious weaknesses, that it has limped at times in this first decade, but if the nations of the world are to find the way to live together without the decisions of war, then something like the United Nations must be kept alive and must grow and develop with experience, maintaining the sovereignty of the individual nations but fitting them together in a cooperative and forum framework, if you please, so that explosions occur in the debate on the floor of the Assembly rather than in bullets or bombs flying across the borders.

Ninth, the spirit of cooperation between countries, of helping others for mutual benefits, should spread.

Perhaps I should say that this way: Nothing will unleash the dogs of war more quickly than a dog-eat-dog attitude between the nations of the world. And I speak, in that respect, not just of the relationship between the major nations but relationships between nations in any area or any circumstance anywhere in the world. Because wars can start out in a tangential situation far removed from major powers but might nevertheless, by reaction, by explosions, spread by action after action until the whole world would be again in flames.

So, this spirit of cooperation, the spirit really reflected in the approach of the Marshall plan, must spread to other nations, and other nations who are able to do so need to help their neighbors or those in less fortunate positions. America cannot carry all of the responsibilities itself that are needed in economic or in military respects. We cannot, we must not do it. We can do a lot, and we can carry it well, with the tremendous productive success of our country, but we can carry it successfully only if all who are able in other nations, including those who were made strong through earlier years of American aid, step forward and do their part in cooperation for mutual benefits between the ntions of the world.

Tenth, peaceful methods of settling disagreements between nations,, such as direct negotiation and mediation, shall take the place of ultimatums, threats of war, and the terrible eventuality of war itself.

We cannot contemplate a world that is just a placid pool of tranquil travelers. There will be disagreements; there will be hot points. We need to develop the way in which those disagreements and difficulties are resolved without the tragedy of war. That means bringing forward the peaceful methods of working out differences between nations. That means expanding direct negotiations, quieting down those who are about to become combatants, bringing up methods of mediation or, at times, arbitra-

tion; bringing forward the alternatives to war in the interest of peace.

Then, eleventh, a secure method, assured by inspection, must be found to end the competitive buildup of greater and greater armaments.

This may well be remote, but all the lessons of history tell us that a long, sustained, competitive buildup of armaments or, in other periods of history, an anxious arms race, carry within them the dangers of war. If we are to level off this danger, we need to seek the way by which openness and inspection will end the competitive buildup.

And I announce to you tonight in this national forum that the United States Government will make a renewed and persistent effort in the coming months of 1956 to reach such a sound agreement for the future limitation of armaments in the interest of a continuing peace.

Now, I said "a sound agreement" because all of our lessons show us that an agreement that is not thoroughly supported by inspection is worse than no agreement at all, because if there is an agreement and it is not thoroughly inspected, doubts and suspicions and charges and countercharges arise, and soon the agreement itself becomes a source of difference and danger of war rather than an aid to peace. So, it needs to be sound. It needs to be the kind in which the inspection system itself can be trusted, and not a matter of the word or treaty between nations.

The United States will endeavor to be responsive to the United Nations resolution which passed the General Assembly by a vote of 56 to 7, with only the Communist nations in dissent. This resolution provides in part, and I quote it:

"The States concerned * * * should as initial steps give priority to early agreement on and implementation of—

"Such confidence-building measures as President Eisenhower's plan for exchanging military blueprints and mutual aerial inspection, and Marshal Bulganin's plan for establishing control posts at strategic centers; and

"All such measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament as are now feasible."

If this first decade of the H-bomb chapter of the history of the world proves to be a 10-year period of world peace—and no one now can say whether or not it will be, but if it proves to be a 10-year period of world peace, then I believe that future historians will say that the President's dramatic and courageous Geneva initiative, in presenting his plans for mutual aerial inspection and exchange of blueprints of military establishments, unlocked the gateway to the path of peace.

I shall never forget that scene in the Hall of Nations at Geneva, when it came time for the President to speak on that Thursday afternoon, July 21, and over on his right were Bulganin and Khrushchev and Zhukov and Molotov and their associates, of the Soviet Union, and, on the left, the representatives of France, Premier Faure, Pinay, the Foreign Minister, and their associates, and, across, Mr. Eden, Mr. Macmillan, and their associates. And the President looked directly across the quadrangle table to Premier Bulganin and to Marshal Zhukov and said he had been searching his heart and mind for the way in which to show that America wanted peace but would move toward it only on a sound foundation. And he emphasized that America will remain strong and ready and secure for as many years as necessary to secure peace, but America also was ready to move on a sound basis to decrease the tension.

Then he proposed the exchange of aerial photography so that we could each see that the other is not stepping toward a great surprise attack and, from this beginning, try to move and lead the nations toward a more durable basis for peace.

There was silence in the room as he spoke. And no one, of any government, could doubt his earnestness and the significance of that moment. The Soviets have been expressing doubts and differences, but the matter is still under study, and this tremendous support in the United Nations is meaningful around the world.

What are the steps that would follow? These months ahead will be tremendously important. No one should underestimate the difficulties and the dangers in the world situation. There should be no false sense of security, but neither should there be hopelessness or cynicism.

A well-informed American people, following a course of calm courage and sustained strength, will improve the chance of traveling on the path of peace. Only on that path can we contemplate with confidence the joy and happiness of "Family Life in a Secure America."

Let us work together, diligently, prayerfully, intelligently, unceasingly, to strengthen that chance, to brighten that hope.

Mr. Dooley Comments on Civil Defense, Teddy Rosenfelt, and Battle iv San Juan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include and article by Roscoe Fleming, a capable and well-known writer of the West.

The article is as follows:

MR. DOOLEY COMMENTS ON CIVIL DEFENSE, TEDDY ROSENFELT, AND BATTLE IV SAN JUAN

(By Roscoe Fleming)

"Our civil defense, as they call it, reminds me iv Teddy Rosenfelt before the battle iv San Juan," said Mr. Dooley, looking up from the evening paper.

"And how was that?" asked Mr. Hennessey, who was warming his hands at the pot-bellied stove, preparatory to warming his stomach with a pre-Christmas Tom and Jerry.

"Addressin' his throops," answered the Sage of Archey Road, "Teddy demanded: 'Will yez fight or will yez run?' 'We will!' says the throops with one voice. 'That's me brave bhoys. I knowed ye would' says Teddy, an' leads 'em in that charge up San Juan Hill fr'm which they was only rescued by a company iv Naygro regulars."

"Well?" demanded Mr. Hennessey.

"Well, this civil defense bhoy we got now, he is in perpetual swivet about whether should we stay or should we run.

"First he was all hot f'r concrete shelters under ivery backyard in the counthry. If we'd done what he said then, the cement industry wud have been ahead a couple iv billion bucks and ivery household wud have had somethin' under the backyard good only f'r a septic tank or such. F'r now he's changed his tune.

"The gov'mint set off a hydrogen bomb, an' after a pause iv only a year or so, gits around to tellin' our civil defense director that the hydrogen bomb makes shelters worthless an' that the only thing to do in case the dastardly foe looses wan, is to put the entire population iv the U. S. on the road headed for some'ers else, at least until they meet the people fr'm some'ers else headed for here.

"Hinnessey, ye ever been caught of a Sunday afternoon thryin' to get back into town after a refreshin' day breathin' gas fumes out in the open counthry? They ye got just the barest notion of what this means.

"All the roads is jammed, an' nobody can get forward or back. The kids is cryin' and hungry and cold, an' the parents at their wits' ends.

"The flower iv our troops is running back an' forth along the road like chickens with their heads off, thryin' to get somethin' started.

"The whole machinery iv our civilization, if you kin call it that, is stuck on dead center. Uncle Joe in his wildest dream iv glory couldn't have dreamed up a better scheme for paralyzin' the mighty United States of America.

"Why, Washington is completely ringed around with them Nikes that our thrusty throops say can stop any airy plane or bomb just by lookin' at it, yet our gov'mint says that in case iv war our capital is to be 'forcibly evacuated.'

"This means, believe it or not that nearly a million men, women an' childer is to be drug out of Washington, willye or won't ye; all the patients in the hospitals, all the prisoners in the jails, and dumped some'rs else where they'll be 10 times as hard to take care of.

"Multiply this touchin' scene be 100, and ye got some idea iv what the 'doctrine iv dispersal' means; an' iv what the dastardly foe could start by merely sendin' one bomb this way. T'is an invitation to universal panic! Besides, which is least beseemin' to human dignity—to dig like moles, or run like rabbits?

"Hinnessey, I know not what others may do, but as f'r me, if the hydrogen bomb falls it'll find me right here, decanter in one hand an' the Book in the other, ready to hand out spirituous or spiritual consolation as the occasion requires. This will save everyone throuble in the long run."

(In a spirit of reverence, I venture one or twice a year to do a piece in the manner of Mr. Dooley, the tavernkeeper of Archery Road, and the Nation's principal and beloved adviser on public matters in the early years of the 20th Century. Mr. Dooley was of course the creation of Finley Peter Dunne. Any lapses from th' genius of Mr. Dunne are of course on me own head.—R. F.)

Nobody Called Truman a Traitor—But Eisenhower in 1952 Summed Up the Soft-on-Communism Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1956:

NOBODY CALLED TRUMAN A TRAITOR—BUT EISENHOWER IN 1952 SUMMED UP THE SOFT-ON-COMMUNISM ATTACK

(By David Lawrence)

Nobody ever called Harry Truman a traitor or disloyal—and the former President ought to know it. What his faulty memory is striv-

ing to recall, rather vaguely, is that his administration was attacked in the 1952 and 1954 campaigns for being soft on communism. That's an issue which, if Mr. Truman wants it so, can readily be revived for public debate, and the facts spread upon the record once more.

For Mr. Truman has never explained why he signed 2 letters—1 on April 30, 1946, and 1 on April 7, 1947—praising the late Harry Dexter White whose connection with a Soviet spy ring had been called to his attention on February 4, 1946, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

When Attorney General Brownell disclosed the facts about the Harry Dexter White case in November 1953 he never called Mr. Truman disloyal, as the Trumanites were quick to charge in an effort to evoke sympathy for their side. What Mr. Brownell did was to question the judgment and administrative efficiency of the Truman administration in letting Communist stooges slip through their fingers. The most carefully worded statement of the case came not from Vice President NIXON or any other Republican spokesman but from General Eisenhower himself in an address delivered at Milwaukee, Wis., on October 3, 1952. The prepared text, which uses the word "treason" three times, reads in part as follows:

"I have come to Milwaukee tonight to talk with you about communism and freedom. * * *

"These two ideas are as opposed as danger is to safety, as sickness is to health, as weakness to strength, as darkness to light. Great truths can, at times, be startlingly simple. This one is of that kind. It is so simple a truth that it seems almost too obvious, almost stale.

"But let not our memories be too short. Only a few years have passed since many moved among us who argued cunningly against this plain truth. Their speech was persuasive, and their vocabulary clever. Remember? It went like this: 'After all, while we stand for political democracy, they stand for economic democracy. Fundamentally these are but two slightly different roads to the same goal. We both believe in freedom.'

"We must all remember that sophisticated lie. We will never forget it. For it partly poisoned two whole decades of our national life. It insinuated itself into our schools, our public forums, some of our news channels, some of our labor unions, and—most terrifyingly—into our Government itself.

"What did this penetration into Government mean? It meant contamination in some degree of virtually every department, every agency, every bureau, every section of our Government. It meant a Government by men whose very brains were confused by the opiate of this deceit. These men were advisers in a foreign policy that—on one side of the world—weakly bowed before the triumph in China of Communists hailed as agrarian reformers. On the other side of the world this policy condoned the surrender of whole nations to an implacable enemy whose appetite for conquest sharpened with every victory. This penetration meant a domestic policy whose tone was set by men who sneered and scoffed at warnings of the enemy infiltrating our most secret counsels.

"It meant—in its most ugly triumph—treason itself.

"These years have, indeed, been a harrowing time in our history. It has been a time of both honest illusion and dishonest betrayal—both terribly costly. It has been a time that should have taught us, with cold finality, the truth about freedom and communism.

"Most of us, young or old, wise or naive, have learned. An important few have not. They have learned very little—and they admit nothing. They are men about whom there is nothing great except their vanity and their complacency. They are proud prisoners of their own mistakes.

"Who are these men?

"They are those who cheered the blithe dismissal of the Alger Hiss case as a red herring. They are those who applauded 2 weeks ago when an administration servant grandly declared that Communists in our national life were not very important, and that we should not waste time chasing phantoms. They are those who slapped their sides with laughter when the same man dismissed the quest for Communists in our Government as a kind of silly game being played in the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries.

"Do you think these fish stories, ghost stories, and animal stories are really very amusing? Such comedy touches do little to relieve the tragic knowledge that we have been for years the gullible victims of Communist espionage experts. These experts in treason have plundered us of secrets involving our highest diplomatic decisions, our atomic research. Tragically, we do not know much more our security may have been jeopardized.

"You can never cure malignant growth just by a hearty bedside manner! I must be blunt, for this is a serious matter. I speak not as a partisan or as a candidate but simply as an American citizen—moved to honest anger by this persistent, gnawing threat of Communist treason in our national life. I know that millions of both parties today are moved to anger and to action.

"Neither these millions nor I have patience any longer with those whose complacency excuses our Government's failures as wholly unavoidable."

Mr. Eisenhower then recalled his own observation of "fifth columns" in Europe. He added that "it is the prerogative of Government to set the strictest test upon loyalty" and that it is a "privilege, not a right" to work for the United States Government. He declared that the Bill of Rights "contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to join together to destroy the Bill of Rights." He said:

"A group—like the Communist conspiracy—dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the Government."

It is a great speech and certainly its doctrines should appeal equally today to the rank and file of Democrats as well as Republicans. Reprints should be widely distributed by the Fund for the Republic, since it has sent out literature on the other side of the same controversy.

Where Expected Longevity Is Greatest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, despite the seemingly perpetual shadow of international strife, I am convinced the greatest problems facing our Nation in the future are those in the domestic areas of health, education, and welfare.

My reasons for making this statement are simple. The Nation's fast-growing population presents tremendous problems in the area of social adjustment. Our increasing birth rate is and will continue to be a challenge to educators. Our increasing life expectancy presents an equally enormous challenge in the field of welfare. Public health problems naturally encompass the other issues.

Our country in recent years has made remarkable accomplishment in the fight against disease. The longevity of its citizens has increased as a result. It is not unlikely that new health research projects now in progress will extend the average life expectancy of our populace even farther in years to come.

With this in mind, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to an editorial published December 3, 1955, in the Journal of the American Medical Association. It was of particular interest to me because it shows Kansas high among States where expected longevity is greatest. I consider this editorial a tribute to the talents of the medical profession, the watchful service of public health agencies, and the habits of clean living instilled in the residents at large in my home State. But above all, I consider it fair notice to the Congress that public welfare, the care of the aged and infirm, will become an increasingly important problem to the Nation in the years which lie ahead.

The editorial follows:

WHERE EXPECTED LONGEVITY IS GREATEST

Often the opinion is heard that the healthiest people in the United States live in heavily populated areas where hospitals, physicians, and other health facilities and personnel are plentiful. Recently published data on the expectation of life, particularly at birth, in each of the 48 States for 1949–51 refute this popular notion, especially for white males.[1] The statistical department of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. has assisted the National Office of Vital Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the preparation of life tables for each State. All the tables, including those for nonwhite males and females, will be published soon by the National Office of Vital Statistics.

The 6 States with the highest expectation of life at birth for white males for 1949–51 were: South Dakota, 68.4 years; Nebraska, Minnesota, and Iowa, 68.2 years; Kansas, 68 years; and North Dakota, 67.9 years. The expectation of life at birth for white males in the United States was 66.3 years. In 1939–41 the six leading States for white males were Nebraska, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, and Kansas. Thus, it is obvious that white males of these sparsely settled States still enjoy comparatively low mortality. The only changes apparent in the figures cited above are: (1) South Dakota has replaced Nebraska as the leader, and (2) Kansas and North Dakota have exchanged ranks.

It is not possible to say that longevity will actually be greatest among the white males of these 6 States, because expectation of life is an actuarial computation based upon the mortality rates at all ages in 3 specified calendar years. This computation, strictly speaking, is not a forecast of the mortality that will prevail during the entire lifetimes of the babies born in each of these 6 States in the specified 3 calendar years. These favorable mortality records among white males in these six States must be attributed, in part, to the strong north European strains in the population and favorable selection factors in migration. The number of miles that many people in these States must travel to visit a physician or

[1] State Variations in Longevity, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., statistical bulletin, October 1955.

become a patient in a hospital might be considered a health hazard by many urban dwellers, but the people in the west north central region of the United States have developed a way of life that makes them well adjusted to these spatial conditions.

Nebraska retained its leadership in life expectation at birth for white females with 74 years as compared with 72 years of the entire United States. Oklahoma, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, and South Dakota follow with 73.8 to 73.6 years. A more general observation is that the State variations in longevity as indicated by expectation of life at birth were less in 1949–51 than they were in 1939–41. The leaders in expectation of life at age 25 were South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa, with 46.8 years for white males. The leading States for white females at age 25 were Oklahoma, Nebraska, Florida, Arkansas, Kansas, Iowa, Texas, South Dakota, and Utah, ranging from 51.8 years to 51.1 years. The States in which the people at age 65 had the greatest expectation of life were Arkansas, Florida, and Oklahoma for white males and Florida, Arizona, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas for white females.

The variations in expectation of life in 1949–51 at these 3 selected ages were less marked, of course, among the 9 regions than among the 48 States. The west north central region (Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas) had the highest expectation of life for white males at birth (67.8 years) and at age 25 (46.4 years), but the west south central region ranked first at age 65 (13.4 years versus 13.3 years). For white females the west north central region had the highest expectation of life at birth, 73.3 years; at age 25 its 50.9 years ranked it second to the west south central region with 51.2 years; at age 65, however, it was outranked by a small margin by the west south central, mountain, and Pacific regions. In 1939–41, the west north central region ranked first in expectation of life at birth, at age 25, and at age 65 for white males; and first at birth, first at age 25, and tied for second at age 65 for white females. These data for the 9 regions, as well as those for the individual States, should remove all doubt about where the expectation of life is and has been the highest, particularly at birth and at age 25.

Passing the Buck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a pertinent editorial from the Carlisle (Pa.) Evening Sentinel from the issue of January 30.

No matter how hard Mr. Luce tries, neither he, Mr. Dulles, Mr. Shepley, whose byline appeared over the article, nor the anonymous Life editor who wrote the headline, can escape the fact that the Secretary of State has accepted responsibility for the quotes directly attributable to him.

The editorial follows:

PASSING THE BUCK

Editor in Chief Henry R. Luce of Life magazine has apologized for the magazine's "unfortunate" brink-of-war headlines on the authorized interview with Secretary Dulles and for the caption on the cover, "Three Times at Brink of War; How Dulles Gambled and Won." Mr. Luce, thereby, in effect, blames some unnamed editor who handled the article or arranged its presentation.

The unnamed headline editor, however, surely did not write into the article that Secretary Dulles and the Eisenhower administration walked to the "verge" of war three times and averted it by "strong action." That was the "news" in the article and that is what the headline is based on.

It seems to us most unfair for the editor in chief to make any subeditor the goat for the effect of the magazine article. The trouble caused by the article was not caused by any headlines but by what Mr. Dulles said.

Resolutions Adopted by the Sangamon County Farm Bureau, Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it is the thought and the hope of all of us that something in the way of constructive and helpful legislation for the farmers will come from this Congress. In this connection, I would like to have printed the following resolutions, which were adopted by the Sangamon County Farm Bureau, Springfield, Ill., favoring enactment of legislation which they believe will help achieve for the agricultural industry and for farm people, a fair share of the national income, as well as aid in stabilizing our entire national economy:

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL POLICY

We reaffirm our belief that the welfare and prosperity of agriculture is basic for the continued economic health and welfare of all the people in our Nation. We continue to stand for high and efficient production and for good income for both agricultural and urban people. We believe that we as farmers should solve many of our problems ourselves through our own efforts. We also believe that in order for these goals to be obtained and maintained, agriculture will need and must have the assistance through legislation of the Federal Government in a similar way that assistance has been sought and obtained by other industries and by labor groups.

We continue to urge an expanded program in research to the end that new uses and new markets can be found for farm products. We believe that programs of research and marketing should be financed in part by farmers and that in addition substantial Federal and State funds and institutions should be used for such programs. Increased efforts should be made to increase sales of agricultural products abroad, including simplifying of trade procedures between the United States and other countries, and other means which will increase the opportunities of moving larger quantities of farm products into foreign markets. We urge greater use of agricultural products in exchange for critical materials, particularly those necessary in the maintenance of a strong national defense, including such products as can safely be stockpiled in this country.

We reaffirm our stand in favor of a sound price support and storage program based on the 90-percent support of basic crops, as one part of a broad program aimed at helping to maintain opportunity for farmers comparable to other groups, believing that the accomplishment of this aim will also help to strengthen and maintain the economy of our Nation as a whole. We recognize that if supports on basic crops are to be maintained at comparatively high levels, that workable production controls must also be put into effect and given sincere cooperation by farmers and also given effective administration. In this connection we believe that some of the so-called soil-bank proposals have merit. However, we would favor a soil-conserving reserve or allotment of 25 percent of the cropland of every farm as a prerequisite for eligibility for price supports, while the balance of a farm could be put in other crops according to a good balanced cropping program. The required conserving acreage allotments could be lowered or raised at the discretion of the United States Department of Agriculture based on available supplies and anticipated demand, and also an estimated need other than normal consumptive demand. In order to encourage participation, and certainly no program can be effective without a majority of farmers taking part, substantial payments should be made for acreages set aside in conserving crops, and in addition, increased payments should be provided for encouraging the seeding of grasses and legumes on increased acreages to be set aside. However, there should be a provision whereby these additional acreages of grasses and legumes should not be used for any other purpose. Also substantial payments should be made for the application of limestone and phosphate where soil tests indicate they are needed in order to secure stands and proper growth of these crops. An acreage rental plan for crop acreages set aside above the required minimum would also probably be helpful in the present situation. Greater participation could be obtained if the administrative officers and general farmer organizations kept in mind the ultimate good of farmers and were sympathetic and willing to administer such a program.

We strongly urge that the Federal Government does not make any funds available for any reclamation projects of land not now in agricultural production until agricultural production and demand are more nearly in balance.

We also recommend consideration of a special provision in our national agricultural policy which will provide that when any section of the agricultural producing area in the country is declared a disaster area, provisions would be made that the Department of Agriculture would make available to farm producers in that area certificates for obtaining feed grains from Government stock of at least the amount that a farmer had reduced his normal production by placing 25 percent (or more) of his crop land in a conserving allotment. We also believe that adequate and sound farm credit must continue to be available for farmers and we stand for a sound program that will continue to make electric power and adequate communications available to farmers at reasonable cost.

We favor the principals and programs outlined above because we believe they will help achieve for the agricultural industry and for farm people a fair share of the national income, and will also serve as aids in stabilizing our entire national economy.

SCHOOL FINANCING

Adequate school finances continue to be one of the most difficult problems facing normal school districts. Continually rising standards of educational and teaching requirements, greater diversification of courses, more elaborate facilities, high salaries for teaching staffs, administrators, and other personnel, all add to the cost of education. Many people enjoy the benefits of our school systems without making any appreciable contribution to their financial support. Rural people in Sangamon County have for several years given thought to how the nontaxpaying school patrons could be brought

into the school supporting group. In the 1954 and 1955 policy development and policy execution meetings in the county, rural people favored an increase in State sales tax with the provision that the increased tax funds would be set aside specifically for schools to be distributed on the basis of enrollment or attendance records.

Legislation was enacted during the 1955 session of the legislature increasing the sales tax, the increase to be for the benefit of schools and State institutions. Many of our people are unhappy with the new law, believing that most of the funds will be diverted to State institutions. The new act provides that school funds are to be distributed on a special distributive fund basis which will deprive some school districts of their fair share of the additional tax which they have contributed. We believe that the method provided by the new law is unjust and discriminatory, and recommend that the board of directors of the IAA, and in addition, rural school boards generally work for an amendment to that act so that all schools will share on a per-pupil basis.

Many groups are favoring a so-called Federal aid to education without controls. Our experience in the past has been that it eventually becomes impossible to have Federal aid without Federal controls. We are vigorously opposed to Federal aid to education as it has been proposed, as we believe it would eventually lead to a centralized and federally dominated educational system in this country.

We are opposed to Federal aid to education for the further reason that income taxpayers in Illinois will have to contribute $2 for Federal aid to education for every $1 returning as aid to Illinois schools.

RESEARCH

Research has been responsible for much of the progress that has been made by the people of America during the last century. Research has brought the answer to many problems which have confronted all segments of our population. Research in agricultural production has met the challenge of rapidly increasing population by making possible increased yields and increased efficiency of production. However, even though the discovery of new uses for agricultural products has been rapid during the last quarter century, we believe that this field now presents the greatest opportunities for much greater advancement. We urge the allocation of more funds for research work in the fields of new uses for agricultural products and more efficient distribution and marketing of agricultural products, such research to be carried on both on a national level and by the States through the agricultural experiment stations. We also urge the IAA and AFBF to endeavor to enlist increasing attention to research by private industrial companies associated or allied with the agricultural industry.

FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

We commend the local, State, and National Farm Bureau organizations for their efforts to get the present 2-cent tax on gasoline refunded where such gasoline is not used on the highways. We also commend other individuals and agencies which are working to secure a change in the present law. We urge continued efforts to have the present law changes, and in addition, urge efforts to exempt any future tax on gasoline or diesel fuel not used on the highways.

FEDERAL ROAD PROGRAMS

We believe that the building of roads should remain primarily a State and local function, and are opposed to Federal programs of roadbuilding involving increases in taxes of any kind.

A License To Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the need for increased appropriations for the United States Tariff Commission.

The attached editorial from the Journal of Commerce under date of January 24, 1956, is an excellent presentation of the need for increased support for an agency that is so vital to our economic welfare.

The editorial follows:

A LICENSE TO DRIVE

Congress has given the United States Tariff Commission so much work and responsibility in recent years that there is a serious question of whether the agency is adequate to its tasks.

The Commission has been given the responsibility (formerly lodged with the Treasury) for making determinations in antidumping cases. Since 1951 it has been charged with the investigation of emergency conditions requiring quotas on agricultural imports. In 1954, it was saddled with the burdensome job of preparing by this year recommendations for simplifying the enormously complex customs classification system of this country. Last year it was also handed the job of investigating any competition from imports that might strike the Office of Defense Mobilization and the White House as threatening an industry essential to national defense.

All this is in addition to the Commission's regular job of determining "peril points" in advance of the conclusion of tariff negotiations, handling escape clause cases, and supplying both Congress and the White House with information on requests, among other things.

By almost any count this is a big responsibility, and since a very large number of the Commission's actions involve public hearings, which are time-consuming, the work load is heavy.

How large an agency bears this responsibility? Would its staff total 500, 1,000 or 1,500? Would its annual budget run closer to $5 million than $2 million, or would it be nearer $10 million?

The Commission normally consists of six commissioners. Its staff last year totaled 194. Its budget, nearly lost in the massive volumes of the Federal Budget, has been running between $1.3 and $1.4 million—less by far than the amount granted the National Science Foundation for the observance of the International Geophysical Year.

Interestingly enough, as the Commission's workload has increased, its staff has been cut. The number of persons on its rolls last year was two-thirds of that in 1945, and proportionately even smaller than in 1939.

This, in itself, is not reprehensible. An agency need not be large to be efficient. It speaks well for the Commission, in fact, that it has been able to do the job it has been doing with so small a staff and appropriation.

But as USTC indicates in its modestly phrased report on last year's activities, there can be too much of a good thing.

"With such a sharply reduced force and the mounting demands upon it, the Commission's staff for many years has had to devote nearly all its time to current projects of the highest priority," the report says. "It (the Commission) has had little opportunity * * * to undertake projects on other subjects that are of great interest to Congress, the Executive, and the public, and that fall within the scope of its functions, as prescribed by law."

It is manifestly unfair to impose so much work and responsibility on the Commission while denying it an adequate staff. It is, of course, unfair to the Tariff Commission. But more importantly, it is unfair to those—and they number in the millions—whose economic well-being is determined in large or small part by the manner in which United States tariff policy is administered.

Those who seek and those who oppose greater protection under the peril point and escape clauses have the right to expect their pleas will be given adequate and unhurried attention. The cost of faulty judgments produced in such cases by an overburdened Tariff Commission would be many times greater than the bookkeeping savings obtained by pruning the staff.

There is an urgent need for the simplification of the customs classification system on which the Commission is now supposed to be devoting much intensive thought and study. Will this be given adequate treatment under existing circumstances?

Finally, when it is considered that the foreign relations of the United States are directly affected by what the Commission does or does not do in specific instances, it is plain that there is a great deal more at stake in appropriating funds for the Tariff Commission than the simple question of whether it isn't cheaper to get along with a staff of 200 than a staff of 300.

These are questions that members of the House Appropriations Committee and other legislators having a direct interest in the subject would do well to raise sharply when considering the independent offices appropriations bill during the coming months.

Congress will do well to consider the matter carefully, because it is Congress that has been steadily loading the Commission with more work and more responsibility. President Eisenhower's budget request for the Tariff Commission (salaries and expenses) for fiscal year 1957 is $1,551,083—which seems quite modest in the circumstances. The question is whether it isn't too modest.

In winding up its 1955 annual report, the Commission observes laconically that it "does not own or operate any motor vehicles." Indeed, it does not seem to have been given much more than a license to drive.

Future Construction of Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, the Veterans' Affairs Committee was fortunate in having the Administrator of Veterans' Administration Harvey V. Higley present to the Committee, at our request, a comprehensive long-range plan for replacement and modernization of hospitals in the Veterans' Administration medical system. In the current budget funds are requested for new hospitals at Downey, Ill., Washington, D. C., Oakland, Calif., Jackson, Miss. and Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Higley presented rather detailed information on the plans of the Veterans' Administration for replacement and modernization, not only in the fiscal year

1957 but through fiscal year 1962. This program, the committee was told, was formulated after considerable consultation with the Bureau of the Budget and the program as presented to the committee has been reviewed and approved by the President.

I personally view this program very favorably and believe that most Members of Congress will share my view. I commend the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration for their work in planning this comprehensive long-range replacement and modernization schedule.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the statement by Administrator of Veterans' Administration, Mr. Harvey V. Higley:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to meet with you this morning to discuss our current program and long range plans for VA hospital and domiciliary construction and improvement.

As requested in your letter of February 2, 1956, the following information, as well as that contained in the prepared folder, represents tentative planning by the Veterans' Administration. I wish to make clear that this tentative planning is subject to adjustment as budget programs for specific fiscal years are developed.

Initially 16 hospitals were listed in the long range plan for replacement. Under date of February 7, 1956, I have been advised by the director, Bureau of the Budget, the President has approved 8 of these projects. Two hospitals, Cleveland, Ohio (GM) and Washington, D. C. (GM) had prior Presidential approval as a part of the post World War II expansion program. They will be accomplished as a part of that program.

More retailed analyses have resulted in the scheduling of the four hospitals at Augusta, Ga.; Hines, Illinois; Oteen, North Carolina, and Richmond, Va., for modernization rather than for replacement, since the ratio of temporary buildings to be replaced is less than the area of permanent buildings which can be improved. These will be programed concurrently with the replacement program.

We have a peculiar problem at Coral Gables, Fla. This project is being restudied to determine the most economical solution of producing a safe and functionally satisfactory hospital.

The VA hospital at Martinsburg, W. Va., has not been included in the Replacement or the Modernization Programs because the authorization for its use extended only through the period required to provide new beds in the State of West Virginia and the District of Columbia area.

Eight hospitals are now in the approved program for replacement, either wholly or in part, due to, either obsolesence, temporary construction (cantonment type), or a combination of both. Those to be replaced in part will eliminate cantonment type construction, followed by modernization of existing permanent buildings. These are Downey, Ill., and the second phase of Long Beach, Calif. They will be kept partially in operation during these replacement and modernization programs.

The replacement of Oakland, Calif., proposes to eliminate the potential hazard from future earthquake action, as well as unsatisfactory operating conditions that result in costly maintenance.

At Wood, Wis., it is highly desirable to vacate the domiciliary buildings—one of which dates from 1869, while others were constructed prior to 1890. By the replacement of the existing hospital with new construction it will correct an overcrowded condition as well as replace obsolete facilities. Following this phase, the present hospital buildings can be economically altered so as to provide very satisfactory domiciliary care, thus making it possible to vacate these very old and obsolete buildings .

The four remaining hospitals are of cantonment type World War II construction; rapidly reaching the end of their useful life expectancy. They should, therefore, be replaced. These are Jackson, Miss.; Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn., and Temple, Tex. At Temple, Tex., it is proposed to construct a new permanent hospital, but continue the use of the buildings now housing domiciliary activities for the present through an extensive program of modernization.

The material distributed this morning provides details regarding these eight replacements and a tentative time schedule for accomplishment. It will be noted that the construction program is estimated to cost approximately $160 million, exclusive of architect-engineer services. This program tentatively contemplates a design period of approximately 6 years, with completion of the last unit in approximately 8 years. It is emphasized again that this schedule reflects only tentative planning on the part of the Veterans' Administration as to the optimum rate at which the program can be developed and does not imply a commitment on the part of the Bureau of the Budget as to budgetary allowances for the program.

We have revised the modernization category, as reflected on page 11, House Committee Print No. 27, 84th Congress. To this list has been added Augusta, Ga.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Hines, Ill.; Lake City, Fla; Palo Alto, Calif., and Richmond, Va., with the removal of Downey, Ill.; Long Beach, Calif., and Wood, Wis., which are now being considered in the long-range replacement program. This results in a total of 58 hospitals, as shown on the charts.

On our tentative long-range planning chart we have shown the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957 projects or phases in black, and the projected projects for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 by diagonal cross hatching. Fiscal year 1958 indicates either a continuing phase, or a start of a project; while fiscal year 1959 shows the logical continuation of existing projects with possible starts. For the fiscal years 1960 through 1966, a tentative schedule is indicated. This, no doubt, will be adjusted somewhat as on-site surveys are made. Because of the tentative nature of this planning and lack of on-site surveys, it is not possible to approximate the estimated cost of this program.

In paragraph 4 of your letter of February 2, 1956, you asked for information pertaining to the fiscal year 1957 appropriation request. A breakdown of expenditures for the $47 million under "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" and $4,447,000 under "Major alterations, improvements, and repair" is shown on the sheet "1957 Construction Appropriation Request."

It will be noted that technical-service funds for the design of the Cleveland, Ohio, Jackson, Miss., Oakland, Calif., and Washington, D. C., general medical hospitals are requested in fiscal year 1957. It is planned that these hospitals will be designed during fiscal 1957 and, subject to appropriation of construction funds in fiscal year 1958, will be placed on the market for construction. However, I should state that we are somewhat disturbed about our ability to meet this schedule, since the recent directive I–19 of the Office of Defense Mobilization raises some doubts as to the acceptability of the sites proposed for the Cleveland, Oakland, and Washington, D. C., hospitals. Unless the problem can be resolved expeditiously, the design and construction schedule will be retarded seriously. If the acquisition of new sites becomes necessary, further delay would result, since the 1957 budget request does not provide for additional expenditures for this purpose.

On separate sheets are shown the distribution of these projects by hospital. Under the fiscal year 1957 major rehabilitation and modernization program request, items in excess of $250,000 each are listed.

Under the schedule for major alterations, improvements, and repair program request, the distribution of items, the estimated cost of which is less than $250,000 each, is indicated.

Members of my staff who are with me this morning are available to discuss the details of this program as you may desire.

Tentative scheduling of VA for replacement construction

[In millions]

TECHNICAL SERVICES	*Estimated cost*
Fiscal year 1956: Downey, Ill	$2.9
Fiscal year 1957: Cleveland, Ohio, Jackson, Miss., Oakland, Calif., Washington, D. C	5.066
Fiscal year 1958: Nashville, Tenn., Wood, Wis	3.75
Fiscal year 1959: Long Beach, Calif. (2d phase), Memphis, Tenn	3.5
Fiscal year 1960: Downey, Ill. (2d phase), Temple, Tex	1.7
Fiscal year 1961: Wood, Wis. (2d phase)	.8
Total	17.716
CONSTRUCTION	
Fiscal year 1957: Downey, Ill	$21.2
Fiscal year 1958: Cleveland, Ohio, Jackson, Miss., Oakland, Calif., Washington, D. C	43.559
Fiscal year 1959: Nashville, Tenn., Wood, Wis. (1st phase)	34.75
Fiscal year 1960: Long Beach, Calif. (2d phase), Memphis, Tenn	32.5
Fiscal year 1961: Downey, Ill. (2d phase), Temple, Tex	20.3
Fiscal year 1962: Wood, Wis. (2d phase)	8.0
Total	160.309

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION: SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS OF PLANNING FOR STATIONS LISTED IN LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR REPLACEMENT, PAGE 14 OF HOUSE COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 27, NONBED BETTERMENTS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS, MARCH 15, 1955

STATION AND DISPOSITION

1. Augusta, Ga.: Transferred to modernization category.
2. Cleveland, Ohio (GM): Included for replacement in 1948 new hospital program.
3. Coral Gables, Fla.: Under study in modernization category.
4. Downey, Ill.: Replacement program.
5. Hines, Ill.: Transferred to modernization category.
6. Jackson Miss.: Replacement program.
7. Long Beach, Calif.: Replacement program.
8. Martinsburg, W. Va.: Not scheduled for replacement or modernization.
9. Memphis (Kennedy), Tenn.: Replacement program.
10. Nashville, Tenn.: Replacement program.
11. Oakland, Calif.: Replacement program.
12. Oteen (Swannonoa), N. C.: Modernization category.
13. Richmond, Va.: Modernization category.
14. Temple, Tex.: Replacement program (domiciliary to be modernized).
15. Washington, D. C.: Included for replacement in 1948 new-hospital program.
16. Wood, Wis.: Replacement program.

Summary

Stations included in replacement program	8
Stations to be replaced in new hospital program	2
Stations transferred from replacement to modernization category	5
Stations deleted from construction program	1
Total	16

Details of tentative long-range replacement schedules

Hospital location	Proposed, fiscal year for technical service	Estimated, fiscal year for plans completion	Proposed, fiscal year for construction funds	Estimated, fiscal year ready for occupancy	Estimated cost including technical service and I. P. E.	Remarks
Augusta, Ga.						Transferred to modernization program.
Cleveland, Ohio [1]	1957	1957	1958	1960	$11,500,000 [2]	Approved in new hospital program. Technical services included in fiscal year 1957.
Coral Gables, Fla.						Subject to further study.
Downey, Ill.	1956 (technical services for phases 1 and 2). 1960 (2d phase)	1957 (1st phase).. 1960 (2d phase)..	1957 (1st phase).. 1961 (2d phase)..	1960 (1st phase).. 1963 (2d phase)..	$24,100,000 (1st phase, including technical services for phases 1 and 2). $10,000,000 (2d phase)..	Technical services funds appropriated in 1956 for replacement and modernization work. 1st phase budgeted in 1957 replacement program provides for replacement of temporary Lawrence-McIntyre beds on Downey site. 2d phase, to be budgeted in a future modernization program, will provide for modernization of existing Downey buildings.
Hines, Ill.						Transferred to modernization category. Survey now being made.
Jackson, Miss.	1957	1957	1958	1960	$13,600,000	Hospital and RO to be replaced on site. Technical services funds programed in fiscal year 1957.
Long Beach, Calif.	1959 (2d phase)	1959 (2d phase)	1960 (2d phase)	1962 (2d phase)	$12,000,000 (2d phase)	1,380 beds to be replaced. First phase to be placed under construction fiscal year 1956.
Martinsburg, W. Va.						To be continued in operation pending construction of new Washington, D. C., hospital.
Memphis, Tenn.	1959	1959	1960	1963	$23,000,000	Construct 1,000-bed hospital. New site to be considered. Crump Boulevard hospital to be phased out when and if TB load permits.
Nashville, Tenn.	1958	1958	1959	1961	$11,500,000	To be located on new site vicinity of Vanderbilt University Consolidate RO clinic only.
Oakland, Calif. [3]	1957	1957	1958	1960	$11,500,000	To be replaced with 500 beds on new site—technical services funds in 1957 budget.
Oteen, N. C. (Swannanoa).						Transferred to modernization program for consolidation at Oteen.
Richmond, Va.						Transferred to modernization program.
Temple, Tex.	1960	1960	1961	1963	$12,000,000	Construct 500-bed hospital. Modernize 350-bed domiciliary.
Washington, D. C. [1]	1957	1957	1958	1960	$11,500,000 [2]	Approved in new hospital program. Technical services included in fiscal year 1957.
Wood, Wis.	1958 (1st phase). 1961 (2d phase)	1958 (1st phase). 1962 (2d phase)..	1959 (1st phase). 1962 (2d phase)..	1962 (1st phase). 1964 (2d phase)..	$26,000,000 (1st phase). $8,800,000 (2d phase)	Construct new 1,250-bed GM hospital with RO clinic; convert existing hospital buildings to domiliary use. Waukesha to be phased out when and if TB load permits.

[1] Site determination pending—subject to dispersal requirements of ODM-I-GEN-DMO-19, Jan. 11, 1956.

[2] Estimated cost does not include possible additional facilities required by location.

Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary facilities appropriation, fiscal year 1957 major rehabilitation and modernization program request

Project location	Hospital type and number of constructed beds, June 30, 1955		Total estimated cost (thousand dollars)	Project title [1]
	Number	Type		
(1)	(2)		(3)	(4)
Grand total			[2] $20,552.7	
1. Bedford, Mass.	1,636	NP	2,141.9	Modernization program, phase II (new physical medical rehabilitation building, chapel building, canteen and theater building, and alterations to recreation building No. 10).
2. Bronx, N. Y.	1,482	GM	620.5	Modernization program, phase IV (alterations to buildings Nos. 1 and 21, provide adequate canteen facilities and replace elevators Nos. 4 and 10 in building No. 1.
3. Chillicothe, Ohio	2,116	NP	646.2	New therapeutic exercise clinic building (to augment existing small scattered therapeutic areas which are inadequate in size).
4. Columbia, S. C.	600	GM	510.5	Modernization program, phase II (alterations to buildings Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5).
5. Danville, Ill.	1,719	NP	532.0	New theater building (to replace unsafe, nonfireproof existing theater building No. 47, which is badly deteriorated).
6. Dayton, Ohio	1,275 2,138	GM DOM	2,789.2	Modernization program, phase II (alterations and addition to GMS building D, Brown Hospital).
7. Fort Howard, Md.	389	GM	430.5	Modernization program, phase I (new warehouse building, utility building, pump and transformer house, and extend central heating to buildings Nos. 18, 20, 22, 23, 30, 43, 57, 59, and 70).
8. Hines, Ill.	3,092	GM	500.0	Replace 2 elevators, unit F, and provide a new electrical distribution system, building No. 1.
9. Kecoughtan, Va.	604 1,621	GM DOM	3,391.3	Modernization program, phase II (new administration wing, building No. 110, and new intermediate hospital building).
10. Kerrville, Tex.	449	TB	290.9	Replace 3 boilers and modernize outside utilities.
11. Lake City, Fla.	381	GM	662.0	Modernization program, phase I (alterations to buildings Nos. 15, 16, 17, 19, 38, and 64, new incinerator building.
12. Mountain Home, Tenn.	605 1,781	GM DOM	938.0	Modernization program, phase I (alterations to buildings Nos. 2, 26, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 78).
13. Murfreesboro, Tenn.	1,307	NP	2,261.4	Modernization program, phase I (new therapeutic exercise clinic and special services building).
14. Oteen, N. C.	1,996	TB	694.4	Modernize patients feeding facilities in 7 buildings, and alterations to provide small dining rooms in buildings Nos. 1, 19, and 20.
15. Portland, Oreg.	415 155	GM TB	1,889.9	Modernization program, phase I (alterations to buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, and 25, and connecting corridor, general site work and outside utilities).
16. Tomah, Wis.	1,176	NP	1,230.0	New dining hall and kitchen and connecting corridors (to replace existing nonfireproof dining hall and kitchen building).
17. Tuscaloosa, Ala.	964	NP	313.9	Expand and modernize present laundry facilities.
18. Waco, Tex.	2,040	NP	613.7	Do.
19. Wood, Wis.	1,340 1,661	GM DOM	313.9	Modernize electrical distribution system, convert to alternating current, and replace elevators in buildings Nos. 20 and 43.

[1] In addition to specific items listed above, each project covers any necessary adjustments and related work to permit the rehabilitated or modernized facilities to tie in with and function as an integral part of existing plants. Even after all projects in this proposed program are completed, standards of affected hospitals though improved will still in most cases be below those approved for our new hospitals.

[2] Total estimated cost rounded off to $20,552.7.

Veterans' Administration fiscal year 1957 major alterations, improvements, and repairs program request

Project location	Hospital type and number of constructed beds (June 30, 1955)		Total estimated cost (thousands of dollars)	Brief project description [1]
	Number	Type		
(1)	(2)		(3)	(4)
Grand total			[2] $4,447.0	
1. Various stations			300.0	Administrator's discretionary project funds.
2. Various stations			927.0	Correction of fire and safety hazards (phase V of interim patients protection program).
3. Albuquerque, N. Mex	500	GM	131.3	Addition and alterations to building No. 1 to expand present inadequate central sterile supply service.
4. Alexandria, La	913	GM	149.3	Modernization program, phase III (alterations, building No. 1; replace elevator, building No. 2; addition to corridor between buildings No. 2 and 3).
5. Amarillo, Tex	156	GM	38.6	Manager's quarters and single garage.
6. American Lake, Wash	904	NP	241.5	New chapel building.
7. Augusta, Ga	1,632	NP	95.2	Detention screens for buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (to replace existing diamond mesh grilles which are in a deteriorated condition).
8. Bath, N. Y	400 1,478	GM DOM	165.4	Alterations and addition to building No. 14 (to provide garage, guardhouse, and fire station).
9. Boise, Idaho	250	GM	142.2	Underground electrical distribution system.
10. Boston, Mass	941	GM	39.2	Relocate and expand research laboratory (to provide adequate space for medical research).
11. Danville, Ill	1,719	NP	62.1	Air condition operating suite, building No. 58.
12. Fort Harrison, Mont	262	GM	28.3	Elevator, building No. 47 (to eliminate hand carrying of supplies to 2d floor of warehouse, and to permit better utilization of storage space).
13. Hines, Ill	3,092	GM	12.6	Surface drainage and resurface roads.
14. Indianapolis, Ind	486	GM	39.8	Enlarge parking facilities (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
15. Iowa City, Iowa	484	GM	14.8	Additional parking facilities (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
16. Lexington, Ky	1,216	NP	30.7	Regrading and paving parking areas.
17. Los Angeles, Calif	1,842 1,403 2,370	NP GM DOM	218.0	New incinerator (of suitable size to handle station refuse and eliminate smoke nuisance).
18. Louisville, Ky	494	GM	18.9	Additional parking space (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
19. Louisville, Ky. (VARO)		RO	55.5	Air cool 5th floor.
20. Marion, Ind	1,650	NP	133.8	Replace worn elevator, buildings Nos. 16, 20, and 25 (with new elevators capable of safe and efficient handling of traffic).
21. Montrose, N. Y	1,965	NP	100.0	Water connection charge.
22. Northampton, Mass	933	NP	38.6	Detention screens, building No. 4 (to eliminate future injuries to patients from broken glass in suicide attempts; and to reduce extensive maintenance from glass breakage and insect screen damage).
23. Outwood, Ky	316	TB	119.9	Boiler plant improvements (replace and improve existing boilers and auxiliary equipment which is badly deteriorated).
24. Phoenix, Ariz	192	GM	57.4	Addition to building No. 1 (to provide adequate space for receipt and storage of supplies).
25. Providence, R. I	393	GM	36.7	Additional parking area (to alleviate critical shortage of parking space).
26. Reno, Nev	166	GM	19.9	Alterations, isolation ward, building No. 1 (to provide septic technique facilities for entire isolation ward and increase capacity from 5 to 6 beds).
27. Roanoke, Va	2,000	NP	163.8	Addition and alterations to warehouse building No. 15 (to provide adequate storage space for items other than subsistence, and consolidate supply activities located in 5 buildings into 2 buildings).
28. Rutland Heights, Mass	615	TB	210.4	Boiler plant improvements, building No. 22 (replace present wornout boilers with 3 new boilers equipped with automatic controls and modernize boiler plant electric system).
29. San Juan, P. R	200	GM	27.8	Shelter for Government vehicles (to protect vehicles from heavy winds, rains, temperatures, and corrosive effect of salt air).
30. Shreveport, La	449	GM	39.2	Alterations for mycology and TB laboratory; isolate electric circuits to operating room, building No. 1, and install explosion-proof electrical outlets and emergency generator.
31. Somerville, N. J. (VASD)		SD	19.5	Alterations and automatic fire sprinkler system, building No. T-83 (for flammatory storage, etc.).
32. St. Cloud, Minn	1,379	NP	105.8	Electrical changes, building No. 1 (and install explosion-proof electrical outlets and emergency generators sewer connection charge).
33. Syracuse, N. Y	488	GM	153.3	Animal laboratory (new building to provide animal quarters and laboratory facilities for station medical research and training program).
34. Temple, Tex	100 350	GM DOM	32.9	Hydraulic elevator for surgical service (to eliminate the hazard of transporting surgical patients up and down long ramps or stairs).
35. Togus, Maine	851	NP	33.8	Construct 300,000 gallon water tank to supplement present water supply and provide adequate storage to eliminate intermittent danger due to insufficient water pressure for normal hospital use on 6th floor of building or for use in case of fire.
36. Wadsworth, Kans	1,082 1,221	GM DOM	190.0	Modernize inadequate refrigeration systems and facilities and improve inadequate street lighting.
37. West Haven, Conn	872	GM	158.3	Animal laboratory (new building to provide animal quarters and laboratory facilities for station medical research and training program).
38. West Roxbury, Mass	304	GM	49.7	Additions and alterations to garage, building No. 10 (to provide adequate space for housing and servicing station vehicles, i. e., stock and parts room, wash rack, grease rack, etc.).
39. Wilmington, Del	320	GM	22.8	Construct minor addition adjacent to main hospital building to provide adequate and safe storage space for hydrocarbon and oxidizing gases, and trash.

[1] In addition to the specific items listed above, each project covers any necessary adjustments and related work to permit the altered, improved, or repaired facilities to tie in with and function as an integral part of existing plants. Some substitutions of projects may be anticipated as a result of changing conditions during the year. Experience has shown that there will be emergencies and changes in requirements that can neither be forecast nor reasonably estimated in advance. However, before any major alterations, improvements, or repairs (nonbed) project is started, it will be subjected to a thorough screening to establish the priority and the fact that it is necessary. Even after all projects in the proposed program are completed, standards of affected hospitals though improved, will still, in most cases, be below those approved for our new hospitals.

[2] Total estimated cost rounded off to $4,447.0.

The Primacy of Strategic Air Power Has Yet To Be Fully Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee, under the most able leadership of Mr. VINSON, has performed a splendid task in its report on the proposed naval shipbuilding and conversion program for fiscal year 1957. I would like to commend the committee and express my conviction that its members have been guided by the principle that this country must be provided maximum military security if it is to successfully resist Soviet aggression.

In considering this proposed program, however, it is imperative that we review it not only in terms of the needs of one service but that it be studied in relationship to the overall military requirements of this country. One statement contained in the report of the committee might well be rephrased to read: "The basic consideration in the preparation of a military program is, of course, the maintenance of the security of the United States. This requires a dynamic military program which, naturally, must take into consideration the overall military capabilities of unfriendly powers."

It is unfortunate, but a review of the report on this program does create the impression that here in one neat package is a military panacea that will take care of all of this Nation's security needs. The fact of the matter is, however, that here in this second decade of the atomic

air age and some 5 years after the first Soviet nuclear explosion, the primacy of strategic air power has yet to be fully recognized by many in whom the security of the country is invested.

The disquieting disclosures of Admiral Burke of recent Soviet naval growth and her achievements in the development of new naval weapons is indeed sobering. Yet air power and the Air Force, because it is inherently capable of operating anywhere and at anytime and because it is not restricted by the definitive boundaries of land or sea, flies over those very same weapons that are a threat to our naval supremacy. The very barriers that in times past have hindered and restricted the movement of surface forces are today neutralized because of air power.

In the near future we can expect to be called upon to consider the requirements of the Air Force for the coming fiscal year. In so doing, it is important that we realize that, regardless of what action we take here today on the naval shipbuilding program, the common denominator of our strategic and our military discussions must be the fact that air power is the dominant factor in modern war. Our security and civilization as we know it is entirely dependent upon the state of readiness and degree of modernity of our Air Force.

Reported qualitative and quantitative improvements in the Soviet air force have become distressingly evident. The adequacy of the presently contemplated 137-wing Air Force has now become problematical. Even this planned level of Air Force readiness may not be possible, in view of the handicaps imposed by current limited Air Force operating funds. It faces a similar difficulty in fiscal year 1957. This is all the more serious when we consider that, except in the category of medium-range bombers, the Soviet Union has overtaken us in all categories of warplanes.

Unquestionably, long-range airpower, whether it be strategic or tactical, is the most portentous single fact of modern life. It has given the free world a true and trusted defense. Our strategic Air Force has prevented postwar Europe from falling an easy prey to Communist pressures. It has proven to be the sole factor responsible for forging the system of alliances that have united most of the free nations of the world.

It is a fact that American airpower has pointed at the very core of incipient aggression. Surprise Soviet attack no longer remains inviolate against retaliation.

Whether American nuclear airpower will succeed in remaining an effective tool for the prevention of war depends entirely upon this Congress. Based upon our actions alone, the Soviets can be made to realize that they cannot defeat the United States or if they irrationally decide to attack us there will be little chance of forestalling even more devastating counterblows.

The price we will pay for these measures will not be small but the cost of an atomic holocaust directed against this country would be incalculable.

Americanism Script of Ruth Miller Steese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, past department president of the American Legion Auxiliary, Mifflinburg, Pa., delivered a very important radio address on January 28, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM SCRIPT OF RUTH MILLER STEESE, PAST DEPARTMENT PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, MIFFLINBURG, PA., JANUARY 28, 1956

With the opening of this new year of 1956, newspapers and magazines, radio and television have iterated and reiterated a few potent words of one of our great living Americans. The words are, "if we remain strong."

To historians interested in words and their impact and influence upon the present and the future, based upon the authoritative findings of the past, these words are dynamite, they are consolation, they are heartwarming words of encouragement.

Today, the 28th of January, we stand in the very midst of anniversaries, of names and dates which should be carved permanently in the hearts and minds, in the very lives of every true American.

Benjamin Franklin, the godfather of our country, born in Boston, January 17, 1706.

George Washington, the Father of Our Country, born on the Bridges Creek Plantation, Westmoreland County, Va., February 22, 1732.

Abraham Lincoln, the savior of our country, born in Hardin County, Ky., February 12, 1809.

Due to the fact that for 1 entire year, we shall be observing the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, we can be pardoned for speaking of him at greater length than of the other two equally eminent Americans. Franklin has merited many titles, including "the first civilized American" and "the father of all Yankees." One author asserts that Franklin possessed "the most eminent mind that has ever existed in America, a mind that moved with perfect ease to its countless tasks."

Another has spoken thus: "Franklin is the most complete and the most characteristic of Americans. Washington is remote; Jefferson belongs indubitably to the 18th century; John Adams is pure Yankee; Hamilton never accepted his adopted country and never understood it. But Franklin could fit into American life at any point, in any decade, and accept it all cheerfully enough and set about improving it with efficient amiability; he is as contemporary as today's newspaper, as entertaining, as informative, as indispensable, and, in the best sense, as commonplace."

These three Americans, Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln, are noted for the versatility of their accomplishments and their abilities.

Franklin, the eldest, was an editor and publisher, a writer and a printer; he was a soldier, a legislator, and a statesman; he was a scientist, an inventor, and a philosopher.

Washington was not without his diversified interests and capabilities. He presented a magnificent figure on horseback and excelled in all sports. He earned the rank of lieutenant colonel at the age of 22. At the age of 28, he was elected to the house of burgesses, and when the time came to elect deputies to the First Continental Congress, he ranked third among the seven elected from Virginia.

When during the Continental Congress, it became necessary to elect a Commander in Chief to lead the small band of 2,000 Colonial soldiers, Washington was the unanimous choice. As he reviewed the motley array of poorly clad farmers, shopkeepers, backwoodsmen, etc., he spoke these signnficant words, "They are now the troops of the United Provinces of North America; and it is hoped that all distinctions of Colonies will be laid aside; so that one and the same spirit may animate the whole, and the only contest be who shall render, on this great and trying occasion, the most essential service to the great and common cause in which we are all engaged."

Lincoln did not possess the distinguished appearance of the exceptional lineal and educational background of George Washington. His tools represented the crudities of sheer dire poverty, but the product of his mind found no superior at any time or any place. A rail splitter, a nature lover, a mighty reader; a legislator, a debater and a soldier—

"Chosen for large designs, he had the art
Of winning with his humor, and he went
Straight to his mark, which was the human heart.
Wise, too, for what he could not break, he bent."

As we ponder on these great Americans, we realize that their challenge to activity, to leadership and to accomplishment is very similar to ours but expressed in a different terminology. Where we today "sound forth" with the words "if we remain strong," these representatives of two vastly different generations, rallied behind the single word "united."

The colonists under the leadership of such patriots as Washington and Franklin suddenly and unexpectedly became citizens of the various newly created States. They just as speedily became those persons referred to in that newly created Constitution, those to whom these words refer, "We, the people of the United States of America," a new term, the United States of America. They were not merely the citizens of the newly created States but they were the citizens of the very new United States, the United States of America.

Their thoughts were reflected even in their music. "Hail Columbia," written by Joseph Hopkinson, the Pennsylvanian, and first played in 1789 when Washington went to New York to be inaugurated, incorporated these words:

"Firm, united let us be
Rallying round our liberty."

The words of this song were penned not long after Franklin wrote a speech to be delivered at the Constitutional Convention, a speech intended to sway the wavering delegates into signing the brandnew, the infant Constitution, the Constitution of the United States. Consider his well and aptly chosen words:

"On the whole, sir, I cannot help expressing the wish, that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would with me on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility, and to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument."

The words "to make manifest our unanimity" are very logical, a very reasonable, a very practical way to say, let's be united.

In a letter to Horace Greeley in 1862, Lincoln wrote: "My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union."

Through this brief analysis of some of the highly pertinent doctrines of these American immortals, we have striven to impress upon you the fact that they lived and preached the principle, the creed, the belief in unity and in strength. Every thought and act were directed to make manifest the dogma of unanimity.

Today, if we as Americans remain strong and if we as alert citizens make manifest the doctrine of unanimity, we in these United States of America will travel far in 1956. The task is not easy but it is surmountable. We would not urge anyone to forget or lay aside his personal, his political, and his spiritual tenets. Those if sincere are inherent. But no American is infallible, no American. Franklin, when the very fate of our infant Constitution was at stake, dared to call on all the delegates to the Constitutional Convention to doubt a little of their own infallibility. Can we with sincerity observe the birthdays of these men who gave to us and saved for us, these United States of America and, at the same time not accept their challenge, their challenge to help America, these United States of America, remain strong; their challenge to us to manifest a spirit of genuine and sincere unanimity.

At the recent dedication of a memorial to one of the distinguished four chaplains who went down on the steamship *Dorchester*, February 3, 1943, this thought was expressed as the sentiment that these men would like to convey to us, today, and I quote: "Ours was a unity that transcended all differences. Ours was a unity that was not uniformity. Ours was a unity that strengthened within each of us every worthy individual loyalty of family and of faith. Ours was a unity that, at its highest and its best, is the United States of America. To this unity, in which we died together, we call upon you of all faiths, of all racial strains, and of all economic conditions, to live together, to live together that those who died shall not have died in vain."

To such a type of unity, a unity that transcends all differences, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln gave their lives. With faith in them and the doctrines they instilled, and with national unity, national unanimity as our slogan, American in 1956 shall be on the march.

Resolution Favoring Pest Mosquito Research Adopted by Illinois Mosquito Control Association, Urbana, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Illinois Mosquito Control Association on January 12, 1956, at Urbana, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation for pest mosquito research:

"RESEARCH ON PEST MOSQUITOES

"Whereas the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers meeting at Washington, D. C. on November 8, 1955 and the American Public Health Association meeting at Kansas City, Mo., on November 16, 1955, and the Florida Anti-Mosquito Association meeting at Clearwater, Fla., on December 2, 1955, did each express concern regarding the mosquito problems of the Nation and by passage of resolutions requested that a comprehensive program of research, demonstration, and technical consultation be undertaken by the United States Public Health Service for the purpose of developing better techniques for controlling pest mosquitoes, and on January 9, 1956, a bill known as Senate bill 2870 providing for the establishment of such a comprehensive program was introduced in the Senate of the United States; and

"Whereas such a comprehensive program would importantly benefit the aims and objectives of the Illinois Mosquito Control Association thereby enhancing the physical, mental, and social well-being of the people of Illinois, as well as those people of all States with such problems: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Illinois Mosquito Control Association in executive session at Urbana, Ill., on this 12th day of January 1956, does hereby support the above national movement and urges the adoption of Senate bill 2870 providing for a comprehensive program of research, demonstration, and technical consultation in controlling all mosquitoes that affect the health, comfort, and welfare of the Nation."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted on January 12, 1956.

J. D. WILLIAMS,
Secretary, Illinois Mosquito Control Association.

Cincinnati Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Cincinnati branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, wrote me regarding two legislative matters in which the association is deeply interested. One of these is an amendment to the bill providing for Federal aid to school construction which would deny funds to States which continue to practice segregation. The other measure is one which would give stronger assurances of civil rights.

Upon receipt of my reply, in which I set out my stand on these two matters, the president of the Cincinnati branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People sent me the following letter:

CINCINNATI BRANCH,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
January 30, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESS: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of January 24, in reply to two letter from me, one requesting your support of a clause in the imminent school-construction bill to deny funds to those States defying the Supreme Court order to desegregate, the other requesting your active support of stronger civil-rights legislation to prevent the recurrence of such atrocities as the Till and other murders in Mississippi.

Permit me to thank you for your clear and unequivocal stand on both very important issues. We are aware of your having once sponsored antilynching legislation and we are grateful that you pledge your wholehearted support of similar legislation soon to be introduced by Representative DIGGS, of Michigan.

Also, we thank you for your forthright statement that you believe that Federal funds should not be granted to States which practice segregation, and that you shall vote in accordance with this belief when the matter comes up in the House.

Sincerely yours,

WEBSTER W. POSEY,
President.

Issues Facing the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the coming election raises some monumental issues which must be determined by the voters. Their decision in large measure rests upon the record made by the respective political parties and the men who carry their banners in every contest. That decision depends, as well, upon the statement of the issues, and the public's grasp of the problems encountered and the answers given.

Because the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], put so simply and so well many of the issues facing the Nation, I request unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the message he delivered to legislative delegates of the CIO steelworkers, at their January 18 meeting in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased and honored to be here at your invitation to discuss some of our mutual problems. I always feel at home with a group like this, because I have worked with labor throughout my 25 years of public life.

In a way, our problems are similar.

When I entered politics as a State legislator back in 1933, we were in the depths of the depression. We were fighting for great social reforms.

For example, I piloted through the legislature a bill abolishing the poorhouse in my State. I participated in drafting one of the first old-age assistance laws in the Nation. Many of its provisions became a model for the national statute.

We were fighting to save people's homes—we were fighting for FHA—for federally insured bank deposits—for the Wagner Act—for a square deal for the people—for a square deal for the farmer.

We were successful—over the constant opposition of the Republican Party and their financial backers.

Since that time a whole new generation of young people have become eligible to vote—are participating in the political life of the country. They take for granted many of the things we fought and bled for.

The problem of a man in political life is to reach these people—to make them understand that the things they now enjoy did not just happen.

It took leadership—statesmanship—and the willingness to put your political neck on the block. These things did not just happen—they happened because we believed in them and fought for them.

In labor, too, you have had problems. Many of the rank and file simply take for granted the present-day wage scales, working conditions, and the protection written into law.

Because these things are in existence—are enjoyed by the rank and file—they are apathetic. Their attitude is—they will always be there.

You and I know that is not true. It is a continual fight to maintain the gains labor has won—it is a continual fight to make further progress.

For example, in my State this fall, there will be a "right to work initiative" on the ballot. "Right to work" is a misnomer—it is a slogan dreamed up by the Madison Avenue advertising boys. It has public appeal—but you and I know it would set labor back for 30 years.

We will defeat that initiative—but it is going to take work—and you people here must somehow make the rank and file realize what they have at stake.

The same people who have sponsored these right-to-work measures across the country are in large part the people who financed the Republican Party. They have been clever—they have organized the drive around the local front—but behind that front stand the boys with the money bags, who have never been for labor.

I don't like to inject politics into a meeting like this, but I feel you want me to speak to you frankly—and I must say, in all sincerity, we are dealing with a big-business administration.

The executive branch of this Government is riddled with corporate executives—from the Cabinet on down. Now, there is nothing wrong with the corporate executive—but I raise the question whether just one segment of our economic community should have such a dominant voice in policies and programs that affect all the people.

Suppose we Democrats win the election in 1956—and I am convinced that we will. Then suppose that we proceeded to set up an all-labor Cabinet.

Suppose we make John L. Lewis Secretary of Labor, that we make Dave Beck Secretary of Commerce, that we appoint Walter Reuther—and I have just the job for him—Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and so on down the line.

Can you hear the screams that would go up? People would say we were crazy. Labor itself would not stand for such a program—labor would not let itself be put in that position.

Yet in reverse, that is exactly what this administration has done. They have made it a big-business Cabinet and big-business Government—and those who are not corporate executives are either lame ducks or retired generals.

Our Government is too one-sided and the effects of that are beginning to show up on the economic scene and I think—in the long run—it spells economic trouble.

There are three great economic groups in this country—the farmer, the wage earner, and our corporate or business structure.

For sustained prosperity—for economic stability—these three great segments must move along together. Each must obtain its balanced and equitable share of the Nation's income.

Now what has happened since this administration took over?

The farmers' income has been cut by over $6 billion. Corporate income—business income—has gone up about $6½ billion.

The wage earner is just treading water. His wages have gone up a little, but prices have gone up a little and he is just about where he was in January of 1953—maybe a little worse off because his wages don't buy quite as much.

The farmer is in trouble—and he represents a great reservoir of purchasing power in our Nation. The income—the money—through profit, is piling up at the corporate end of the scale.

We Democrats always operated on the principle that if the wage earners and the farmers have purchasing power, business will do all right.

Farmers' and the wage earners' dollars are spent for a thousand different things and that spending keeps the wheels of the business community turning.

The Republicans and their backers have always operated on the trickle-down theory. I just don't believe it will work—

Unless we can get these three great economic groups moving back on the road together, we are heading for real trouble—in my opinion.

Just a word now about some of these terrible New Deal laws we heard so much about in the 1952 campaign.

I defy anyone in this room to point to a single New Deal law—social security, FHA, unemployment insurance—that this administration has changed.

No; they don't change the law—they don't make a frontal attack. They whittle at these gains by subterfuge and backdoor methods.

The favorite technique is to appoint a man to administer the law who does not believe in it.

You know what they have done to pack the Labor Relations Board—what they have done to the Federal Power Commission—what they have done to the Federal Trade Commission. They picked a man to be Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission who had spent 25 years of his life fighting with the Federal Trade Commission as the legal representative of some of the biggest firms in the country cited for violations.

You do not have to change the law. You can get an administrator who does not believe in it.

I think labor has a terrific stake in the coming election.

The Madison Avenue boys can dream up slick slogans—but slogans are no substitute for performance—and in this administration there is a veritable chasm between what they say and what they do.

No Republican administration—to my knowledge—ever helped the trade union movement. On the contrary—they have subtly sabotaged it. They may play you for votes but they don't believe in what you are trying to do for the average man.

They believe in the specific privilege few—at your expense.

It has been a pleasure to be with you tonight. My final admonition is to be vigilant—be militant—and give your people the facts.

The Meaning of Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Does Interposition Mean," written by John Temple Graves, and published in the Birmingham Post-Herald of February 4, 1956. Dr. Graves is one of the great columnists of this country, and his article is very interesting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING

(By John Temple Graves)

"They might as well try to dip the Atlantic dry with a teaspoon."

What does "interposition" mean?

Today it means "null and void" in Alabama, "illegal encroachment" in Virginia, simple protest in other Southern States.

Strictly and historically, it is the assertion by a State of a sovereignty not surrendered.

John C. Calhoun called it "the negative power—the power of preventing or arresting the action of the government—be it called by whatever term it may—veto, interposition, nullification, check or balance of power—which in fact form the Constitution."

None of the Southern States talking interposition seem to have decided exactly what they mean or to be prepared to implement a meaning. Yet "interposition" means something.

With it are to be understood all the other measures against Supreme Court encroachment on rights of States and Congress, it seems to me—school placement laws, the three-way school plan, the private school one, the not-guilty jury verdict plan, the legal obfuscations, hairsplittings and delay, and the now innumerable citizens' councils.

Interposition is all the ways the South can conceive of saying it will not submit to integration of its public school masses in what it deems plain violation of the Constitution.

It is Mississippi's new Governor, James Plemon Coleman ("the calmest, least racialistic of the five candidates," Time called him) declaring that "those who propose to mix the races in our public schools might as well try to dip the Atlantic dry with a teaspoon."

Interviewed over NBC a few days after the first desegregation decision in 1954, this writer predicted that "the decision has tortured the Constitution, and the South will torture the decision."

That is another definition of interposition.

If there is a constitutional crisis—and there is—it isn't because Alabama has called the decision null and void, and Virginia has called it illegal. There is constitutional crisis because, in calm and sorrow, the South is refusing to mix its school masses.

Interposition was proposed first and most famously, of course, in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798 against the Federal sedition law.

Written by Thomas Jefferson for Kentucky and James Madison for Virginia, the resolutions avowed that in the event of a "deliberate, palpable and dangerous" exercise by the Federal Government of powers not granted to it by the Constitution, the States "have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them. * * *"

After reading the speech entitled "Interposition: The Barrier Against Tyranny" delivered in the House January 25 by Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, I marvel that so scholarly, thrusting and competent an effort, impressive with legal and historic references, should have been dismissed by a part of the Nation's press as ignorant, emotional "southern oratory."

Or rather, I do not marvel. Mr. WILLIAMS is from the ceaselessly libeled State of Mississippi.

Congressman Jack Brooks, of Texas, and His Subcommittee on Special Government Activities Reflect Credit on Congress by an Able, Dignified, and Effective Use of the Investigative Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the recent resignation of Mr. Mansure as the head of General Services Admiinstration was brought about by the investigations made by the Subcommittee on Government Operations, chairmaned by Congressman JACK B. BROOKS, of Texas. The Washington Post of February 8, 1956, in an editorial pays a very high tribute to Congressman BROOKS in the conduct of that investigation, describing it as "most able, dignified, and effective." The editorial goes on to state that "this kind of supervision of executive agency conduct is one of the most important uses of the congressional investigating power. He and his subcommittee have made a real contribution toward that end." We all know that some investigations have not merited this kind of praise, which makes it all the more important to call it to the attention of our colleagues. I join with the Washington Post in commending Congressman JACK BROOKS, of Texas, and his subcommittee, on their excellent work conducted in the best traditions of the exercise of the congressional investigating power. Members of the Subcommittee on Special Government Activities are JACK BROOKS, chairman, Texas; LESTER HOLTZMAN, New York; JOHN E. MOSS, JR., California; HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; PORTER HARDY, JR., Virginia; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, California; and OTTO KRUEGER, North Dakota.

The editorial is as follows:

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INTEREST

Whatever may be said in extenuation of Edmund F. Mansure's official conduct, the fact remains that he was guilty of an indiscretion that ended his usefulness to the administration. By his own admission, he allowed political favoritism to enter into contracts falling under the supervision of the General Services Administration which he headed. "Practical politics," he said in his testimony before the House Government Operations Committee, dictated that a major brokerage contract should not go to a firm that did "not help this administration get into office." Personal friendship with Mr. Mansure, moreover, did not appear to be any handicap in obtaining business in connection with the GSA.

Mr. Mansure's behavior was, to say the least, exceedingly obtuse. Like former Air Force Secretary Talbott and former Federal Buildings Commissioner Strobel and former Interstate Commerce Commissioner Cross, Mr. Mansure seemed to have no real awareness of his obligation to keep his private interests wholly divorced from the public interest. This kind of obtuseness is peculiarly unbecoming in an administration which campaigned for office in part on a pledge to "clean up the mess in Washington." The prompt resignation of these officials was indispensable to maintenance of the standards the President has set.

Representative BROOKS' subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, which uncovered Mr. Mansure's indiscretions, conducted its investigation in a most able, dignified, and effective way. This kind of supervision of executive agency conduct is one of the most important uses of the congressional investigating power. "I hope," said Mr. BROOKS in commenting on Mr. Mansure's resignation, "that this will result in a more efficient and economical administration of GSA." He and his subcommittee have made a real contribution toward that end.

President Eisenhower Takes Lead in Putting Highway Program on Right Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the February 2, 1956, edition of the San Francisco Examiner carried an editorial crediting President Eisenhower with putting the road problem back on the bipartisan track.

The editorial, entitled "Ike Saves Road Bill," recognizes the statesmanlike action by the President in agreeing to a compromise approach because he realizes the necessity of putting an expanded highway program into motion as expeditiously as possible.

Better and safer roads and highways should not be made a matter of partisan politics. Everyone is affected, and concerned. I decried the maneuvers which led to defeat of the highway bill last year, and I trust that the President's lead will result in this must legislation being enacted promptly.

The editorial, which I desire to include with my remarks, is as follows:

IKE SAVES ROAD BILL

In agreeing to a Democratic "pay-as-you-go" Federal highway bill, President Eisenhower put the road problem back on the bipartisan track from which it had sadly wandered.

He gave up his own bond financing plan because, in the words of GOP Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN:

"The President wants roads.

"He thinks it is very imperative for the safety of the Nation as well as for the progress of the country.

"We concluded we did want a highway bill.

"We wanted roads as fast as you can get them and, therefore, we would go along with a pay-as-you-go system."

This statesmanlike action by the President makes all the difference in the world in estimating the chances of passage of an adequate highway bill in the present session of Congress.

Without such administration support, all highway legislation was in grave peril.

With the backing of the President, the Democrats who are writing the legislation in the House will be able to count upon Republican support when the bill comes to a test on the floor.

It was precisely the lack of Republican support last year that started the landslide of votes against the highway bill.

Now both parties can take credit for the passage of a good bill and both can shoulder the responsibility for the tax increases that will be needed.

And a great deal of the credit for the bill will have to go to President Eisenhower.

His willingness to abandon his own position in the greater interest of the better roads movement is what will make passage of the legislation possible.

American Participation in International Trade Fairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have just today introduced a bill, recommended by the executive branch, which includes a vital provision to enable the President of the United States to secure the further participation by our country in foreign trade fairs.

I regard this as one of the finest types of investments in our overseas activities. Through our participation, we are telling and selling the free enterprise story to the world. American products and services, produced by the genius of the system of private profit and initiative, are being demonstrated to the peoples of the world and, in particular to the businessmen of the world.

The response throughout our country to our trade-fair work has been most encouraging. A number of enthusiastic articles have appeared in the Nation's press. I have in my hand several such articles. The first is from the Reader's Digest, issue of December 1955, entitled "the U. S. A. Goes to the Fair."

The second is from the famed magazine, the Rotarian, written not only by a Rotarian himself, but by a man who, by virtue of his position in the Department, is in one of the strongest possible positions to appraise the effectiveness of our fair participation. I refer to Secretary Sinclair Weeks' able associate, Hon. Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce.

I send to the desk the texts of these two articles and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I trust that they will help highlight the need for prompt and favorable action on this phase of the legislation which I have introduced today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest of December 1955]

THE U. S. A. GOES TO THE FAIR

(By J. D. Ratcliff)

In Bangkok, Thailand, a 2,000-seat theater was jammed day after day with people who came to see the wonders of Cinerama. In Bari, Italy, farmers listened fascinated while a six-foot wooden chicken, with egg-producing organs exposed, gave a tape-recorded

lecture on modern poultry practice. In Bogotá, Colombia, throngs jostled around a stand offering free ice cream made from surplus powdered milk from Wisconsin. The United States was going to the fairs—the world trade fairs—and registering a smash success.

Each year there are something like 130 large fairs, ranging from the giant International Trade Fair in Paris, with nearly four million visitors, to the agricultural fair at Verona, Italy, which attracts about 130,000. Totally unlike United States State and county fairs, the trade fairs are market places where new goods are displayed, where businessmen go to buy and sell.

Although United States businessmen long ago saw the wisdom of buying space and displaying goods, the United States Government stood aloof until 1954, when President Eisenhower reviewed some disturbing facts. Since the war, Russia and her satellites had participated with spectacular exhibits in 133 fairs. Personable young Chinese sipped tea with German businessmen; Russians talked the virtues of Soviet tractors; Czechs demonstrated heavy machinery and spoke of booming production. The impression was left that the United States was too busy preparing for war to take part in such peaceful pursuits.

President Eisenhower decided to correct this. He earmarked $2,250,000 from an emergency fund to be spent at trade fairs to "put the United States in the best possible light overseas."

The Departments of Commerce and State and the United States Information Agency drew the planning job. There were two main objectives: To sell the idea that this Nation's vast industrial production is the result of a free-enterprise system, and to stress trade as a two-way affair.

To direct the program, the Commerce Department borrowed Roy A. Williams, New England industrialist and executive vice president of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, who recruited a team of architects, designers, idea men. With only 3 months to design and build an exhibit for the fair at Bangkok, where a year earlier Russia had taken first prize with a costly and elaborate pavilion, Williams chose Fruits of Freedom as the United States theme. The exhibit would emphasize ways and means by which United States industrial techniques could help lift living standards in the east. Cinerama was an added eye catcher.

Russia had 242 crates of murals on the Bangkok fairgrounds—heroic representations of Soviet industrial might. Getting wind of United States plans, the Russians didn't bother to unpack them. They withdrew from the fair.

A similar situation arose in Paris last May. When it became clear that the lively United States exhibit was almost sure to be the hit of the fair, the Russians packed up and went home. Altogether, the Soviets have withdrawn from five fairs rather than face United States competition.

The United States exhibit, America at Home, was the outstanding success at Paris, drawing as many as 70,000 people a day. It included a five-room house through whose open windows visitors could look while "Mother" prepared meals in a model kitchen equipped with freezer, garbage-disposal unit, dishwasher, mixers, and other gadgetry. "Father" puttered with the car in the carport, worked with power tools in the home shop, broiled steaks on the terrace. But the real delight was the playroom, where children of United States soldiers stationed in France concentrated on toys, oblivious of the crowds.

A similar display at the Vienna fair in September caused a newspaper to comment: "The Americans stole the show. They show us how we could live if we had plenty of money. But they do it in a way that makes us forget we do not have it."

When possible, exhibits are related to local problems. Italian farmers are keenly interested in United States agricultural methods. Hence, at the agricultural fair in Verona the United States exhibit included a small field of hybrid corn in which farm machinery was demonstrated. A model cow, cut away to expose internal organs, lectured on cow diets that increase milk production.

Spain has always had export difficulties with her valuable citrus crop. Fruit is often poorly sized and packed. Losses due to spoilage are high. For display at the Valencia fair the United States imported a citrus-packing plant from Lakeland, Fla. In a continuous, automatic operation the plant cleaned, sized, and waxed oranges. (Waxing retains juice and cuts spoilage.) Another exhibit suggested a new market for the Spanish and a new market for United States machinery: it showed how orange juice is extracted, concentrated, and frozen—all new to Europe.

Lately Pakistan, the world's largest producer of jute, has worried about the growing competition of other fibers. Jute is used mainly for burlap and coarse sacking. The United States exhibit at the Karachi fair included ingenious new machinery which converts coase jute into a soft fiber—suitable for dress and other fabrics. Knitting machines, poultry-raising equipment, TV, and a fashion show rounded out the lively display.

The Communists spread the story that the United States is planning to hydrogen-bomb the world. Atoms for Peace, which tells of our peacetime atomic projects, has been a key United States exhibit in a number of fairs. Including a 30-foot model reactor, mechanical hands to handle "hot" atomic materials, and other eye-catching displays, it presents the atom as a friend of man, the producer of medically useful isotopes, the source of curative radiations, a future producer of commercial power.

At the fair at Jakarta, Indonesia, last summer the United States exhibit included a glass-walled TV studio broadcasting to 24 receiving sets spaced around the fairgrounds—the first TV the country had seen. A model train built by Lionel, puffing and whistling its way through a maze of tracks, gave Indonesians an idea of what a modern transportation system looks like.

At the Berlin fair, hordes of people swarmed over from Soviet-controlled East Berlin to see the Western World on display. Two United States labor unions—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union—provided a stirring rebuttal to the Communist story that the American worker is the slave of a capitalist economy. Pictures showed union health centers, camps, clubs; explanatory material told about the wage scales, pension plans, and arbitration procedures.

In state-controlled stores in Communist East Berlin shoddy clothing brings sky-high prices. On living models at the Berlin fair a large United States clothing chain displayed a complete winter wardrobe for a family—mother, father, two children. A large tag carried the price of each garment. Total cost of outfitting a family: About 3 weeks' pay for an American carpenter. To East Berliners this was an impressive demonstration of the fruits of free enterprise.

The key part of every United States exhibit is a trade mission—a six-member panel (usually), drawn half from the Department of Commerce, half from industry. These men answer questions about buying goods from the United States and about exporting to the United States market. In 8 fairs last spring such panels handled a total of 26,000 queries.

In Hanover, Germany, the woman owner of a linen shop seeks and gets information about importing the bath towels displayed in the model United States home. In Salonika a dealer wants the agency for a small tractor. He is put in touch with several makers. At Cologne a grocer wants floor plans of American supermarkets. Several United States firms can supply them.

Such advice often bears immediate fruit, advantageous to all concerned. At Milan an Italian was interested in exporting ceramics. Two Americans interested in importing ceramics happened to be present. They got together on the spot.

This American readiness to do business now has been impressive. At the International Trade Fair at Lyon, France, Red China had a lavish display of motorcycles, saxophones, heavy machinery—much of it clearly handmade. When asked about prices and delivery dates, the Chinese were noncommittal. It became apparent that the goods displayed were pure propaganda, not for sale. Meanwhile, the United States trade panel was doing a land-office business—a fact duly observed in the French press.

Trade panels occasionally get hecklers. A man with clear Communist leanings denounced the group in Hanover: the United States was interested only in war, he said, not in helping people. Panel members questioned the man about his interests. He was an out-of-work salesman of household appliances. It was arranged for him to get the agency for a United States refrigerator. The line went well, he prospered, and has altered his political outlook.

By next July 1 the United States will have been represented in 34 fairs. No one will hazard a guess as to how much trade has directly resulted, but Roy Williams is sure that the small investment has been repaid many times over. The business world apparently agrees. The year before official United States participation at Bangkok there were 47 American industrial exhibitors. This year there were 140. At Hanover the number increased from 13 to 47; at the giant Milan fair from 571 to 700.

Thirty million people are expected to see our exhibits this fiscal year. "They will all go away," says Williams, "with a new realization of what free enterprise in a democracy really means."

[From the Rotarian magazine of December 1955]

It's Fair Weather

(By Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce)

(Walter Williams has been United States Under Secretary of Commerce since 1953. Before that he was a businessman in Seattle, Wash., engaged in real estate and insurance. He is a former president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, and a past president of the Rotary Club of Seattle.)

Just a year ago the United States, in cooperation with industry, launched a global-wide trade-fair program "to tell adequately the story of our free-enterprise system and to provide effective international trade promotion cooperation," in the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Uncle Sam's first exhibit in the trade-fair movement last December in Bangkok, Thailand, showed that we were really in business to sell the American way of life; how the United States operates under a free political economy and how our productive capacity is dedicated to peaceful purposes and the progress of free nations.

Eager throngs flocked to view American trade exhibits, See Yourself on TV exhibits, the movie This Is Cinerama, latest model automobiles, and farm equipment. More than 140 American firms exhibited their products under the general theme The Fruits of Freedom.

Many Americans will recall the Bangkok event. They will remember the difficulties encountered before opening the first United States exhibit—difficulties of time, inexperience, and weather. A typhoon even threatened to wreck a ship bringing vital

displays. Even so, they will recall with satisfying memories of being awarded Bangkok's first prize, of meeting thousands of Thailanders, and of strengthening the ties of trade.

Since that opening event of the United States Department of Commerce's international trade-fair program, it is estimated that 15 million people have seen joint industry-Government exhibits in 16 fairs during the first or "crash" year of our program. Almost double that should see the second year's program since it will be principally in the heavily populated Near and Far East sector.

Record turnouts have been reported this fall in Djakarta, Indonesia; Stockholm, Sweden; Karachi, Pakistan; Salonika, Greece; Bari, Italy; Vienna, Austria; and Berlin, Germany. It is also estimated that more than 25,000 firms representing 10 countries asked business questions of United States trade missions during the spring fairs. And 5,000 of them had consultations ranging from 15 to 45 minutes to help them in their problems of import, export, licensing, etc.

Far more impressive than mere figures, though, are the personal results. Let us take the Frankfurt, Germany fair, of which Kartl T. Steidler, director of the foreign section of the fair, said: "The American exhibit has been the highlight of the National Pavilion section. Tremendous interest."

Last March, 70,000 Germans strolled through the portals of the United States main pavilion; its theme was America at Home. Here they saw a completely furnished full-scale 5-room American home. Actors impersonating an American family—husband, wife, and 2 children—demonstrated what their standard of living meant; using the kitchen appliances, tuning the television set, and so on. In a separate display the Germans saw products used in American homes—a magic kitchen, sewing machines, refrigerators, gardening equipment.

So successful was this exhibit that it was repeated in Brussels in April, was requested by the Munich Fair officials and by department stores in Sweden, Belgium, and France. As a businessman and a Rotarian, I am glad to say the United States Government shared credit for the show, shared it with private businessmen. We would have given a false impression if our free-enterprise system had been illustrated only by Government. Private businessmen—some of my country's best—freely gave weeks of their time to make this exhibit possible. They loaned more than 300 products to the display. They registered with our information booth, which was an integral part of our trade mission, and helped answer questions asked by interested Germans on doing two-way trade.

American businessmen called the Frankfurt Fair an unqualified success; in 5 days more than 1,300 meetings were held with German businessmen interested in American products. It is interesting to note that about one-third of these queries were concerned with selling to and the remainder with buying from the United States.

The spirit of our private businessmen joining our trade mission in answering import and export problems of the Germans was equalled by a large number of personable, wholesome young American women. When the United States exhibit needed more personnel to answer the questions, hostesses from United States air lines serving the Frankfurt area volunteered for duty. A German visitor might ask, "Does every family have a power lawn mower?" And a pleasant young lady could tell him from her own experience, "My father does, but our next-door neighbor doesn't."

The official United States exhibit at Frankfurt, which is characteristic of all American pavilions at international trade fairs, was organized to give two kinds of information. First, we helped visitors who wanted to buy United States products they saw on display; we put them in touch with United States suppliers and gave them useful information about purchases.

The second part of our message broke with tradition. It was directed to the European seller rather than the consumer. We tried to explain to this European exporter how he could sell more goods to United States buyers. We explained our marketing techniques, the preferences of United States housewives for certain kinds of packages, and other useful facts. So that this information would be to the point, our trade missions had gone to Germany several weeks before the fair opened, to talk with German businessmen at trade meetings and conferences. From them we learned what kind of questions to expect and what sort of information the Germans would find of help. Our trade-information centers also had on display all sorts of American trade magazines, directories, Government publications, and various data about the American market. What were questions like?

Well, a German businessman from Cologne had seen the model of a United States supermarket. "Is this setup the usual one in your stores?" he asked. It was. He learned that canned goods are usually kept in one place, meats in another, dairy products in another. "Could I have a floor plan of such an arrangement?" he asked. He got one.

A woman manufacturer of novelty playing cards wanted to know whether she should export her wares to the United States. "Every novelty store in the United States has cards like those," said the United States consultant. "But those"—he pointed to another design, facsimilies of 14th century playing cards—"are individual. Try exporting those to the U. S. A."

The success of this two-way message was so great that it has been applied at succeeding fairs. We feel that American exhibits should be far more than a national boast. Or, put in terms familiar to all Rotarians, we believe in genuine International and Vocational Service.

Records clearly show that businessmen in other lands agree. Merchants and manufacturers in Paris, Lyon, Verona, Valencia, Palermo, Hanover, Tokyo, Stockholm, Vienna, Berlin, Djakarta, Karachi, Salonika, and New Delhi have shown enthusiasm about our central exhibits and trade missions.

One French businessman drove 100 miles for a 10-minute trade-mission interview. He said he was completely satisfied with his journey. Another Frenchman remarked that while he had to wait 2 hours for his interview—there was quite a long line, about 76,000 crowded the American pavilion—he found the information well worth his while. Several of the foreign countries have requested the trade missions to return at their expense, so well were they received in their advice-giving.

A measure for the success of these face-to-face talks can be found in Tokyo's first great trade fair last May. Japanese manufacturers negotiated 265 technical licensing agreements with United States firms. Who can question the mutual advantage of such transactions? The American companies are rewarded for their research; the Japanese companies open profitable new markets and create new jobs.

To accommodate the many persons—more than 20,000 visited daily for a total of 200,000 during the fair (May 5–18)—the American exhibit at the Japanese Fair was opened to the public for a period of 2 weeks after the fair ended and drew several thousand visitors. The Economic Journal of Japan sponsored an exhibition of 28 of the American products in a tour of the cities of Osaka, Nagoya, Fukuoka, Sapporo, Sendai, and Kanazawa. This was done with the support and cooperation of the economic section of the Japanese Foreign Ministry.

We have tried to keep local interests in mind even with our exhibits themselves. In Djakarta, Indonesia; Karachi, Pakistan; and New Delhi, India, for example, we produced those countries' first televison shows. Local talent and American films were shown over a closed-channel circuit.

So popular has been this first demonstration of television that it was necessary for the American programs to end half an hour before closing time so officials could clear the fairgrounds for the day. In Karachi, where the fair had been delayed a week (until September 16) because of the heavy damage wrought by rain and monsoon, the huge crowds at the American show, viewing it on the twenty-four 21-inch sets scattered throughout the fairgrounds, created a problem to other nations. According to a newspaper report, their outdoor displays were blocked off by the backs of hundreds of fans getting their first glimpse of television on the American screens..

Do we hope someday to sell television equipment to the Asians? Certainly, we hope so. And, so they can afford it, we also hope to buy more products from their fast-developing lands. While on television, the Morning News, of Karachi, on its editorial page, had this comment: "Participation of the United States for the first time in the Pakistan International Industries Fair has enabled the people of Pakistan to view that dream invention of modern times—the television."

In such hopes we see a basic and worthy motive for trade fairs: the mutual exchange of products, services, and ideas. Such was the one reason for the trade fair that Sidonius Apollinaris reported in Brue, France, in A. D. 427. Such is a motive in the young international fair in my home city of Seattle, Wash. But trade is not the only motive. Since that unrecorded day when a farm girl put a flower in her hair to attend the first fair on earth, there has been a social motive.

Folks do not long remain strangers in the exciting atmosphere of a fair. Exchanging praises and problems, the businessmen attending the 100 or more international trade fairs each year are widening their understanding. When we see excellent products made in other lands, our own competitive instincts are stimulated. And from sharp, honorable competition comes greater gain for all; on that point my own free countrymen are solidly united.

This month, crowds of citizens in many parts of the world will file through fairgrounds of other lands. Thousands of them will be viewing the million dollars' worth of products loaned by more than 1,200 private United States companies, small and large.

In New Delhi they will see the largest atoms-for-peace exhibit we, or anyone else, ever assembled. In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, they will examine a model 175-acre United States-style farm, a United States voting machine and voting booth. In Bogota, Colombia, the story of antibiotics and their contirbution to mankind and in Trujillo, Dominican Republic, the story of agriculture, coffee, and cotton will be told through animated exhibits.

The exhibit of products of American industry, dedicated to peace, demonstrates the vital arteries of economic development without which no nation can prosper. Our trade-fair program is another step promoting friendship and commerce and meeting other nations' needs for two-way trade.

The American People Have Confidence in President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the January 30, 1956, edition of the Petaluma (Calif.) Argus-Courier.

Entitled "After 3 Years, Ike Is Still Popular President," this editorial is an expression of the confidence that the American people have in President Eisenhower. It was 3 years ago last month that he was inaugurated as President of the United States, the highest honor that the people of this country can confer on a fellow citizen.

President Eisenhower, during his 3 years in office, has earned the confidence and high esteem in which he is held. Under his leadership we have achieved peace, and the highest degree of peacetime prosperity ever enjoyed in the history of our country.

He is a man of outstanding ability, dedicated to the tasks of the presidency which he approaches with dignity and firmness of purpose. The people like the results.

I consider it a distinct honor to be serving on the same team with President Eisenhower, and I commend to this body the following editorial:

AFTER 3 YEARS, IKE IS STILL POPULAR PRESIDENT

Three years have gone by since President Eisenhower was inaugurated, and he still seems to be at the height of his popularity. In the 3 years the American people have had a chance to weigh his administration, and to determine what kind of a President he has been. If popular opinion polls accurately reflect the feelings of the American public, then President Eisenhower enjoys such confidence as the American people have given to few Presidents.

In the past few days there have been celebrations all over the country honoring the President. To be sure they have been Republican celebrations. But there is evidence to believe that many others would have joined in paying their respects to a popular President. Certainly the reaction of the people, not only in the United States, but in other parts of the world as well, at the time of his illness, indicated in what high esteem he is held.

As General Eisenhower, he had led the American people successfully through a great war. As President Eisenhower, he has devoted himself just as intensely to peace, at the same time preparing our defenses against the prospect of another war. But it is as a man intensely dedicated to the preservation of peace that he has earned the esteem of the American people and the respect of the peoples of the free world.

In the domestic realm, his policies are generally credited with the enormous prosperity that the country is now enjoying. He tends to be a liberal in matters concerning the individual, a conservative in matters concerning the Government. He is a man of decency and sincerity, and he has stamped these qualities on the public life of the country. He has brought a feeling of unity to the country, after a period when extremists were stirring up angry currents.

The President has his critics in both parties. There are some Republicans who think he is too much of a Democrat. There are Democrats who claim that he benefits from the "illusion" rather than the fact of peace and prosperity. But he stands above the criticisms as a man whom the people like. And if he should decide to run again, his adversaries would have a hard time proving that the peace and prosperity we now enjoy are an "illusion."

The people have watched President Eisenhower perform the functions of his office for 3 years. They still like what they have seen.

Vital Void Is Apparent in Public Works Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing on Saturday, January 25, in the Sacramento Bee entitled "Vital Void is Apparent in Public Works Policy":

VITAL VOID IS APPARENT IN PUBLIC WORKS POLICY

The fallacy in the national administration's public-works policy, of the Federal Government building only those projects which private or local interests are unable or unwilling to construct, has been exposed dramatically by the flood disasters of the past year in the Northeast and West.

The fallacy stems from the fact the Federal Government and the private interests have totally different approaches to the matter of building dams on the rivers.

Whereas the Government concerns itself primarily with constructing the huge multipurpose dams to provide flood control, irrigation, power generation, recreation, and other benefits, the privately owned utilities are interested in only one thing, and that is the generation of electric power.

In the West the crying need is for all of the benefits which the Government's great multi-purpose projects like Shasta and Folsom can provide.

By reason of their sizes and the nature of their operation, dams constructed only for power generation do not measure up to the full potential of the big multi-purpose dams designed to meet all of the needs of the area with respect to flood control and water conservation.

NOR, in fact, should the power companies be expected to build structures to provide the maximum in flood control and water conservation.

The point is it would be a shame and an improvident misuse of the people's rivers were the Government to waive its responsibilities to erect a big multi-purpose dam whenever and wherever a private company proposed to construct a power dam.

That is precisely what is happening on the Snake River in Idaho where the Federal Power Commission has granted licenses to a private company to erect three small power dams on the site of the proposed big Hells Canyon Dam which, under Government construction, would provide flood control, irrigation water, and power for three States.

Shasta Dam is a striking example of the necessity of such multiple-purpose undertakings. Flood waters held back this winter will irrigate the arid fields next summer. And the power generated there is what makes the other benefits feasible.

A Philosophy of Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week of February 4, 1956:

THE TREND—A PHILOSOPHY OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

The new economic report of the President has a significance that will outlast any immediate arguments about the current state of the economy and what—if anything—the Government should be doing about it. For in this report the Eisenhower administration sets forth a thoughtful and eloquent statement of the principles it has evolved in the last 3 years. Moderates of both parties will find this a clear and forceful expression of the philosophy they live by.

It is a philosophy of growth—a growth that arises from the qualities of the American people: "A strong devotion to family life; a deep-seated, widespread urge to improve one's position; * * * and the cherishing of freedom, independence, and individual initiative." An expanding economy, the report declares, "is the natural fruit of such a people."

But it is also a philosophy that recognizes that the very qualities that give the economy its expansive power make the process of growth irregular: Production will periodically get out of kilter with sales, or confidence will turn to overconfidence and threaten to cause inflationary boom, or caution will degenerate into pessimism and threaten to create depression.

The administration does not think government should stand by and watch such swings go wild. "We have come to believe," the President's report declares, "that the Federal Government has the capacity to moderate economic fluctuations without becoming a dominant factor in our economy."

Extremists find this economic philosophy incomprehensible and pernicious. One group, the arch-conservatives, finds efforts to restrain inflation but the very soul of sound national economic policy, but efforts of Government to curb deflation and depression appear to them as a form of "New Deal" madness, a presumptuous tampering with the divine law of the market.

The other extremist group, the arch-liberals, broods over the stagnationist tendencies of an enterprise economy, wants government to be the force that perpetually keeps the economy growing, sees little danger in inflationary tendencies.

The administration's economic philosophy gets caught in the cross-fire. But the record shows that the Administration effectively checked the downslied of 1953–54 and turned it into the prosperity of 1954–55. Administration policymakers think they can handle whatever lies ahead by the same flexible methods.

No one can be dead certain which way the economy is now tending. "In a high-level economy like ours," the report declares, "neither the threat of inflation nor the threat of recession can ever be very distant." But whichever way the trend develops, the Ad-

ministration's philosophy prescribes prompt and effective ways of dealing with it.

"The only rigid rule that we can afford to admit to our minds," said the President, is the principle that the best way to fight either a recession or an inflation "is to try to prevent it from occurring."

Asian Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing by request the summary of an interesting program designed to encourage the growth of knowledge of Asian Culture, particularly at the high school level. The importance of better understanding and greater attention to the great world of Asia is so obvious as to require no elaboration. Therefore, I think the readers of the RECORD will be glad to know of this activity begun in Washington. The article follows:

ASIAN CULTURAL EXCHANGE

(By Walter E. Hess, managing editor of Student Life)

In the belief that the increasing importance of the Asiatic countries with their 1.3 billion people in today's world demands a greater understanding and knowledge of Asian peoples by the citizens of the United States and that a sure and sympathetic knowledge of the essential cultural values of a nation is gained through acquaintance with the arts and crafts of that nation, the Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation, Inc., has made it possible for schools of our country to develop a collection of artifacts from Oriental countries. Such a collection which a school might have would show the development of art forms within each culture, the relationship between cultures, and the religious and traditional significance of art forms. With such an art exhibit permanently available within the school, classroom instruction in the various subject areas can be immensely enriched and vitalized by the circulation of these art objects in the classrooms of the school.

Last year five high schools of Washington, D. C. (Calvin Coolidge, Dunbar, Eastern, Spingarn, and Woodrow Wilson) obtained a collection of Asian art and handicraft articles. John P. Collins (now retired), principal of Eastern High School, when the 104-piece art exhibit was received at his school, termed the collection 'remarkable and a wonderful educational vehicle." Charles S. Lofton, principal of Dunbar High School, which has a 135-piece collection, stated: "Educationally, we believe that this action is most sound. The benefits to be derived from the collection will permeate, all areas of the school curriculum. I can easily envision the departments of English, art, social studies, and language, both individually and collectively, benefiting from this gift. It will afford stimulation in an area that has been largely overlooked. It is my sincere hope that this movement will develop and grow so that all students in the Nation's Capital and those throughout the United States will eventually become united in their awareness of the cultural contributions of the peoples of Asia." Vice President Nixon was the speaker at the formal opening of the Dunbar exhibit, March 17, 1954.

John F. Brougher, principal of Woodrow Wilson High School, speaking about the exhibit in his school, remarked: "One gains a feeling about people through the study of their creative work that is unobtainable in any other way. Our students exhibit a keen interest in the pieces, and it is my opinion that contacts with these items give them an insight into the culture of the people who created them that they did not have before." This year some Baltimore, Md., schools are establishing similar exhibits.

Quite a number of high school principals outside of Washington have already indicated their interest in establishing a permanent exhibit in their schools. This certainly is a direct means of rapidly spreading knowledge of far eastern culture through the organization of small collections showing cross sections of Asian arts and crafts from Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, Afghanistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Tibet, etc. Such diversified and individual collections can be owned by any high school or library in the United States.

Student councils, chapters of the national honor society, and other school organizations could select this as a most worthwhile project. A collection with a fairly informative cross section of Asian arts and crafts can be started with as little as $500. This could be added to each year until a collection of $2,000 or more would be available for supplementing classroom instruction. Certainly, this would be an educational project from which the school will reap benefits over innumerable years. So worthy is the project and so appealing has it been to the public, that local community organizations and institutions should be interested in making a collection as a gift to the school. The Anacostia National Bank of Washington, D. C., became so interested in the potentialities of a collection of this type it is financing the cost of one comprehensive collection of some 200 artifacts through the Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation and making it as a gift to its local community high school—the Anacostia High School. Without a doubt, business institutions in many other communities could readily be interested in making similar gifts to their local schools. The foundation, being a nonprofit organization, will, as its treasury permits, add additional items to the collection being sent.

The pictures accompanying this article represent a meager sampling of materials that are available. The school can send $500 or more to the foundation. Its personnel, with its extensive familiarity with Asian culture, will make selections on as broad a cross-section basis as the money sent will permit.

However, it is suggested that any school, civic, commercial, or other organizations as well as individuals interested should write to the foundation of the following address: Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation, Inc., 4700 Morgan Drive, Chevy Chase, Md. Complete information about the materials available and about the services rendered by the foundation will be sent upon request. In selecting the articles for the collection, the foundation works with the principal and the teachers in a school in order that the collection will be most usefully tied in with class instruction in practically any course in the school. It is important to know that gifts or donations made to the Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation, Inc., are tax exempt.

Another service which the foundation is including is that of providing names of English speaking persons in foreign countries for high-school students who wish to correspond to foreign high-school students. This project will add additional sources of information on the arts and culture of people of other nations.

The Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation, Inc., is in the process of organizing a program of exchanging various items and correspondence between Asian and American schools. Tentative plans call for a kind of central post office in the foundation, through which United States schools and other groups can ship gifts of books, stamps, educational materials including laboratory equipment, art exhibits, and handicrafts by American students to Asian schools in general or to specific schools in the Far East.

The foundation will greatly appreciate any of the above items. School yearbooks are particularly desired, as they best reflect school life in general in the United States.

The GATT Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., of Sunday, February 5, 1956:

THE GATT SCHEME

For the second time, President Eisenhower has requested Congress to approve United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. This is the administrative organ of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, otherwise known as GATT. Congressional resistance to OTC and GATT is clearly justified, as even cursory examination of the subject indicates.

From 1945 to 1948, when one-worldism had its brief heyday, some State Department planners conceived and brought to fruition an International Trade Organization. Its charter was signed by 50 nations, including the United States. It would have set up a governing board on which the United States would have 1 vote out of 50 plus. The ITO's objective was free trade, through progressive reductions of tariff and trade barriers.

ITO provisions went so far beyond the powers delegated to the President, empowering him to enter into trade agreements, that it was regarded as necessary to submit the ITO Charter to Congress for ratification.

Meanwhile, it was decided to enter into a general trade agreement with several countries, in 1947. This was GATT, to which 35 nations adhered, including the United States. The ITO was to administer GATT, according to State Department plans, when the ITO Charter was ratified by a sufficient number of nations.

But Congress recognized ITO as a program that viewed nations as units in a worldwide master plan, not as individual countries working within the framework of their own governments. So emphatically did Congress repudiate the ITO that its charter was never reported out of committee.

GATT, not having been submitted to Congress, obviously has no legal standing, but still acts as the supreme arbiter of United States tariffs and similar matters. It has reviewed sovereign acts of the Congress and the President; it binds members against using import quotas other than in exceptional cases. This is strong action, considering that GATT is an illegitimate organization and the Constitution authorizes Congress to regulate United States commerce.

Worse, in 1951, Congress, by law, directed the President to withdraw all trade-agreement concessions from the Communist-controlled countries. The President signed the law.

Yet the United States had to wait for approval from GATT before it applied this law to Czechoslovakia, a GATT member which is Communist controlled. Thus Congress is deprived of its constitutional powers because the State Department wants to use tariffs as diplomatic pawns.

The State Department denies the United States is bound by GATT or that GATT has the power of review over the United States. The latter denial was repudiated by the 1951 precedent, now established; Americans already have permitted GATT the power of review over its affairs. As for the former, if the United States is not bound by GATT, why not submit GATT to Congress for ratification?

Submitting OTC to Congress is mere sham. It contains only the administrative features of GATT without its substance; yet congressional approval of OTC would give GATT the stamp of legality without having to put it before Congress. And GATT is essentially the same thing as the International Trade Organization which Congress refused even to consider.

A Cost of War

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received one of those general information pamphlets from the Veterans' Administration. It was full of statistics, and not easy reading, but the title caught my eye. "Cost of War," it read. At long last, I said to myself, the powers that be are beginning to recognize veterans' benefits for what they are—not charity, not a handout, but a "cost of war."

Obviously this is so. The cost of a veterans' program is just as much a cost of war as the planes and ships and shells that were hurled at the enemy. And they should be viewed in the same spirit of urgency and sacrifice as are other more readily recognizable war costs.

I have often repeated a phrase which I think sums the situation up pretty neatly. "Veterans do not create the wars which create veterans." This is a one-package answer to those critics who complain that there are so many veterans we should do something about cutting down the cost of their benefits. The care of these men and women is an aftermath of war, and directly although belatedly a cost of war.

All the veteran did was win that war. If he had not, we would not have a nation, rich and strong and powerful enough to give the veterans a helping hand, or to look after the well-being of any of its citizens, for that matter.

The number of men and women who have been aided in one form or another by our veterans' program is very impressive. But so is the number of veterans. Over 16 million Americans participated in World War II alone, and over 15 million of these are living today. Then, almost 5 million more entered service after Korea and over 4 million of these are with us today.

America did not lose by coming to the aid of these men and women. The 7,800,000 veterans who received education and training benefits will, by 1970, have paid the entire cost of that program back, because they have with their education reached an income level at which they are paying an extra billion dollars a year in Federal income taxes.

Veterans have purchased 4 million homes under the loan-guaranty program. Did that hurt America? Can you imagine what an influence that has had on our postwar and our present prosperity? And do not forget that these homeowners pay their communities and States real-estate taxes.

Many prominent economists actually feel that the veterans' program helped prevent an economic crisis after World War II by stimulating civilian demand. The benefit to the Nation did not stop there, however. Now that the country is desperately in need of engineers, scientists, and doctors, where would we be without the 145,000 engineers, 744,000 scientists, 63,000 doctors, 238,000 teachers, 700,000 mechanics, and 380,000 construction workers trained under the GI bill?

Two weeks ago, I had the warm satisfaction of introducing a bill which is most essential to the continued progress and security of our Nation. It would extend the education benefits of the GI bill to peacetime veterans. In my view, this bill should encourage enlistments in the Armed Forces, encourage the post-service training of urgently needed scientists and engineers and, at the same time, show the veteran he is not forgotten.

This is one cost of war which is a lot easier to take than some of the others. It is always repaid—and with heavy interest.

Common Termination Date of Shoreside Labor-Management Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee regarding a possible agreement on a common termination date of shoreside labor-management agreements of the east and west coasts is of great significance. It has been established that lack of such a common expiration date has been detrimental to the maritime industry. I understand all parties, except the New York ship operators, have assured Chairman BONNER that August 1 is a satisfactory date. It would be tragic if the latter do not approve.

In my district in the Pacific Northwest, intercoastal service has diminished until this important segment of transportion is almost a thing of the past. I have felt a common anniversary date of labor agreements is a necessary step toward restoration of such shipping service.

I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for his action and express the hope a final understanding will soon be consummated. It is unthinkable that the New York operators would fail to approve this agreement.

Doubts About the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing belief among Members of Congress that the budget for fiscal year 1957, recently submitted, has several serious weaknesses. It errs on the side of allocating too little to such things as supersonic aircraft, guided missiles, and atomic power. And yet if we are to hold our lead against the Russians, it is to these items that we must give most serious attention. In this race, however one defines it, we simply cannot afford to fall behind.

These thoughts are expressed very ably in an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 24, 1956, under the title, "We Must Stay Ahead."

The editorial itself was inspired by the publication of the 41st annual report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, currently edited by Dr. Jerome Hunsaker of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The NACA is no special pleader for any branch of the armed services or for any partisan political interest. As the editor of the Evening Star says:

Its annual report * * * is as objective as any such document can be.

Dr. Hunsaker has said nothing to encourage a belief that we can maintain our present position of world leadership in the air without a very great effort. Dr. Hunsaker said that the decisions we make now regarding the extent of our research effort may well prove to be the decisive factor in this respect—

At a time when the world is searching for the means to an enduring and honorable peace, it is vital that we in the United States maintain our qualitative lead in aeronautics and the resulting economy of effective air power. We will do well to remember that to maintain such a lead depends on the vigor and skill with which we press our fundamental and applied research.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the Appendix this editorial from the Evening Star, which reiterates my contention that our position tomorrow depends on the ac-

tions this Congress takes. The editorial follows:

WE MUST STAY AHEAD

The 41st annual report of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics lends some perspective to the confused picture of American military strength. And the comments of this group, headed by Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, should carry special weight. For the NACA cannot be accused of serving as special pleader for any branch of the armed services or for any partisan political interest. Its annual report, one would think, is as objective as any such document can be.

In his letter of transmittal to Congress, Dr. Hunsaker spoke of past gains and future problems. In his view, the United States now enjoys a position "of world leadership in the air." But he said nothing to encourage a belief that we can maintain this position without a very great effort. Instead, he said that the decisions we make now regarding the extent of our research effort may well prove to be the decisive factor in this respect. These two paragraphs from the Hunsaker letter should be of special interest:

"Today, problems associated with a nuclear engine suitable for aircraft propulsion and with an intercontinental ballistic missile are perhaps the most pressing. An airplane powered by a nuclear engine would have range limited only by the endurance of the crew. An intercontinental ballistic missile traveling at speeds from 10,000 to 15,000 miles an hour would be extremely difficult to intercept. Only seconds would elapse between the time such a missile could be detected and the time it would reach its target.

"At a time when the world is searching for the means to an enduring and honorable peace, it is vital that we in the United States maintain our qualitative lead in aeronautics and the resulting economy of effective airpower. We will do well to remember that to maintain such a lead depends on the vigor and skill with which we press our fundamental and applied research."

The encouraging aspect of this comment—its suggestion that the Russians have not pulled ahead of us qualitatively—is similar to a statement made in Oklahoma City on January 13 by General Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff. General Twining said that in quality—quality of planes, weapons, bases, equipment, men, and training—we have maintained our lead in the air. But he added that we are concerned over the rapidly improving quality of the Communist air force, and he came to this conclusion: "We are not in an arms race in the traditional sense. It has become a race for quality—or better, more effective weapons. Today we are in a good position in this race. Our position tomorrow depends on what we are doing now."

In other words, it is the decisions we make now which will be critical for the future. Are spending and planning to spend enough, or too little? Dr. Hunsaker doesn't say. But his letter implies a belief, and General Twining undoubtedly believes, that the 1957 budget errs on the side of allocating too little to such things as supersonic aircraft, guided missiles, and atomic power. Of course, the President and his advisers disagree, and their judgment is apt to prevail. Nevertheless, the difference of opinion, considering the area it touches, is a most critical one, and Congress should insist on the fullest exploration and debate of the various points of view. For in this race, however one defines it, we simply cannot afford to fall behind.

Flood Protection Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgent and important matters before the House of Representatives during this session is the matter of flood insurance. During the last year the need for some such program has become ever more apparent. Many of us right here in the House have had first hand experiences with the tragedy which major floods can bring to the areas which we represent. A program for some measure of protection is urgently needed.

The bill which I have introduced would establish a Federal Flood Insurance Administration which could issue policies at rates within the capacity of property owners to pay. The amount of coverage authorized would be up to $10,000 on 1- to 4-family residences, including contents, and up to $100,000 on any other single piece of real or personal property. Private insurance companies, which are presently unable to offer flood insurance at a reasonable rate, would be assisted by Federal reinsurance to provide coverage for loss in excess of the limits of the Federal program. The program would be financed through premium receipts, salvage transactions, and borrowing from the United States Treasury, up to a limit of $1.5 billion. No insurance would be offered under the provisions of the bill to cover risks which are insurable on reasonable terms through private or other public sources.

The past year has been the most expensive year on record in the matter of flood damage, but it must not go down in history like the previous most expensive year, 1951. That was a year which prompted Congress to stir a bit under the consciousness of a national problem, but it failed to take effective action. The private-insurance companies state most emphatically that they cannot do the job. It is up to Congress to act, and the time is now. Legislation to bring about a Federal flood-insurance program of the people at home. This is clearly shown by an editorial which appeared on February 1, 1956, in the Trentonian, one of the leading newspapers in my district. I should like to include it here as a part of my remarks:

[From the Trenton (N. J. Trentonian of February 1, 1956]

PROTECTION NEEDED

A New York engineering firm's prediction that New Jersey, Pennsylvania and other Northeatsern States must anticipate rains and storm tides considerably worse than those created last August by Hurricanes Connie and Diane underlines the need for immediate action on both flood relief and flood prevention.

On the basis of the engineers' prediction of greater disasters, the American Insurance Association reiterates that no form of private insurance against flood damage is feasible.

Therefore, it must be concluded that the only possibility of flood insurance lies with the Federal Government. Congressman FRANK THOMPSON said in his weekly report on this page yesterday that many measures have been introduced in Congress, one of them cosponsored by himself and New York's Senator LEHMAN, and that they have been assured high priority in the legislative mill.

It is interesting to note that THOMPSON sees no tendency in Congress to insist on the passage of any one measure as introduced. This could mean that the legislation which eventually reaches the floor will embody the good points of most if not all of the proposed bills.

While insurance of some sort naturally takes priority, it goes without saying that flood prevention will, in the long run, be much more important than relief from losses incurred. Support for dams on the upper Delaware is growing rapidly, and perhaps New Jersey and Pennsylvania can look forward to the day when the river's newly discovered flood potential can be appreciably mitigated. Again, it appears that the Federal Government must lead the way toward that end.

A Former President Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks marks in the RECORD, I include the fol- in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by our former beloved President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, in New York City, February 2, 1956:

I am very glad to be here tonight. I always like to come to New York. And, of course, New York has a special attraction for Mrs. Truman and me now that a certain young lady is living here.

It does my heart good to be here with so many wonderful people and fine Democrats.

When I take a look at the Democratic leaders here—and all over the country—it is easy to see why the Democratic Party is getting stronger all the time. And it is also easy to see why all the signs point so strongly to a Democratic victory in 1956.

Among our great advantages over the Republicans is the fact that we have a number of men of outstanding character and ability who are available to head the ticket. Some of these outstanding men are active candidates for the nomination—some are not. Some of them are here with us tonight—some are not. But whether our candidate is here tonight or not, I can tell you this: We are going to give the American people a chance to vote for a President—and not a regency or a part-time chairman of the board.

The Republicans, on the other hand, are desperate. They know they don't have a chance with anyone except Ike; and the pressure they are putting on him to run in spite of everything is indecent. They are in trouble no matter what they do—and I wouldn't care very much for their prospects, in spite of all their money.

Now, I want to talk a little about the duties of the Democratic Party in the coming campaign.

It is not our duty to win at any price. It is our duty to maintain the honesty and integrity of our party. I don't want to see the Democratic candidate making any campaign promises he is not prepared to try to keep. In the past 3 years, I have seen Republican campaign promises not only deliberately broken—but also flatly denied. That is not my concept of political morality—nor is it the concept which has enabled the Democratic Party to endure through the years. In the long run, it is not the way to win elections.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. Last month I made a speech in St. Paul, Minn. Many of the people in the audience were farmers. They had decorated the hall with huge signs that said:

"In Ike we trusted. Now we are busted."

Oh, yes, my friends; the loose talk of 1952 about 100 percent of parity and the glib promises about 90 percent price supports may have won some votes then. But now the chickens are coming home to roost. The farmers know that not only have they been let down—they have also been double-crossed. And you can take it from me—the prairies are on fire. And this duplicity is not only going to backfire on the Republicans in 1956—it is going to haunt them for years to come.

The farmers, of course, are not the only victims of broken Republican promises. There are many others. And don't think the people will forget these broken promises at election time.

I have heard complaints from some of my fellow Democrats because the Republicans are now copying so many items of our program which they once said they were against. But I am not complaining about this. Frankly, I think it is a good thing. I am glad to welcome the Republicans to the 20th century. They have been living in the 18th and 19th.

Sometimes, however, it seems to me they may be overdoing it a little. I am constantly amazed at their claims that they are the real authors and champions of various New Deal and Fair Deal measures. It used to be only the Russians who claimed to have invented everything.

Now that we have come to another presidential election year, the Eisenhower administration has finally come out in support of several other programs that I recommended to Congress when I was in the White House—such as Federal aid to education, better health services, extension of social security, and others. Whether this belated conversion is genuine, I don't know. It looks to me like death-bed repentance. But at least it is a move in the right direction. And I think the American voters will be able to distinguish properly between those who have labored for years for these programs for the benefit and welfare of the people and those who jump on the bandwagon at the last minute for no other reason than that of political expediency.

The thing that worries me most in the political scene for 1956 is the shambles that is being made of our bipartisan foreign policy. I believe in a bipartisan foreign policy. I tried to practice it. I did everything I could to keep foreign policy out of partisan politics. I gave many top positions in the State Department and the Department of Defense to Republicans.

But the Republican politicians brought foreign policy into the 1952 campaign in the most cynical way. And ever since that campaign, they have continued to seek a partisan advantage in the conduct of foreign affairs.

They had attacked our foreign policy so violently in the 1952 campaign, they were stuck with their own propaganda. They had to pretend to change our foreign policy whether the change was good for the country or not.

They began by claiming to "unleash" Chiang Kai-shek, for no reason in the world except partisan politics—and in a state of the Union message at that. And they ended up having to leash Chiang up again in circumstances that made the United States look ridiculous before the whole world. This was not because Chiang was a menace to anyone, but only to save him from disaster—just as I kept the Seventh Fleet in the Formosa Straits to save him from Mao and Chou, not to chain him up.

They cut down on our Armed Forces—in the face of growing Communist strength—so they could claim to reduce Government spending. When they boast about the reduction, they don't tell you that every last nickel of the net reduction came out of our national defense—but it did.

The reduction in our Armed Forces was accompanied by talk about "massive retaliation," which meant bluff and bluster with atomic weapons. This didn't frighten our enemies, but it surely did scare our friends.

Democrats were systematically excluded from participating in the administration of foreign policy, because the Republicans had made political capital of general charges of treason against the Democratic Party, and they wanted to be in a position to do it again.

And now, the Secretary of State comes along in an authorized interview, boasting of his doctrine of massive retaliation, saying that we were brought three times to the brink of atomic war, describing diplomatic defeats as diplomatic victories, claiming advance where there has been withdrawal, and success where the plain result has been failure—and on top of all this, so twisting the facts of history that he brought dishonor to our national reputation for truth and honesty. He now wants to change "brink" to "verge"—but what's the difference?

What is the reason for all this? Politics, pure and simple. The ignoble and partisan use of foreign policy.

And what are the results? The results have been to dismay our friends, comfort our enemies, weaken the position of the free world, and drive other nations closer to the Communist bloc.

The situation in Europe is more precarious than it has been since 1947. We have lost heavily among the millions of uncommitted people in Asia. We seem to have no strategy for defending the Middle East against Communist subversion. We watch the Communists pour arms into that area—arms that may be used in local wars, unless we achieve a peaceful settlement that will safeguard the independence of the countries located there—both the Arab countries and the State of Israel.

And as the world situation worsens, the Republican leaders continue their frantic efforts to discredit the Democrats, and fail to develop new ideas or policies to deal with these critical situations.

My friends, this is not the kind of bipartisanship I believe in.

I hope that some day the United States may once again have a true bipartisan foreign policy. We don't have one now, and I don't think the best interest of the country is served by pretending that we do.

Remember this—the responsibility for bipartisanship in foreign policy rests squarely on the administration in power. It is impossible for anyone else to bring it about. In that responsibility, the Eisenhower administration has failed.

In these circumstances, where does our duty lie?

I believe that the policies of this administration are leading us into a situation of growing danger where the balance of strength may shift strongly against the free world. This would be a terrible disaster. I think it is our inescapable duty to point out this danger to the American people. If we stand quietly by and let the people think that all is well, then we will share the blame and the guilt. This I am unwilling to do.

I am glad to see that a number of Democrats in and out of Congress have been speaking up on this subject. They are doing a great service to our country.

Our criticism should be responsible. I hope it will have constructive results. But it must be plain, forthright, and persistent. The Republicans will not welcome this criticism and they will do all they can to silence it. They are likely to be pretty nasty about it—and their techniques in that regard are highly developed.

But we should not be deterred or frightened into silence. The national interests involved are too vital for us to fail in our duty.

If the leaders of the Democratic Party—in Congress and out—will speak out plainly and bluntly on this subject in the year ahead, I think the results will be very beneficial. If the American people are fully informed on these matters of life-and-death importance, I have no doubt as to how they will respond.

Bee Photographer Tells of Rescue by Ducks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a column by Mr. Harlin Smith which appeared in the Sacramento Bee on January 24, 1955, entitled "Bee Photographer Tells of Rescue by Ducks." The column provides a gripping eyewitness account of the recent devastating floods in northern California:

BEE PHOTOGRAPHER TELLS OF RESCUE BY DUCKS

(By Harlin Smith)

YUBA CITY, SUTTER COUNTY.—I saw all these houses and cars under water, the cars filled up inside, and you could see Christmas packages floating at the windows. I couldn't see inside the cars. I don't know if anybody was trapped in them or not. There were people on top of buildings, on little islands of high ground, everywhere. A lot of them climbed trees.

PICK UP 34

The duck I was on with three national guardsmen picked up 34 people and took them to safety.

I'll never forget the happy looks on their faces when they saw us. The water was anywhere from 12 to 15 feet deep at the worst spots. There were big signboards almost all under water.

In one large residential section the water was at the rooftops. I don't know what happened to the people there.

Our duck passed over the tops of many cars, you could see just the tops of them below the water. I have no way of knowing if there were people inside.

We had reports of people being trapped in cars but I couldn't see far enough through the murky water to tell.

NEVER FORGET SIGHT

It was a sight I'll never forget. I've seen lots of disasters but this was the most impressive thing I've ever seen.

It was especially heart tugging coming at Christmas. The streets and houses still had

these sodden decorations, hanging. Many of them were still lit. Christmas tree lights in the windows. And all around was desolation.

I boarded the duck at the Yuba City side of the 10th Street bridge from Marysville. When we started, they were just bringing four people to the bridge approach in a rowboat. They were bedraggled, exhausted. They were still frightened. You could see it in their faces.

One woman could still smile, though. "I spent the night in this gentleman's house," she said, "and his wife wasn't there."

AIRCRAFT FILL SKY

As we drove the duck into the water, the sky was filled with every type of aircraft, beginning the rescue work. Amphibian planes, helicopters and light craft.

There were small boats with outboard motors appearing out of nowhere, it seemed.

The city itself looked like nothing but empty buildings and water, water everywhere lapping the sides of the walls.

Lights were still on everywhere. Street lights and in the stores and homes. That's how fast the people had to get out.

PLOW THROUGH WATER

Our duck plowed through the water to people stranded wherever we could find them. We plucked them off doorsteps, high points of ground everywhere. We worked for 6 hours picking them up and ferrying them to the west side of town. From there they were taken by bus to Gridley.

The 34 people we picked up were still stunned, shocked at the suddenness of the flood.

SAFE THROUGH NIGHT

One woman said that when the flood hit, she yelled to her next door neighbor that the water was at the door step, and then started to get blankets and food to take with her family, and by the time they did that and started for the car the water was too deep to leave. Luckily their house was high enough the water only covered the floor by a few inches and they were safe through the night.

Her next door neighbor told me that by the time she gathered up her family and went to the door, the water was too deep for her to leave.

DRIVES SWIFTLY AWAY

One man said he was working on the levee by the place where the Feather broke through. He said he jumped into his car and drove swiftly home.

But by the time he got his family together and started to load the car, the water was already 3 feet deep and he figured he was safer at the house. As it turned out, he was.

RUN TO HOUSE

One of the first ones we picked up was a 72-year-old woman and her grandchildren, two boys and a girl. The youngsters were on the roof and their grandmother on the second floor. The water filled the first floor.

The grandmother said they had to run 150 yards from a car to the house when the water suddenly swept down on them.

One of the boys had a cast on his leg, but he said he ran with the others.

The grandmother said she had to leave $70 in her purse in the car, but 1 boy said he stuffed $100 in his boots when they left the house earlier.

PERSUADED TO LEAVE

At another place a man did not want to leave his dogs. His wife persuaded him they would be all right and he came with us.

We saw a cat up on top of a tree. The water around it was a good 10 feet deep. The cat was curled up all by itself.

There was a box nailed to the side of one house. The water was just under the box. In the box, leisurely scratching himself, was a small puppy.

DANGER OF FIRE

At one house three families, men women, and children, were so glad to see us they left the house with a fire blazing in the fireplace. We had to tell them there was the danger of fire—silly as it seemed with all that water around.

Another woman left her dinner laid out in the kitchen ready to cook. She figured the house would smell something awful when she gets back, but at that point she did not care.

TRAGIC ACCOUNTS

We heard accounts of tragic scenes from the men on other ducks.

In one case a father left his wife and baby stranded in a tree and swam for help.

When the duck got there the tree was empty.

In another account a woman climbed a tree with her baby. Finally her arms were too weak from the cold and exhaustion and the baby fell and was swept about by the water.

Small boats tried to rescue the woman, but could not get near the tree. Neither could the ducks because the current was too swift. The men in the other duck do not know what happened to the woman.

CANNOT GO TO RESCUE

Another thing that hit me and the men in the duck I was in was having to leave two men stranded in a house across a rapid current from us. We had 30 refugees with us and it was too much of a risk to their lives to go after the men.

The two men were waving and signaling for help but we had to leave them. I don't know if they got out.

ONE DUCK OVERTURNS

The water was calm in some places and raging torrents in others. Three ducks were damaged. One was overturned by the swift water. Another was hurled against a telephone pole. The third hit a submerged car.

The duck which tipped over had a refugee inside. The refugee was picked up by a helicopter; the crew was rescued later by another duck.

The rescue work the men on the ducks did was terrific. It was hard, grinding work and dangerous throughout, mainly due to the swift water.

Those men of the 184th Infantry Regiment, national guardsmen, deserve a tremendous hand.

GENERATOR BURNS OUT

Our duck burned out a generator and fan belt and broke down after we had the 34 refugees aboard.

The current was so swift, we had to put all men on the nose of the duck to give the driver traction in steering.

We were in a bad way. We had no radio contact. It looked like we'd have to spend the night, stranded out there, ourselves.

Suddenly, around the corner came another duck—empty, on its way for refugees. He got a load quicker than he had expected.

We transferred our refugees to it, leaving our duck's crew behind, and came out on the other duck.

HARD TO DESCRIBE

When it was all over, I came out with a feeling that—well, it's hard to put into words.

I felt that with all this tremendous damage, how anybody ever came out of it alive—

Well, God must have had a hand in it. I can't put a thing like that into the right words. But that's all I can think.

It must have been Gold's help.

Nutter's 10 Years at International House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial tribute to Mr. Charles Nutter, managing director of International House in New Orleans, La., which appeared in the New Orleans Item for Sunday, February 5.

International House has become a famous institution of the free world. Mr. Nutter has brought to the institution great vision and understanding.

I am particularly pleased to see this tribute, not only because of my great regard for Mr. Nutter but because of my own personal interest in International House.

Back in 1943 I served as first executive secretary of this institution, which is founded on the concept of mutual respect between the peoples and nations operating through private enterprise and not through Government largess. International House has pioneered relations particularly between our country and the republics to the south of us. It has demonstrated the many fields of common interest between our countries and has also opened up new vistas of trade and commerce of great benefit to all of the nations involved.

NUTTER'S 10 YEARS AT INTERNATIONAL HOUSE

Shortly after 8 o'clock last Wednesday morning, Charles Nutter left his home at 4030 Carondelet, walked over to St. Charles and caught a streetcar downtown. By 8:30 he was at his desk at International House.

For Nutter it was just another workday, and we're sure he wanted it that way.

But Wednesday was also his 10th anniversary as managing director of International House—and, it seems to us, an appropriate time to take note of a man who symbolizes the great international program of New Orleans.

Too often we take community leadership for granted—especially when it's by those who eschew the limelight.

But one cannot travel very far in this hemisphere without hearing admiring mention of Nutter and of the ever-expanding International House program which he, William G. Zetzmann, the late Mr. Hecht and a number of other Orleanians have so remarkably advanced.

The Cincinnati Enquirer recently hailed Nutter for having "spearheaded the most imposing trade development plan any city in America has instituted."

He was one of those who long ago recognized our city's destiny as a great port and as a gateway to the hemisphere. During his first residence here he had repeatedly urged that the city take advantage of its potential.

As Fortune magazine observed some time ago, when the New Orleans program was formalized Nutter "was brought back to work it out." That he has done so is, of course, a matter of record. But Nutter is less interested in credit than in results. He works in the present, looking to the future. He is that rare dreamer who performs.

Six years after he envisioned and proposed a Louisiana Purchase celebration, it was a

wonderful actuality, participated in here by President Eisenhower, some 30 ambassadors to the United States and a French mission sent especially for the occasion.

In the last seven year Nutter has organized and directed 23 trade missions to Latin America and Europe and taken part in most of them.

Under his guidance, International House has played a major role in two recent historic assemblies here—the Inter-American Investment Conference and the meeting of the Inter-American Press Association.

James G. Stahlman, Nashville publisher and new IAPA president, said he had never worked with any one man who had done as outstanding a job as Nutter in planning such a session. "There has never been a meeting like it," Stahlman added. Suffice it to say several hundred North American and Latin American publishers and editors returned home singing the praise of our town.

For 20 years before coming to International House, Nutter worked around the world as writer and executive for a press service—in New Orleans and other major United States cities, in Europe and particularly in Latin America.

He has for more than 30 years been a firm believer in, and a dedicated worker for, trade and cultural exchange as the most effective path to world peace.

Charlie Nutter is dreaming and performing more fruitfully than ever. Right now, he is trying to promote a 4-year southwide celebration, with New Orleans as the focal point, to mark Dixie's progress in the 100 years since 1865. It's our guess you'll hear a lot more of this in the months ahead.

As Charlie Nutter begins his second decade at International House, we salute him and we wish him well in the years to come. We in New Orleans are fortunate to have him.

Construction of Government Buildings in Large Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, complexities of modern living and transportation have given rise to many new problems with respect to the construction of Government buildings in large metropolitan areas. One of the major problems is that of adequate parking. Some of our large cities have already incorporated parking provisions into their building codes. Unfortunately, however, in the majority of cases no such provision exists. Consequently, except in instances where it is required by ordinance, no parking facilities are required in construction of Federal plants.

The postal department is presently engaged in a large scale new construction program with proper parking furnishing one of the major headaches. Recognizing the seriousness of this problem, I have introduced H. R. 9135, to provide adequate parking facilities for employees and patrons where needed in all recent, present, and proposed construction of postal installations. I hope the distinguished Members of this House will give this legislation serious consideration. Traffic conditions in any of our larger cities are a major factor in any new construction.

A case in point is my own city of Seattle, where the Postal Department has just completed construction of a vast new postal annex to serve this ever-expanding community. This beautiful new facility, a source of pride to employees and patrons alike, has no parking facilities of any kind save the surrounding busy streets and avenues. This creates an almost impossible situation for literally scores of postal employees who for one reason or another are compelled to use private cars in going to and from their jobs. An equally bad situation is imposed on the patrons whom this station was designed primarily to serve. Every attempt made thus far to solve this problem administratively has failed; hence the recourse to legislative action. If this legislation receives the approval of Congress, which I believe it richly deserves, an important step forward will have been taken toward solving a portion of the complex traffic problems besetting our modern cities of today.

Federal Disaster Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me by the House I include herewith a statement I made at the February 1, 1956, hearings of the House Banking and Currency Committee, urging prompt enactment of legislation providing for a Federal disaster program.

The statement and the discussion I had with the committee follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, unless you have lived through a flood or a hurricane you cannot appreciate what an ordeal it is.

You read about it and see pictures of it and your sympathies are aroused, but to use the vernacular, "you ain't seen nothing."

Gentlemen, I tell you from personal experience, it's a nightmare. Your morale goes to bits and your spirit leaves you. You feel for the moment that the end of the world has come.

That, in a few words, is what happened to us in Rhode Island last August and again in October. It had also happened on several occasions in the past. In 1954 the southern part of the State was hit badly. In 1955 it was the northern part.

I have here a booklet which records the 1954 hurricane disaster, and a sheet of pictures on the 1955 flood. I ask you to study these. They will move you, I am sure. Fortunately, we of New England are a hardy type of people. We soon regain our composure and set outo reestablish our homes and our businesses, hoping that, without too much delay, the Federal Government, the only agency able to do so, will take the necessary measures to control flood damage in the future and establish a program of Federal disaster insurance, at reasonable rates—and when I say "reasonable rates," I mean ranging anywhere from 50 cents to $1 a thousand. I say that because I feel that the Federal Government itself is the only agency that can help in this case, and with full realization that it would be a cost to the Federal Government, a cost to the taxpayers. But, after all, the taxpayers are now footing the bill to a great degree when the Federal Government steps in to give relief in this type of case.

I hope that the rates will be reasonable and within the means of those who may in the future be the victims of natural disasters so that they may be compensated to a degree for their losses and be enabled to rehabilitate their homes and their businesses rather than have to seek public relief.

Private insurance companies will not issue policies against flood or other water damage. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the Federal Government to do it, in view of the fact that natural disasters know no geographical lines.

When I speak of natural disasters, I mean floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, dust storms, tornadoes, cyclones, and so forth, the type of catastrophe that the President proclaims to be a disaster and orders that the facilities of the Government be used to bring relief.

On January 3, I introduced the bill H. R. 7897, to provide for Federal disaster insurance and reinsurance.

It represents a great deal of study and an effort to be practical in approaching a subject which I consider most important and most urgent. And here I want to pay tribute, as Mr. Dodd did, to the legislative counsel's office, because they went out of their way to try to put into legislative language the ideas that I advanced.

My bill is intended to have broad appeal and thus bring in a larger amount of premiums to sustain the fund that if the coverage were restricted to one particular type of disaster, such as a flood or a hurricane.

Disasters of different types strike different parts of the country and for that reason I feel that all the potential victims of disasters are entitled to, and should be given, an opportunity to purchase this type of insurance.

In brief, the bill provides insurance coverage against natural disasters, as defined in the bill itself, for industrial and commercial buildings, homes and household effects.

Household effects, as you will note in section 3 (11) on page 6 of the bill, is defined to mean furniture, furnishings, and equipment necessary and appropriate for the operation of a household. It does not include objects of art nor antiques, nor negotiable papers or bonds, or the like

No one may obtain insurance or reinsurance under the provisions of this bill except to the extent of his insurable interest, nor if such insurance is available to him from other sources at reasonable rates.

The potential liability of the United States is limited to not to exceed $500 million at any one time, except that on July 1, 1957, and on July 1, 1958, the President may, in his discretion, increase it by another $500 million.

The bill provides that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall administer the program. From time to time he is to determine the aggregate amount of such insurance outstanding in each geographical area of the United States and take into account the needs for such insurance in each area.

He shall establish premium rates at the lowest practicable level, taking into consideration the risks involved, and the desirability of providing such insurance at reasonable rates shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Insurance contracts written on household effects are limited to $3,000, with the first $50 of damage deductible.

On real estate the payment of claims would be in full for the first $15,000 and 50 percent of the excess over the first $15,000, with a deductible clause of $100, but the maximum

claim allowance on a single item of real estate would not exceed $250,000.

Through an oversight there is nothing in this bill providing insurance coverage of inventories.

I respectfully urge your committee to include inventories in any bill you report out on this subject.

To cite an example of the need of disaster insurance coverage of inventories, let us take the city of Woonsocket, in my district.

Woonsocket has a population slightly in excess of 50,000 with 120 industrial firms providing employment for 11,000 workers.

In the 1955 floods 34 of these firms, employing over 6,000 workers, more than half of the city's work force, were victims of flood damage.

The losses to these firms ranged from a few thousand dollars to a maximum of $750,000.

The aggregate damage to industrial firms—including real estate, machinery, and inventories—was estimated at $4,500,000.

Commercial losses, while more widespread and involving a far larger number of individual firms were lower in dollar value but equally devastating. Nearly 200 commercial firms, many of them small owner-operated businesses and a great majority comprising retail stores, were reduced to almost total loss.

In many instances, accumulations of a lifetime of hard work were entirely wiped out. Losses to these businessmen ranged from a few hundred dollars to well in excess of $100,000 in a few instances. While no exact figures are available, these losses are estimated to aggregate in excess of $2 million.

These amounts do not seem large when we think of the billions in our national budget but I assure you gentlemen that in view of the serious economic situation that has existed in Woonsocket for the past few years, due to the depressed condition of the textile industry, the loss of some $6 to $7 million of property in this area is a most severe loss.

Disaster insurance to communities of this type is really a must if we are to avoid ghost towns.

Getting back to the bill—

The Administrator would issue regulations relative to adjustment and payment of claims.

He would be authorized by contract or otherwise to utilize the facilities, services, information and agencies of private insurers.

If a claim were disallowed the claimant would have a year to institute action in the United States District Court for the district where the property is located or in the Court of Claims.

A Disaster Insurance Fund would be established in the Treasury of the United States, into which would be deposited all premiums and appropriated funds and interest on these funds.

Claims would be paid out of the Disaster Insurance Fund in accordance with awards by or under authority of the Administrator.

Administrative expenses would not come out of the fund but would be paid out of appropriations for that purpose.

The administrator would appoint an advisory committee of not less than three experts in the field of insurance to advise him with respect to the execution of his functions under this act.

The Administrator would report to the Congress each year, in February, on the operation of the act and recommend legislation needed to improve it.

Persons making fraudulent claims would be liable to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

The authority, responsibility, or function of the Administrator would not be affected by the termination of the Small Business Act. He would continue as the Administrator of the Federal disaster insurance program.

That, Mr. Chairman, is my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. FORAND, I know how interested you are in obtaining some help for your people who are in distress, and I think we all share that desire, but don't you think it would be absolutely essential, when we go back and tell our people that we have some help for them, to let them know just exactly what they would have to pay for this insurance?

Mr. FORAND. Very definitely, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the main questions. I don't think we can sell them the insurance unless they know what they are going to pay.

Now, the administration witnesses have appeared, and they have introduced a bill, and they say that they cannot tell us the amount people would have to pay for this insurance, that it is purely problematical now. However, they did make 2 surveys, in 2 communities, and the cost in those 2 communities—which I suppose were typical communities—ranged from $115 to $620 per thousand. Now, the insured would have to pay from $69 to $372 per thousand dollars for insurance. What do you think about that?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I personally think the sponsors of that type of legislation are thinking of self-sustaining programs. I take a very different view. I believe this program should be sponsored and paid for by the Federal Government, in participation with the people who are going to be insured, and it is for that reason that I suggested that we fix the rates arbitrarily, between the brackets of 50 cents a thousand to $1 per thousand, realizing that the Federal Government may eventually have to pay out some money, and for that reason I suggest the appropriation of $500 million to start with.

We must realize that each year we have a disaster fund that we in the Congress vote to the President. That disaster fund becomes exhausted, and we vote additional money. Why would it not be wiser, instead of having to continually make appropriations for that purpose, to set up a definite amount of money, $500 million to start with, sell the insurance contracts at the rate where we realize we may be losing money, make it 50 cents to a dollar a thousand, but bearing in mind always the thought that if you have a low rate it is going to appeal to more people. And if you have a wide base, such as I suggest here, you will operate practically on the same basis that the war risk insurance operated on. You will recall we were selling war risk insurance for about $10, and working through the insurance brokers and agencies, each one would receive a dollar for writing a policy contract for the Government.

That program made money. I don't have the figures here, but with your permission I should like to insert them in the record, showing that the war-risk insurance that we had in World War II actually made money for the Government, and unless we have a broad base—and that is the principal reason why I include all these natural disasters—unless you have a broad base the Government will have to foot the major portion of the bill, but through this suggestion it is my thought that people will be hungry to purchase that type of insurance, particularly those who have been the victims of disasters. The premiums collected would lower the cost of the program to the Government.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. FORAND, the figures on war-damage insurance, premiums collected, amounted to this: We collected about 250 times as much in premiums as we paid out. That is because we had no damage.

Mr. FORAND. I agree with you a hundred percent, but the appeal was there. Now, the damage has been done in these cases, and I believe there will be more appeal. There will be more appeal to the people to try to purchase this type of insurance.

The war-risk-insurance figures referred to above are as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., September 26, 1955.

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORAND: In response to your questions on war-risk insurance, the following information is submitted:

1. How much was collected by the Government in premiums for war-risk insurance during World War II?

The Maritime Administration reports that total premiums collected by the Government during World War II for war-risk insurance amounted to $544 million.

2. When was the war-risk agency dissolved?

General administration of war-risk insurance was handled by the Wartime Insurance Committee which was established under the Maritime Commission on December 19, 1941. By Executive order of February 7, 1942, the Wartime Insurance Committee was transferred to the War Shipping Administration. On April 7, 1942, the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration appointed a Director of Wartime Insurance who took over the responsibility for administration of war-risk insurance. By the act of July 8, 1946, the War Shipping Administration was terminated and its functions were transferred to the Maritime Commission on September 1, 1946. By this act, all unobligated funds remaining in the marine and war risk insurance fund on December 31, 1946, were to be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

3–4. How much money was left on hand at the time of dissolution? What became of this money?

The Treasury Department reports that the remaining balance of $57,751,884.92 in the marine and war risk insurance fund was carried into the surplus fund of the Treasury on June 30, 1948.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe I made a misstatement when I cited what the cost would be. That was not per thousand dollars. That was $69 for $10,000 and $372 for $10,000. That was the range. Not per thousand dollars. I would like to make that correct.

Are there any questions?

We are very glad to have your views, Mr. FORAND, and we want your assistance.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chariman, I am deeply appreciative of the fact that this committee has allowed me to appear, and I also appreciate the fact that each and every member of this committee is sincerely interested in this subject. We all realize it is a difficult problem to solve, but it is one that must be solved, otherwise our people are going to be wiped out completely in several places, and the Lord knows that our public welfare rolls are swelling too fast as it is. We don't want to add to that.

The CHAIRMAN. I know what it will do. In my section it keeps coming.

Mr. FORAND. You have had it.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had it. It has made slums of cities, destroyed property, and if we can give them some relief it will not only relieve them of the effects of disaster, but will also relieve their minds from the apprehension of floods that are coming.

Mr. FORAND. I believe, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing we must realize, and that is this is a type of program that cannot be made self-sustaining, and that the Federal Government will have to appropriate money if we are going to render this type of service.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Mr. FORAND, before you go, and I think the other Members of Congress here ought to know some of the difficulties we are meeting in considering these problems. Most of us who are concerned with the problem have tended to put in bills of one type. All of us were agreed that that was the approach to this type of problem. Of course, the easy answers, let us cure the situation by proper flood control, and so forth. But that is a long-term program, which is going to cost a lot of money, and eventually it will have to be done. But some of us are beginning to feel that this is not the right approach, and I am one of those who introduced a comprehensive disaster-insurance bill. Your bill points it up. Let me indicate to you why.

You recall the national life insurance we had. We found it was costing more to administer the program than we were paying out. Not only premiums collected, but actual administration of the program cost more than we were actually paying out in liabilities. So we decided instead of having all that administration we would give each man a policy, and the Government would make the payment. We were saving money by doing that. We may have the same situation here.

In the case of the crop-insurance program, in the first 7 years we lost $71 million. It is still not a self-sustaining program. In the last few years we have lost $2 million. And that is limited to loss, and to areas, and on a selected basis, and insuring only certain crops and only to the good farmer. In other words, if a farmer has a history of not being able to do a good farming job he cannot get the insurance.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will you yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. You are talking about flood control, long range and everything, but Representative FORAND and I don't have those troubles. Our trouble is from hurricanes and salt water. That is where our trouble comes from. It is not flood control because our rivers apparently take off all the water and dump it into the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. FORAND. Unfortunately, last August we did have floods.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, we had them in Massachusetts, but we also had tidal waves and that is what we are interested in.

The CHAIRMAN. When these disasters occur America has always responded to the necessity of her people. We have aided not only our own people but we have sent immense sums to assist other nations. And I think we will have to take part of the responsibility if we are going to get any relief.

I feel as you do, Mr. FORAND, on the subject. It has to be in some form.

Mr. FORAND. It is a realistic approach, I consider, and that realistic approach is the fact that the Federal Government will have to bear the greatest burden. We are doing it indirectly anyway, so why not let these people feel that they are paying a part of the risk, paying for a premium on insurance for a possible risk, and if you broaden your base by including the several disasters throughout the country, of one type or another, I think the appeal for the purchase of this insurance will be very great.

Mr. MULTER. Have you any idea what it would cost per year to administer this program?

Mr. FORAND. I have not.

Mr. MULTER. Will you tell us your thinking as to why you selected the Small Business Administration to administer this program rather than an independent agency or some other agency?

Mr. FORAND. It would be a separate agency. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is also the administrator of disaster loans under the present system. That is why he was selected.

But if you have noticed, there is a clause in this bill providing that even if the Small Business Administration is wiped out at any time this would be a continuing program, and the Administrator would continue his functions as the administrator of the disaster insurance program.

Mr. MULTER. But I am wondering why you pick an agency that has had no insurance experience as against an agency which has had insurance experience; for instance, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has had tremendous insurance experience. They are taking policies all the time, and are adjusting policy losses, and have an insurance department as part of the Agency now. The Small Business Administration is a lending agency, even under the disaster loan program.

Mr. FORAND. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. Why should we give it to that kind of an agency rather than another agency? If you give it to them they will have to set up a new bureau. Either set up an independent agency or give it to an agency of Government that has had experience in the field.

Mr. FORAND. I am not wedded to this idea, but I felt that when I came before you I should have something concrete to offer. Anything that the committee does to carry out the principles underlying my proposal would be very acceptable and very agreeable.

Mr. MULTER. I am in agreement with you that if you can sell this insurance at a dollar a thousand, you are going to have a lot of takers in the disaster areas. I doubt if you will get any takers if it is on a voluntary basis in the areas which have not yet been visited by floods. As testimony indicates, the fellow on top of the hill is not going to take any flood insurance, but the man down at the bottom of the hill is going to have to pay a high rate.

Mr. FORAND. The fellow at the top of the hill may be struck by a hurricane.

Mr. MULTER. That insurance is presently available to him.

Mr. FORAND. To a very limited degree. I happen to be an insurance broker, and I can tell you that, if you read the fine print in your policy, you will find you don't have the coverage you think you have.

Mr. MULTER. Because in Rhode Island you are in what is now the hurricane area. But you could have gotten that insurance very cheaply 20 years ago, because the area had not been visited by hurricanes. The same as New York. In those days the companies were giving it to us for 10 cents per $100.

Mr. FORAND. That may be true. But don't forget the publicity in the newspapers and over the radio and television have stirred up thinking in the minds of the people in every section of the country.

Mr. MULTER. Let us consider one other phase of your program as you have outlined it, having in mind that you would fix a uniform rate of $1 per thousand, with a maximum liability of $500 million. On that basis you can collect $500,000 a year in premiums. The direct damage only as a result of just the August 1955 floods, in the New England area, was well over half a billion dollars.

Mr. FORAND. True; just direct damage.

Mr. MULTER. Direct and indirect, $1,600,000,000, just as a result of that flood.

Mr. FORAND. But how much money did the Federal Government spend by way of relief work, and is it still spending, as a result of that? Charge that amount against the losses that would be paid under these policies and I think you will find that you have reduced the cost of the insurance program by quite a margin.

Mr. MULTER. As you compare what happened there, just taking one flood, any one of the floods we have had in the last 12 months, as against this kind of a program, I think it would be much smarter for us to say to the people, "In the event of a loss come in and prove your damage, the Government will pay it to you," instead of setting up an insurance program and getting not even the cost of administration of the program out of it. We would only be fooling the people.

Mr. FORAND. Well, Mr. MULTER, I don't care how you do it. I want relief for the people. That is the important thing. And I know that is what you are trying to work out.

Mr. MULTER. We would like to give it to you.

Mr. FORAND. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have your views, Mr. FORAND. We will consider them in executive session.

Mr. FORAND. Thank you very much.

Thomas Alva Edison, Great American Scientist and Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, February 11 is the birthday of the late Thomas Alva Edison. I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht for the East Side News in commemoration of the 109th anniversary of this great benefactor of mankind. I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading it:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON, GREAT AMERICAN SCIENTIST AND HUMANITARIAN

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

They are truly great, who as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding generation nearer to the heart of human love. Such a man was Thomas Alva Edison. On February 11 we commemorate the 109th anniversary of his birth. We salute the American and patriot. We honor the scientist and humanitarian. We hail the greatest benefactor of mankind.

His life is the story of progress. His ideal was service to humanity. His monument is in every home. His epitaph is written in every heart.

He was a precious asset to the world. He was the universal lamplighter. He was the prophet of the machine age. He was the father of American industry.

He gave 1,100 inventions to mankind. He gave light and understanding to the world. He gave to humanity the greatest ascendancy over the forces of nature. He gave us the dawn of a new civilization to man.

He was a mighty conqueror. He conquered the elements. He flashed thought over the continents. He garlanded cities in light.

He struck the shackles of drudgery from the backs of millions. He lighted the pathway of art and science and industry. He has made light a social force. He has brought happiness to the humblest.

Wherever there is an incandescent light, wherever there is a phonograph, wherever there is a radio, wherever there is a motion picture, silent or sound, Edison will live. He stands as a shining symbol of America. He rises in glorified silhouette against the horizon of the ages. He symbolizes electricity and good will. He will live forever in sound, light, and electric power.

Thomas Edison has never created an electric light which has shone with greater brilliance and beauty than his own noble

character. It is recorded that before he lapsed into the final sleep, his face became illumined, as from an inner light. Opening his eyes, he said to those about him: "It is very beautiful over there."

It would seem that this greatest of all apostles of light had caught a foregleam of that splendor which lies beyond the shadows of the earth. He died as he lived. He was joyous and intrepid. He was dauntless in mind and heart. He was indeed the supreme pathfinder of the last half century.

Let us recall some of his famous utterances:

"Genius is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration."

"The greatest of all studies is human nature."

"The world owes nothing to man, but every man owes something to the world."

"Until man duplicates a blade of grass, nature can laugh at his scientific knowledge."

"From his neck down a man is worth a couple of dollars. From his neck up he is worth anything that his brain can produce."

"The thing with which I lose patience is the clock. Its hands move too fast. The only time I become discouraged is when I think of all the things I would like to do and the little time in which to do them."

If Thomas Alva Edison could speak to us today, he would say: Let us be American. Let us be loyal to our country. Let us adhere to the principles of personal initiative. Let us urge free cooperation among all classes of citizens. Let us work for the good of all which has made our Nation the hope of the world. Let us in spite of clouds and darkness and difficulties have faith. Let us go forward.

Chautauqua, N. Y., Leads Farm Income in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the counties in New York State of which I have the honor to represent. The farmers rank the very highest in skill, training, and production.

I want to call attention particularly to the record made by Chautauqua County, inasmuch as it leads the income for the whole State of New York. In this connection I am inserting an article which appeared in the Jamestown (N. Y.) Post-Journal of February 6, 1956:

The New York State Commerce Review, just issued by the New York State Department of Commerce, and called to our attention by Seidman and Seidman, shows that in 1954 Chautauqua County's farms led every other county in the State with its $6,600,000 income. While the 1955 figures are not available a similar trend is anticipated.

Nearest county to Chautauqua in farm income was Orange, with $6,200,000. Broken down into farm production areas under the new measuring device of the department for gauging area consumer markets the survey shows the Rochester area, with nine counties included, far ahead of all other upstate sections with a total farm income of $36,500,000. Chautauqua County is bracketed with Cattaraugus and Allegany under the heading "Southwest Gateway." Cattaraugus County's income was $4,100,000, and Allegany's $2 million, giving this group a total income of $12,700,000.

Under the heading of income from wages this county ranked 11th in the State in 1954 with a total of $165 million. Leading us in wages outside the metropolitan area were Broome, Albany, Schenectady, Dutchess, Orange, Oneida, Erie, Niagara, Monroe, and Onondaga, a comparison that reflects mostly the fact they contain many large cities and consequently many more large factories.

Chautauqua County also rated 11th in the State in business and professional income with $15,900,000, the same 10 counties being ahead of us.

Erie County led the State outside New York City on a where-earned basis with a $1,952,000,000 income. Of the $35,100,000,000 intotal personal income $21.5 billion was earned in the five counties of New York City, although many of those working in the city lived outside of it. Nine hundred million dollars was earned in the State by persons living outside it.

Although citing no tables the survey declares overall business activity in the State during 1955 was at an all-time high, establishing the year as the best on record.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the House of Representatives, beginning in 1939, I have regularly conducted polls in my congressional district of public thinking on vital national issues. These polls have been in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simply yes and no answers, mailed to registered voters in my district, regardless of their political affiliation.

Response to these questionnaires have always been excellent. The tabulated results, which virtually constitute a referendum of the district, have proved of enormous value to myself and, I hope, to my colleagues in the Congress.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries and some of the finest farm lands found anywhere. Many nationality groups reside therein and the Negro population is considerable. The district includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh and many large and small residential towns in northern Allegheny County and extends to important rural areas.

The percentage tabulation of the answers on this latest poll are included below without comment. I trust they will prove as interesting and informative to all who study them as they are to me.

POLL RESULTS

1. Is a tax cut more appealing to you than a balanced budget? Yes, 15 percent; no, 83 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

2. If a budget surplus is apparent, would you prefer a tax cut to debt reduction? Yes, 29 percent; no, 68 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

3. Should the United States resist with arms Communist aggression anywhere the people attacked desire help? Yes, 52 percent; no, 38 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

4. Should the $25 billion interstate highway program be financed with a combination of increased use taxes and bonds? Yes, 67 percent; no, 22 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

5. Would you object to paying 4 cents, instead of 3 cents postage, for nonlocal first-class mail (ordinary letter)? Yes, 26 percent; no, 73 percent; no opinion, 1 percent.

6. Do you think we are moving with satisfactory rapidity to establish full civil rights for everyone? Yes, 80 percent; no, 15 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

7. Do you think we are going too far, too fast with the reclamation and irrigation program? Yes, 25 percent; no, 59 percent; no opinion, 16 percent.

8. Do you believe that the proposed $4½ billion foreign-aid program should be cut 25 percent or more? Yes, 77 percent; no, 16 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

9. Should the Government encourage and guarantee private health insurance programs? Yes, 47 percent; no, 47 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

10. Do you agree that the administration's farm-price-support program is an improvement over previous programs? Yes, 70 percent; no, 15 percent; no opinion, 15 percent.

11. Eisenhower says our defense preparations are adequate. Do you agree? Yes, 68 percent; no, 19 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

12. Do you believe that Eisenhower can and should stand for reelection? Yes, 64 percent; no, 22 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

The Weekly Newspaper Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have never concealed the great admiration which I have for the ability of Bob Stewart, editor of the Westbank Herald, published in New Orleans and one of the finest weekly newspapers published anywhere in this country. I have even been moved on occasion to compare him to William Allen White and if there was ever any doubt about the justification of such a comparison it should be removed after reading one of Bob Stewart's latest editorial contributions entitled "No Apologies."

In this editorial he gives an unmatched appreciation of what the weekly newspaper editor should be. This editorial is a human document which should take its place alongside some of the finest editorials which Bob Stewart has written and for which he had won Freedom's awards.

In the recent gubernatorial campaign in Louisiana, Editor Stewart supported one of the losing candidates with vigor and energy and opposed the successful candidate with equal characteristic vigor and energy. There is no halfway mark with Bob Stewart. It is all the way or nothing. That is the way he plays the game and that is the way he writes. When he lost he did not sulk and surely did not back a fraction of an inch. In-

stead he wrote this editorial "No Apologies" and even those who do not agree with him in his political views and actions, in all fairness, must admit that here is an editor with courage and conviction. Although the editorial is directed to the local situation at hand, I am bringing it to your attention because it so well applies to any weekly newspaper editor anywhere a Main Street exists. Here it is:

NO APOLOGIES

There is no ivory tower of solitude to which the editor of a weekly newspaper may retire after saying his say and speaking his piece. Unlike the editorial writers of great metropolitan dailies who remain, more or less, in anonymous background, the weekly editor must mingle with the crowd and bear the plaudits and brunts with equanimity. Praise or criticism is accepted as part of his job. He would have it no other way.

By the same token any weekly editor, who is worthy of his salt, becomes immune to the barbs, the jibes, the accolades—and, sometimes the insults, of those who may agree or disagree with him.

For this would be a sad world, indeed, if an editor were influenced by public opinion and disregarded the force and beauty of truth. It would be almost as bad for those who disagree with him, as it would be for the writer. For if this were true then the editor would prey upon the dream world of fancy in which most of us like to live, and he would become a weaver of fairy tales.

It isn't that a weekly editor is an unusually brave man, or that he possesses less the weaknesses of the flesh and more of the virtues, but it is simply that he has a job to do, and he takes pride in this job. It isn't that an editor has less sensitiveness to barbs and more composure in the face of criticism because like all other men he cries for affection, sympathy, and understanding—when there is so little in the world. But he knows that unless he speaks the truth he is a fraud. He knows that if he veneers and varnishes over the facts he practices hypocrisy.

An editor should never compromise truth with half-truth or fact with fancy. If he is a good editor and worthy of your leadership he must lay the truth bare, although it be harsh and irritating. And because there is no compromise between that which is right and that which is wrong he cannot and never will apologize, ingratiate, or excuse himself. Truth needs no apologist no matter how unpalatable the dose. But the tonic always seems to cure us of the ills of illusionment.

No ivory tower we say. No place of solitude. Who wants an ivory tower? Who wants solitude? The greatness of this life is in the living of it. Every breathing moment of it. Not in avoiding the collisions of disagreement, or apologizing for truth.

Remember, an editor is like that good Admiral Farragut, who said, "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead."

And also like the great bard who said, "The play's the thing." But we also add, "Aye, there's the rub."

Get Mission 66 Rolling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, at long last, Congress has been presented with a long-range and realistic program to protect and develop our national parks and monuments. This program is long overdue, and President Eisenhower, in recommending this development, deserves the praise and support of every American.

Need for such action is pointed up by the situation in Utah. In my State, there are five national monument areas, totaling hundreds of thousands of acres of magnificent, unequalled, scenic beauty. All of this areas has been a part of the national park system for nearly 2 years, yet there is within this area not 1 mile of surfaced road. As I said recently in a letter to the Department of the Interior:

If these areas are worth reserving, they are worth being seen.

I commend to Members of Congress the following editorial from the Salt Lake Deseret News:

GET MISSION 66 ROLLING

It takes a farsighted and courageous man to look at the statistical history of our national parks, to face realistically what those statistics mean for the future—and then to do something about it.

Conrad L. Wirth, director of the National Park Service, has shown himself to be such a man by the comprehensive, long-range program he has given Congress for park and monument development.

This is the long-awaited Mission 66, aiming for an adequate national parks system by 1966. It is to be hoped Congress will have equal courage and vision to get started on it and follow through.

These are the statistics that stagger the imagination and that might well discourage the timid: From the time they were established in 1916, visits to the national parks doubled every decade up to 1941. Up to that point, the National Parks Service did a reasonably good job of keeping park facilities equal to demand. Then came the war, which ended all development. At its end, the pent-up vacationing energies and spending power of Americans broke out in an astonishing flood of visitors. By 1954, 48 million tourists were tramping over trails and bulging lodges, cabins, and campgrounds whose capacity was 20 million at the most. Deterioration was inevitable of facilities and in some cases even of the scenery itself.

The flood continues to rise. Increasingly shorter workweeks and longer vacation periods made the use of leisure time one of American's great future problems. The national parks will bear a tremendous share of the burden. The estimate that by 1966 there will be 80 million visitors a year to the parks seems a modest one.

Obviously, a tremendous and expensive task faces America in getting ready for such a flood. The $66 million President Eisenhower asked for the National Park Service this week is only the beginning. He will ask increasing appropriations for the next 10 years.

Should we undertake such a burden?

On a cold cash basis, the answer must be yes. The natioanl parks are the major touring destinations of the American public, which is spending $16 billion a year on pleasure travel. Exactly how much of that spending is stimulated by the parks is difficult to say, but Yellowstone visitors in 1954 spent $20 million in and immediately around that park alone—not counting expenditures coming from and returning to their homes. The Bureau of Internal Revenue estimates that of every dollar spent in America, 25 cents ends up in some form of tax. If 1954's 48 million park visitors spent an average of $10 apiece—and this is conservative—the income in tax receipts was in the neighborhood of $120 million. An investment of this magnitude is worth preserving and developing.

But the real value of these forests and lakes and mountains, these historic shrines, these natural wonders and relics of antiquity, is not to be measured in dollars. As Mr. Wirth told editors in Washington some months ago, these are the shrines to which Americans can come and leave, knowing within their souls that "This is my country, and it is good. These are my people, and they are worthy." America cannot neglect this source of strength and inspiration.

Utahans know all this; we live among some of the most spectacular real estate in the national parks system. We appreciate the increased appropriations requested to improve facilities and open up new country in our national parks and monuments. We are in a position to know how sadly this development has been neglected.

But Mission 66 is not a matter of pleasing the localities in which national parks and monuments happen to be located. These resources belong to all Americans. The visitors to them come from all America.

All Americans should be—and, we believe are—willing to pay the cost of preserving them for our own use and for future generations.

Hearings on the Administration and Effects of the 50–50 Cargo Preference Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on the administration and effect of the so-called 50–50 cargo preference act. Certain foreign governments have objected to this legislation and our State and Agriculture Departments seem to support their position. On the other hand, the Commerce Department and the Maritime Administrator state that the very existence of our merchant marine depends on this law.

Since our defense is dependent on the maintenance of an adequate active merchant marine and since the objection to the cargo preference act is ideological, I have suggested a substitute. I am having legislation drawn which would substitute a fair labor standard provision for the preference. This would provide that all Government-financed cargoes would have to be transported in vessels regardless of nationality which are manned by crews whose rates of pay and working conditions conform to approved American standards. Thus, my legislation would apply the Davis-Bacon theory to Government-financed cargoes as it does to federally financed construction.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Middle East Situation

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject. Ever since the end of World War II and the coming into being thereafter of Palestine as the State of Israel, there have existed tensions and controversies in this area. During that period, when the Secretary of State was Mr. Dean Acheson, many of us urged on the then Secretary of State the importance of the recognition of the integrity of the new state and many of us opposed plans for the shipment of arms and aid of one kind or another to various of the Arab States.

The other day I came across a headline of the year 1950. That headline said: "Scott Raps Acheson on Arab Arms Aid."

It did not get me anywhere, and I have about come to the conclusion that attacks on Secretaries of State, be they Mr. Acheson or Mr. Dulles or anyone else, probably will not be as effective an approach as the continuing logical presentation of the reasons why we believe that the preservation of the integrity of the State of Israel can be achieved by preventing the growth of an imbalance in arms between Israel and the Arab world, at least on a temporary basis, but can only be permanently achieved by the negotiation of peace between the parties to this controversy in their troubled area. These negotiations have a better chance of success if promptly and vigorously pursued.

Together with several other Members of Congress, and representing 40 Republican Members of Congress, we called the other day on Secretary Dulles, having presented him with a letter which I am including in the RECORD, stating our views. Those views included our belief that there should be immediate shipment of arms to Israel to counter the Communist activity in the area, and the shipment of arms from Soviet satellites to Egypt. Those views also included our concern over the resettlement of the refugee problem, the Jordan Valley development; but most of all they concerned means by which we might preserve the peace of the area through the implementation of the Tripartite Pact or by use of the framework of the United Nations if, in proceeding within the framework of the United Nations, we would have a reasonable hope of success.

We talked to Secretary Dulles and from that talk emerged several important developments. In the first place, in an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 27, I noted that the Secretary of State at that time had implied that it might be months before a decision would be reached on the arms bid. I think it is real progress to be able to report that peaceful negotiations looking toward peace are now presently being undertaken; that those negotiations are with other members of the Tripartite Pact and presumably with other nations; that as one member of this delegation said to the press after leaving Mr. Dulles, it was expected and the clear implication was received that some determination which would permit the Secretary to make some further announcement could be expected in about a month. This is a great improvement over previous reports that decision might be delayed for many months. If we have succeeded in advancing the time limit in that degree. I think that is an important contribution. We have not changed our mind. We still think that arms to Israel to counter this imbalance are necessary. But the position of the Secretary is that he should be given an opportunity to work out peaceful solutions on the basis as suggested in our letter particularly through the implementation of the Tripartite Pact, the guaranty of existing frontiers, as we suggested, and other methods, including the increase in the number of persons engaged in neutral patrols along the borders.

It is, I think, fair to state that it would be the Secretary's opinion that time is needed to work out some of these problems. Some of us think that that time should not be very long, because we recognize the danger to peace and the menace to our own national security through delay.

But we learned something else. We secured from the Secretary in that conversation a firm policy statement which was reported in the press conference, and that statement is this:

> It is one of the basic tenets of American foreign policy that Israel be saved.

Another restatement of the same policy as used by the Secretary was:

> It is one of the basic tenets of American foreign policy that the integrity of the State of Israel be preserved.

I think we may say categorically that in learning from the State Department something that we have been very anxious to hear for some time, that the Department has a basic intent that the people who live in Israel shall not be attacked without action on our part and on the part of other friends of Israel who are tremendously concerned about her danger, is an important assertion of policy. An even more important development occurred today when President Eisenhower gave flat assurance that every constitutional method would be used by the United States to avoid outbreak of war in this area.

Naturally the negotiations themselves looking to peace cannot be spread open to the public gaze as each step is taken, because to do that would in itself defeat the purpose of the negotiations.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. However, the gentleman, I am sure, feels that arms should be sent immediately?

Mr. SCOTT. I have said so.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure he feels that any kind of a declaration may be unable to save Israel if there is any aggression, a sudden aggression on the part of Egypt. The United Nations brought Israel into being. That was a declaration. We joined in that declaration. Then immediately seven hostile Arab nations converged on Israel and sought to destroy her. Israel therefore was sorely put to and had to defend herself with great difficulty. Israel may not be able to defend herself as well now as she did then because of the superiority of arms that Egypt now possesses. So that it is the arms to which we must address ourselves immediately.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the import of what the gentleman has said and I am particularly aware of the danger through the attainment of air superiority on the part of Egypt. That is why I think that what is called for here in the treatment of this matter is expedition. The sooner we act to assure the free world's security, the better.

I think at the same time we have to take at face value the statement of the Secretary of State that within a near period, within some early period, the United States should be aware of whether its steps directed toward a permanent peaceful solution are going to succeed.

The position of the State Department is, "We believe there are better solutions than are now proposed." They say that in their opinion something can be done within the near future. We say if that cannot be done, then at the very least there should be arms aid at that time. We are going to continue that position,

we are going to maintain that view to the State Department. We have stated to the Secretary of State that we would like to act as a continuing committee to keep in touch with him because, as the gentleman from New York himself has indicated, we do not look with complete trust upon the intent of the enemies of Israel. Therefore, the watchword, I think, is to be eternally vigilant day by day in the hope that an early solution will appear. I believe we will get that solution sooner if we do not at this time waste our energies in an attack on the Secretary of State, as I used to do when I attacked Mr. Acheson. Mr. Acheson and his administration never did anything for us. I think there are better ways to do it, than to make attacks on Cabinet officers, which confuse the issue with partisan politics.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that in that same conference the Secretary most emphatically made it clear that he was not ruling out the necessity of arms to Israel and that that would be very seriously reconsidered at the time when the present negotiations warranted it?

Mr. SCOTT. The Secretary made the point that what he was saying was more of a revelation and much more of a forward step than had been indicated as American policy up to that time, and, further, that the question of arms to Israel is wide open if other solutions are not arrived at. In fact, the release of arms to Israel remains very much in the picture, if peace negotiations bog down. Yes, in our call on Secretary Dulles, we succeeded in clarifying the picture and we advanced, in our opinion, chances for the solution of this problem.

FEBRUARY 3, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know many of us, in our individual capacity of Members of Congress, have been in continuing communication with the Department of State concerning the tragic increase of tensions in the Middle East. Your statement of August 26, 1955, outlined the basic concepts which could, through effective implementation, bring peace to this troubled area. In your statement, you outlined certain specific problems requiring solution in order to bring about peaceful conditions. You referred to the lack of fixed permanent boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the fear of an imbalance of power which might lead to violence on the part of one of the parties to the controversy against the other, and to the tragic plight of the 900,000 refugees whose displacement presents a continual problem.

We, therefore, proceed from the premise that you recognize the great danger to peace in the Middle East. We and the millions of constituents whom we, collectively, represent are gravely concerned about the immediate necessity for finding means to bring about a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world.

We, therefore, would like to state in further detail some of the problems which we consider need to be met by our Government and associated governments particularly Great Britain and France. Under the tripartite declaration of 1950, our Government recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of Armed Forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole." Because of a fear of growing imbalance of arms, the Government of Israel desires to purchase through private sources defensive arms strictly for purposes of self-defense. We have individually, and now collectively, taken the position that Israel as a firm part of the free world should be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her protection against aggression. What is the position of the State Department on this matter?

We do not contend that tension in the Middle East can be finally resolved by the provision of defensive arms alone. We are convinced that immediate negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world should be undertaken. These negotiations should be effectively implemented by our Government in association with those governments which joined in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

It is vital that prompt and decisive measures be taken to end the threat of war in the Near East.

To achieve this end, the negotiation of formal treaties guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations is essential but essential also is a willingness to negotiate such treaties. We believe that a treaty of peace and a guaranty of existing frontiers should be offered to all interested parties in the Middle East and should be implemented promptly as to the frontiers of that nation or those nations which accept the proposed peace terms. Otherwise we continue to be faced with the refusal of some nations to enter into peace negotiations or even to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

There are two additional matters as to which we seek information from the Department: first, we do not believe that economic aid should be extended to any nation which is engaging in warlike or aggressive maneuvers against any part of the free world. Therefore, we would like to go on record as urging our Department of State to consider most carefully further extension of economic aid, denying such aid to those countries which by their actions endanger the peace and security of free nations. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

Second, we agree with your August 26, 1955, statement concerning the immediate desirability of economic and technical help in resettling those Arab refugees whose continued presence in their present location delays or impedes the possibility of a total solution of the Arab-Israel problem. What progress has been made by our Government and associated nations toward the solution of this matter?

We recognize that the continuing effort of our Government to counter the spread of world communism has many facets. Action taken anywhere may have repercussions in all parts of the world. But we do urgently feel that our constituents will be better informed by frank statements of the position of the Department of State wherever that is possible, consistent with national security. As Members of Congress, who support the aims and objectives of this administration, we are particularly anxious that our constituents be advised that the Department is taking positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world.

We would much appreciate an early response to this urgent expression of our concern.

HUGH SCOTT, 6th District, Pennsylvania; ALBERT P. MORANO, 4th District, Connecticut; KENNETH B. KEATING, 38th District, New York; EDMUND P. RADWAN, 41st District, New York; JAMES G. FULTON, 27th District, Pennsylvania; THOMAS M. PELLY, 1st District, Washington; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, 6th District, Washington; KARL M. LECOMPTE, 4th District, Iowa; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, 35th District, New York; ALBERT W. CRETELLA, 3d District, Connecticut; HOWARD H. BAKER, 2d District, Tennessee; HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., 2d District, Connecticut; TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, 11th District, Illinois; ALVIN M. BENTLEY, 8th District, Michigan; LAURENCE CURTIS, 10th District, Massachusetts; GORDON CANFIELD, 8th District, New Jersey; ROBERT W. KEAN, 12th District, New Jersey; JOHN P. SAYLOR, 22d District, Pennsylvania; JOSEPH L. CARRIGG, 10th District, Pennsylvania; STUYVESANT N. WAINWRIGHT, 1st District, New York; STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, 2d District, New York; FRANK J. BECKER, 3d District, New York; FRANCIS E. DORN, 12th District, New York; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, 28th District, New York; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, 32d District, New York; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, 34th District, New York; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, 39th District, New York; THOMAS B. CURTIS, 2d District, Missouri; JAMES T. PATTERSON, 5th District, Connecticut; WILLIAM E. MILLER, 40th District, New York; ROBERT J. CORBETT, 29th District, Pennsylvania; JACKSON B. CHASE, 2d District, Nebraska; PAUL A. FINO, 25th District, New York; RUTH THOMPSON, 3d District, Michigan; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, 15th District, California; DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., 17th District, New York; CARROLL D. KEARNS, 24th District, Pennsylvania; DONALD L. JACKSON, 16th District, California; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., 5th District, New Jersey.

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of February 3. I share your concern at the continuing tense situation in the Near East, and at the persistent threat it represents to the peace. Let me say that the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

The Government of Israel, feeling that its peaceful existence is threatened by the large amount of arms now made available to certain Arab countries by the Soviet bloc, desires to purchase from the United States and other countries additional armament to balance what it considers to be the increased threat against it.

The United States recognizes that current developments could create a disparity in armed force between Israel and its Arab neighbors. However, we are not convinced that that disparity can be adequately offset by additional purchases of arms by the State of Israel. Israel has a population of under 2 million, whereas the Arab population amounts to tens of millions, and they apparently have been offered access to huge stores of Soviet bloc material. Under this circumstance the security of Israel can perhaps better be assured by means other than an arms race.

The having in hand, by Israel, of equal or superior arms is not the only deterrent to aggression. Israel is a creation of, and mem-

ber of, the United Nations; the Arab States are also members, and all are solemnly bound by that Charter to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. The United Nations organization is capable of providing many forms of protection. Furthermore, the United States in 1950 joined with the United Kingdom and France to declare a policy of action within and without the United Nations to deter aggression by either side against the other. United States policy in that respect has recently been reemphasized in the statement issued on February 1, 1956, by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden. The combined influence of the nations which would, under the United Nations Charter and the Tripartite Declaration, be against any armed aggression is a far more effective deterrent to any potential aggressor than any amount of arms which could be obtained by either side.

We do not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel. But it is our belief that the security of states in the Near East cannot rest upon arms alone but rather upon the international rule of law and upon the establishment of friendly relations among neighbors. We are actively working toward the establishment of such relations.

In my speech of August 26, 1955, made with President Eisenhower's concurrence, I referred to the fear and tension arising in the area from the lack of fixed permanent boundaries and indicated United States willingness to assist the parties in substituting agreed frontiers for armistice lines. To encourage the parties to work toward such agreement and to assure them that the United States would be prepared to make its contribution to the maintenance of international respect for such boundaries, I stated that the President would recommend that the United States participate in an international guarantee of agreed frontiers. That statement still stands.

You inquire about economic aid. United States policy in the extension of economic aid is based upon the desire to strengthen other free nations. In the case of each aid program we take into account the nature of the project in question and the purpose for which it was intended. I can assure you that United States aid would not be extended for purposes or under circumstances which we judged would undermine peace in any part of the world.

The Arab refugees remain perhaps the most important single source of bitterness existing between the Arab States and Israel. In my speech of August 26, 1955, I proposed that the problem of the Arab refugees be attacked in several ways. I suggested United States participation in an international loan to Israel to assist her in funding her obligation to pay compensation for property left in Israel by the refugees and which is now being utilized by Israel. I recommended assistance to Israel and the Arab States in the rehabilitation of the refugees both by repatriation to Israel to such extent as might be feasible and resettlement in adjoining Arab States. In this connection the Arab States and Israel have accepted, on a technical basis, the Jordan Valley plan which would provide new economic opportunities for several hundred thousand refugees. But final political approval remains to be achieved. Thus, some progress has been realized, but much remains to be done.

I know that you all understand that it is not practical, or in the interest of the goals we seek, to discuss publicly all of the factors involved in this complicated situation. I know you also recognize that the problems of this area must be studied in the larger context of the free world's unceasing struggle against international communism. I have, however, no hesitation in declaring that the United States, seeking for itself to avoid involvement in war, is earnestly striving as a friend of both Israel and its Arab neighbors to relieve the present tension in the area. If the political and economic developments should subsequently become such as to make congressional action desirable or necessary, the President would, of course, promptly communicate with the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. However, I want to point out I made that statement in my opening remarks prior to yielding to other Members. I do want to bring out this point that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I took a trip to Europe with a subcommittee and it was only there in Europe that we learned of the Czech-Egyptian arms deal. That is in the record of the subcommittee. It was known to the Department of State as a rumor in the spring. I think it should have been brought to the attention of the House during the session last year. I also feel that had it been brought to the attention of the House, we might have, which I also wrote into the report of th subcommittee, we might have and we should have called off and postponed the Foreign Ministers' Conference in the fall and thus show to the world the insincerity of the Russians.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. We all appreciate the intense interest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has had in this problem all through the years and his very sincere approach to it. We all appreciate how important it is that peace negotiations in a delicate situation such as this be carried on behind the scenes, but I would like to have the House advised about, and if it cannot be answeerd orally at least to have the record completed by supplying for the record, a single instance where the Secretary of State has said to the head of any of the Arab States that the United States as a part of our foreign policy guarantees the integrity of the State of Israel. I think that should be made clear—not to us—not to a press conference, but to the Arab States. Now, if we can supply that for the record, I think we will have moved forward a long way. Can that be supplied?

Mr. SCOTT. I would answer the gentleman by saying that, in effect, that is exactly what was accomplished by the tripartite declaration.

Mr. MULTER. That, too, I am sorry to say is not a declaration to the heads of the Arab States. Let us have a statement from the Secretary of State to the heads of these Arab States that this is it.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman also said that in August of 1955.

Religious Persecution in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Boston who regard religious oppression behind the Iron Curtain with profound sorrow and dismay have forwarded to me the following statement with regard to the situation in the Ukraine. I desire to bring it to the attention of the Congress and include it under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December 1917 Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the estern provinces of this country. The Soviets were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terrorized the people with threats of exile, torture, and death.

First, the Communists attacked the church in eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as, for example, the Golden Domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters, and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity.

Though article 123 of the Soviet Constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U. S. S. R. explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of western Ukraine (1939–41), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This anti-Christian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christianity in Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1946, the Soviets arrested the Metropolitan of Halych and Archbiship of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. SS. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more,

when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops' term expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic Bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the "Church of the Catacombs," as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to achnowledge the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—this church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave labor camps. The Reds exterminated all 5 dioceses of the Ukraine Catholic Church, desecrated 4,440 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church and faith.

Our Mental Health Program—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, proper care and more attention to individuals can result in a decrease in the number of patients confined in hospitals for the mentally ill all over the country. The following article, the fifth in a series on the mentally ill which appeared in the Amarillo Globe-Times, illustrates what can be accomplished when a State tackles the problem realistically:

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—72 YEARS IN A STATE HOSPITAL AND SHE WAS NEVER CRAZY

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

The little white-haired woman who walked from the Topeka State Hospital last spring had a doubtful distinction.

She had spent more years in a State hospital for the insane than any other American. But she was never insane.

At 85, she had spent 72 years in the Topeka institution. She was 13 years old when she became the 313th patient, only 3 years after the hospital doors opened.

"Pale, fair health, is cross, talks foolishly," reports the admission card for No. 313.

The cause of insanity? The card says "Sincerity and love of truth and finding that nearly everything was a lie."

But the child never received any treatment. She simply sat out the years. As late as 1927, records show she was alert and understanding.

In the years afterward a wall of silence grew. When the staff was reorganized in 1948, even she could help little to trace her history.

She was too old to support herself—this child born in 1869. She could not get old-age assistance. Even residency requirements under the law could not be proved.

But a persistent social worker went to the history books and found the record of her family. Her father was an author and public official. Her case was reviewed, and the assistance check was granted.

So in the spring of 1955—72 years too late—she walked out of Topeka State Hospital for the Insane and went to a nursing home to spend her last years, an old lady as entitled to her pension checks as any other Kansan. (This could happen in Texas, too. Hundreds of our patients have never been diagnosed.)

PATIENT POPULATION DROPS

Today every worker in the Kansas State hospitals is dedicated to the goal of finding the best solution to the individual problem—the patients are not statistics; they are individuals. With no more attention than this, many a patient is kept from becoming chronically ill.

It is well understood that in mental cases, as in surgery, speed in treatment is essential. Adequate treatment from the admission date can bring about a 90-percent chance of recovery, which in 5 years drops to less than a 5-percent chance.

In 1948, for every 3 patients admitted into Kansas hospitals, only 1 left cured or improved. In other words, 2 out of 3 were accepting a life sentence. In Kansas today 82 percent of first admissions are released in the first 6 months.

Within the Topeka hospital the average daily patient load dropped from 1,844 to 1,422 in 5 years. Including the other two Kansas hospitals, the overall daily population in Kansas mental hospitals dropped from 5,148 to 4,551.

But it took skilled workers to accomplish these results: In 1949 there were 2 physicians in the Topeka unit; today there are 24. Psychologists increased from 1 to 7, social workers from 0 to 12, nurses from 5 to 40, therapists for 0 to 24, psychiatric aids from 125 to 140.

The successful dismissal program can be traced directly to such a staff-patient ratio. As the number of staff members has grown steadily the number of patient dismissals has grown as steadily.

OUT OF THE SHADOWS

The staff did not concentrate all of its attention on new admissions. It rediagnosed (unfortunately, in many cases, made the first diagnosis) those already in the hospitals. Some of these, like the little 85-year-old woman, had spent most of their lives in the institution.

Typical of the cases dismissed is a 76-year-old woman who had been in the hospital for 20 years. After a short stay in a nursing home, she was able to get out and find an apartment of her own and at 78 is living satisfactorily in her own home.

Another woman who had been in Topeka for 20 years had not spoken a word for the past 8 years. Her doctor, a young man, refused to be discouraged. He went on talking to her until she answered. Gradually she began to get well. Today she is a practical nurse making a good living, after spending 22 years in a State hospital because no one ever took enough interest to talk to her.

Sent back to Denmark was a man who was in the Kansas Hospital for 19 years because he couldn't speak English. After a brush with a law he didn't understand, he was sent to the hospital because he couldn't tell in precise English that he didn't understand the law. At the hospital, he couldn't find the English words to explain that he wasn't sick.

TEXAS COULD SAVE, TOO

In 1954, of the 1,000 patients discharged from Topeka Hospital, 55 had been in the hospital a total of 1,331 patient years. (Had those patients been in Texas hospitals, based on the cost of $2.13 per day, they would have cost the State $1,034,785.95. Since the other 945 patients released in Kansas in 1954 had an average stay of less than 2 years in the hospital, Texas will save more than $1 million on 55 such patients, if a program similar to that of Kansas is instituted.)

Since the courts are not involved in the original commitment proceedings of a patient—no more than in the treatment of an ulcer in a general hospital—the superintendent of the hospital signs the dismissal order, which carries full return of civil rights. If a jury trial has preceded admission, the person is returned to the court's jurisdiction. In the case of the criminally insane, when sanity is established, the patient is returned for trial on the original charge, if the charge was insanity at the time of the commission of the crime, rather than established insanity afterward. One hospital, Larned, houses the criminally insane of Kansas.

Of course, patients may leave the hospitals without such final dismissal orders. They may go out on a parole, or into boarding and nursing homes, or report only for outpatient treatment, but they remain in the custody of the Department of Social Welfare—of which the Kansas State hospitals are an arm—until rehabilitation is believed complete.

By Kansas law, no patient who is violent, dangerous, or unusually troublesome or filthy shall be released or returned to any county not provided with suitable facilities for the proper care of the patient.

It is obvious that Kansas hospitals, therefore, are not clearing out their patient load by that good old human method of passing the buck.

MANY ON PAROLE

If a man has been actually ill for a long time, it is expected he may have to learn to walk again when he leaves his hospital bed. If his leg has been broken, he may well limp a little the rest of his life. If he were to return to his job and find that his coworkers gather around the water fountain and whisper "That man has been ill" with overtones of fear, apprehension and even cruelty, he might well return to his sick bed.

Now, people act exactly the same after mental illness as they do after physical illness. But because of the group that always gathers around the water fountain, the State hospital workers have to be sure the person who has been mentally ill is well enough to tolerate such reaction.

Therefore, many people go out on parole, as it were. Others actually return to the hospital to spend the nights after they take their first jobs.

Boarding homes are used for those who do not require hospital treatment or the more costly care of a nursing home. Boarding and nursing home operators and their workers come into Topeka State Hospital for 6 days of intensive training. Many come with an irrational fear of the patients they are to take, but they leave after an educational program knowing, as do staff members, that very few of the patients are violent. The patients who are sent into these boarding homes and nursing homes are for the most part the aged, but the homes also serve rehabilitated patients as way stations from the hospital back to normal community life.

Social workers in the counties are used in the follow-up work of dismissal patients, when the hospital social workers release the patients. In many cases, these are the same social workers who persuaded a man to voluntarily commit himself or assisted the probate judge in placing the patient in the hospital for the 90-day observation period.

The Kansas system is integrated and the pay-off is a steadily reduced patient-load cost; a high rate of rehabilitation; and among the community centers, training schools, day hospitals and out-patient clinics, much mental illness is prevented.

DEATH RATE DROPS

There is another form of dismissal from a State hospital, death. The death rate of patients in the Kansas hospitals virtually was halved in the first 4 years, and in the past 2 years it has been cut another 24 percent. This can only come from improved medical care.

Of the 66 who died in 1954 in the Topeka hospital, 50 were 65 years of age or over. Of this number, 30 died from one cause—cerebral arteriosclerosis and senile disease, a combination of physical and mental causes that add up to plain old age.

(The Texas Research League noted the manner in which cemeteries for those who had died in Texas institutions were kept—in many cases so poorly that no one knows exactly how many persons were buried during the past year. Burial procedures are extremely informal, says its 1954 report.)

WHAT LOCAL CLINIC COSTS

Here is a sample of a community psychiatric clinic, as worked out by the National Association for Mental Health:

Salaries:	
Psychiatric-director	$12,000
Clinical psychologist	5,000
Chief psychiatric social worker	5,000
Psychiatric social worker	3,600
Office manager and secretary	3,000
Stenographer	2,600
Total	31,200
Rent	2,000
Heat, light, water	300
Telephone and telegraph	400
Stationery and office supplies	300
Postage	100
Insurance	250
Social security	300
Retirement	1,000
Conference travel	300
Repairs and replacement to equipment	150
New equipment	100
Educational supplies and toys	150
Dues	100
Publications	75
Miscellaneous	200
Total	36,925

The Non-Russian Nations of U. S. S. R. in the Current World Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the strategic importance of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union to the free world is a matter of common knowledge in many of our universities and private and public agencies. Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Georgia, Armenia, North Caucasia, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, and Idel-Ural, once formerly independent nations, now constitute the first ring of captive nations in the Russian Communist empire. On the basic theme of Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism, we have not as yet made the strongest possible appeal to the peoples of these captive non-Russian nations whose desire for restored independence and national self-determination is unsurpassed anywhere in the world today.

Presenting several concrete ideas on the appeal that could be made is an address delivered last fall by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Major portions of this interesting address have appeared in the Courier, publication of the internationally renowned School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. I wish to submit into the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of this address on the non-Russian nations of U. S. S. R. in the current world picture:

THE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS OF U. S. S. R. IN THE CURRENT WORLD PICTURE

It is a veritable privilege for me to be given this opportunity to address the Pan-American Ukrainian Conference which in its august representation encompasses the greater part of this continent and the largest nations of Latin America. Within the limited time allotted to me I should like to dwell on a subject that only in recent years has attained to international status of discussion and about which in the past few months certain baseless doubts have emerged. In developing this critical subject in succinct outline the orientation is established from my own vantage point in Washington and in the States generally, but the prime aim is to indicate the boundless possibilities that are opening up for the spirited endeavors of each of our organizations and certainly for this Conference in its work through the United Nations in the immediate future. For, contrary to the obtuse thinking of some, the position of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. in the current world picture—particularly that of Ukraine, the largest of these nations—is both promising and bright.

This, in substantial measure, is both the fruit of our recent intensified efforts and, at once, a formidable challenge to our continued imaginative endeavors and plans. If, perchance, I appear to wax a bit too optimistic, forgive me. But if you are in with a stalwart and patriotic American group that for the good of all knows what it wants, that with patience and perseverance fights for what it wants, and that in justice and truth is confident it will obtain what it wants, then this is not even optimism but rather hopeful wisdom. It is in the luminous spirit of this hopeful wisdom that many are by conviction and passion committed to the noble goal of the liberation and independence of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. It is in this spirit that they pragmatically view the final collapse of the colossus of the Russian empire, now in the immediate form of the Soviet Union, as indispensable to the lasting security interests of the United States, as prerequisite to the foundation of permanent peace with freedom and justice among all nations, and as crucially essential to the real independence and freedom of the minority Russian nation in the U. S. S. R. from centuries of autocratic totalitarianism, political tyranny and costly imperialist adventures. It is in this reassuring spirit that the prospect of the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. is viewed with stimulating hope and sound wisdom.

WHAT WE STRONGLY BELIEVE

It goes almost without saying that in any field of studied interest the ability to discern and assess real possibilities and prospects presupposes a vivid awareness of the flexible realities of the field in its manifold ramifications. So in this particular field, complicated and complex as it is in its interrelationship with the free destiny of human existence itself. In truth, there exists no other ground but this for what I have called hopeful wisdom. It is from this firm "hopeful wisdom." It is from this firm ground that we can properly characterize as peculiarly emotional the notion—which has even spread into many emigre quarters—that present developments spell the abandonment of the captive nations in the Russian Communist empire, that concrete coexistence and the status quo between free nations and Communist-enslaved nations are in the making, that the once heralded American policy of liberation is only a faint echo of the 1952 presidential campaign. This is a notion of unbridled emotion than of considered analytic thought. It is a notion that springs from the inability of some of to see beyond their long cherished beliefs the emergent possibilities of the current world situation which, to be sure at great risk, might be realized for the very materialization of their innermost hopes and beliefs.

The essentials in which we believe are in no way altered by the transient changes of the current world picture. Formed by study, experience and moral conviction, these essentials of guiding belief are as follows:

1. That, in historical perspective, there can be no genuine peace in our time without the compelling expansion of freedom—freedom realized for all nations and peoples, especially those entombed in the very fortress of imperial Communist totalitarianism, the Soviet Union itself. The pressures of freedom are no respecters of borders, be they the present ones or the pre-1939 ones in eastern Europe. The advocacy of this belief is by no means discouraged by present developments. On the contrary, present world developments provide food for the expanded advocacy and realization of this grounded belief;

2. That the peace offensive of Moscow is a colossal Red masquerade to gain time in order to meet the long-anticipated problems of empire consolidation, to augment toward relative superiority their weapons of nuclear warfare, to sow seeds of disunity among the free nations, and to strengthen their subversive network of world conspiracy. Few Americans can take pride in the adolescent statements of some of our legislators—"the 9-day Russian experts"—who toured the Soviet Union. However, we are grateful for the sobering observation of the Honorable PATRICK HILLINGS, of California, who came, who saw, and then concluded that Moscow's peace offensive is "the biggest con act in history." As a member of the former Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, Congressman HILLINGS could not be fooled for he had learned too much. For him as for others the outstanding fact, so far, is that no real, conclusive evidence can be advanced to justify the genuineness of Moscow's exhibited desire for peace. The expendable frills of farm delegations, sports events, congressional tours, the cession of Finnish real estate, amnesty to political prisoners in the U. S. S. R., the release of German, American, and other war prisoners and so forth can scarcely be counted as real, substantial evidence. Some may construe this as only the beginning and we, in good conscience, cannot deny such hope. Yet at the same time neither can they deny us this opportunity to press critically for demonstrations of real evidence and impressive tests of the much advertised Russian Communist desire for peace and civilized relations;

3. That a peaceful policy of liberation, founded, as it is, on a fixed moral commitment to all the captive nations, is alone in the best interests of our country and the free world. It is a dynamic policy of innovation—the innovation of free institutions—as against one of reckless evolution as expounded by Mr. Kennan and some of his followers in our Government. In almost subservient alacrity to the misleading goddess of evolution, Mr. Kennan writes, "Evolution occurs everywhere, if only as response to change in physical conditions—alterations in population and resources and tech-

nology. Does anyone really suppose that a nation could undergo so violent a process of technological change as has marked the Soviet Union in these past decades and yet remain unaffected by its social and political life" (Realities of American Foreign Policy, p. 92)? Now, isn't it really strange that after these many years of American public enlightenment on the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R., a man who is supposed to be an expert on Soviet affairs should persist in obscurantizing this truth by implying that the Soviet Union is a nation? Furthermore, for these familiar with the most advanced trends of thought in the social sciences, his intellectualist appeal to evolution in our relations with the totalitarian empire of the Soviet Union can be accurately dated some 30 years behind our time. Innovation and the moral responsibility of men and governments for their acts are the paramount forces recognized in our day. To pray at the altar of evolution for the conversion of Russian Communists to the good by technological change revives some of the romanticism one can find in the writings of Thorsten Veblen. It contributes not to the realities of American foreign policy but rather to its unrealities. The present world picture allows for considerable innovation that a peaceful policy of liberation alone is capable of—to innovate freedom for true world peace; and

4. We strongly believe that this phase of world events is another chapter—indeed, the most hazardous and tenuous—of the cold war. It is not, as some wishfully hope, a new period succeeding the cold war. Here, too, it is most significant that all of the frills staged by Moscow are speedily exploited by its far-flung apparatus for propaganda and psychological warfare reasons. Only witness the propaganda usage of its generous cession of Finnish real estate the other day, bases without strategic value and, to boot, not even Russian property. This founded conception of present world events, as another chapter of the cold war, fundamentally guides us as to what we can powerfully do and still be utterly consistent with the essentials of our beliefs. In short, and in great essence, our challenging task now is to innovate and generate pressures of freedom against not only the outlying portions of the Russian Communist empire but also, and more importantly so, against the very heart of this empire, namely the Soviet Union. Thus, with this broad understanding, who can fail to see the buoyant opportunities and the bright and promising picture that surround today the position of the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R.?

WHAT WE CAN POWERFULLY DO

The general approach to this challenging task is necessarily a pragmatic and flexible one, adapted to the fluctuating circumstances of the international scene and constantly poised in the direction of capitalizing on them. Within the limits of this address allow me to cite only a few of the solid directions in which our combined efforts may be channeled. They may be grouped as follows:

1. Primarily to all else, the continued expansion of our educational and informational work on Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. As many of you know, in the United States tremendous strides have been made in this respect. Beyond question of doubt, the most authoritative source of public opinion and judgment on this vital subject is the disclosures and reports of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, otherwise internationally known as the Kersten Committee. In a democracy such as ours, foreign policy adjusts itself in time to the will of the people and nowhere is this will more clearly crystalized than in the elected representatives of the people. The work of this former committee is being steadfastly carried on through the measures, addresses, and various other activities of its many members for whom freedom is indivisible and cannot be restricted to only 1 or 2 sectors of the Russian Communist empire. For example, Congressman Dodd recently showed many of his colleagues and the general public that the record of Russian Communist violation of treaties and pacts extends back to the Russian imperialist conquest of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and the other non-Russian nations in the period following World War I.

Our determined fight against the unsound and unrealistic restriction of freedom to the so-called satellite countries must continue unabated. It has contributed to solid results these past few months. Our good friend, the Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, definitely saw to it that his resolution on opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism (H. Con. Res. 149) was generally inclusive for it to be the sense of Congress—

"That the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world."

Passed by Congress unanimously, this resolution was accompanied by Senate Resolution 127 on the restoration of sovereign rights of self-government to the enslaved peoples, which also embraces by thought and direct implication all of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. Likewise in unanimous passage, it resolves—

"That the Senate proclaim the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter."

Equally salutary was the address delivered last month by President Eisenhower before the American Bar Association. As an overdue response to the mounting pressure against the lulling effects of the dubious spirit of Geneva, his address emphasizes that true peace cannot be had without justice and freedom, which, incidentally, was the poignant theme of our memorandum to him before Geneva, and states that the "domination of captive countries cannot longer be justified by any claim that this is needed for purposes of security" (New York Times, August 25, 1955). The term of captive countries or nations is the only accurate and consonant one with the realities of the entire Russian Communist empire—indeed, with the concept of indivisible freedom itself.

2. The skillful initiation and development of measures bearing on Ukraine and Byelorussia, especially from the point of view of their representation in the United Nations. It is heartening to note the views of Edward Weintal, a Newsweek correspondent who attended the Geneva Conference and now observes that "Serious American thought also must be given to the nationally conscious Soviet components such as the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The fact that these two nations have their own representatives in the United Nations has never been properly utilized by the United States. To encourage their independence and to strive for the decentralization of the Soviet Union into its separate though not necessarily unfriendly components is likely to become one of the chief United States objectives" (Newsweek, August 29, 1955). It is evident that our past concentration on this matter, as demonstrated in the House hearing on United States diplomatic representation in Ukraine and Byelorussia, and in Senate hearings on United Nations Charter revision, was not without results. The idea of diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia is still attractive to many of our legislators and executive officers. The idea of testing the secession right in the Soviet constitution also intrigues many. There are innumerable other ideas, such as the foundation of American institutes in Ukraine, the publication and distribution of American papers and periodicals in the native Ukraine language, that can be pursued in the spirit of expanded freedom.

3. Systematic opposition to the liberalization of trade with the Russian Communist Empire without political concessions in return. Last winter and spring we were engaged in this battle and along with others succeeded in forestalling measures calculated to expand trade and ship American farm surpluses to the Soviet Union. Since Geneva business pressure in the United States has been mounting and the next session of Congress promises to be in a more sanguine mood for liberalized trade. Our efforts will be pitted on an economic leverage for political concessions in the name of expanded freedom.

4. Persistent pressure toward the abolishment of the Iron Curtain. The very existence of the Iron Curtain is a mockery to the concept of peaceful coexistence of nations. Greater social and cultural intercourse with peoples in all areas of the Russian Communist Empire should and could be developed. An official delegation to Vorkuta, made up of knowledgeable people who would know what to look for, is just one example of the implementation of the pressures for freedom.

5. The expansion and improvement of our informational services to the nations behind the Iron Curtain. Contrary to the myopic suggestions of some on the supposed need of contraction, present developments necessitate the expansion of such services, today more than ever. The opportunities of the present, which might be highlighted by the pressure for Soviet cessation of radio jamming, should not be missed, and it is with this thought in mind that we wholeheartedly support the Feighan resolution (H. J. Res. 433) which seeks to achieve these very things.

These are only a few general directions open to us in the conduct of our work and toward the realization of our set objectives. These do not involve, as Mr. G. V. Ferguson, the editor of the Montreal Star, naively believes, "the feuds of Europe to be perpetuated inside (your) borders" or ours. They bear on issues that today encompass the globe. If Mr. Ferguson were more informed on these issues, and someone here should see to it that he is, he certainly would not have written such patent untruths as that "The Ukrainians have never achieved any extended period of national identity and have never been able to accomplish their dream of a separate Ukrainian state"; or that Canadian Ukrainians are violently anti-Russian, instead of anti-Russian Communist: or that the recent Russian visitors are a "harmless group of agricultural scientists and managers * * *" (Washington Post, September 11, 1955). Perhaps the demonstrations here were more enthusiastic than what we staged in the United States. In both instances, however, they symbolized a living conscience against the crimes and the designs of imperialist Russian communism that threaten the security of all free nations, including Canada.

To maintain this living symbol of moral opposition and to work in terms of pressures of freedom require the full resources of united action. In addition to these other opportunities, present developments provide us with the much needed opportunity to bolster and extend our respective unity and

our united action for the certain events that lie ahead. We would prove derelict of duty to fail in the seizure of this opportunity. Such unity and action we possess in the States and we mean, with all the power of moral responsibility, to preserve it. Such unity and action are necessary among groups in Europe and we mean, with all our power of moral suasion, to contribute to it. Such virile unity and action are now more than ever required in this Pan American Conference and we mean, with all reciprocal moral and financial support, to acheive it. Our people look to such expression of leadership and we are determined to serve them and the overriding convictions that possess all of us.

Was 1955 a Boom Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have read the economic report of the President with great interest, particularly that portion which deals with the problems of small business. As a member of the Select Commttee on Small Business, I would at this time like to make the following statement concerning our general economic situation and the plight of small business during the 3 years of the present administration as revealed by the President's economic report.

WAS 1955 A BOOM YEAR?

The economic report of the President reveals that in the last 3 years our country has—

(a) Failed to maintain the rate of economic growth which took place in both war and postwar periods.

(b) Brought about a rapid inflation of prices in the big-business industries and an offsetting deflation in the more competitive segments of the economy, namely the farm and small business segments.

(c) Resulted in very little increase in productive capacity but in greatly increased corporate profits, at the expense of farmers and consumers.

(d) Resulted in the greatest increase in the Federal debt of any peacetime period in history, as well as the greatest increase in consumer debt and in the debt of State and local governments of any like period in either peace or war.

Rates of economic growth

	3 years, 1952 to 1955	3 years, 1949 to 1952
	Percent	*Percent*
Gross national product in 1955 prices	8.4	21.2
Per capita personal income in 1955 prices, after taxes	7.0	7.3

In 1955 the gross national product, which is the value of all goods and services produced in the Nation, was only 8.4 percent greater than in 1952. This represents an average growth of 2.8 percent per year in the 3 years of this administration. The Nation's output of goods and services would have to increase between 3 and 3.5 percent per year just to keep up with increasing productivity per man-hour of work, to say nothing of the effects of increasing population and increased numbers of people working.

In the last 3 years of the Truman administration, 1949 through 1952, the gross national product increased 21.2 percent, or an average yearly rate of 7.1 percent. Similarly the growth between 1939 and 1952 was 6.8 percent per year. The above comparisons are all based on goods and services valued at 1955 prices.

The 1955 per capita personal income, after taxes, also failed to keep pace with the growth in the Truman and Roosevelt administrations. The comparisons shown in the economic report in terms of 1955 prices reveal that the 1955 per capita income, after taxes, was 7 percent above 1952, which was equal to a yearly increase of 2.3 percent. Also in 1955 prices, there was a 3.6 percent average yearly increase in per capita income between 1939 and 1952.

Big corporations were the beneficiaries in the 1955 boom

[Dollars in billions]

	1955	1952	Percent change from 1952
CORPORATIONS			
Corporate profits, after taxes	$41.4	$36.9	+12
Corporate depreciation and amortization allowances [1]	$14.5	$10.4	+39
Dividend payments	$11.1	$9.0	+23
Stock prices (December index)	$333.6	$203.4	+64
Big manufacturers' profit rate [2] percent	14.1	11.1	+27
Small manufacturers' profit rate [2] percent	6.4	11.4	−39
PERSONAL INCOME			
Income from interest	$15.6	$12.3	+27
Salaries and wages	$215.4	$190.5	+13
Proprietors' income	$27.3	$25.7	+6
Farm income	$11.1	$14.3	−22

[1] Excludes banks and insurance companies.
[2] Annual rates of profits, after taxes, as percent of stockholders' investment, 1st 9 months of 1952 compared with 1st 9 months of 1955—corporations with more than $100 million of assets and corporations with less than $¼ million of assets.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five was a boom year—the greatest in history—for the big corporations. Compared to 1952 total corporate profits, after taxes, increased $4.5 billion, or 12 percent, despite the fact the profits of smaller corporations were way below 1952.

In addition, industrial and utility corporations alone had another $4.1 billion of increased income from depreciation and amortization allowances, largely as a result of the 1953 and 1954 changes in the tax laws—income from depreciation and amortization for banks and insurance companies is not reported.

Corporations paid out 23.3 percent more in dividends, and the price of corporate stocks was 64 percent higher at the end of 1955 than at the end of 1952.

Small-business profits since 1952 have, however, fared much like farmers' income. In the first 9 months of 1952, profits of manufacturing corporations with less than one-fourth million dollars of assets were at an annual rate of 11.4 percent of stockholders' investment. Profits of the giant manufacturing corporations—those with more than $100 million of assets were at a corresponding rate of 11.1 percent. In the first 9 months of 1955, the profit rate, after taxes, of the smaller corporations had dropped 39 percent, while the rate for the giant corporations had gone up 27 percent.

Other comparisons between 1955 and 1952 were as follows:

With the higher interest rates, persons who received personal income from interest received 26.8 percent more such income.

Labor income increased 13 percent although there were 3 percent more people employed.

Proprietors' income, from professions and unincorporated business increased only 6.2 percent.

Farm income dropped 22.4 percent.

The administration has claimed that the changes it has brought about in corporate taxes, interest rates, and credit policies would encourage investment and increase productive capacity. Although corporate operations in 1955 took $4.5 billion more in profits after taxes, and $4.1 billion more in depreciation and amortization, than in 1952, the corporate outlays for plant and equipment—including new and replacement items—was only $2.1 billion more than in 1952.

In 1955, the total investment made in producer plant and equipment, by both corporate and noncorporate business, was only $3.6 billion more than in 1952, and most of this was taken up by increases in prices of producers' durable goods and increased construction costs. In 1952, investment in new plant and equipment was $8 billion more than 1949, and in 1948 it was $14.3 billion more than in 1945.

I have, with reluctance, concluded that it is a sorry record set out in the economic report of the President.

Debt charges

[In billions]

	3 years postwar, 1952 to 1955	3 years Korean war, 1949 to 1952	3 years postwar, 1945 to 1948
U. S. Government	+$13.4	+$10.2	−$25.8
State and local governments (net)	+12.6	+7.7	+2.5
Consumer debt	+10.4	+8.7	+8.7
Home mortgage debt	+37.7	+26.9	+14.7

The record of the national debt draws a neat distinction between promises and performance. In spite of all of the campaign promises to reduce the national debt, the Federal debt has been increased by $13.4 billion between the day this administration took office in 1953, to the end of 1955.

This staggering peacetime increase in the Federal debt has been made despite the fact that substantial assets inherited by the administration, such as the synthetic rubber plants, have been sold or otherwise separated from Federal ownership, the liquidation of which should have gone to reduce the debt. Moreover, services to the public have been severely cut back; for example, loans for small

business such as were made by RFC have been virtually stopped.

The Truman administration increased the Federal debt only $10.2 billion in the preceding 3 years, although it had the expenses of the Korean war, plus substantial economic aid and assistance to our allies in that period. In the first 3 postwar years following World War II, between the end of 1945 and the end of 1948, President Truman reduced the Federal debt by $25.8 billion. While the Federal debt has been piling up during the past 3 years, other debt obligations of the general public have been growing by leaps and bounds. The debt of State and local governments has increased by $12.6 billion; consumer installment debt and charge accounts has run up another $10.4 billion; and home mortgage debt has shot up by $37.7 billion.

The supposed economic achievements of 1955, cited in the President's report claims that these have "been accomplished without the specious aid of price inflation." That is just specious reporting of the facts. There has been a tremendous inflation in the prices of the big industries since the beginning of 1953, and most of this has taken place in the last year and a half. Faced with galloping inflation in these prices, the administration has maintained the overall buying power of the dollar by policies which have brought rapid deflation in farm and small-business prices.

Prices of steel, aluminum, copper, and other metals have jumped 16 percent since the first of 1953, and the profits in these industries last year, after taxes, was 13 percent of the stockholders' investment. Prices of all machinery and transportation equipment together have increased 9 percent, and the after-taxes profit rate in these industries last year was 15 percent.

Prices of motor vehicles have increased 6 percent, and the profit rate in this industry was 21 percent last year.

The fact that increased prices of the giant corporations have gone into increased profits is reflected in the phenomenal rise in stock prices and stock dividends. Although big business profits were already lush in 1952, they have now shot up to unparalleled levels. In the first 9 months of 1952 profits, after taxes, of the giant manufacturing corporations, those with more than $100 million of assets, were at an annual rate of 11.8 percent of stockholders' investment. In the first 9 months of 1955, their profit rate had shot up to 14.1 percent, or a 27 percent increase in the profitability of these giants, not counting about equal increases in their income resulting from the generous depreciation and amortization allowances which have been put into the tax law since 1952.

While big business prices have shot up, many small business prices have gone down. For example, prices of textiles and apparel have gone down 5 percent since the first of 1953, and the profit rate in these industries last year was only 5 percent. These are typical small-business industries. The prices received by farmers have fallen by 16 percent since the first of 1953.

The administration sponsored tax relief for the big corporations in 1953 and 1954, on the theory that these corporations would be induced to make capacity expansions, which the country needs. These tax changes, particularly dropping the excess profits tax, merely gave the big corporations an incentive for raising prices and taking more profits. The excess profits tax tended to place a ceiling on the amount of profits a corporation could take without increasing its investment. Dropping the tax removed the ceiling. The exorbitant prices and profits which have resulted have done almost nothing to increase productive capacity, but they have stimulated the big corporations to buy up and merge the capacity of smaller firms. The inevitable result will be even less competition to check prices and profits.

I do not suggest putting the excess profits tax back on the books, but I point out that it is urgently necessary to adopt a graduated corporate tax, similar to the graduated rates for personal taxes. Such a graduated rate would tend to put a ceiling on monopoly profits and at the same time encourage an expansion of smaller firms.

This or any succeeding administrations cannot continue policies of plundering our economic system, robbing the poor to fatten the rich, without bringing us to economic disaster. Feeding the poor on slick propaganda is no substitute for sound economic management.

Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Norfolk, (Va.) Journal and Guide of January 21, 1956. It concerns the issue of civil rights and the latest invention of defiance the State of Virginia proposes to counteract the Supreme Court order for desegregation of schools. It is reason for the gravest alarm on the part of our Federal Government, since the plan, which is to pass a resolution of interposition, is one which asserts the right of a State to declare null and void an act passed by the Congress of this United States. The plan is one born of a desperate drive to retard this Nation's attainment of full and impartial rights for all its citizens, but it is very evident that any success in such a proposal would establish a pattern relieving the Federal Government of authority in regulating the actions of States on other matters extending over an unlimited area. I offer it to you as further evidence of the need now for forceful action by the Federal Government to end such reckless and shameful defiance of the highest laws of this land:

INTERPOSITION DOCTRINE

Since Virginia suddenly sidetracked consideration of the Gray plan constitutional convention—at least temporarily—to ponder the notion of having the general assembly pass a resolution of interposition by which backers of the idea think that the State could avoid compliance with Supreme Court decisions on school desegregation, it is in order to clarify what the doctrine of interposition, revived from pre-Civil War days, is all about.

At least four States, Virginia, Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina, are considering resolutions of interposition by their legislatures. Delegate Boatwright offered a bill on interposition on the opening day of the current session of the Virginia Legislature. It was promptly declared to be a fantastic project by the principal antiorganization Democrat in the house of delegates, Robert Whitehead.

"Interposition is popularly equated with the doctrine of nullification," says the January issue of Southern School News, established to give nonpartisan reports on the school segregation issue.

The first proponent of the idea in this State was the Richmond News Leader, and it commented that "this plan contemplates an assertion of fundamental principles, coupled with an appeal to our sister States to decide, by ratifying or rejecting a proposed constitutional amendment, whether the power to operate racially separate public-school facilities should be prohibited to the States."

In Mississippi, however, the plan is opposed by the incoming Governor, James P. Coleman, although its chief advocates in that State are two members of its congressional delegation, a judge and a former governor.

The Cyclopedia of American Government offers the following definition of interposition:

"The Virginia resolution of 1798 declared that the powers of the Federal Government result from the compact to which the States are parties, and 'that, in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the social compact, the States, which are parties thereto, have the right and are in duty bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil' for maintaining their rights.

"What was meant by interposition? It has sometimes been asserted that it meant nothing more nor less than nullification by a single State. Madison declared, in later years, that such was not the meaning. It is not unlikely that nothing more was intended than to secure, by cooperation among the States, a general expression of opinion.

"But it is possible that the framers had in mind a convention of the States to pass upon the Constitution or that they planned authoritative interpretation by amendment."

And the New Dictionary of American Politics gives this definition of nullification, which interposition effectively is:

"An alleged right of a State in the American Union, acting in a sovereign capacity through a convention of its people, to declare an act of Congress 'null, void, and no law, not binding upon the State, its officers or citizens.'"

Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD the following article from the Norfolk, (Va.) Journal and Guide of January 28, 1956. It is

the second editorial appearing in that paper on the proposal of the State of Virginia to introduce a resolution of interposition, designed to nullify the provisions of the 14th amendment. Again, it is pointed evidence of the extent to which defiance of Federal law may go and of its threats to democratic concepts and the total pattern of American social relations:

INTERPOSITION IS NULLIFICATION

Those who are advocating interposition (nullification of the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954), are ignoring the 14th amendment entirely. True, some of them express the opinion that the 14th amendment has been incorrectly construed by the present Supreme Court. They place their own private opinions above the considered decisions of the unanimous court.

The interpositionists are bent upon invoking theories about the rights of States which were debatable issues long before the Civil War occurred, resulting in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The Civil War and the incorporation into the Constitution of these amendments cut the ground from under the doubtful validity of a State's right to interpose itself between the Government of the United States and the people of a single State or a group of States, in the matter of individual rights conferred by the United States Constitution.

It is clear that the issue which prompts the present interposition movement is one of race. The theory or contention of those who wish to interpose or to nullify is the right of States to deny certain minorities within their borders due process of law, or equal protection of the law.

Without citing them, (they are there in the records for all to examine) enough decisions were made during 25 years of Chief Justice John Marshall's tenure to firmly establish the right of the Federal Supreme Court to review the laws of the 48 States composing the Union, and to pass upon their constitutionality.

The claim that the decision of the Supreme Court on the school-segregation matter was made on a basis of sociological theses written by "foreigners" is the height of absurdity. The decision was made on the content of the 14th amendment. The States' attorneys general, especially Virginia's, used many sociological arguments in presenting their case to the Supreme Court in behalf of racial discrimination.

It is just as logical to say that the Supreme Court's legislated in 1896 when it established the doctrine of separate but equal as to say that the Supreme Court legislated or amended the Constitution in 1954.

The Constitution was originally drafted when slavery was an established, legal institution in the United States. It is unreasonable to suppose that the framers of the Constitution did not intend that it would apply to all free Americans if and when slavery was abolished; and many of the framers had disturbed consciences on the slavery question when they drafted the Constitution.

There was nothing inherent in slavery which placed upon the Government of the United States the responsibility to keep an American minority from enjoying equal protection of the laws as freemen.

There are no good reasons to suppose that the framers of the Constitution intended that the separate States should keep a minority in civil slavery after chattel slavery was abolished.

Questions now bothering Virginians are: (1) If interposition (nullification) is a part of the Gray Commission's plan, why was an extra session of the general assembly called for the purpose of authorizing a referendum on repealing a section of the State constitution?

(2) If the State intends to nullify the Supreme Court's decision by interposition, why adopt the Gray proposals?

What the general assembly is doubtless giving serious thought to is the obvious fact that interposition now would be just as much of a step toward secession as it was in 1832, the last time it was tried.

There is little sentiment in the South, other than among a few extreme racists of the Griffin, Eastland type, who would want to put themselves in the position of appearing to favor a step in that direction.

Disposition of Agricultural Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a most unusual paradox in our country today—in the midst of plenty there is want.

We are told the Government holds $8 billion in various food commodities in storage. At the same time we see hundreds of thousands of our own people subsisting on inadequate diets because they lack the income to purchase our bountiful food production.

A food stamp or certificate plan would be one excellent way for us to feed our hungry and dispose of large amounts of our stored food. I have sponsored legislation—H. R. 3773—along with other distinguished Members to accomplish this objective.

Similar legislation has also been introduced in the other body and it is my hope that this session of Congress will approve this type of program.

The legislature of the State of Michigan has come to the same conclusion and has expressed its concern on this subject in the following memorial.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have printed in the RECORD this joint resolution of the Michigan Legislature:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; and the Congress to humanely dispose of surpluses

Whereas the agricultural surpluses of the United States have risen to an alarming proportion; and

Whereas said surpluses are costing the American people a million dollars a day storage; and

Whereas said surpluses are costing the American people a tremendous sum in spoilage, depreciation and deterioration, and through other losses; and

Whereas these surpluses have tended to depress farm prices and greatly reduce the income of the farmers; and

Whereas the Federal Government and the various States of the Union are paying many people aid to dependent children, old-age benefits, and welfare assistance; and

Whereas these sums are grossly inadequate to the needs of these most deserving recipients; and

Whereas a humane disposition of these surpluses would not encroach upon the storekeeper in the regular disposition of his commodities because of lack of buying power of these deserving people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress take such steps as are necessary to distribute these surpluses as rapidly as possible to these deserving people, so that they and their children may receive the benefits of the bounties of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That these benetfis shall be distributed in such manner that no reduction shall be made in the benefits now being made to these recipients, it being the intention to make these benefits in addition to the benefits now being received through small grants of cash; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; our 2 United States Senators and 18 Congressmen; and to the county welfare departments and the county boards of supervisors of the State of Michigan.

Adopted by the senate, January 12, 1956.
Adopted by the house, January 27, 1956.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Speech Delivered by Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., the Adjutant General of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Banquet of the Polish-American Citizens League of Pennsylvania, February 5, 1956, at the Hotel Adelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

My warmest greetings fellow countrymen, so many of you of Polish descent. This is not the first time I have had the pleasure of being among you. Over 15 years ago, during the tragic days of World War II turmoil, I met with many of you at Moose Hall. I was at that time just back from the country of your forebears where I spent, as Ambassador of the United States, between 3 and 4 of the most memorable years of my life. I learned then to know Poland and the heroic Polish nation for which I shall always guard the deepest respect and affection.

The qualities which have preserved the Polish people throughout history will assist them today.

The dauntless courage which has, for centuries, characterized their spirit—their love of their native soil, their devotion to family and to God, their tenacity, and their patriotism—these qualities will survive all attempts at suppression.

The Americans of Polish extraction and the Poles who adopted the United States as their new home may well be proud of the people in the land of their forebears.

They may furthermore be justifiably proud of their important contribution toward the advancement of our Nation. It is a record of patriotism and achievement for which I have abiding admiration and respect.

The ideals and principles, to which all of us are dedicated, are not lifeless abstrac-

tions. They are living things, and like all other living things, their survival depends upon their nourishment and sustenance. This would be true, even under the least threatening of conditions. However, we live in a world in which the fundamental values that make up our priceless heritage of freedom are actively menaced. This menace is militant communism; it has economic, political, and psychological facets.

Moreover, these evil forces would, by the persecution of religion, deny the soul and its relation to God.

The danger to human freedom from power-mad, evil forces is by no means an empty one, and this in spite of recurrent peace offensives. In the world-power climate of today, the scope and magnitude of the threat with which our Nation is faced may be weighed mainly in terms of the strength of all major components of the unprecedented peacetime military power of the Soviet bloc. They may also be assessed in terms of the Soviet's fundamental attitude of hostility toward the free world in general, toward the United States in particular. And hardly less importantly, they may be measured in terms of the Communists' capability for conducting political subversion throughout the world. To fully grasp the scope of this disruptive technique, we have only to realistically evaluate what has been taking place over the past few years in a number of critical situations abroad, to recognize it as deterioration. And lest we become entangled in the trip wires of wish thinking, let us not exclude the possibility that at least part, if not all of these situations might worsen before they grow better; that consequently the thin ice, underlying the theater of cold-war operations, might turn dangerously thinner.

I have in mind the creation of certain trouble spots by Moscow and Communist China; as well as their exploitation of existing trouble in other areas. I am also thinking of a comparatively new problem, which is apt to render the cold war bitterly competitive, namely, the Soviet diplomacy of blandishments in the field of economic aid to underveloped countries.

In the past 10 years we have made great strides toward containing and countering Communist expansion. But there is still much to be done. Meanwhile, these critical trouble spots, and the problem created by the Soviet trade and aid program, urgently require the contrivance and exercise of effective measures to deal with them.

Now, a word about the Soviets' dangling of offers of assistance before the non-Communist countries.

In light of the Soviets' record of absorbing other nations, it would be only natural that their venture into the field of economic aid would be apt to incite free-world suspicion, lest the program might be aimed at enticing non-Communist countries into the Communist embrace.

It was with a great splash that the Soviets embarked last year on a trade-and-aid program, but when compared with the investment of the United States in the welfare of other countries the Soviets' contribution was incalculably small.

For this and perhaps other reasons, some may be inclined to minimize the importance of this Soviet action; they may tend to assume that the Communists would not be able to deliver the goods.

But, I think, we must not underestimate either the Communists' intentions or their capabilities.

In the past decade 14 nations and more than 600 million people have been drawn into the Communist orbit.

Hence, nations presently confronted with these Communist trade-and-aid temptations should take a good look at the record. They would find the wholesome good neighborly spirit motivating our assistance against the potentially sinister purpose behind Soviet aid. They would find that the purpose of our economic aid is not to purchase friendship, but to strengthen other countries, to enable them to remain free economically and politically of any foreign domination in order that they can remain independent members of the family of nations.

Now let us compare this with the grim fate that befell other less-fortunate countries which have become dependent for aid upon Soviet Russia. They were enveloped in the suffocating wet blanket of Communist domination. And today behind the Iron Curtain the will and actions of their peoples are controlled by the "gun in the kidneys."

And the Iron Curtain is there not merely to prevent entry, but to hold the insiders captive.

Yes; nations tempted by Soviet blandishments would be well advised to examine the record. For those, which might be considering the Communists' offers of assistance and toying with the illusory idea of coexistence, without the backing of free world collective security, would be risking the fate of becoming the "truck" with the Communists in the driver's seat. This fate is similar to that which so often befalls misguided individuals, beguiled into cooperation with the Communists. The latter find themselves rapidly involved beyond their depth; thereupon hopelessly compromised, consequently victimized by blackmail, and end up as the truck with the Communists in the driver's seat. When the truck has outworn its usefulness the driver junks it, and goes in search of another vehicle.

It is pertinent to recall what was said in 1931 before the Lenin School of Political Warfare by Soviet Diplomat Dimitry L. Manuilsky. He said: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin, by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. Then will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

This was spoken in 1931, about 25 years ago.

Since the close of World War II, we have observed the cynical, mercurial switches in Soviet foreign policy: from bluster to affability and back again to bluster. When the wave of affability, which marked the Soviet approach to the conference at the summit gave way to renewed bluster, the chief of the Soviet Union Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev, had something significant to say. He announced the approaching downfall of the free world through a worldwide triumph of communism. He, moreover, confirmed the Cominform as a boring-from-within spearhead, aimed at achieving this end by every means, including the violent overthrow of free governments. This would mean, of course, the Cominform on the outside, working hand in hand with the Moscow-controlled Communist parties and their agents on the inside of each targeted country.

As Mr. Khrushchev is the molder and spokesman of Soviet foreign policy, we should be in error to underestimate the boundless ambitions, or the formidable armed force behind his vehement utterances.

The ultimate objective of the Soviet Union's foreign policy remains global preeminence.

To the Soviets, coexistence means a temporary gap in the process of achieving ideological domination.

In our way of thinking, it implies acceptance of differing political systems.

We believe the nations of the world can live in peace and mutual acceptance of their several forms of Government, but only if there is removed the atmosphere of hate and suspicion, generated by Moscow.

A declaration by the Reds that they do not want war is not sufficient. Adolph Hitler said that. No; the most effective way to steer a course away from war is to abstain from actions that may lead to war.

It is abundantly clear that the greatest threat to the inherent rights of free men today is militant communism.

A decade ago, in Poland, I saw the Soviets operating in pursuit of their clear and oft-stated objective to secure world domination.

I saw how they cynically disregarded their stated beliefs, by allying themselves with Nazi Germany, which until then the Soviets had held up as the antithesis of all they stood for.

The record of Soviet actions, since 1939, has consistently followed in the direction indicated by the Soviet-Nazi deal to dismember Poland.

Although, from time to time, Soviet policies may have seemed to veer sharply, the fact is that they have invariably followed a single course—unscrupulous opportunism in the pursuit of extending their power, regardless of what innocent people may suffer. The fall of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, the achievement of Communist domination in China, the Berlin blockade, all provided a lesson which the aggression in Korea drove home.

The lesson is, that communism is the political tool of despotic imperialism, and is no more than any other of the historic attempts by totalitarian states to seize and extend power.

Their weapons are not limited to the rifle, the machine gun, the cannon, the atomic bomb. Besides the boring-from-within technique and coercion, their weapons include misrepresentation and falsehood, and half-truths. With these they would turn neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend.

Their methods include the probing for and exploitation of weakness, with a view to gaining a foothold and eventually control over a given area, which in turn is intended as a springboard for expansion further afield.

Experience has taught us that the imperialist-minded oligarchy, which rules the Soviet police state, does not negotiate, unless it believes it cannot lose; that a contract with the Soviets is good only as long as the Soviets consider that the contract serves its own interests. Furthermore, Moscow has shown itself capable of exchanging toasts with a smile, while brewing trouble behind our backs.

The results of the recent summit Conference at Geneva would certainly have dashed any illusions that might possibly have been entertained concerning Soviet sincerity.

In any evaluation of sincerity of their motives, we have only to recall that among the nations, which have accepted Russian nonaggression pacts, have been Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Finland, Poland, Rumania, and Nationalist China. The first three—the Baltic States—were overrun by the Soviet forces following the fall of France in 1940, and have since been incorporated into the Soviet Union. In 1939 the Red army invaded Poland and Finland. The following year the Soviets seized Bessarabia from Rumania. The Soviet's pact with Japan endured only until Germany had been defeated in 1945, at which time the Soviet forces invaded Japanese-held territory in the Far East.

Moreover, Nationalist China was invaded by Russian troops in 1945, and Russian arms helped Mao Tse-tung to conquer it. This adds up to 10 nonaggression pacts broken in 16 years—and 12 treaties of alliances

broken by the Soviet Union. Figures show that armed aggression has followed a nonaggression treaty by an average of 8½ years.

And let us not forget the promises already made, yet unfulfilled by the Soviet—promises made at Yalta, at Potsdam, at Panmunjom. Let us be mindful of these unfulfilled promises, when reading of the acts of Soviet officials traveling abroad, in the pose of the placid good neighbor, warning against the West—declaring that the Soviet Union was bent upon freeing oppressed people, and upon giving them self-government. For you and I know that the Soviet has refrained from applying these principles in the cases of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of East Germany, of Estonia, of Latvia, of Lithuania—or, for that matter, in any other countries the Soviet has brought within the clutches of its colonial structure.

The President's Christmas message to the captive nations of Europe brought forth an unjustifiable bitter tirade from No. 1 spokesman for communism, Nikita Khrushchev. His attack upon the President was an affront to the conscience of all Americans, and of all free peoples.

It revealed the Kremlin's acute sensitivity concerning this crime against the rights of peoples to choose the form of their respective governments.

The President's message, expressing, as it did, hope for the ultimate liberation of the captive nations, was clearly based upon the President's oft-stated position, that the United States intends, by peaceful means, to help attain freedom and justice for the oppressed peoples of the world.

This indeed reflects the traditional American point of view. And this point of view stems from the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, whose stirring proclamations concerning the God-given rights of free men have long thrilled the hearts of oppressed peoples wherever they might be. There would be no man today who could not understand their meaning.

Were Mr. Khrushchev willing to acknowledge the facts, he would necessarily agree that the United States, established out of revolution and a demand for freedom, has long been the source of spiritual inspiration to millions in many lands.

Lafayette said: "America's independence will implant liberty, and make it flourish throughout the world."

And Woodrow Wilson said: "The interesting and inspiring thing about America is that she asks nothing for herself except what she has a right to ask for humanity itself."

The answer lies in our basic conception of freedom and equality of opportunity.

Communism is no match for this—its aims are not to free the peoples from exploitation, but rather to maneuver them into a new form of selfish exploitation.

And let us not be misled by the Soviet's claim to have cut military spending. The Soviet's budget is far from a carefully detailed document. Hence, it affords many opportunities for disguising military expenditures.

Only when the Soviet rulers permit outsiders to scrutinize their figures, should we attach any degree of credence to Soviet propaganda concerning cuts in military expenditures.

It is possible that the Soviets are shifting from spending for outmoded means of waging war, to newer and potentially more dangerous weapons (only recently the Russians offered to furnish atomic weapons to the armed forces of the captive countries) but it is safe to say that their overall military effectiveness is unimpaired.

It would be well to write off this claim to subtly timed propaganda.

As matters stand, the dimensions of the Communist military threat are impressive. On land, on sea, and in the air, the threat from the East comprises a force in being of considerable magnitude—also, these forces are in position. And, as the decision to attack is up to the Soviets, we probably would not get very much warning.

These huge armed forces are far in excess of anything needed to defend Soviet territory.

Such are the Soviet military capabilities, and when using the term "capabilities," I do not mean to imply intentions. For intentions involve risky guesswork, potentially dangerous speculation. Soviet intentions are known only to the men in the Kremlin.

Meanwhile, the fears, engendered by the threat of the Soviet's formidable military capabilities, are exploited by the Kremlin to the advantage of its imperialistic aims.

And we know that fear is the breeding ground of suspicion and distrust; that it preaches the text of surrender, of spineless acquiescence; that it leads to the abandonment and denial of all the qualities which elevate and ennoble human life.

At this point, let me make it emphatically clear that, while we live with the constant possibility of war, that does not mean, I am convinced, that the outbreak of war is inevitable.

It is extremely important that we maintain a dignified, deliberate, cool position, whether the Soviet resorts to threats or cajolery; that while recognizing the danger of war, we remain open to all conciliatory gestures the Communists may advance, and that we continue to strive for an honorable, just, and equitable peace.

At the same time, it would be only prudent for us to be mindful of Soviet objectives, of Soviet methods, and of Soviet capabilities. For to approach negotiations, and not to bear in mind these facts of life, would be to risk being taken for a sleigh ride of unwarranted hopes, only perhaps to find ourselves headed up a blind alley of disillusionment.

What is more, in light of the historic duplicity of the Russians, and until they demonstrate a willingness to translate words into such concrete acts, as would warrant some measure of free world trust, we would be justified in insisting, as did that much quoted, sage gentleman from Missouri, that we "want to be shown."

The lesson implicit in Communist actions has been recognized by the nations of the free world for what it is. Clearly, moral suasion has no impact upon the unscrupulous.

The only effective deterrent is strength, which entails force and the capability of using it. The only world opinion, for which the Communists have any regard, is that which is so backed up.

It is this language that the leaders of militant communism understand.

Let us now briefly examine what measures we and other nations of the free world have taken to counter the overhanging threat.

Our Nation is engaged in a defense effort which dwarfs anything we have had in time of peace before. For reasonable preparedness in peacetime is essential to our hope for victory in war. At the same time we must maintain our strength—economically and psychologically, as well as militarily—so that we are prepared, if need be, to deal with whatever dangers may arise.

It is also essential to our hope for maintaining peace on acceptable terms. This is true, because successful diplomacy depends upon our ability to negotiate from a position of strength. A policy which depends for effect upon military capability becomes nothing but bluff—an obvious bluff—when the military capability for backing it up is patently inadequate.

The purpose behind our defense effort is to build up such a posture of strength as to enable us to keep the peace by deterring aggression—to make it unprofitable to attack, to forewarn a potential aggressor that an attack would be to risk national suicide—and to develop that strength to such a point that, in event we fail to deter an attack, we may meet it successfully. And, in all likelihood, we shall have to maintain this strong posture, perhaps for decades to come.

Such preparedness has taken on a greater importance than it ever had before. It is the only way, under the circumstances of our times, to insure the respect of our enemies and the confidence of our friends.

All of us know the price that has already had to be paid 3 times in less than 40 years, for our Nation's lack of military readiness, when hostilities broke out.

If we are to avoid the errors of the past, we must face up to the realities of the future.

Because of the free world's vulnerabilities in areas of contact with Communist nations, and because of the emergence of Communist China, as well as of the Soviet Union as the chief partners in the Communist bloc, and as potential aggressors, action had to be taken to fill the vacuum wherever its existence constituted a serious threat to peace and security.

The United States took steps specifically in this direction.

We have had to undertake an extensive program of military assistance to help to develop military strength in the nations located in threatened areas. In addition, we have provided forces of our own military strength in such areas, or in locations from which those areas are readily accessible.

Moreover, we do not stand alone in defense of the great cause of freedom. Recognizing the value of collective security, we joined hands with the free nations in regional defense pacts, both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific areas—and we helped to form collective strength in the Middle East.

Hence, collective security, an instrument of enlightened self-interest, forms the bulwark against possible Communist aggrandizement. It helps to protect the territory of our allies, and it protects our own territory as well. If aggression should occur, it is obviously to our own national advantage to meet it as far as possible from our own shores.

We must maintain balanced forces, not at war strength, but capable of absorbing initial blows, and capable also of providing the nucleus around which rapid expansion can take place.

Never before have the demands upon our youth and upon our veterans been greater, nor the tasks before them so worthy of their finest efforts.

Necessarily, our defense effort places a heavy obligation upon all of us, and especially upon our youth. They are required to interrupt or delay their civilian careers, to postpone their personal plans, to serve in uniform in strange lands, sometimes under hazardous conditions. But there is a compensation. That compensation is that through their service to the Nation, they are helping to guard the rights and liberties, without which there could be no free choices, no personal plans—for all that would be subservient to totalitarian authority.

This obligation and the privilege of service are not confined to our youth and to our veterans, however. Since our freedom is shared by all, it should be safeguarded by all. There are limitless opportunities for service in all forms of human endeavor.

Our people have not sought the easy way; they have placed right before convenience.

Nothing is free, and nothing worthwile is cheap.

From our forebears we inherited a priceless birthright of freedom, of justice, and equality.

We must fulfill the trust which has been passed on to us.

We must preserve this heritage and pass it on to our successors, not only unimpaired, but enriched.

It is a challenging responsibility which faces us.

Inspired by the deeds of the courageous men and women who have gone before; armed with the ideals for which our Nation stands; and strong with the determination to uphold those ideals, regardless of the personal cost, we can look to the future with courage and confidence.

Imprisonment in Communist China of Very Rev. Harold W. Rigney, of Chicago—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on July 25, 1951, after years of brave resistance as rector of Fu Jen Catholic University in Peiping to the intimidations of the Chinese Communists, the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, a native of Chicago, Ill., was arrested as an American spy and sent to imprisonment and torture that were to last for 4 long, heartbreaking years.

On September 17, 1955, Father Rigney was finally released and soon after returned to this country to travel the long road back to health in the atmosphere of freedom, and with his mother, Mrs. Addie Rigney, relatives, and friends in the back-of-the-yards council who did so much to press his case and secure his release.

Father Rigney's struggle against Communist tyranny did not end with his release, however. For the information of the free world he has written up the account of his bitter experience with the Communist terror, and the Chicago Sun-Times has been running this account as a fine public service in its news columns.

For the information of Members and others across the country, I ask unanimous consent that the first installment of this story of human courage be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR YEARS IN A RED HELL—FATHER RIGNEY TELLS OWN STORY OF TERROR

(By the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., Divine Word missionary)

"You are arrested as an American spy," said a woman member of the Sepo (security police of Communist China) who had accompanied the police to my living quarters where they had handcuffed me. As she spoke, she held up to my view a piece of paper with Chinese characters on it.

I was arrested as a spy—an American spy.

For 5 years I had fought the Chinese Communists to protect the Fu Jen Catholic University of Peiping from their infiltrations and destructive tactics. I had tried to preserve this university as a citadel of learning and culture and to keep it from being taken over by the Communist government.

These were my "crimes," the real reason for my arrest.

It happened on July 25, 1951, the day when a decision was expected on whether the cease-fire talks at Kaesong, Korea, would resume.

I had felt unwell and had taken a long rest after my noon dinner. At 3:40 p. m., I arose, intending to listen to the 4 o'clock Voice of America broadcast for the latest news of the cease-fire talks.

As I started to dress, I was startled by the sound of many men running near my living quarters. Alarmed, I looked through a window and saw helmeted policemen with tommyguns surrounding my residence.

Six of them formed in a line near the entrance to my quarters, their rifles pointed at the doors and windows. I knew then that I was going to be arrested. I had been expecting this since the Communist armies had occupied Peiping on February 1, 1949—and especially since the "people's" government of China had taken over Fu Jen University.

I was dressing as fast as I could when I heard a pounding on my door. I opened it and in a moment my modest quarters were filled with armed Sepo men.

Two seized me by the arms while others searched my bedroom and toilet. One of the guards took from me a silver medal of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a gift of my brother, that I wore around my neck. As I didn't have a shirt on, they got one from my chest of drawers and gave it to me. I was then handcuffed with my hands behind my back.

SHOWED CARDLIKE PIECE OF PAPER

The policewoman then showed me the cardlike piece of paper and spoke in Chinese and English.

"You are arrested as an American spy," she said. To this, I could only smile wryly. Another policeman took my picture.

My brain was flooded with thoughts and conjectures. Perhaps the Korean cease-fire talks had been called off; perhaps a state of declared war existed between Red China and my country and, as a consequence, I was being arrested by the Communists in retaliation against the United States.

Maybe, I thought, I would be questioned and given rough treatment for a few hours or days and then be deported like other missionaries. I was in a daze. I could not know what was in store for me.

I was led out of my quarters and ordered to stand in the compound, facing some 40 or 50 children of the parish catechism school. In the past, whenever these children saw me, they would run and surround me, holding my hands, all laughing and talking at the same time.

Now it was all so different. I looked at them, their little faces distorted and torn by strong conflicting emotions: fear of the Communist police; love and sympathy for me. They were crying, but some dutifully and fearfully clapped their hands. I blessed them, making a little sign of the cross with my right hand, handcuffed as I was, behind my back.

DRIVEN IN AMERICAN-MADE JEEP

My picture was taken again and I was ordered into an American-made jeep, with 3 or 4 police guards. The rest of the Sepo boarded a truck.

I was then driven in front of Fu Jen University where all could see me in chains.

After this, the guards drove to the Ts'ao Lan Tzu Hutung (a Peiping prison), near the national library. The jeep slowly drove through the open gate at No. 13 of the hutung. I was ordered out and placed in a small room. I wondered: What next—was I to be shot, was I to be deported immediately, or was I to be questioned and then deported?

Soon a policeman removed my handcuffs and ordered me into an office. There I was searched and my rosary, watch, fountain pen, automatic pencil, pocketknife and money were taken from me. I was given a list of these articles, which I signed first in English, then in Chinese. Lastly, my fingerprint was added to it.

I was then led through a dark and damp corridor of an old one-story building into cell No. 10. The heavy wooden door slammed behind me and was bolted.

I was in prison.

There were six other prisoners, all Chinese, in the small cell. They looked at me in silence, then motioned me to sit on the wooden kang (bed).

"What is your name?" one asked.

"Rui Ko Ni," I said, giving my name in Chinese.

"What is your nationality?"

"Mei Kuo jen (American)."

INFESTED BY RATS

I looked around the cell. It was about 11 by 10 feet. The wall was white and bare. The kang, 6 by 10 feet and a foot-and-a-half high, was made of rough boards. There was one window, about 2 by 3 feet, with heavy iron bars.

In one corner of the damp, earthen floor was a hole; rats scurried in and out of it. There was another such rathole under the kang. A strongly stinking bucket was used as a urinal and in emergency cases for bowel movements. In the center of the ceiling was a single light of 15 candlepower.

Under the kang were two small bowls. One was for drinking water and the other for food which was usually "wo tou," a tasteless and unleavened mixture of steamed maize and water. Most of my cellmates had a little cup with a toothbrush and soap; these were kept under the kang. They used their small bundles of extra clothes for pillows.

DAILY ROUTINE HEAVY ON BRAINWASHING

The cellmates had a daily routine. It follows: Rising, 6:15 a. m.; toilet, 6:30 a. m.; study (brainwashing), 6:45 a. m.; breakfast, 8 a. m.; study (brainwashing), 9 a. m.; free period, noon; study (brainwashing), 1:30 p. m.; supper, 4:30 p. m.; toilet, 5:15 p. m.; study (brainwashing), 7 p. m.; retiring, 9:30 p. m.

On Sundays, the study periods after breakfast and supper were dropped and the prisoners were free to sew clothes. Some—those who progressed in brainwashing—were allowed to play cards or other games. The prisoners made the cards of several sheets of paper pasted together with the figures drawn on them. Chinese chess was also played.

My imprisonment started at about 5 p. m. Prison supper was over. When my cellmates asked me if I had eaten, I told them I had had a heavy noon dinner and was not hungry.

I sat on a kang next to the well. A cellmate who knew some English told me that all the prisoners in this cubicle had been arrested because they were spies and friends of the then President Harry S. Truman, stigmatized by the Communists as an enemy of the Chinese people.

THOUGHT CELLMATES PLANTED BY REDS

At first, I suspected that one or all of my cellmates were Sepo guards planted in the prisons to trick me into a confession.

I discarded this notion later. The Sepo didn't have to plant any agents in the cells because the prisoners, with few exceptions, were more than eager to show how they had become converted from anti-Communists to pro-Communists. They demonstrated this change of heart by cooperating with the prison authorities on every possible occasion. They readily and vehemently joined in tou chengs.

A tou cheng is a sort of brainwashing procedure used by pro-Communist prisoners to break down the resistance of an anti-

Communist cellmate. It is a form of mental torture, occasionally accompanied by physical blows, in which the pro-Communist converts would gather around the anti-Communist "black sheep."

The pro-Communists would shout at the anti-Communist, insult and curse him, point accusing fingers at him and do everything possible to soften him up to the point where he would even confess crimes he did not commit to gain a moment's surcease.

A nerve-racking procedure, the tou cheng would often last for hours, and few could stand it for any considerable length of time.

The bulk of the prisoners also strove to give proof of their conversion to communism by vigilantly reporting every infraction of prison rules or other reactionary acts committed by unconverted cellmates. The Chinese called a cellmate who become such an informer a "running dog."

THEY ACT SPEEDILY AND UNIFORMLY

At 9:45 that first night, an officer blew a whistle and shouted: "Shui, chao" (sleep). In a moment's time the cell was a hive of activity. The prisoners quickly put away their books, unrolled their thin cotton mattresses, took off their shirts and pants and went to sleep. I was impressed by the speed and uniformity of action. No one delayed. No one was at a loss what to do.

I had no mattress, no covering for the cool of the evening. I saw a coat hanging on the wall and asked if I could use it as a cover. But my cellmates forbade me to touch it. It was against the rules to use the belongings of others, I learned later; the permission of the chu chang (cell leader) was necessary and my chuh chang offered no such permission.

So I lay on the hard wooden kang in a place next to the wall allotted me by the chu chang. All seven of us slept on the kang.

Fifteen minutes after I lay down on the kang, the cell door opened and an officer called out: "Rui Ko Ni." When I answered to my name, he motioned to me to leave the cell. As I started to put on my shoes, my cellmates, eager to demonstrate before their jailers that they were no longer anti-Communists but fervent pro-Communists, began to shout: "Kuai, kuai" (hurry, hurry).

It was dark. As I passed through the entrance of the compound, I came to open ground, but I could not see 10 feet beyond me.

GUARD URGES HIM TO MOVE QUICKLY

I hestiated, not knowing which way to go. Also, I was afraid that I might be tricked to walk into the open and be shot for attempting to escape. The guard was angered by my hesitation and he shouted: "Tsou, tsou. Kuai, kuai." (Go, go. Quick, quick.)

He pointed the way and trailed close behind me, with his pistol drawn and his finger on the trigger.

When I reached a row of rooms in a long, 1-story building, he ordered me to halt, and announced my arrival. A voice replied: "Lai." (Come in.)

I followed the guard's shouted command to enter and found myself in courtroom No. 4 of the "People's" military court.

The chamber was 18 feet wide and 27 feet long. At one end, the judge sat at an ordinary office desk. To his right sat the recorder who took down the minutes of the proceedings, and to his left an interpreter. Nearby sat the guard, his pistol aimed at the concrete floor near my feet.

On a wall in back of the judge hung a picture of Mao Tse-tung.

I was ordered by the Sepo guard to stand before a wooden chair facing the judge. My eyes were only half a foot from an electric light suspended from the ceiling. Swarms of insects buzzed around the light. Soon they began to crawl over my face and neck, but I was forbidden to shoo these pests away. The light hurt my eyes. The Sepo guard tore off my spectacles and threw them on a window sill.

QUERIED BY JUDGE, ASKED TO CONFESS

The judge, a lean man about 30 years old, eyed me for a minute, then ordered me to sit down. He spoke in Chinese, I in English. The interpreter translated for us.

Question. "What is your name?"

Answer. "Rigney, in English; Rui Ko Ni in Chinese."

Question. "What is your full name?"

Answer. "Harold William Rigney."

Question. "Where do you live?"

Answer. "Li Kwang Chiao, Nan Chieh, No. 1."

Question. "What is your nationality?"

Answer. "American."

Question. "What is your occupation?"

Answer. "I am a Catholic priest, a missionary, the rector of Fu Jen University."

Question. "Now tell me what crimes have you committed against the Chinese people?"

Answer. "I have committed no crimes against the Chinese people."

"Shih ma." (What.) He shouted, banging his fist on the desk. "Chan chi lai." (Stand up.)

I stood up. The insects swarmed around me again and the glare of the electric light was painful.

So started my trial that was to last 3 years and 2 months. The first phase of this ordeal lasted 60 days and nights. In the first week of my trial I stated clearly and emphatically, "I am a Catholic, and I will not give up my religion; I would rather die. Moreover, I will not become a Communist."

The judge replied, "No one asks you to give up your religion, and you could not become a Communist even if you wanted to."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SESSIONS DURING SIXTY DAYS

I think I had about 150 court sessions during these 60 days and nights. The sessions would run variously; usually I had 1 or 2 during the day, starting in the late morning and resuming in the late afternoon.

During the entire period I was permitted only 2 nights of rest. One was given me because I had a fever and the prison physician prescribed rest. The other was granted by the judge for the obvious purpose of making me realize how sweet a night's rest was, even on boards.

Those were 60 terrible days and nights.

Imprisonment in Communist China of Very Rev. Harold W. Rigney, of Chicago—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the second installment of Father Rigney's story of imprisonment in Communist China from the Chicago Sun-Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with comments of Chicago leaders on the story.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR YEARS IN A RED HELL—FATHER RIGNEY TELLS STARVATION PRESSURE TO CONFESS

(By the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., Divine Word missionary)

During my first weeks in the Ts'ao Lan Tzu Hutung (the Chinese Communist prison in Peiping), I gradually wasted away and became very thin.

At the time of my arrest, I weighed about 180 pounds, a considerable figure, since I am small-boned. Not long after my internment, I dropped to less than 100 pounds.

I was hungry all the time, since I could not eat the food served me. Even the pigs in America ate better than I did.

Our regular menu consisted of "wo tou" and "pai tsai." Wo tou was made of 3 or 4 ounces of steamed corn meal, unleavened and unsalted. One mouthful was enough to make me lose my appetite. It took me 4 months to get used to it and eat enough to stave off hunger for an hour or two. During these months, the prison authorities, to keep me alive added boiled rice to my menu; it also was unsalted and tasteless.

BOILED WATER WITH A LITTLE CABBAGE

Pai tsai was boiled water with a little Chinese cabbage in it. While it could hardly be called soup by American standards, I liked pai tsai. But, for the first 3 months, I was given less than half a bowl of it, while the other prisoners received a full bowl. There was no reason to reduce this one food item I could eat, unless it was part of a scheme to starve me or keep me undernourished.

We ate twice a day, in the late morning and late afternoon. By nightfall, I was very hungry.

Throughout my imprisonment in Ts'ao Lan Tzu, we were served special meals about 12 times a year. We prisoners looked forward to these meals long in advance and ate them like hungry dogs.

They consisted of kan fan (dry, steamed rice) or man tou (Chinese steamed wheat flour bread) with meat soup. The meat was cut to the size of bouillon cubes. Each prisoner usually received 3 or 4 meat cubes, but sometimes none at all. In my first year in prison, I think I received at most 3 or 4 ounces of meat.

How I longed for a good meal. But how I longed for salt, too.

I was salt-starved because our diet was deficient in this very important respect. Most prisoners had private supplies of salt, either purchased or sent them by relatives. I was not allowed at first to buy salt or receive any items from the outside.

A cellmate, quite a decent fellow who had his own supply, once gave me a pinch of salt in my bowl of water when no one was looking. I still recall how delicious the water tasted. A week later I asked him again for a pinch of salt, but he refused.

Later I learned it was against the rules to give anything to a fellow prisoner without permission of the chu chang (cell leader). Giving was regarded as an imperialistic way of making friends, and friendship between prisoners was strictly forbidden.

Hell is like this. There are no friendships there.

I considered salt the most important item I could buy or have sent to me during my first year in prison. Next in importance was toilet paper and the third was soap.

Our toilet paper consisted of a coarse paper about 2½ feet long and a foot wide. On receiving it, the prisoners tore it into oblongs 4 inches long and 2½ inches wide.

The Government supplied toilet paper and soap only to those prisoners who lacked money or permission to buy anything and to those who failed to get supplies from the outside. But since Government supplies were inadequate, the prisoners were on the alert for scraps of paper of any kind and

for used laundry water with suds, which they reused to wash their clothes.

After a month or so in prison, I was allowed to buy toilet paper and soap. The rats, however, ate the soap and for about 4 months I washed by face and hands in cold water without soap.

I remember the morning I washed my face for the first time. I had returned from a court session early enough to get a nap of an hour or so. When the signal for rising was given, everybody jumped up, dressed, and began to wash.

First to wash was the cell leader. He washed his face and hands in about a pint of water. Then the others followed.

DIRT ACCUMULATES

I was last. By that time, the pint of water was full of dirt.

Bathing was another problem. In my quarters at Fu Jen Catholic University in Peiping, I bathed 2 or 3 times a day. But in prison it was different. From the time I was incarcerated on July 25, 1951, until mid-November of that year, I had only 2 or 3 sponge baths in my cell, each with about 1 quart of cold water.

During this time I accumulated layers of sweat and dirt. I was wretched. I often asked the court to allow me a hot bath, but was always told that I had to confess first.

My cellmates scolded me and said I gave off a disagreeable smell and one day the cell leader shouted that he didn't like my smell and ordered me to sit in a corner. I replied that all I needed was a hot bath.

Before long I was full of lice. Later, the prisoners linked the fact that I had lice with the Communist charge that the Americans were carrying on germ warfare in Korea. During that period, whenever a cellmate found he had lice, he would usually point to me and say: "These came from that American imperialist."

Searching for lice on one's clothing becomes a daily routine. Each prisoner undressed and thoroughly examined his clothing for vermin. I always felt relieved when I discovered and killed any of the insects. The more I found, the more relieved I felt. The most I ever found in one search was nine, and I became quite expert in the technique of lice hunting.

That such an occupation could become a form of mental relief indicates how dull was prison life at Ts'ao Lan Tzu.

My first day in prison was spent in a court session that lasted until long after daybreak. Fatigued from my night's ordeal, I returned to my cell and lay down on the wooden kang (bed) to sleep. But my cellmates soon swarmed around me, telling me it was forbidden to sleep in the daytime.

During the court sessions that followed, the judge insisted I was a spy. I denied it. At one of the hearings during the initial phase of my imprisonment, the judge informed me that I disclosed the price of millet (hsiao mi), the staple food of North China in one of my monthly reports to my superior general in Rome.

This, he said, was economic intelligence and was as important as military intelligence. Furthermore, he declared, this economic information that I gave to the Vatican and to America was responsible for the economic embargo that Washington had imposed on China.

I replied that I only reported to my superior general that the price of millet was going up in an effort to explain why we increased salaries at Fu Jen University. In the early days of the Communist occupation, salaries were calculated in terms of catties, or pounds of millet.

Angrily, the judge accused me of arguing. I was not allowed to argue, he said; I was only in court to confess my crimes.

But my only "crimes" were that I sent those reports to my superior general and had copies sent to Father Ralph in Chicago.

I dispatched them either by mail from Peiping or via travelers bound for Hong Kong, where they would be given to the Reverend Joseph Henkels, S. V. D., to forward them to their destination.

On one occasion a friend, who was leaving Tientsin by ship for Hong Kong, took two of my monthly reports to deliver to Father Henkels in Hong Kong for remailing.

REPORTS SEIZED

My friend was searched by a customs officer who confiscated the reports, but who assured him they would be returned in a few days.

Weeks passed and they were never returned.

The judge told me (and I am certain this was a lie) that the court had all those monthly reports. Therefore, he said, I could not hide anything from the court but would be forced to confess everything about them. If I failed to confess about any item in the reports, the court would know that I was dishonest, he concluded. He then emphasized that my reports contained economic intelligence.

JUDGE STRESSES POINTS

The judge hammered on these points for the next 3 or 4 days.

Finally, I said that if the Communist government considered the gathering of newspaper reports about the price of millet and the relaying of this information to others as intelligence work, then I did intelligence work. But, I insisted, I was not a professional spy.

This angered the judge. He shouted that I was a spy and that was all there was to it.

LEADERS HAIL RIGNEY STORY AS GREAT HUMAN DOCUMENT

Reactions to Four Years in a Red Hell, the dramatic story of the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney's imprisonment in Red China, stress its importance as a significant document of our times.

Following publication of the first installment in the Sun-Times Sunday, community leaders, students of the Far East and educators recognized that the Chicago priest's ordeal and his objective, firsthand account of it—published exclusively in the Sun-Times—comprise a major contribution to the world's knowledge of communism and its meaning.

There was universal agreement that Father Rigney's own story should be read by every American. There was lavish praise for the illustrations by famed cartoonist Milton Caniff. And there was unanimous expression of interest in succeeding installments of the epochal narrative detailing the stark, incredible story of indomitable faith.

Governor Stratton called it an education in Red policies. He said: "I hope every American gets to read it. It's a revelation. I urge all people in the State to follow this important document carefully."

The governor congratulated the Sun-Times for presenting this as a public service in citizenship. He called the Caniff illustrations technicaly impressve and obviously the result of extensive research.

Dr. Hans Morgenthau, professor of political science and director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy at the University of Chicago, commented:

"This is an excellent piece. Really very moving and impressive. It gives a concrete demonstration of the regime of Chinese communism. You can read a lot of books on the general character of communism, but an outstanding, personal, life story such as this makes an indelible impression."

Mayor Daley said he read the installment through twice and then read it aloud to his children.

"It is a shocking and brutal story," he said. "The Sun-Times is to be congratulated for bringing the public this firsthand, clear, and objective story that exposes the tactics used by the Reds. This gives us some idea of what we're up against in this world conflict of ideologies."

Joseph B. Meegan, director of the Back of the Yards Council, declared: "It's simply terrific. I think it is one of the great accounts of all time of an experience of this sort. I hope every living American has an opportunity to read it.

"What impresses me most is the realism and objectivity of it. You feel as though you're actually going through the same experiences as Father Rigney."

Carter Davidson, executive director of the Council of Foreign Relations: "Father Rigney's story is not only a great human document, but it is also a document of high political significance."

NAACP Civil Rights Leadership Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a news release from the office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which announces a leadership conference on civil rights to be held here in Washington, March 4–6. This conference will be composed of 50 national organizations, representative of the total American population, and they will be gathered to express the views of those they represent on the status of civil rights in our Nation today and to demand in their behalf enactment of civil-rights legislation in this session of the 84th Congress. There has been abundantly sufficient evidence presented to Congress and our Federal Government of the need for enforcement and the protection of constitutional guaranties for all citizens. Further, there has been abundantly sufficient evidence of the fact that the majority of the people of the United States want this action now. The test of a democratic government is in its ability to recognize threats to its way of life and to respond to those dangers as pointed out by the majority of the people it represents.

The news release follows:

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ANNOUNCES CIVIL RIGHTS ASSEMBLY, MARCH 4–6

NEW YORK, February 2.—Anticipating a showdown fight for enactment of civil rights legislation in this session of the 84th Congress, the leadership conference on civil rights has issued a call for a national delegate assembly for civil rights in Washington, March 4–6, Roy Wilkins, chairman, announced today.

Mr. Wilkins, who is also executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, heads the leadership conference composed of 50 national church, labor, fraternal, civic, and minority group organizations. Arnold Aronson of the national community relations advisory council is secretary of the conference.

In making the announcement, Mr. Wilkins stressed the need for wide geographical dis-

tribution of delegates. "The influence of the assembly on the Congress," he pointed out, "will depend less upon the number of individual delegates in attendance than upon the number of States and congressional districts represented."

The participating organizations were urged to send delegates from as many different congressional districts as possible. The conference anticipates an attendance of about 2,000 delegates. Registration for the assembly is scheduled for Sunday, March 4, at the Willard Hotel. The opening session will be held that night in the Interdepartmental Auditorium. Monday and Tuesday, March 5 and 6, the delegates will visit their respective Representatives and Senators and attend a night session Monday at the Willard. The assembly will close Tuesday afternoon with a report session in the Interdepartmental Auditorium.

Citing the breakdown of law and order in some parts of the South, the call charged that the Constitution and the Supreme Court are being flouted openly. Citizens are being denied their constitutional rights and persecuted for demanding them. To permit these violations to continue is to sanction lawlessness and defiance of the Government of the United States.

"It is essential," the call declared, "that Congress enact legislation in this session to safeguard the civil rights of American citizens and the processes of orderly government."

The conference seeks enactment of an eight-point legislative program including job equality through the establishment of an effective Federal FEPC, withholding of Federal funds from any institution which defies the constitutional prohibition against segregation in public facilities, making lynching and other race-inspired acts of violence Federal offenses, abolition of the poll tax and protection of the right to vote, establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice with authority to protect civil rights in all sections of the country, creation of a permanent Federal Commission on Civil Rights, elimination of remaining segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate travel, and provision for majority rule in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The supporting organizations include the following: A. M. E. Zion Church, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, American Civil Liberties Union, American Council on Human Rights, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Veterans' Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Catholic Interracial Council, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, Congress of Racial Equality, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Hotel, Restaurant, and Bartenders' International Union of America, Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World.

Also the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Japanese-American Citizens' League, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, National Alliance of Postal Employees, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Association of Colored Women, Inc., National Baptist Convention, United States of America, National Bar Association, National Catholic Committee on Race Relations, National Community Relations Advisory Council, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Negro Women, National Frontiers Club, National Negro Business League.

Also the National Newspaper Publishers' Association, National Religion and Labor Foundation, National Supreme Council Scottish Rite Masons, Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Phi Delta Kappa Sorority, Textile Workers' Union, the American Ethical Union, the Workmen's Circle, Transport Workers' Union of America, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, United Automobile Workers of America, United Hebrew Trades, United Rubber Workers, United Steelworkers of America, United Transport Service Employees of America, Workers' Defense League, and the Young Women's Christian Association.

Promise of the Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appears in the current issue of the Reader's Digest. It is an advertisement by the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., which has its headquarters in my home city, Tacoma, Wash.

The article to which I refer describes a new and highly successful facet of the lumber industry which started formally in 1941 in Washington State and is rapidly spreading over the Nation. It is known as tree farming.

This undertaking is especially deserving of note because it is an excellent example of the effectivenesss of cooperative effort on the part of industry and Government in behalf of the conservation of our natural resources. I hope that many of the Members of Congress will read the article, either in the Appendix of the RECORD or in the magazine in which it appears.

The article follows:

PROMISE OF THE TREES—THE STORY OF MODERN FORESTRY AND TREE FARMING IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

For 300 years, the people of America have gained an abundance of wood products, game, sport, and enjoyment from the vast forests growing on this continent. Today, many of these forests still remain * * * carrying on their role as man's most versatile natural resource. It is important that they continue to serve the needs of present and future generations. Toward this end, multiple use of tree-growing lands must be considered, particularly the relationship of timber growing and harvesting to grazing, watersheds, recreation, and wildlife. The forest industry is applying these management principles in growing timber as a crop on privately owned tree farms. This is true forest conservation because it means that the Nation's forests can be both wisely used and perpetuated.

As our Nation's economy continues to expand, an increasing amount of wood is required for lumber, plywood, pulp, fibers, chemicals, and many other forest products. To help meet this demand, man and nature are working together to grow and harvest crop after crop of trees on millions of acres of privately owned forestland. These timbered areas are operated under a scientific system of modern forest management known as tree farming.

A tree farm is a privately owned area of forestland voluntarily dedicated to the growing of timber as a perpetual crop. All tree farm owners agree to protect their trees from fire, insects, and disease, carry out a clean, systematic log harvest and grow new trees to replace those harvested. The tree farming concept recognizes the fact that a forest is not static, but is a living, dynamic unit * * * and that, given a chance, it will reproduce itself as a renewable natural resource.

The primary goal of tree farming is to provide a perpetual supply of forest raw materials. Foresters know, however, that tree farms also supply other benefits to both man and wildlife. They give consideration to proper use of timberlands and the relationship of tree growing to such other factors as agriculture, recreation, game management and protection of watersheds.

This improved philosophy of forest management has not always been in existence. Early settlers were concerned about timber supply, but only in the sense that there seemed to be too much. Forests stood in the way of fields to grow food, and they were cleared away. Vast areas of trees were cut and burned to provide clear land for the building of roads and cities. As the Nation's economy became more industrial, the timber that was once a nuisance became a necessary commodity. This was the real beginning of the forest industry in America.

Early in this century, both private industry and Government agencies began to take an active interest in perpetuating timber as a valuable natural resource. They knew that the key to future forests lay in their ability to manage two natural assets—forest soil and the reproductive power of trees.

The industrial tree-farming system that grew out of this thinking was designed to maintain a favorable ratio between the number of trees grown and the amount harvested. Foresters say this balance is now being achieved.

Dedication of Clemons Tree Farm, owned and operated by Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., took place in June 1941, marking the actual beginning of the formal tree-farm movement. Since that time, the movement has spread rapidly across the Nation, as shown on the chart below. Today, the figures show that about 7,400 private timberland owners are managing more than 38 million acres as tree farms.

In the United States, certain areas of land are more suitable for growing trees than other crops. This is particularly true throughout the Douglas-fir region of the Pacific Northwest. In this area, the natural combination of wet, mild climate, rugged terrain, and good soil favors abundant forest growth.

On western tree farms, harvesting methods are based on the life cycle and growing habits of the species being cut. Douglas-fir trees, for example, grow in dense stands on steep mountain slopes. In such forests, most mature firm trees are about the same age and size. Usually, there is an understory of smaller shade-tolerant species such as western hemlock, western redcedar, and true firs.

The growth habits of Douglas fir are such that its seed will not germinate nor its seedlings thrive in the deep shade of mature trees. As a result, planned harvesting in the fir region is done by area selection. This is a logging system that requires clear-cutting of selected small areas or corridors of timber, leaving adjacent islands of mature trees to serve as a natural seed source. This method provides the open, sunlit ground needed to establish new crops of fir seedlings. Where a natural seed source does not exist, the land is artificially reforested by hand-planting or aerial seeding.

Ponderosa pine tree farms are located in a dry inland plateau region, east of the Cascade Mountain Range. In contrast with the dense, evenly aged fir growth, pine timberlands contain trees of all ages and sizes, growing in very open, park-like stands. Here are found seedlings and young trees intermingled with older, larger pine trees which are ready for cutting. Since the

climate of the pine region is quite dry, there are fewer trees per acre than in the moist Douglas fir region to the west.

Harvesting of mature pines is done by individual tree selection, which is a planned system of cutting that removes individual trees as they reach marketable size. The vigorous smaller trees left standing continue to grow and increase in usable volume until they are marked for harvesting. In the meantime, they serve as a natural seed source to reforest nearby areas. The selective removal of mature trees provides growing room and permits more sunlight and rain to nourish the younger trees, improving their rate of growth.

PROTECTING TREES FROM FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASE

Long-range programs for planned harvesting and natural reforestation of tree farms are worthless without adequate protection of both trees and land for future use. Loss of timber from forest fire, insects, and disease is one of the major hazards faced by all tree farmers. To combat such forest enemies, each new tree must be protected from seedling to harvestable size. In the Douglas fir region, this is a period of 80 to 100 years.

On tree farms in the Pacific Northwest, every precaution is taken to prevent and control forest fires. Tree-farm owners pool resources, maintaining constant protection in cooperation with State and Federal forest agencies. They man lookouts, construct and maintain thousands of miles of forest roads, operate mobile mechanized fire-fighting equipment, and speed communication in the field by shortwave radio.

Industrial forests are also guarded against insect and disease epidemics by removal of both afflicted and susceptible trees, aerial spraying, and other preventive measures. The Nation's privately owned tree farms are among the best-protected forest lands in the world.

FOREST PRODUCTS ARE IMPORTANT TO OUR WAY OF LIFE

Wood is one of America's most versatile and valuable raw materials. It is used daily by every person, business, and industry in such diversified items as lumber, plywood, pulp, paper, textiles, cellophane, felts, cork, glues, plastics, insulation, and chemicals. Through product development, market research, and improvement of manufacturing techniques, the forest industry is continuing to expand wood's economic usefulness to the Nation.

Forest industry scientists no longer look upon trees only as round logs to be sawn into square lumber, but rather as bundles of wood fibers packaged in bark. As a result of this new concept, it is now possible to use a greater variety of tree sizes and species, as well as to more completely utilize each log delivered to the mill. Many useful products are now being made from bark, slabs, chips, shavings, edgings, and other secondary forest raw materials.

The potentialities of wood are almost without limit. To assure a supply for the products of tomorrow, the Nation's privately owned tree farms are managed as permanent wood-producing forestlands, growing timber as a crop under the direction of trained industrial foresters.

RESEARCH IN THE FOREST INDUSTRY

Contributing to our American standard of living are the various wood products developed through forest industry research. Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. is active in four fields of research—forestry, chemical pulp, new product development, and marketing.

In forestry, new methods of growing, harvesting, and protecting timber crops are always under study. Pulp research is resulting in more diversity of chemical cellulose products, better wood utilization, and improved processing methods. Product development and marketing research are bringing about a steady flow of new wood, wood fiber, and wood chemical products.

Such research and development programs are economically sound because the wood for tomorrow's products is growing on the Nation's industrial tree farms today.

University of Alabama Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial published in the New York Times of February 7, 1956. We all are aware that Alabama is another of the rebel States presently testing the authority of our Federal Government and the highest courts of our land through open, irresponsible, and reprehensible defiance. The latest episode of defiance is national news and concerns the admission of Miss Autherine Lucy, a Negro, to the University of Alabama. The reaction of the writer for the New York Times is representative of that of the majority of American people of all races and walks of life. With other articles I have previously inserted in the RECORD on the matter of civil rights, it is further evidence that the alarm of the American people who, through labor, ingenuity, and sacrifice of life—their faith in democratic principles—have brought our Nation to the position of esteem it holds today, is exceedingly prudent. This shameful defiance by a growing number of Southern States is establishing a pattern in America, which will ultimately endanger and destroy the liberties of all people, regardless of race. The editorials, daily appearing in the Nation's press, and the voices that are daily being raised in alarm are certainly evidence which is as pointed as it is possible to have that the American people are demanding forceful action on civil rights. It should be sufficient to every requirement our Federal Government might have for action.

MOB RULE AT TUSCALOOSA

Is it "white supremacy" that is being demonstrated when a mob of a thousand demonstrators turns on one mild-mannered little Negro girl, guilty of no other act than attending classes which the Supreme Court of the United States says she has every right to attend, and pelts with rocks and eggs the car in which she is being spirited across the University of Alabama campus? Is it "respect for law and order" that is being shown, when the trustees of that university, instead of standing up to this threat, vote to suspend not the instigators of the outrage but the Negro girl herself?

We are glad to note some opposition among the University of Alabama students to what has happened here, and we honor them for this opposition. They are better defenders of the good name of their university than the rock-throwers. For the rock-throwers themselves there is only this much to be said: they are not the real makers of opinion in this sorry business; they are merely immature young men who have taken a tip from some of their more irresponsible elders who happen to be in positions of high power. What does a man like Senator EASTLAND expect to happen, on the student level, when he declares that a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court is the result of "leftwing brainwashing of that Court? This is what he is asking for. This is what he gets.

The Anniversary of the Yalta Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Yalta Pact, which resulted in the enslavement of millions of people of central and eastern Europe and Asia.

Since that fateful day of February 11, 1945, Soviet Russia has grown in leaps and bounds as a menace to world peace, and in direct proportions the position of the United States has dropped as a leader of the free world.

The time has long passed for futile and partisan recriminations for our part in the Yalta agreement. The fact remains that, though we entered into the agreement with a misplaced faith in Soviet promises—promises which have been systematically violated—the results are a national disgrace and the time is long overdue for a formal recognition of that fact.

The sad fact is that, despite political recriminations and protestations of the errors of judgment of those who participated in the Yalta agreements, the bitterly criticized tactics and policies then used are still in force and effect in our State Department. We still continue to deal with Soviet Russia as an honest partner and not as an unscrupulous outlaw. And all this despite the fact that we know so much more about Soviet treachery now than we did in 1945, when the Yalta agreement was entered into.

Our position of free-world leadership can be maintained only if we adopt and adhere to a policy of firmness and of refusal to compromise on matters of principle. It was that willingness on our part to compromise on matters of moral rights that has helped the expansion of the Communist empire and is continuing to bring about a loss of our own international respect and prestige. We can regain it only by basing our foreign policy on moral principles and not on expediency. We have no moral right to build up the hopes of the capitive nations and then cruelly shatter them, by continuing to barter their lives and future for sham promises which we accept as a pure matter of expediency, and which we should know from past bitter experience, will eventually be broken again, as they always have been in the past, when it serves Soviet Communist purposes.

On this sad anniversary, let us soberly analyze our errors of the past and in the interest, not only of justice, but of our own national security, resolve to learn from past experiences, and deal with the Communist threat to world peace in a resolute manner, with courage and moral strength, which is the only way to gain respect not only for our loyal allies in the free world, but also of the Communists themselves.

Middle East Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram recently sent to Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, by the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit and its numerous affiliated organizations. Eighty-five of my distinguished Democratic colleagues and I joined in a declaration on February 6, 1956, similarly urging the Government to take immediate action to end the threat of war in the Near East. This telegram serves as a further illustration of the gravity with which many Americans view the powderkeg situation:

FEBRUARY 3, 1956.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,

Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned presidents of organizations affiliated with the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit share the deepest concern with the direction that may be chosen by our Government in respect to the critical turn of events in the Middle East. In the perspective of the history of recent decades we are mindful of the folly and futility, of the danger to freedom and peace, inherent in a policy of appeasement. We prayerfully hope that timeless considerations of morality and justice will not be yielded to a phantom expediency in shaping the dedecisions of our Government. At an emergency meeting in Detroit on February 1, the undersigned unanimously resolved to respectfully urge that United States action be guided by the traditional will of our Government to protect democracy and to preserve the peace in the face of the strident threats and belligerent actions of those who would irresponsibly destroy it. In consonance with American principles we are convinced that the ultimate interests of our country and of world peace can best be served by the immediate offer of security pacts to all Middle East countries demonstrating a willingness to respect peace, by sound economic aid and rehabilitation, and by rapid provision of defensive weapons to Israel to offset the present Communist engineered imbalance in that area.

Samuel J. Rhodes, president, Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit; Michael Wainer, Aesculapian Pharmaceutical Association; Mrs. Bernard A. Breyer, Aesculapian Ladies' Auxiliary; Rabbi Leon Fram, American Jewish Congress, Council of Michigan; Dr. Bernard Weston, American Physicians Fellowship Committee, of the Israel Medical Association; Frank Mersky, Berdichewer Progressive Aid Society; Ben Eizelman, Bereznitzer Aid Society; Morris Indianer, Beth Abraham Free Loan Association; Samuel H. Rubin, Bialostoker Western Aid Society.

B'nai B'rith: Jack Caminker, Greater Detroit Council; Mrs. Henry P. Onrich, Greater Detroit Women's Council; Miss Sarah Steinberg, B. & P. Chapter; Julius Tapper, Ivan S. Bloch Lodge; Mrs. Bernard Indenbaum, Ivan S. Bloch Chapter; Norton J. Taylor, Louis D. Brandeis Lodge; Mrs. Louis Magedman, Louis D. Brandeis Chapter; Nathan D. Rubenstein, Detroit Lodge; Mrs. Alan Hagenjos, Detroit Chapter; Carl Agranoff, Downtown Lodge; Mrs. Saul Schwartz, Downtown Chapter; Sherman M. Fisher, East Side Lodge; Mrs. Albert Cooper, East Side Chapter; Max Freedman, Donald Fox Lodge; Mrs. Arthur J. Frayne, Donald Fox Chapter; Mrs. Leonard Miller, George Gershwin Chapter; Larry Harwoods, Philip Handler Lodge; Mrs. Charles D. Jones, Philip Handler Chapter; Dr. Moses Cenker, Theodore Herzl Lodge; Mrs. Goldie Roth, Theodore Herzl Chapter; Jack Goldfarb, Israel Lodge; Mrs. Fred Weinstein, Israel Chapter; Harry Thomas, Harry B. Keidan Lodge; Mrs. Max Yorke, Harry B. Keidan Chapter; Max Sussman, Louis Marshall Lodge; Mrs. Leonard R. Levin, Louis Marshall Chapter; Alex Adelberg, Henry Morgenthau Lodge; Mrs. Fred Rapoport, Henry Morgenthau Chapter; Stanley A. Baar, Oak Woods Lodge; Mrs. William Litt, Oak Woods Chapter; Isadore Perlman, Pisgah Lodge; Mrs. Allan Laban, Pisgah Chapter; Robert Burk, Rex Lodge; Mrs. Sidney Pianin, Rex Chapter; Mrs. William Fogelman, Louis Stone Chapter; Morton Lewis, Tikvah Lodge; Mrs. Seymour Weiss, Tikvah Chapter; Hyman Matoff, Rabbi Mandel M. Zager Lodge; Mrs. Henry Schore, Rabbi Mandel M. Zager Chapter.

Mrs. Pearl Hoffman, Bobrowskar Ladies Society; Sam Freedman, Brezner Aid Society; Joe Zeidman, Brisker-Mlawer Umgegend Verein; William L. Stein, Brith Shalom of Detroit; Mrs. Louis Markzon, Center Mother's Club; Louis Rosenberg, Chaim Weizmann Society; Hyman Halberg, Chenstochover Rajoner Verein; Harry Rosenthal, Chernigover & Loyever Aid Society; Eugene J. Epstein, City of Hope, Detroit Businessmen's Group; Charles H. Charlip, Adas Shalom Synagogue; Jack Shenkman, Beth Aaron Synagogue; Dr. Albert Schwartz, Beth Aaron Men's Club; Mrs. Irving Chaiken, Beth Aaron Sisterhood; Mrs. Jerome Kirschbaum, Congregation Ahavas Achim Sisterhood; Rabbi Israel Halpern, Congregation Beth Abraham; Mrs. Oscar Rosenberg, Beth Abraham Sisterhood; Isadore Rosenthal, Congregation Beth Itzchock; Charles Keif, Congregation Beth Moses; Mrs. Sam Arlin, Beth Moses Ladies Auxiliary; Max Dobrowitsky, Congregation Beth Shalom; Mrs. Louis Goldman, Beth Shalom Sisterhood; Isadore Rosenberg, Congregation Beth Shmuel; Morris Dorn, Congregation Beth Tefilo Emanuel; Harry Stolsky, Congregation Beth Yehudah; Mrs. Charles P. Koenigsberg, Beth Yehudah Ladies Auxiliary; Mr. Charles N. Shere, Congregation B'nai David; Mrs. Zeick Needle, B'nai David Ladies Auxiliary; Lew Kruger, B'nai David Men's Club; Mrs. David Liebow, B'nai David Sisterhood; I. M. Faxstein, Congregation B'nai Israel; James Landsman, B'nai Moshe Men's Club; Mrs. Fred Weiss, B'nai Moshe Sisterhood; Mrs. Rebecca Bialick, Congregation B'nai Zion Ladies Auxiliary; Morris Snow, Congregation B'nai Zion; Benjamin Goldstein, Congregation Emanu-El, Suburban Temple; Mrs. Maurice B. Weiner, Sisterhood of Congregation Emanu-El; Isadore Sosnick, Congregation Ezras Achim; Siegfried Cahn, Congregation Gemiluth Chassodim; Mr. John Hurtig, Congregation Gemiluth Chassodim Men's Club; Mrs. Jack Wildstrom, Women of Congregation Gemiluth Chassodim; Abram Shainak, Congregation Mishkan Israel; Max Kaplan, Congregation Mogen Abraham; Nathan Borinstein, Mogen Abraham Men's Club; Mrs. Harry Altman, Mogen Abraham Sisterhood; Dr. Leonard Sidlow, Congregation Shaarey Zedek; Dr. Max Lichter, Shaarey Zedek Men's Club; Mrs. Baer Keidan, Shaarey Zedek Sisterhood; Hubert J. Sidlow, Young Married League of Shaarey Zedek; Herman Sussman, Evergreen Jewish Congregation; Harry L. Blitz, Northwest Israel Synagogue and Center; Sydney Sarasohn, Temple Beth El Men's Club; Louis H. Schostak, Temple Israel; Irving A. Levy, Temple Israel Men's Club; Mrs. Irving S. Wolfe, Temple Israel Sisterhood; Sidney Dworkin, Temple Israel Young Married Group; David I. Berris, Young Israel of Detroit; Mrs. David J. Cohen, Women's League of Young Israel; Mrs. Oscar Warren, Council of Jewish Women's Reading Circle; Rabbi Isaac Stollman, Council of Orthodox Rabbis of Detroit; David I. Zide, David Horodoker Benevolent Society; Mrs. Moses Moiseev, David Horodoker Independent Ladies Society; Mrs. Charles P. Koenigsberg, Davison Mothers Club; Marshall Wallace, Detroit Alumni Club of SAM Fraternity; Mrs. Vera Rom, Detroit Ladies Lechem Aneeim; Milton K. Mahler, Detroit Service Group; Mrs. Ben Katz, Dexter Mothers Club; Dr. Emanuel Zingeser, Downriver Jewish Community Center; David H. Rom, Eishishker and Umgegend Society; Mrs. Michael J. Kushner, Equality Club.

Farband Labor Zionist: Hyman Wiener, Order No. 79; Maurice I. Gelfand, Order No. 114; Morris L. Schaver, Order No. 137; Berl Hearshen, Order No. 552.

Mrs. Louis Saginaw, Fenkell Mothers Club; Sam Kaufer, First Galician Society of Detroit; Mrs. Harry L. Goldberg, First Galician Society Ladies Auxiliary; Louis Phillips, Gombiner Society; Joseph Rosson, Goodfellowship Club; Mrs. Charles Weinbaum, Goodfellowship Women's Auxiliary.

Hadassah: Mrs. William B. Isenberg, Detroit Chapter; Mrs. Harold Hoffman, Greenfield Chapter; Mrs. Herman Prady, Southern Oakland County Chapter; Mrs. Leo Rozanoff, Halevy Singing Society; Joseph Koller, Hapoel Hamizrachi of Detroit; Mrs. Max Brumer, Hebrew Ladies Aid Society; Mrs. Sidney Tauber, Home Relief Society; Paul Kron, Independent Protective Association; Mrs. Jack Hencken, Infant Service Group; Jacob Natow, Jericho Lodge I. O. O. P., No. 90; Mrs. Paul Shapiro, Jewish Consumptive Relief Society, Detroit Ladies Auxiliary; Joseph Bernstein, Jewish Labor Committee; Irving W. Schlussel, Jewish National Fund Council; Mrs. Sidney Ravin, Jewish National Fund, Ladies Auxiliary; Philip Slomovitz, editor, Jewish News.

Jewish War Veterans: Jack Kraizman, department of Michigan; Mrs. Sam Spolan, department of Michigan Ladies Auxiliary; A. Albert Sugar, Memorial Home Association; Eliot J. Raskin, Joseph Bale Post; Mrs. Seymour Kraft, Joseph Bale Auxiliary; Mrs. Thomas Tannis, Bloch-Rose Auxiliary; Julius Perry, Detroit Post; Mrs. Morris Tulupman, Detroit Ladies Auxiliary; Jack Gormezano, Ginsburg-Rosenberg Post; Mrs. Jack Gormezano, Ginsburg-Rosenberg Auxiliary; Joseph Newmark, Gold Star Parents; Sam Spolan, Lieutenant Roy F. Green Post; Mrs. Harold Weiss, Lieutenant Roy F. Green Auxiliary; Jules J. Sanders, Lawrence Jones Post; Mrs. Herman Bregman, Lawrence Jones Auxiliary; Dr. Robert S. Greenisy, Charles and Aaron Kogan Post; Mrs. Morton Margolis, Charles and Aaron Kogan Auxiliary; Irving Marshall, Lieutenant Eli Levin Post; Jane Remer, Lieutenant Eli Levin Auxiliary; Bernard Schwartz, Robert Rafelson Post; Mrs. Harry Partrich, Robert Rafelson Auxiliary; William Greenberg, General Maurice Rose Post; Leo Panzer, Sholom Post; Mrs. Louis Weinstein, Sholom Auxiliary; Isadore Silverman, Silverman Post; Mrs. Lawrence Gubow, Silverman Auxiliary; Florence Steinman, Lieutenant Jack Winokur Auxiliary; Al Selick, Sol Yetz-Morris Cohen Post; Mrs. Harry Shapiro, Yetz-Cohen Auxiliary; Sam Bernstein, Lieutenant Raymond Zussman Post; Mrs. Irving Sims, Lieutenant Raymond Zuss-

man Auxiliary; Mrs. Sadie Bienenfeld Haut, Jewish Women's European Welfare Organization, North Woodward Branch; Irving H. Cantor, Keshenever Bessarabier Aid Society; Hyman Friedman, Korostishever Aid Society; Joseph Katz, Kvutzah Ivrith; Mrs. Julius Ring, Kvutzah Ivrith Ladies Auxiliary.

Labor Zionist Organization of America: Mrs. David Sislin, Detroit Branch No. 1; Morris Ginsburg, Detroit Branch No. 3; Ben Harold, Detroit Branch No. 4; Irving Pokempner, Detroit Branch No. 6; Henry K. Faigin, Detroit Branch No. 7; Morris Ginsburg, Labor Zionist Youth Commission.

Abraham E. Betensky, Lachowitcher Aid Society; Morris Malin, Landsmanschaft Council of Detroit; Mrs. Philip Bernstein, League of Jewish Women's Organizations; Joseph Linden, Lutzker Voliner Society; Josseph Rosson, Maccabees, Mattathias Tent No. 1005; Mrs. Max Steiner, Maimonides Medical Society, Women's Auxiliary; David Feldman, Meseritcher Progressive Benefit Society; Sol Selman, Minkowitz Podolier Verein; Philip Stollman, Mizrachi Organization of Detroit; Mrs. Emil Spilman, Mizrachi Women, Fanny Gluck Chapter; Mrs. Morris Goldberg, Sisters of Zion Mizrachi; Abraham Ginsberg, Mogilover Progressive Aid Society; Louis Lifshitz, Mozirer Society; Morris Lieberman, National Committee for Labor Israel; Mrs. Arthur Gould, National Council of Jewish Women, Detroit section; Mrs. Joseph Katz, Northern Progressive Ladies Society; Jack B. Ormond, Odessa Progressive Aid Society; Harry Climstein, Ostrowitzer Friendship Society; Louis Gorelick, Pinsker Progressive Aid Society.

Pioneer Women's Organization: Mrs. Gerson Berris, Detroit Council; Mrs. Albert Herman, Avodah Chapter; Mrs. Ben Schwartz, Brandeis Chapter; Mrs. Morris Friedman, Channa Czenesh Chapter; Mrs. Dora Kumove, Club 1; Mrs. Movsas Goldoftas, Club 2; Mrs. Charles Bronson, Club Israel; Mrs. Isadore Cohen, Club Kinneret; Mrs. Max Kanarek, Hanita Chapter; Mrs. C. G. Sarasohn, Massada Chapter; Mrs. Sara Diamond, Golda Myerson Chapter; Mrs. David Schrage, Negbah Chapter; Mrs. Theodore Sallen, Sharona Chapter.

Nathan Zack, Progrebishtcher Progressive Society; Mrs. Joseph Rodman, Primrose Benevolent Club; Mrs. W. H. Landsman, Progressive Ladies Aid Society; Mrs. Henry Wilner, Pythian Sisters, Greater Detroit Temple No. 152; Samuel H. Rubin, Radomer Aid Society; Louis Warren, Rovner Progressive Farein; Hyman Karp, Ruzhiner Progressive Verein; Morris Wasserman, Sokolivker Progressive Verein; Philip Greenwald, Sosnovitzer Bendiner Aid Society; Saul Rubin, Turover Aid Society; S. A. Kayne, Vladimiretzer Emergency Relief; Mrs. Oliver A. Ruby, Women's American ORT, Michigan region; Mrs. Anna Berg, Women's Golden Rule Aid Society; Mrs. Isadore Levin, Women's Sabbath League.

Workmen's Circle: Mayer Schneider, District Committee; Alex Levitt, Branch No. 111; Jacob Reissman, Branch No. 156; Isadore Katz, Branch No. 181; Kune Greenbaum, Branch No. 227; Eugene Brownstein, Branch No. 460E; Robert Israel, Branch No. 470E; David Feldman, Branch No. 945; Edwin Shifrin, Branch No. 1000; Bernard Broder, Workmen's Circle Schools; Mrs. Adolph Gottfurcht, Workmen's Circle Singing Society.

Wolf Cohen, Yeshivath Beth Yehudah; Mrs. Hyman Rottenberg, Ladies of Yeshivath Beth Yehudah; Rabbi M. Rothenberg, Yeshivath Chachmey Lublin; Mrs. Anna Bennett; Yeshivath Chachmey Lublin Ladies Auxiliary; Israel Finkelstone, Yiddish Folks Ferein of Detroit; Max Nusbaum, Young Israel Center of Oak Woods; Mrs. Samuel Glanz, Sisterhood of Young Israel Center of Oak Woods; Mrs. Joseph Viedrah, Young Women's Bicur Cholem; Mrs. Ben Feldstein, Youth Education League; S. Elbom, Zamosc Tomashover Progressive Society; Mrs. Joseph Stalburg, Zedakah Club; Harry Gote, Zhitomir Progressive Verein; Irving W. Schlussel, Zionist Council of Detroit.

Higher Postage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 4 issue of the Washington Daily News regarding the proposed postal rate increase.

I think it is significant that this Washington newspaper is on record in support of rate adjustments which will, at least, lessen the deficit of post office operations.

At the same time, I reject the seeming blanket indictment of Members of Congress on this issue. The debate on the floor of this House on last Tuesday has made it a matter of record that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am a member, favors a rate increase. The debate also focused attention on the statement in the report of the appropriations subcommittee that—

> The committee cannot avoid again expressing concern that some action must be taken to get postal rates more appropriate to the costs of the service.

There is room for honest difference of opinion as to the allocation of the rate increase. There is no escaping the fact, however, that postal service must be paid for in one way or another—either through higher postal rates, through tax dollars, or by future generations to whom this part of the Federal deficit and national debt is transferred.

The editorial follows:

HIGHER POSTAGE

The reaction in Congress to President Eisenhower's request for increased postage rates is disappointing. There is as yet no indication that the Democratic leadership intends even to bring the matter to a vote. Indeed, some Congressmen seem to think it odd a bill for additional revenue of any kind should be offered in an election year.

Such an irresponsible attitude toward Government deficits is nothing new. But the cost of Government goes right on during campaign seasons as well as the rest of the time.

The Post Office Department has been running in the red for years. And there seems not the slightest chance of its being made to pay its way unless it is authorized to charge users of the mail more for its services.

The cost of delivering the mails has increased, as have the costs of most other things, during the period since the depression. Yet most postage rates are the same.

So, as long as the deficits continue, all the taxpayers will be forced to subsidize those who use the mails heavily. And Congress doesn't seem to care.

Liquor in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, February 6, 1956, entitled "The CAB Needs Information." The letter to the paper was written by Mr. Daniel B. Scully, of Highland Park, Ill.

The article follows:

THE CAB NEEDS INFORMATION

To the Christian Science Monitor:

The letters, editorials, and articles which you have published regarding the serving of alcohol on commercial airlines have been both interesting and educational. Although United States airlines have been serving liquor only 1 year, the problem has mushroomed to the point where the airlines are losing control of it. Fortunately, some airlines put the comfort and safety of their passengers above the erroneous competitive advantage of serving liquor aloft. They deserve our support and thanks.

The reaction of flight crews to the serving of liquor can be summed up very quickly: they are against it. This statement is based on personal conversations with pilots and stewardesses and the stand the Airline Pilots Association and the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association have taken.

Not only is the serving of liquor unfair and distasteful to the nondrinking majority, but the safety factor is a great deal more serious than most passengers realize.

Every stewardess I have talked to says that it is a small group of the passengers who drink. Many who drink when on the ground will not do it in an airplane. However, we all pay for the liquor consumed by the few.

Recently I received a letter from the Civil Aeronautics Board which said in part: "For more than a year the Board has been seeking factual information from flight crew members, airline personnel, and the public, concerning specific instances that adversely affected safety due to the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft. Attached hereto is a statement issued by the Board in response to several hundreds of letters received during the past 4 months. As of this date, not a single incident has been verified to the Board."

The most competent person to judge the safety of an aircraft is the pilot. Paradoxically, if he reports a safety violation to the CAB he will put his job and possibly his career in a precarious position. No airline management will stand by while one of its pilots reports violations to the CAB. They will either fire the pilot or correct the situation.

Section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act states that air carriers must provide safe and adequate service, equipment, and facilities. A CAB interpretation of this section states: "It is conceivable that if service of liquor were carried to such an extent that passengers become boisterous, unruly, or offensive in their conduct to other passengers, there would be a violation of this section." The word "offensive" can mean different things to different people. However, keep in mind that "offensive conduct" can be interpreted as a violation of a Federal law. The airlines should be held accountable.

The Board has held in the past that the liquor laws of the several States can be ap-

plicable to the serving of liquor on aircraft and the matter is one subject to State law enforcement. Many States prohibit the serving of liquor on railroads. Why are airlines allowed a special privilege and, in the minds of some, an unfair competitive advantage?

The CAB needs information and facts from the paying passengers. I would like to suggest the following action:

1. Report incidents of doubtful flight safety and/or offensive conduct to Mr. Ross Rizley, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C.

The report should include what happened, name of the airline, flight number, date, and the cities where you boarded and left the flight. Names and addresses of other witnesses would make a stronger case, but they are not absolutely necessary.

2. Send a copy of your letter to Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Washington, D. C.

Representative LANE has introduced a bill prohibiting the serving of liquor on interstate flights.

3. Send a second copy of your letter to the president of the airline concerned.

4. Contact your State government and ask them why they permit airlines to serve liquor and not railroads. If there is no law against the serving of liquor on railroads in your State then go on record as opposing liquor on airlines as a "dangerous custom * * * a potential nuisance to passengers and crews and a threat to safety of all." (Representative LANE.)

DANIEL B. SCULLY.

HIGHLAND PARK, ILL.

Private and Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasant experience to serve approximately 13 months as a member of the Special Government Activities Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Congressman from Texas, the Honorable JACK BROOKS.

This subcommittee has conducted a number of hearings and studies which have resulted in substantial savings for the Government and has reviewed practices which were not in the best interests of the Government. Some of the subjects studied have been of a type which would lend themselves to political exploitation. It is to the credit of the chairman that he has avoided that opportunity, has applied himself, and insisted upon the subcommittee maintaining an unusually high degree of objectivity with the paramount thought at all times that the subcommittee should act only to bring about better, more economical administration of our Government.

The following editorial from the February 8 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald recognizes the constructive nature of the work done by this subcommittee under Chairman BROOKS:

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INTEREST

Whatever may be said in extenuation of Edmund F. Mansure's official conduct, the fact remains that he was guilty of an indiscretion that ended his usefulness to the administration. By his own admission, he allowed political favoritism to enter into contracts falling under the supervision of the General Services Administration, which he headed. "Practical politics," he said in his testimony before the House Government Operations Committee, dictated that a major brokerage contract should not go to a firm that did "not help this administration get into office." Personal friendship with Mr. Mansure, moreover, did not appear to be any handicap in obtaining business in connection with the GSA.

Mr. Mansure's behavior was, to say the least, exceedingly obtuse. Like former Air Force Secretary Talbott and former Federal Buildings Commissioner Strobel and former Interstate Commerce Commissioner Cross, Mr. Mansure seemed to have no real awareness of his obligation to keep his private interests wholly divorced from the public interest. This kind of obtuseness is peculiarly unbecoming in an administration which campaigned for office in part on a pledge to "clean up the mess in Washington." The prompt resignation of these officials was indispensable to maintenance of the standards the President has set.

Representative BROOKS' subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, which uncovered Mr. Mansure's indiscretions, conducted its investigation in a most able, dignified, and effective way. This kind of supervision of executive agency conduct is one of the most important uses of the congressional investigating power. "I hope," said Mr. BROOKS, in commenting on Mr. Mansure's resignation, "that this will result in a more efficient and economical administration of GSA." He and his subcommittee have made a real contribution toward that end.

The Late J. Mark Wilcox

SPEECH
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Florida expressing my sadness because of the death of the Honorable J. Mark Wilcox, who was the former Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida.

Mr. Wilcox had many friends in the Eighth District of Florida, that I have the high honor to represent. He died on his farm at White Springs, Fla., on Friday, February 3, 1956. This community is in my district, and I think there is a Divine Providence in the fact that Mark Wilcox died surrounded by the beautiful Suwannee River and the trees that he loved so well.

As a Congressman, his colleagues will remember that his Municipal Bankruptcy Act saved many cities in this country from financial destruction. Mark Wilcox believed in peace through national preparedness, and he sponsored the National Frontier Defensive Act, which was so important in making America conscious of the need for an adequate defensive system.

When Mark Wilcox was a Member of Congress, he represented a district which extended along the east coast from Jacksonville to Key West. With enormous energy he dedicated himself to the task of representing this great area and all of Florida was the beneficiary of his constructive legislative action.

In later years, Mr. Wilcox was busy in the practice of law, which absorbed most of his time. I saw him frequently, however, in Hamilton County in the Eighth District of Florida, and in other areas of that section which he loved so well.

I want to extend to the family of Mark Wilcox, and to his many friends, my heartfelt sympathy, and I know we all recognize with sadness that Florida will sorely miss one of her most illustrious citizens.

Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9063) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to continue reading from the letter from which the gentleman from Connecticut just quoted, I think it is extremely important to all of us in New England. When we suffered from these 2 floods, 1 in August and 1 in October, this report which has been discussed had already been filed. This is the last of the paragraph of the letter:

While the Chief of Engineers is authorized within limitations to transfer planning funds between projects authorized for planning, and construction funds between projects authorized for construction, he cannot transfer either planning or construction funds to meet survey requirements.

That is what we are emphasizing. That is what has been eliminated.

The survey funds available now to the Chief of Engineers are completely committed, and unless an appropriation is made available for this survey, this program, which we consider of the utmost importance, cannot be funded.

The Chief of Engineers testified before the committee that—

The purpose of this review will be to determine in the light of the 1955 floods, and predicated upon sound basin planning, what additional projects and measures may be necessary and feasible to protect against or reduce the damages from flood occurrences.

I do not have the figures readily at hand, but it is my impression that only something like 20 percent of the funds

authorized have been granted to all of New England. I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] will ask to restore this $330,000. Without it, as the majority leader has stated, New England will be stopped dead in its tracks. Remember, these were the worst two floods in New England history. We must have action now—not 6 months or a year from now.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I want to commend the gentleman for his very fine statement. I am glad he stresses the urgency of this matter because time is of the essence. If we try to save a few pennies we are going to lose millions of dollars and many lives later on.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate the gentleman's point. It is an excellent one. Even though these two floods did not reach his district he has worked hard and effectively to bring about the comprehensive flood-control system New England needs so much and to which it is entitled. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of our Massachusetts delegation subcommittee, agrees with us. I am certain that he shares our conviction that these funds are needed now.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made during this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. CRETELLA. The gentleman has read from the letter of General Itschner, and parts of it have been read by others, but I think there is a very important sentence that has been left out up to this time. It is as follows:

The frequency of disaster storms in the Northeast seems to be increasing and we believe it would be unwise to delay action on certain projects because they were not in the August or October patterns. New England has a lower degree of flood protection now than any other section of the country.

I think that is very important.

Mr. HESELTON. That was stressed repeatedly in New England last year and it was presented forcefully by General Itschner. I do not believe anyone, considering the contributions New England has always made whenever disaster struck any other part of our country, would be unwilling to accept the responsibility of helping New England now to have the fair degree of flood protection to which it is entitled. I am certain that this House will approve that principle this afternoon.

A Hindu Would Convert Americans to the Christian Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article has come to my attention which appeared in the Saturday Review. I believe it was written by Mr. Norman Cousins.

The Plan of Satis Prasad is a challenge to every Christian; and it is certainly out of the ordinary, for we like to believe that most of us need no conversion to the Christian religion. However, I repeat, his theme is most challenging in this day of the hydrogen bomb and screaming missiles.

The article follows:

THE PLAN OF SATIS PRASAD

In a village in the hills below Jakarta, Indonesia, I met a man whose name, if I recall it correctly, was Satis Prasad. He was a Hindu priest who had come to Indonesia to look into the religious situation of the many people of Indian descent who lived in the area.

"I am not what you in the West would call a missionary," he said. "My purpose here is to find out how strong the attachment is to Hinduism of the present generation. But I would in fact like to become a missionary and perhaps you can help me."

"Help you? How?"

"By telling me if it is true that the American people believe in missionaries and support their work."

"To a very large extent, yes," I replied.

"Then they would be agreeable to my coming to the United States to work as a missionary among the Americans?"

"You would like to convert Americans to the Hindu religion?"

Satis Prasad smiled. He rose to his feet and slowly circled my chair.

"No," he said. "I would like to convert them to the Christian religion. You see, there are no basic differences in the moral substance of Hinduism and Christianity. Historically and theologically, of course, each has its own distinct character. But in the moral teachings they have far more in common than most people realize. I would like to concentrate on making Americans aware of the need to believe in these moral teachings, by whatever name they go. The important thing is not what I call it but the teachings themselves."

I asked Satis Prasad several questions. First, exactly what moral teachings did he have in mind that both Hinduism and Christianity had in common. Second, why did he feel the American people were in particular need of this kind of missionary work.

"I have made a study of the similarities," he said. "It is a pity, a great pity, that the Americans know so little about the religions of other peoples. That is one thing, incidentally, I should like to help to correct. For it is un-Christian not to understand one's neighbors. Let me give you just a sample of the moral teachings shared by both religions."

He produced a card. In parallel columns he had written out in longhand passages from the Old and New Testaments to correspond with similar passages from the Mahabbarata, the epic poem of the Hindu religion. Under the Golden Rule, for example, he had copied the following:

"This is the sum of all true righteousness—Treat others as thou wouldst theyself be treated."—Mahabbarata.

"Whatever you do not wish your neighbor to do to you do not unto him."—Old Testament.

"Whatsoever ye would that men do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."—St. Matthew.

"A man obtains a proper rule of action by looking on his neighbor as himself."—Mahabarrata.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."—St. Matthew.

Under "Evil and Righteousness" he had copied out:

"Love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again."—St. Luke.

"High-minded men delight in doing good; without a thought of their own interest; when they confer a benefit on others they reckon not on favors in return."—Mahabbarata.

"Overcome evil with good."—St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

"Overcome the evil man by goodness."—Mahabbarata.

"Behold, God will not cast away a perfect man, neither will he help the evildoers. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears are open unto their cry."—Old Testament.

"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."—St. Matthew.

"Then, in a religion bright with golden luster—Center of light and immortality—The righteous after death shall dwell in bliss."—Mahabbarata.

Under the heading "Moral Conduct":

"If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink."—St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

"Even to foes who visit us as guests, due hospitality should be displayed."—Mahabbarata.

"A soft answer turneth away wrath; but grievous words stir up anger."—Old Testament.

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust does corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourself treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust does corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal."—St. Matthew.

"Lay up the only treasure; do good deeds; practice sobriety and self-control; amass that wealth which thieves cannot abstract, nor tyrants seize, which follows thee at death, which never wastes away nor is corrupted."—Mahabbarata.

"Straight is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."—St. Matthew.

"Heaven's gate is very narrow and minute; it cannot be perceived by foolish men, blinded by vain illusions of the world."—Mahabbarata.

"This is only one side of one card," he said. "Actually, the parallel teachings could fill many pages."

"But the same could be said of all the world's great religions," I replied. "The oneness of man is nowhere expressed more dramatically than in the similarity of the spiritual teachings."

"Precisely," he agreed. "But the important thing is to get people to act on the basis of these teachings. And that is why I am so eager to help save Christianity. Christianity cannot survive in the abstract. It needs not membership but believers. The

people of your country may claim they believe in Christianity but from what I read at this distance, Christianity is more a custom than anything else.

"Your very way of life, your whole economy, your foreign policy, your values—surely you must see the great inconsistency between them and the teachings of Jesus. Christianity is a religion of humility, of renunciation, of sacrifice, of moral purity. It is not a power doctrine for a nation or an individual. Yet even as you flout Christ's will you call yourselves Christians. My mission will be to get you to realize what you have to do before you have a right to use the term.

"I say this not in anger. America has given much to the world and can give more still. But in recent years you have lost much strength in direct proportion as you have departed from the literal acceptance of the doctrines you profess to follow. I can think of no country in history that weakened itself more than America did when it dropped two atomic bombs on living creatures. Please do not stop me by saying that there can be no religion in warfare. When you kill without meaning, you go beyond war.

"Atomic energy transcended warfare and was the beginning of a new age on earth. You had sole possession of the bomb. Your leaders knew the end of the war was at hand. They did not tell the truth when they claimed they were trying to save the thousands of lives that an invasion would cost. All the documents which have come out since the war have proved that your leaders knew the atom bomb was not necessary to win the war. Yet they used it not once but twice. If there was an excuse for the first bomb, what excuse do you give for the second a few days later?

"These things weigh very heavily on me. Americans are my brothers. So are the Russians. But the Russians are opposed to the Hindu-Christian spiritual development of man. You at least accept it in theory, and that is why I want to come to America to see if I cannot get you to accept it in fact."

"What is it you would have us do?"

"I would ask in good conscience and in good faith that you first of all come to terms with yourselves. I would ask that you cease justifying your inconsistencies by saying, as so many of you often say, 'Of course, Christianity does not exist here in its pure form, any more than it exists anywhere in the world in its pure form; it is an aspiration and we are moving toward it.' I would ask that you not take refuge in this argument. It is a trick of reasoning and is meaningless. Can you imagine Jesus explaining away the present Christian paradox by pointing to an aspiration?

"I would ask that you either accept the teachings of Jesus in your everyday lives and in your affairs as a nation or stop invoking His name as sanction for everything you do.

"Perhaps without realizing it, you have a superiority complex. You claimed that only you could do certain things, as in science, and it turns out that you were as wrong as everyone else in history who had made claims of superiority. Mistakes like these come at heavy price.

"America has much to offer the world. But it will continue to weaken itself unless it throws off its assumptions of superiority and thinks in terms of mutuality. True strength can only be in moral principle come to life.

"One has the impression you are made uneasy by talk concerning the literal application of such principles. You are impatient, for example, with anyone who says you should reexamine fearlessly all the circumstances and aspects concerning the decision to use atomic weapons on living targets. You are annoyed by this and would prefer to drop it and forget it. But you cannot drop it or forget it. You cannot because the same faulty reasoning which led you to use it expresses itself in so many other ways and decisions. And faulty reasoning creates its own punishments.

"I want to come to America to make you try to understand that retribution is not a random divine act for a random event but something men themselves fashion out of continuing error and out of a continuing failure to see the validity of moral law in their actions. I should like to tax the Christian individual with responsibility for the group.

"But most importantly, I should like to do what I can to help America prepare itself for the big developments of the next few years. Asia and Africa are now awake. They are tearing themselves free of their bondage. They are learning how to read and write and make things. Soon they will be more powerful even than you. What will happen when America discovers that it no longer is the most powerful nation in the world? Will it become resentful and antagonistic? Will it learn how to abide the fact that it is not predominately a white man's world? It must not be a dark man's world either; and both white and dark will have to make the adjustment.

"I would like to be able to convince the Americans that their guideposts at such a trying hour can be found in their own spiritual legacy, and not in striking out fiercely and wildly in an attempt to hold back history. For I would persuade them that the greatest honor and source of pride is to be found not in the banners of the group but in human brotherhood.

"I preach. I know I preach. That is exactly what I would like to do in America. I want to be a missionary in your country. I want to help save Christianity for the Christians. How do I go about doing this? Do the Americans believe in missionaries? Will Americans welcome me."—N. C.

The Boy Scout Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 46th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America.

Within the brief period of one generation, 46 years, the Boy Scouts of America has grown from a handful to a membership of 2,765,000 boys and nearly 1 million leaders. Nor has this growth ended. Last year the scouting movement in this country added 280,462 additional members. No organization could have grown so great so fast unless it offered something very worthwhile to American living and culture.

Boy Scouting does offer much of great and enduring value to the youth of America and for the well-being and happiness of our country and its people.

The equalities of character which every Boy Scout is pledged to seek to develop within himself are those of self reliance, courage, reverance for God, helpfulness to others, good health, mental alertness, and moral straightness. All of these are qualities that make for that good citizenship upon which good government depends.

The greatest and most important resource that this Nation possesses is its boys and girls. Upon the development of a nation's youth, more than upon anything else, depends the nation's future. The Boy Scout movement, since it develops boys into better citizens, builds wisely and well for a better, stronger and happier America. May the Boy Scout movement continue to grow and prosper because it serves all that is noblest and best in our national life.

Inside Sarasota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a very pertinent newspaper article which was written by one of Florida's outstanding young journalists, Mr. Paul Einstein, who writes for the Sarasota Herald-Tribune. The article appeared in the Sunday, January 29, 1956, edition of the Sarasota Herald-Tribune. Mr. Einstein is concerned with our need for better highways and the methods by which a highway program can be financed. It is a very timely article and I sincerely hope that each of my colleagues will take the opportunity to read Mr. Einstein's pertinent words on this important subject. The article follows:

INSIDE SARASOTA
(By Paul Einstein)

TAX TALK

The "something for nothing" boys are at it again with this talk about Federal aid for highway construction.

They would make you think the Government is going to wave a magic wand and presto, we will have highways without so much as a blink of the eye.

Someone will have to pay for the program and the record shows a few States carry the burden of the Nation's gasoline tax and receive fewer roads.

And Florida is one of those States.

Florida motorists are paying some $22 million in gasoline taxes to the Federal Government each year. And the State road department gets back only $14 million for roads.

We feel that the States should foot the bill for their own highways.

We need more and better highways and we think there should be a 1- or 2-cent tax per gallon increase to get them, if necessary. But it should be done by the States.

Records show that Federal gasoline taxes collected in Florida go to build roads in 10 western and midwestern States, in the dust and desert belt. These are North Dakota, South Dakota, Nevada, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, and Oregon.

Bearing the brunt of the tax burden for highways in these States along with Florida are New Jersey, Maryland, Connecticut, California, Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, Ohio, North Carolina, Massachusetts, and Michigan.

Most of the other States are getting roads back for the tax money they shell out.

The State of North Dakota gets the biggest hunk out of the pie. It receives 285 percent of the gasoline taxes collected in the State. Nevada gets 259 percent; South Dakota, 252 percent; Montana, 230 percent; and on down the line to Oregon with 122 percent.

It just isn't right for a few of the more progressive States to bear the brunt of the cost for new highways in sparsely settled areas while they are being forced to go to toll turnpikes to provide adequate facilities to handle fast-growing populations.

Even after giving taxes to the Federal Government for roads, the State has to go through a lot of red tape to get back any of it.

Plans must be approved by the Federal engineers, matching funds must be supplied, and the road funds can only be used on certain types of projects.

Any highway-aid program which may come out of the present Congress can be expected to mean more dollars from the motorists here to build roads in the West.

Peace-Debts Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on December 31 the British Government paid its fifth installment in repayment of the reconstruction loan negotiated with this country at the end of World War II. At the time that the loan was made a number of Americans prophesied that not one cent would ever be repaid, and I am sure that they, to say nothing of the American taxpayers, are only too happy to find themselves proved wrong.

The American taxpayer should, however, be aware of what this repayment means in the world economic situation as it exists 10 years after the loan was made. The payment of this year's installment cannot have been easy for Britain at a time when her gold and dollar reserves were under heavy pressure and she was having to take special internal measures to expand her export trade. It is important that we should realize how much Britain's ability to service her debts depends upon her export trade. This year's payment to the United States represents the value of her exports to this country for 3 months—a heavy burden indeed. Britain's ability to continue payments on the loan and to buy from this country the products of farm and industry which she needs will depend to a large extent on whether American trade policies permit her to earn enough.

We cannot have tariff walls, complicated and uncertain customs procedures, quotas and trade restrictions, and at the same time expect repayment of debts from abroad. It is futile for us to expect other countries to buy American exports and to pay back their debts unless we are prepared to allow them to earn the dollars with which to do so. Let us therefore press forward instead with trade policies suited to our own enlightened self-interest.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 3, 1956]

PEACE-DEBTS PAYMENTS

With Britain's fifth annual installment of principal and interest on the loan made by the United States to Britain in 1946, a payment amounting to the value of about 3 months of British exports to the United States has been made. The 1946 loan of approximately $4.3 billion is repayable in 50 equal annual payments of $138 million, which includes interest at 2 percent. Of the 5 payments made thus far, which total $690 million, $266 million has been paid on principal and $424 million as interest. This peace debt, which was incurred primarily to cover essential purchases by Britain from the United States after the war, still amounts to considerably more than $4 billion.

This annual loan payment at year's end serves to focus attention on Britain's race to close the dollar gap—an attempt that seems to be almost as far from success as it was several years ago. The trouble is that Britain annually buys more from the United States than this country buys from Britain. Even the all-out effort in 1955 to close this dollar gap, which brought British exports to the high of $560 million during the year, still left Britain in the red by some $320 million. For the British bought $880 million worth of American products.

This situation points up once more the need for continued American efforts to buy more abroad from Great Britain and other friendly nations. It's good business to increase our purchases from our own good customers.

A Federal Judicial Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the late Federal Judge John Knight, who served for 24 years as a distinguished jurist on the United States District Court for the Western New York Judicial District, passed away on June 15, 1955. Judge Knight was an esteemed member of the bench and was to me a beloved personal friend.

In the interest of assuring that his successor was imbued with the same measure of personal integrity, human understanding, and professional ability, I undertook to support the candidacy of Joseph Rubenstein, Esq., of Dunkirk, N. Y., for the nomination to replace Judge Knight. I took this action because of my personal knowledge of Mr. Rubenstein's record of professional achievement and his reputation for outstanding personal character. My decision to support his candidacy was also motivated by the countless letters of endorsement of Mr. Rubenstein I received from prominent citizens throughout the western New York area.

In addition to support from private citizens, Mr. Rubenstein had the endorsement of the majority of the county chairmen in the 17 counties in western New York that had an interest in the appointment. That Mr. Rubenstein did not receive the nomination is, I believe, a loss to the quality of our Federal judiciary. The character of Mr. Rubenstein's conduct during the entire period that this matter was pending is a tribute to his professional ethics and personal integrity. It is also convincing proof of the good judgment of those many persons who were privileged to support him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a few of the letters I received endorsing the candidacy of Mr. Rubenstein for appointment to the United States District Court for the Western New York District:

DUNKIRK PRINTING CO.,
Dunkirk, N. Y., November 21, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: During the period of your convalescence I urged you to pay no attention to pressures or political matters which might require the slightest worry or energy on your part.

However, I understand you have put yourself back in the harness now and so I dare to address you on a matter which I am sure must be troubling you as it has been troubling me. I am afraid some members of our party are stooping to tactics which will be harmful to the party, and dreadfully distressing to those of us who believe in the Republican Party, not as professionals in the hope of reward, but as rank-and-file members who have long believed in the Republican Party as the way to good citizenship and good government.

My own republicanism dates back to a grandfather who introduced Lincoln to several audiences in western Ohio. It is a matter of faith with me, and consequently I am doubly distressed by the apparent bad faith and shortsightedness, if not bigotry, on the part of some leaders who have opposed the appointment of Joseph Rubenstein to the Federal judgeship.

Mr. Rubenstein is a close and valued personal friend. But more than that he is an able, conscientious, thoroughly honest, and completely respected Republican leader. He is a competent lawyer who has made an avocation of service to our party and to our country. Lately he has been beset by a peculiarly vicious form of attack, which, in my opinion, was inspired by professional jealousy. The courts and public opinion have completely exonerated Mr. Rubenstein.

Mr. Rubenstein is your candidate for the Federal court in the vacancy created by the late Judge Knight. He has been endorsed by the majority of western New York county chairmen. His service to the party places him clearly in line for the position. His capabilities qualify him superbly. The opposition comes at least in part from sources inspired by considerations other than the best interests of the party and the country.

To me, this is a test of the party to which I have always given my allegiance. I always shall, but any failure of the party to act properly and decently in this matter will be a sad blow to my faith and the faith of others.

As Republicans we believe in tolerance, in the melting pot, in justice to all men of whatever creed. We profess to fight for those things for our country. We should fight with equal zeal to preserve them within our party. This is not prompted by an emotion of friendship, but by a sense of political reality. The whole party suffers any time there is a departure from ideals. To support the best fitted for the office, uninfluenced by prejudice or vicious, trumped-up and insupportable charges is to be true to the ideals of the party. In short it has reached a point where the support of Mr.

Rubenstein is the only course which can be right both politically and morally.

I know that you personally agree with this viewpoint just as you have always been on the side of decency and justice throughout your long career. Because you are what you are you have always personally reflected great honor and credit on the Republican Party. That has been true of all your acts. It has been true in the Rubenstein case. As a citizen I am very proud of you and Joe, and of our party. Your stand in this matter enhances my pride in the party.

I had resolved never again to be one of those who transgressed upon your time to add to your burdens. And I would not do so now were it not for the extreme importance of this matter which transcends personalities and relates to the ideals which, I know, we share for our party. A square deal for Joe symbolizes a party which must be incapable of acting on lesser motives.

With good wishes always for your continued good health, I am,

Cordially,

WALLACE A. BRENNAN,
Editor, Evening Observer.

GOWANDA, N. Y., *November 16, 1955.*

Re Joseph Rubenstein.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: We represented Joseph Rubenstein in the disciplinary proceeding prosecuted by the Bar Association of Northern Chautauqua, Inc., in the appellate division, 4th department, which resulted in an unanimous dismissal and his complete exoneration. Recent developments and publicity concerning the nomination of an United States judge for the Western District of New York compel us to give you the background and facts of this disciplinary proceeding.

Joseph Rubenstein has practiced law in western New York for over 25 years. He is a member of a busy and successful firm of excellent repute, locally and statewide. For some years past he has also been the Chautauqua County Republican Chairman.

The disciplinary proceeding was instituted on the complaint of lawyers, not laymen or clients. These lawyers were dissatisfied and disappointed, either professionally or politically, or both. The bar association was officered by gentlemen of comparative inexperience and recent admission to the bar. The president of the bar association appointed the complainants as the grievance committee. This committee, as might be expected, scoured the countryside for witnesses, investigated thoroughly, and recommended prosecution, which landed the matter in court. The proceeding was prosecuted vigorously by the district attorney, assisted throughout by the grievance committee which at times seemed to run the show.

And a show it was. In total disregard of the law, established procedure, and any consideration for the rights and reputation of Mr. Rubenstein, the whole proceeding was conducted in a pitiless glare of publicity, radio, newspaper, and by word of many mouths. This was not only a disciplinary proceeding. It was a whispering campaign, pushed by jealous lawyers and disappointed politicos, to break Rubenstein professionally and politically.

The appellate division referred the proceeding to the Honorable Earle S. Warner, official referee, to take proof. Four days were consumed in the taking of testimony before the referee in Mayville. There were two appearances before the appellate division in Rochester. The lay witnesses, relied on by the bar association to establish its charge, gave testimony completely vindicating Rubenstein. An impressive array of character witnesses, headed by the Honorable Frank Moore, and including leaders of the bench, bar, and business, gave eloquent testimony of Mr. Rubenstein's reputation for ability, integrity, and ethics.

The learned official referee, in a 23-page report to the court, stated:

"I find and report that, in the light of all the surrounding and rather anomalous circumstances, not of the respondents making, which are shown by the proof to have existed, the proven acts and conduct of the respondents, which are complained of, were warranted by personal relations and may not fairly and properly, in my opinion, be found to constitute an improper and unethical solicitation of legal business in violation of the provisions of paragraph 27 of the Canons of Ethics; * * *.

"I conclude, after consideration of all the proofs offered before me, in relation to the issues raised in this proceeding which were referred to me by your honorable body, that the petitioners have not sustained their charges of violation, by Joseph Rubenstein * * *.

"I respectfully recommend that the proceeding against the respondents herein, Joseph Rubenstein * * *, be dismissed." (Matters affecting other persons and not pertinent to this résumé, are omitted.)

The appellate division unanimously confirmed the referee's report and dismissed the proceeding. No appeal has been taken and the time to do so has expired.

Speaking from long experience in bar association work, both on the grievance committees and as past presidents of our respective associations, we state without hesitation, that the proceeding against Joseph Rubenstein has no parallel in our knowledge. It was vicious. It was conceived in politics, weaned on professional jealousy, and flourished on both. Its object was to destroy a respected practitioner rather than to protect the public and the profession. The final result reflected adversely on the attackers and officially confirmed the excellent reputation of the attacked.

With kind personal regards and best wishes for your health,

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL D. LOMBARDO,
MARVIN M. SIMON,
Attorneys at Law.

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress,
Dunkirk, N. Y.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want you to know that I approve your strong stand for Joe Rubenstein and the county chairmen in the matter of the appointment of a United States district judge for the western district of New York to succeed Judge Knight.

Upon Judge Knight's death, the people who run the New York Republican State committee bestowed the judgeship upon Mr. Justin Morgan and then set out to make their choice look genuine. They called a meeting of the seventh judicial district Republican chairmen at Rochester in July. Morehouse told the chairmen that Mr. Morgan was the only serious candidate. The county chairmen had no reason to believe that Morehouse was false and went along with him when he asked them to recommend Mr. Morgan. Besides, it was really an eighth judicial district matter anyway and nothing to them.

Morehouse then called a meeting of the eighth district chairmen in Buffalo. I am told that before the meeting took place, the State committee had already passed the word to the White House that Mr. Morgan was the unanimous choice for the job. Actually, at the meeting, the chairmen were for Joe Rubenstein and said so.

I was formerly county chairman of this county. In that capacity I became well acquainted with Joe. I knew he was seeking the office. I knew that he deserved it more than any of the others. I knew that he had all the qualifications for the office, including the important but frequently overlooked one of being an experienced, successful practicing trial lawyer. I was disappointed to read in the newspapers that Joe had not received the appointment. I felt that the county committee system had been dealt another blow.

Later I found that Mr. Morgan had not in fact been appointed and that you had been able to get some of the true picture through to the White House. I attended the meeting of the rural chairmen at Batavia in October, and their resolution supporting Joe and reaffirming the position they took at Buffalo was encouraging indeed.

It's no longer just a question of who is going to be the Federal judge. There are now two other very important questions. First, shall the county organizations, the basic sources of political strength in our system, be deprived of any voice in political appointments important to them, in favor of the Albany crowd, who produce nothing of political value? Second, shall the White House, by appointing their candidate, indicate approval of the methods used by the Albany crowd in trying to have their own way with this appointment?

I do not know Mr. Morgan very well. I presume he is deserving as are scores of others. I doubt that the devious means employed in the name of the State committee were his doing.

Joe Rubenstein has been an outstanding contributor to Republican strength. The county chairmen are behind him and it is now their fight as well as his. I hope you will stay with them and, for the good of the party and the community, I hope you win.

Sincerely,

THOMAS CROUCHER,
District Attorney.

ROGERSON & HEWES,
Jamestown, N. Y., November 21, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives
Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DAN: It appeared a few weeks ago that the appointee to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John Knight in the District Court for the Western District of New York had been determined. I am now informed that such determination is not irrevocable and that my good friend, Joe Rubenstein, is receiving serious consideration. Such being the case, I wish to add my word of commendation in support of Mr. Rubenstein's candidacy.

Over a period of 15 to 20 years Joe has established himself as a leader at the bar, learned in the law and with a fine personality which commands affection and respect. He enjoys an excellent reputation for integrity, industry, and ability among his fellow lawyers and with the public generally and I believe he is fully capable of carrying out the duties of the office to which he aspires.

I am glad to hear that your recovery is continuing and that you fully expect to be a candidate for reelection next fall.

With warm personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL ROGERSON.

MAYVILLE, N. Y., *November 23, 1955.*

The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
United States Representative,
House of Representatives Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I should like to take this opportunity to urge your consideration and support for the appointment of Hon. Joseph A. Rubenstein to the highly important post of Federal judge recently vacated by the death of Hon. John H. Knight.

It has been my privilege to have been associated with the county of Chautauqua for

a period of approximately 18 years and more recently to have served as county treasurer. In this capacity, I have had the opportunity to become intimately acquainted with Mr. Rubenstein; and I am sure that I not only speak for myself, but also for many other people who have been closely allied with him for many years.

Mr. Rubenstein is recognized as one of Chautauqua County's outstanding attorneys, having been in the practice of law for many years. He has had a wide variety of legal experience, therefore, providing excellent qualifications and background for the highly important post of Federal judge. He is a tireless and efficient worker. Throughout his service as chairman, good government has become a byword in Chautauqua County.

Through my close association with Mr. Rubenstein, I have found him to be extremely fair and a most diligent and aggressive chairman for the Republican Party. This is substantiated due to the fact that Mr. Rubenstein has been elected and reelected to the important position of chairman; and as further proof of the esteem in which he is held, he has been selected as chairman of the Western New York Association of County Chairmen for several years.

In closing, I again most sincerely recommend the Honorable Joseph A. Rubenstein for Federal judge and feel that he would lend himself of his talents and afford dignity to the office.

Best personal regards.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT H. MILLER,
County Treasurer.

OLEAN, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL REED,
United States Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: I have known Joseph Rubenstein for the past 15 years as an attorney.

He is a good lawyer and a highly respected member of the bar.

I am proud to be his friend.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. NEVINS,
Children's Court and County Judge, Cattaraugus County.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: Our mutual friend, Joseph Rubenstein, is available for appointment as a judge of the District Court for our district. I am sure that his candidacy meets with your unqualified approval and I wish you to know that I heartily concur.

In our years of acquaintance, and particularly during the 12 years of my judicial tenure, I have naturally had occasion to gain first-hand knowledge of his character and capabilities, both personally and professionally, as he has enjoyed an active practice.

I consider him very well qualified for the judgeship by all standards and anticipate for him a long and honorable judicial career in the event of his appointment.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

HUGH V. N. BODINE,
County Judge and Surrogate, Chautauqua County.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I congratulate you on your support of Joseph Rubenstein for United States District Judge for the Western District of New York?

I have known Mr. Rubenstein for 25 years, and believe him to be eminently qualified for this office.

He is an able and experienced practicing attorney, and his morals and integrity are above reproach.

In my opinion he will be a worthy successor to Hon. John Knight who served for so many years with credit to himself and the district.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. MUNSON,
Justice, Supreme Court, State of New York.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress,
Washintgon, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last summer, the death of the late John Knight, Judge of United States District Court for the Western District of New York, left a vacancy which has not yet been filled.

I am glad to recommend for appoint to that position of United States District Judge, Joseph Rubenstein of Dunkirk, N. Y.

Joseph Rubeinstein is especially well qualified for this judgeship. He has an active general practice of wide scope. His life has been lived in an atmosphere of keen interest in public affairs, and he has a well developed sense of fairness and justice. He is an able lawyer of broad vision. He is possessed of good commonsense, and is of the highest integrity.

I heartily recommend him for this important appointment.

Sincerely,

LEE L. OTTAWAY,
Justice, Supreme Court, State of New York.

CUBA, N. Y., *November 22, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Dunkirk, N. Y.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this letter in behalf of Joseph Rubenstein, of Dunkirk. I understand that Joe is still being considered as an appointee for the Federal judgeship in western New York.

I would like to state that I have known Joe for a number of years last past and I have always found him to be a friendly and courteous gentleman. I believe that his temperament, integrity, and abilities would qualify him for a Federal judgeship and I sincerely hope that this letter may be of some help in furthering his cause.

Very truly yours,

WARD M. HOPKINS,
Allegany County Judge and Surrogate.

CHURCH OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST,
Dunkirk, N. Y., November 21, 1955.

The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: May I respectfully urge you to use your influence to secure the appointment of Joseph Rubenstein, of Dunkirk, to the Federal judgeship now vacant in this district?

I have known Joe for over 25 years, and consider it an honor to number him among my close friends. He is a man for whom I have the greatest affection and admiration.

His honesty and integrity are beyond question. His professional reputation is above reproach. He is learned and experienced in the law; he is a deeply religious man, and is fearless in his defense and advocacy of what he knows to be right.

Joe has always been foremost in every good work for the betterment of the community, and is esteemed and respected by his fellow citizens, irrespective of race, creed, or party.

He will be a distinct asset and adornment to the Federal judiciary, and we trust our great President will be prevailed upon to appoint him.

I hope you are completely recovered from your recent illness, and enjoy good health once more.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE F. CHARD,
Rector.

ALBANY, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been requested to write to you to give my opinion of the character and legal attainments of Mr. Joseph Rubenstein of Dunkirk, N. Y. My opinion can be given succinctly and unequivocally: I believe that Mr. Rubenstein is a man of unquestionably good moral character and that he is an able, thoroughly competent lawyer.

I have known Joe Rubenstein since his law-school days. While I was engaged in the practice of law in Buffalo, I was associated with him as counsel in many litigated matters and I had ample opportunity to observe his conduct and to form a judgment as to his character and ability. I found him at all times to be fair and honorable in his conduct; I can vouch for his integrity and trustworthiness. As a lawyer, he showed a sound grasp of fundamental principles; he was always diligent and conscientious in the performance of any task undertaken by him. He was always courteous and considerate, even-tempered and genial, and very pleasant to work with. In my opinion, by character, temperament and ability, he is well qualified for judicial office.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP HALPERN,
Associate Justice, Erie County.

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY, N. Y.,
November 23, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND DAN: I understand there is some opposition from some of the State politicians to the appointment of Joseph Rubenstein to a Federal judgeship which was promised him.

In my opinion, and I know this to be the opinion of a great many people in Chautauqua County, Mr. Rubenstein is well qualified to fill this judgeship.

I have had the privilege of working with Mr. Rubenstein in several different capacities in the past 10 years and have never found him wanting. He has an unlimited amount of energy to always follow through with whatever he starts.

Mr. Rubenstein's loyalty and honesty cannot be questioned by anyone who has ever worked with him. I know that Mr. Rubenstein has always conformed to a strict code of loyalty and honesty with everyone, never stooping to anything which could be questioned for either political or financial gain for himself or friends.

Mr. Rubenstein is, without question, one of the best attorneys in this district, and I know that he would conduct himself and his court in a manner which would be a credit to the office, and bring to the courts and judgeship the high honor and esteem to which we all wish the people to have for them.

Sincerely yours,

HALL R. CLOTHIER,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors.

WOODIN & WOODIN,
Dunkirk, N. Y., November 21, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the first place, we are all very happy that you are well on the road to recovery. In the same way, we are very thankful that President Eisenhower has been spared to us.

In the second place, I am very pleased to endorse whole-heartedly, the candidacy of my old friend, Joseph Rubenstein, for appointment as United States district judge. I have known Joe all his life. For many years, we have practiced law together in this community. He is sound in mind, heart and body. He has had an excellent education. He has practiced law successfully for 20 years. The country will not have to pay for his education upon the bench. He is qualified to render excellent service from the first day of his appointment. Intelligent, industrious, honest, he will, if appointed, be a credit to himself and his sponsors.

Further, we feel strongly that the county districts of western New York are entitled to recognition. Joe has served this community for many years, loyally, intelligently, and effectively.

We urge his appointment without any reservation of any kind.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

GLENN W. WOODIN,
Counselor at Law.

SENECA FALLS, N. Y., *November 21, 1955.*

Re Mr. Joseph Rubenstein, Dunkirk, N. Y.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: This is a letter of recommendation for the above named in connection with his candidacy for the office of United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

I have known Mr. Rubenstein for over 30 years. He is highly regarded, not only in his home town of Dunkirk, but also in western New York State, and in fact throughout the State of New York.

The professional standing of Mr. Rubenstein is beyond reproach, and he is of the highest integrity and character.

He is a good lawyer, has a well rounded practice and is a man of experience, well qualified to assume the roll of a United States judge.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP SERLING,
Attorney at Law.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK
OF SILVER CREEK, N. Y.,
November 22, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: I wish to take this opportunity to commend you for your efforts in behalf of Joseph Rubenstein for appointment to the Federal judgeship.

We feel that Joe is capable and well qualified and if appointed would serve in a manner reflecting credit and admiration on himself and this community.

We of this county are well aware of his party efforts and accomplishments, and if possible to select a man from Chautauqua County it would be appreciated.

If there is anything we could do up here to advance his chances for appointment, we will be glad to hear from you.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

HERBERT J. CRANDALL,
President.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *November 22, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is to express to you my endorsement and support of Joseph Rubenstein, of Dunkirk, for the office of judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of New York.

I have known Mr. Rubenstein in his public and professional life for the past 25 years and have always found him to be an estimable and upright gentleman and an able and energetic lawyer. In all of his public service, he has maintained a reputation for integrity and forthrightness which is rare in public life; while his private and professional activities have been of a character to furnish ample assurance of his qualifications and fitness for the high judicial office for which he is a candidate.

I am certain I am expressing the conviction of all of us here who know him that he will carry out the difficult duties of a member of the Federal judiciary in exemplary and notable fashion.

With kind personal regards,

Faithfully yours,

SIDNEY B. PFEIFER,
Attorney at Law.

DUNKIRK TRUST CO.,
Dunkirk, N. Y., November 21, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: As you know, Joseph Rubenstein, a member of the legal firm of Towne, Rubenstein, and Foster, Dunkirk, N. Y., is a candidate for appointment as Federal judge to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge John W. Knight.

I have known Mr. Rubenstein for more than 20 years and have been acquainted with his family for nearly twice that length of time.

Joseph Rubenstein is an active, practicing attorney in this city and he has handled many legal matters for both this trust company and myself. I have always found him to be diligent in his work, a forceful attorney and a man of excellent character and unquestioned integrity.

In addition, I have had a long period of association with him in various civic affairs and for many years he has taken an active part in practically every project for the betterment of the city.

In my opinion, he has the experience, mind and temperament to make a good Federal judge, and I feel very sure that if he is appointed Federal judge to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Knight, he will perform his duties in a capable and distinguished manner.

I know that Mr. Rubenstein has many friends throughout this area who are very much interested in his appointment to this judgeship and I hope that he may receive favorable consideration for the office.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT R. DEW,
President.

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY, N. Y.,
November 22, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: We have been reading quite a lot in the press of late about the Federal judgeship in our district. I felt I wanted to tell you how some of us feel back home.

Joseph Rubenstein, in my opinion, is one of the most capable attorneys in our area. I have observed his work in court several times, my office being, as you know, adjacent to the courtroom, and his appearance and ability has always seemed to me to be outstanding. I have had many private contacts with him and have always found him to be a man of integrity, indeed the type of individual who would add stature and prestige to any activity in which he might be engaged. As you know, I have been a supervisor and a county officer now for 16 years, and in my work I contact a great number of people about the county. It has been my observation that, with practically no exceptions, others feel the same as I do.

Anything that you can do to aid him in his candidacy would certainly have the wholehearted backing of this area, and I also believe, from the adjoining rural counties.

I trust that you are pretty well recovered from your recent illness. From reports I have been hearing I am sure you are back in the saddle, doing your usual excellent job.

Kindest personal regards,

EVERETT F. NECKERS,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors and
County Auditor.

Educational Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed resolutions adopted by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters favoring the continuance of the reservation of television channels for noncommercial educational stations, and requesting that there be no encroachment on the FM band presently used by schools:

Whereas many school systems, colleges, universities, educational and public service agencies, and commercial broadcasters are licensed to operate FM stations, or present educational broadcasts over such facilities; and

Whereas the educational and cultural programs broadcast over these stations have proved to be valuable to their communities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, assembled in Chicago for its annual convention, urge the Federal Communications Commission to retain for FM broadcasting the entire frequency band between 88 and 108 megacycles, in order that these services, developed through the years, may be continued and expanded.

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission, in its sixth report and order of April 14, 1952, displayed great wisdom, foresight, and courage in the reservation of television channels for education; and

Whereas great strides have been made in the activation of these channels, so that there now are 18 noncommercial educational television stations on the air with a potential audience of over 30 million persons; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is now considering several proposals for the future utilization of VHF and UHF channels: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the NAEB, assembled in Chicago for its annual convention, urge the FCC to retain the principle of reserved channels for noncommercial educational television stations in any future allocations plan which may be formulated, and further petitions that these educational reservations be continued under conditions no less favorable than those presently in effect.

Whereas under the order of the FCC, educational organizations, institutions, and agencies have been licensed to operate broadcasting stations of all types; and

Whereas the FCC is currently considering subscription television: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the NAEB, assembled in Chicago for its annual convention, urge the FCC, in the event that any form of subscription television is authorized on either a temporary or permanent basis, to extend to educational organizations, institutions, and agencies, the same opportunities to participate as may be extended to any others.

The Free World in 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as food for thought, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in Intelligence Digest for January 1956, entitled "A Critical Year Opens":

A CRITICAL YEAR OPENS—A DIPLOMATIC CORRESPONDENT REPORTS

This observer thinks that 1956 will prove to be the most important year since 1933. That year saw the rise of Hitler and, in consequence, the virtual certainty of World War II.

War was not certain because of Hitler. It was certain because public opinion in the West was in such bad shape that any intelligent observer knew that the West would postpone rearmament until Hitler had gone too far to withdraw.

The danger in 1933 was that, misled by western disarmament, Hitler would quickly commit himself to a course from which retreat would be impossible.

The year 1933 was thus the critical year; 1939 was only the inevitable outcome.

WESTERN OPINION AWOKE TOO LATE

No responsible observer believed that western opinion would be aroused in time—and it was not. It awoke only when it was too late to avert war, and when it was possible to win a war only with the aid of forces which would create all the necessary factors for a third and much worse crisis—in the midst of which we now find ourselves.

Between 1933 and 1938, all those who pleaded for strong military forces and implored the British Government not to rely upon France were harried and hounded. The Socialist Party called them armament-mongers; the Conservative Party excluded them from its platforms for reasons of political expediency. Churchill was ostracised, and many lesser men likewise.

All that increased Hitler's ambitions. The very people who most feared war were its real encouragers. Many of them were good, decent people with a real love of peace. But their escapism and ignorance brought upon the world the very calamity which they sincerely desired to avert.

THIS YEAR MAY DECIDE THE ISSUE

Much the same is true now. This year will finally decide the issue, although the ultimate outcome of our actions in 1956 may not mature yet a while.

Russia now thinks that the West is disintegrating; that it cannot create an effective defense system; and that it will eventually collapse. Russian leaders make no secret of their opinions. You can read them almost any week in Russian newspapers.

THE BASIS OF RUSSIA'S ACTIONS

The West has tried to convince Russia that it has peaceful intentions. This is almost funny. Russia needs no persuasion on that point. She is more than convinced. It is the basis of all her actions. The Soviet Government uses the fear complex of the Russian masses to justify immense armament projects; but the Government itself knows full well that there is no danger of attack from the West.

What is needed to halt Russia's moves toward a policy which the West will one day be forced to resist (if it is not to be strangled) is the exact opposite.

Russia must be convinced that unless she makes reasonable concessions and gives up her aggressive policies, the West will resist. That, and that alone, would make Russia stop to think.

No mere words will convince Russia that the West means business. The only thing which would do that would be precise reports from her own agents that the West has the means to act. Then Russian policy would change.

COMPARABLE WITH 1933

Either events in 1956 will make Russia stop to think, or she will commit herself too deeply to withdraw. She is on the verge of commitments from which there can be no retreat, and which the West could not ignore and must eventually resist. The issue of war or peace will be decided in 1956, though the outcome may not be clear for some time afterward.

RUSSIA'S CONVICTIONS

Russia now believes that the West is helpless and divided. She thinks that no one could sound a real warning and survive politically. She thinks that any publication which did so would lose its circulation and disappear.

She is convinced that France can be reduced to complete political chaos; Germany to neutralism; Italy to leftism; Britain to strikes and economic confusion; and America to disgust.

This observer does not say that any of these things will happen: That is a separate question. The critical point is that Russia believes that all these things will happen. Unless she can be convinced that she is wrong she will commit herself to a position from which retreat will be difficult if not impossible.

A WIDE GAP

It is true that the gap is a wide one between the present political, ideological, and economic difficulties of the western nations, and the internal strength, unity, and powerful defences which are essential. But it is not so wide that it cannot be bridged.

It must be bridged in 1956, or the prospect will become very grave indeed. It will not be bridged unless public opinion is given adequate reasons why it must be.

RUSSIA COULD BE MADE TO THINK

Therein lies the whole problem. The West, united and powerful, could force Russia to think. That would be the beginning of a solution. It proved so after 1945, when Russia not only had to stop but actually withdrew from Persia.

Why? Because she knew that the West alone had the A-bomb and was consequently all-powerful. The position could have been exploited; but it was not. The West weakened and Russia also made the A-bomb.

ANOTHER CHANCE MISSED

Then, for a brief moment the West alone possessed the H-bomb—despite a near miss in that dreadful race. Russia at once paused and smiled. Instead of following a strong policy—as Dulles wished—the West again weakened, and now Russia has near relative parity in all nuclear weapons, and total superiority in all conventional ones.

In consequence of this, and with an eye on China, Russia is rapidly committing herself to projects which the West cannot tolerate. Unless she can be convinced that to go ahead means a disaster to her, she will not now withdraw.

THE ONLY WAY TO CONVINCE RUSSIA

The only way to convince her is by incontrovertible strength. This cannot be forged without public opinion. The public will never give support to such a policy unless it is convinced of the need; and it will not be convinced without the facts.

Russia is nervous about nuclear war. Who is not? This should be the starting point. She is nervous about China; that should be the followup. She is afraid of a united Western Europe and a powerful Anglo-American alliance; that should be the groundwork. She is appalled at the possibility that the West may develop the African Continent; that should become the ultimate check.

If all these policies were made evident by action, and clearly supported by an enthusiastic public opinion, even Khrushchev would pause. To tell Russia that she need not worry (as we did at Geneva) is, of course, madness. She should be encouraged to worry by every means.

Short of this, your observer, in common with all his colleagues (whose contacts are not inconsiderable), fears that Russia will commit herself in 1956 to actions and projects from which she will be unable to retreat. History warns us in plain language what that would mean.

This observer therefore urges responsible people to do the first thing needful—get to work on public opinion, without which our governments are helpless. Every escapist is a contributor to world war III. Everyone who helps to spread the facts is a real contributor to peace.

SOVIET MOVES IN 1956

Your observer thinks that the direction of Russian commitments in 1956 will be the Middle East, and north and east Africa as far down as Ethiopia. Great efforts will be made to isolate and subvert Turkey and Persia. The Indian and Afghan cards will be played to checkmate Pakistan.

In your observer's opinion, Israel will be a target of progressive Soviet dislike, accompanied by anti-Jewish measures within Russia.

If the West fails to consolidate in 1956, and fails to create a bastion in the Middle East fully supported by rapid development in central Africa, then—your observer thinks—Russia will go beyond the point of return and a clash will eventually occur.

Your observer does not subscribe to the opinion that Tito and Chou En-lai can or will be able to stop their Russian associates, although he does recognize certain rivalries within the tripartite Communist bloc. These might prove useful in a long pause, or in war; but they have no relevance now except as an incentive to Soviet policy.

Your observer does not think that Russia would win a war. But he thinks that, by reason of her belief in Western weakness and her desire to match China and keep Tito in his place, she may create one by an accident resulting from her projects.

THE VISIT TO LONDON

Whether a visit by Bulganin and Khrushchev, with all its attendant civilities and flatteries, would help to create an impression of Western strength is a matter of opinion. One is inclined to think that these two men, having insulted Britain by every possible means in India, may think that failure to cancel the invitation to London proves the weakness of the Western Powers.

They know perfectly well that British statesmen do not relish having the Katyn Wood murderers to dinner at Buckingham Palace. They think they would not be invited if the West were strong. A cancellation of the visit would, in itself, make them think.

WE SHOULD LEARN FROM HISTORY

Your observer ventures a final word on the approach to the Russian question. All

great nations have made big mistakes in policy. But there comes a time when a mistake having led to the same result several times, a nation should learn from history.

In Sir Evelyn Wrench's book on Geoffrey Dawson[1] (editor of the Times at the outbreak of World War II) Mr. Dawson is quoted as saying that he did everything in his power, night after night, to keep out any news which might hurt German feelings. That was the very attitude which Hitler interpreted as weakness and the signal for safe aggression.

The Times then plunged from that mistake into a convulsive reaction. Mr. Dawson's successor told this observer in 1941 that the allies should use communism up to the hilt, because a victorious Britain could easily control it afterward.

MISJUDGMENTS WHICH MUST BE REJECTED

Greater misjudgments than those two of Dawson and Barrington-Ward have seldom been made—although the Times is now slowly moving toward a wiser policy.

These mistakes must, at all costs, be avoided in this critical year of 1956. The Dawson approach to foreign policy, if repeated, will lead to war. If war should eventually come, the Barrington-Ward approach to its conduct must also be rejected.

It is never safe to tempt a powerful military nation by appeasement. It is never safe to use evil allies to win a war. Both mistakes lead to disaster.

NO EXCUSE FOR THE GENERATION

Earlier generations may perhaps be forgiven for having forgotten the lessons of history. This generation, however, has had its lessons twice within less than half a century. We have no possible excuse for repeating the mistakes of the first decades of the century, particularly since, for a brief hour, we proved the value of a wiser policy in the fourth decade—only, it is to be feared, to weaken in the fifth.

It is still within our power to correct this weakening. This observer is for peace; but he is convinced that peace cannot be had through weakness or appeasement. Least of all can it be had through means involving the decline of Britain, or through her abdication in areas which she alone has the experience and ability to administer.

[1] Hutchison, London, 30 shillings.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress is conscious of the fact that this is Boy Scout Week. A week appropriately set aside to emphasize the importance of this great movement among the youth of America.

In the past few day a Boy Scout has visited each of our offices and personally presented each of us with a Boy Scout badge to be worn in our lapels during the week. I was much impressed by this occasion when I was thus honored, as I am sure every other Member was impressed. And like my colleagues in the Congress, it is a pleasure to thus lend my support to this great organization which has for its basic purpose the preparation of the youth of the country for good citizenship of tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there is no more effective agency in carrying out this great task than this splendid organization.

The splendid young Scout who presented me with my badge with Keith Bryan, from our neighboring State of Maryland. In presenting this badge he had the following to say:

I am Cub Scout Keith Bryan. During Boy Scout Week, February 6–12, the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 46th anniversary. As a representative of the Boy Scouts of America, we want you to join in our celebration by wearing this Scout badge during Boy Scout Week.

The Boy Scouts of America was chartered by Congress in 1916. This week our Nation will honor its 3 million Scouts and leaders. In 46 years, more than 20 million men and boys have been members of the Boy Scout organization. Many of these boys have grown to become outstanding leaders.

The National Capital Area Council, which I represent, has a membership of 33,484 boys and over 12,000 adult leaders. We want to invite you to say "Happy Birthday" to the Boy Scouts of America by wearing this Scout badge in your lapel during Boy Scout Week.

May I in turn say to Keith and through him to the thousands of other splendid boys making up this worthwhile organization: "To you also many happy returns of the day. May both you and your organization continue to grow and continue paying such splendid dividends to your country and your God."

The United States Has Lost a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the shocking and terrible incident of the stoning and persecution of Autherine Lucy when she attempted to attend classes at the University of Alabama is clear proof that the evils of discrimination still flourish in the United States, and that we cannot afford to lose any more time in ending the evils. This shameful exhibition of unfounded hatred against a defenseless girl has cost the United States loss of prestige, honor, and the confidence of the many nations we have been trying to win to the side of democracy; it is a powerful weapon in the hands of the Communists and will be spread by them throughout the world as proof that we do not practice what we preach. Our loss is incalculable; the expenditure of billions of dollars and many years of effort are for naught; our leadership in the cause of democracy has been dealt a serious blow from which we may never completely recover.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. John Hughes which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 9, which shows to some extent the damage which has been done:

CAPE TOWN.—This is to report that the United States has just lost a friend.

He is Joseph Ngubane, an African laborer. He is poor, ragged, and has only a couple years of schooling. As an individual, he doesn't count much up where great international issues are fought out.

But however insignificant an ally he might be, the United States has lost him—and nobody knows quite how many more nonwhites like him.

The reason is a simple one: It is the egg-pelting by white students, and the suspension of Autherine J. Lucy, first Negro student at the University of Alabama. The story of the white students' anti-Negro rioting was splashed across the front pages of South African newspapers of all shades of opinion on February 7, and probably also in most other parts of Africa.

ALL FACTS SEEN?

[Moscow Radio on February 8 reported the case of the exclusion of Miss Lucy from the University of Alabama stating that "the persecution of this Negro student has aroused public protests throughout the United States," Reuthers reported in London.]

Perhaps it isn't clear why the scuffle on the university's campus can lose friends and influence people in Africa.

But to Joseph Ngubane the issue is plain: "The United States isn't practicing what it preaches. I thought it stood for equality of races. The Alabama affair shows it doesn't. So I am through."

It doesn't do to dramatize Joseph's case too much. Maybe he is not seeing all the facts. Maybe he is overlooking the United States Supreme Court's desegregation ruling. Maybe not too many other Africans feel as he does. And maybe, too, he will soon change his mind about the United States.

What it does all serve to underline is the amazingly far-reaching impact of the slightest United States act on the Negro issue and southern desegregation upon the nonwhites of Asia and Africa, who number 200 million on the African Continent alone, and who are scrutinizing the United States.

UNITED STATES CONCERNED

The United States is vitally concerned with these nonwhites, for it greatly desires their loyalty to the West, as opposed to communism. And incidents like the Alabama one wield great influence among people highly sensitive to color prejudice.

The Alabama incident's effect is seen clearly in the reception of the incident by members of the prosegregation South African Government.

In the parliamentary lobby, Government members are jubilant at the anti-Negro American incident, on the eve of the historic sitting here to strip the colored (mixed race) people of the common vote.

One member said to this correspondent: "How can America ciriticize us? Alabama riots mean that Americans are just as much for segregation as we are. Yes, I know all about the Supreme Court's ruling; but in practice, there is educational segregation."

Maybe, like Joseph, this legislator is also overlooking the facts. But, nevertheless, that is the sort of comment which the Alabama affair is rousing in some important quarters.

INTERRACIAL CAMPUS

The unfavorable effect is twofold, too, in Cape Town, where, despite full South African pressures against educational integration, the liberal and intellectual stronghold of Cape Town University has stoutly defied all to maintain an interracial student body.

Purely economic factors put nonwhite students currently in the minority; but the story of the Alabama riots has gone down among South African students here who strongly resist racial discrimination, despite such odds.

Probably the weight of the whole issue is about this: Any such anti-Negro incident touches off suspicion among both whites and

nonwhites of this continent that the United States, which appears to stand as a champion of racial equality, has not in fact put things right in its own backyard.

NET EFFECT WEIGHED

There are a few good friends of the United States who regard such suspicions as grossly unjust and do their best to remove them. Nevertheless, among the millions of subject peoples who are just emerging and who are often uneducated, suspicious, and prejudiced, such doubts are capable of greatly diminishing the stature of the United States and the whole Western World.

If that is what the West wants avoided, that is why some western observers here would like these far-reaching foreign implications weighed carefully against any local gains which incidents such as the Alabama riots can conceivably achieve.

And, of course, everybody here is waiting to see what ultimately happens to the University of Alabama's first Negro student.

Remarks of Hon. Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of New York City, at the Dinner of Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks made by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, the mayor of New York City, at the dinner of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, held on January 28, 1956, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

We cannot reiterate too often the basic concepts, upon which these, our United States, were founded. It is a story, which must be told over and over; for each succeeding generation must hear it as a child, live it as an adult, and cherish it in its maturity. This is not a nation, which is afraid of strangers; for we, all of us, were ourselves strangers, or are descended from strangers. This is not a nation, which persecutes those, whose customs and habits and thinking are different than our own. But rather, it is a nation, which, through its history, has offered a helping hand to all who seek to come. This much I know, for I too am a son of an immigrant—an American, who became a Senator of the United States, who fathered a concept of the dignity of labor, which, I know, will never depart from the thinking of America.

I could cite you the names of leaders of industry, of great teachers, of discoverers, of leaders of government, doctors, lawyers, and scientists—yes, even of presidents—and they would all be the children of immigrants of yesterday. And because of the principles of our Democratic Party, we have attracted them to our banner. For we, of this Nation, are not all of one race, nor all of one culture, nor of one belief. We are bound together by the mutual concept of the equality, and integrity, of men, and by our American way of life.

Our culture draws its strength and richness from the cultures of many people. New ideas and new arts have come to us from the Old World. We have not tried to make them over, but rather, we have selected what is best. Those, who come to us from foreign lands, have one great challenge. In their enthusiasm for our new Nation, they must not lose their pride in their heritage. they must not forget that they, in turn, are bringing this to us, so that, together we may build a stronger, richer, and a better Nation. This, in our democracy, is the hope for tomorrow. This is the strength on which we have built in the past, and on which we must continue to build.

Unfortunately, our present immigration laws are not fully consistent with these principles. If our present regulations had been in existence in 1885, my father might never have been able to come to the United States. I am referring, of course, to those phases of our law, which limit the seekers of peace and freedom who come to our shores, on the basis of their national origin. This is not the question which we have asked in the past; nor is it the principle, under which we gained our strength. Rather, it is tantamount to saying, that we will accept only a limited number of people, who need us most; while holding the door open for others, who do not even wish to come.

If we are to maintain our traditions, we must return to the spirit, so eloquently expressed by Emma Lazarus, in her poem on the tablet at the main entrance to the Statue of Liberty:

"Keep ancient lands your storied pomp!
Cries she with silent lips.
Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I life my lamp beside the golden door."

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Liberty (N. Y.) Register on January 12, 1956. This editorial is in opposition to the upper Colorado River project.

The editorial follows:

CURE FOR SURPLUS LAND—MORE LAND

With nearly 21 million acres of excellent farmlands lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States; with President Eisenhower, in his annual farm recommendations, asking for a soil bank plan which would take out of farm production thousands of other acres, there is yet before Congress presently legislation setting up the gigantic upper Colorado River project.

This scheme would bring into production more than half a million acres in high, barren, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. The project is being sponsored in Congress by the Federal Bureau of Reclamation.

With millions of acres of the best farmland awaiting the plow in areas where rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, the Reclamation Bureau would force this great new burden on the American taxpayer.

This is an excellent example of the tendency of government, when it gets too big to become, quite frequently, silly and stupid. The President, on the one hand, asks Congress for heavy appropriations to take unneeded farmland out of production. On the other hand, one of his agencies asks Congress for heavy appropriations to change barren land into fertile, productive agricultural soil.

The overburdened taxpayer may well wonder if these governmental agencies ever really know what they are doing. The fault, dear taxpayers, is largely yours. So long as you are personally doing all right, you spare little time or trouble to let bureaucracies know that you bitterly oppose these inconsistent and contradictory wastages of your money.

Readjust Postal Classification of Educational and Cultural Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to aid churches, libraries, and religious and educational organizations in the dissemination of educational and cultural materials by removing from the law an undue restriction on the mailing of these materials under the special rates provided for them by Congress for some time past. My bill also will correct inconsistencies in the postal classification of these materials and clarify its application.

The dissemination of educational and cultural materials through the postal system is a well-established national policy. Provision for nationwide mailing at equal rates is essential if all areas of the country are to have access to these materials. Nationwide mailing rates for reading matter in newspapers and magazines dates from 1879 and for books from 1938. Special rates on library books exchanged between libraries and between libraries and readers were established in 1928 and repeated in the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948.

Under present law the special rates for books and similar educational and cultural materials, mailed to or from libraries, religious, and other nonprofit organizations, apply only to mailings addressed for local delivery or for delivery in the first, second, or third zones that apply to fourth-class mail matter. These materials, therefore, generally must be mailed at higher fourth-class rates when they go beyond these limits, which prevents equal access to educational and cultural materials in all parts of the country. The increased cost for mailings beyond the third zone is an unwarranted burden on the dissemination of these materials which will be removed by my bill.

This legislation also spells out in detail the types of materials that may be mailed under these special rates, such as books, music, academic thesis, other library materials, film, filmstrips, projected transparencies and slides, microfilms, sound recordings—on magnetic tapes, wire, or other mediums—and similar forms of educational, instructional, research, and cultural material. The rates will apply to mailings of such

matter to or from schools, colleges, universities, public libraries, and religious and other eleemosynary and nonprofit organizations.

This readjustment of the postal-rate structure for educational and cultural materials is necessary in the public interest, and I intend to request that it be scheduled for early action in this session.

Purchase of New Automobiles—Letter From L. J. Salter, of North Rose, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which was forwarded to me on February 6, 1956, by Mr. L. J. Salter, president of the Salter Canning Co., of North Rose, N. Y.

The letter concerns Mr. Salter's experiences in purchasing a new automobile:

SALTER CANNING CO., INC.,
North Rose, N. Y., February 6, 1956.
Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: I have followed with interest the discussions in Congress on the plight of auto dealers, including your insertion in the RECORD of January 24. There is one aspect, however, that has not been presented: namely, to what extent has the public turned against buying new cars because of bad experiences with the ones they presently own? Here is an angle that the dealers in no way were responsible for but which is injuring them unmercifully. Here's how:

I now own my third Lincoln, bought in the spring of 1953. The first two were excellent, but this third one (cash paid on delivery) occasioned so much trouble that I often wished I had the old one back. On the day it was delivered I had difficulty in starting the motor and when it did start it galloped, rocking the body of the car. The following day I decided to take my wife for a ride in the new "buggy." We were not 10 miles from home before the motor began to halt, wheeze, and stumble, and I had to turn back for fear of being stranded. I complained to the dealer (45 miles away) and he sent down a mechanic who put in all new spark plugs. This did not help and over the next 2- or 3-month period I drove my car in to the dealer (in Rochester), several times, to try to cure the evil. On one occasion I had to stay overnight in Rochester, to complete the overhaul. Later I learned that many other Lincoln owners had similar troubles with this model.

I had also discovered that the car's rear-vision mirror was unusually low, blending with the front glass, and 2 or 3 times on approaching a curve or crossroad I narrowly escaped collision with approaching cars, hidden behind the mirror. I complained to the dealer; he replied that other owners had the same complaints but he could not provide mirrors with shorter stems. I thereupon wrote the Ford Motor Co., pointing out that my attorney informed me that if an accident could be proven due to faulty design, it—Ford—could be sued. I had a shorter-stemmed mirror in trigger time.

Now I wish to emphasize that I believe the dealer was doing his best under the circumstances. But I could not see how he could stand all these repairs and I assumed that he charged them back to Ford. Apparently not, from information now available. At one point in the attempts to "cure," a salesman told me that Ford put together a Mercury in 23 minutes. I replied that Ford put together this Lincoln in 10.

Lincoln was not the only "bad egg" that year. I heard of a man who bought a new Cadillac and started for Texas; he spent more time in garages than on the road with it. Back ends went out of Chryslers and a friend owning a new Nash had two new rears put into it. I assume all these expenses were absorbed by the dealers, not the manufacturers.

For the past year and a half my Lincoln has operated excellently. I would like to buy a new car, but I simply balk at going through such grief again. I have lost confidence in the new cars like, no doubt, thousands of others have. In fact, today, with dealers in the plight they find themselves, there is a greater risk of no service whatsoever. I just wonder if the makers, in futile attempt to overcome this negation, are not hoping the new crop of gaudy colors will rebait the hook. Not for me, and I doubt for the man on the street. Too many of the latter have, in my presence, commented upon the gruesome mess of design and colors. The interesting thing is that the body design of the cars is fundamentally good, but that the gingerbread on the sides, the chopping up of otherwise flowing lines, made more hideous by colors that do not complement, suggests a managerial floundering around with a double-barreled shotgun. The aim may be rotten, but scattered shot must hit something.

So the dealers, poor devils, are caught between the makers piling unwanted cars upon them and the public resistance to being mulcted again. The seriousness of the latter is that, while the makers are guilty of asking higher prices for poorer and poorer products, the public blames the dealer for the makers' sins.

It might be a very good thing if auto dealers in certain zones alternately agreed to shut up shop and boycott the makers over a period of time. This would have to be all dealers of all makes of cars, within a designated area. I have found that in dealing with big business the club or knobbed battleax is much more efficient than legislation or the bended knee.

Most sincerely,

L. J. SALTER.

Full-Fledged Partner of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday morning, January 31, Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, addressed the board members of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the occasion of their annual visit to the Pentagon. These ladies, who are the leaders of the DAR in all the States and Territories, are an outstanding group of citizens, vitally interested in the problems of national defense.

General White's address to these ladies is a clear statement of the Air Force mission and of the problems confronting the Air Force today. It is also a brief history of the reorganization of our Nation's defense from which the United States Air Force emerged in 1947 as a full-fledged partner.

The Air Force knows that the best way to provide defense is to prevent war and the best way to prevent a war is to be able to win one.

To achieve their ambitions, the Communists are building the largest war machine in the world. If we are to win a war that Communist aggression might start or, better still, to stop such a war before it is started, we must build the best Air Force in the world. The Air Force that we are building has proved effective so far. We must continue to give it the weapons that will allow it to perform its mission.

Fine as its weapons must be, however, they would be worthless without an even more priceless asset—men. But Americans, unlike the peoples of Communist countries, cannot be forced to a lifetime of military service. We must make military service desirable enough to attract and hold men of a superior quality.

Last year, Congress approved a pay raise for all servicemen. Under a completely reorganized recruiting effort, Air Force enlistments and reenlistments climbed. The pay raise was but a partial solution, however, to the problem of making the service sufficiently attractive. Outstanding among Air Force needs are more and better housing for Air Force personnel, medical care for their dependents, and adequate survivor benefits.

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution afforded General White an excellent forum in which to present Air Force problems and Air Force needs. The DAR themselves can help to correct a lack of public understanding and to stimulate an interest in the problem of defense, which is the common problem of all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address by Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force:

ADDRESS BY GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE BOARD, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, AT THE PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 31, 1956

President General Carraway and ladies, I am very happy to see you here again this morning. I say again because it was exactly a year ago today that I had this same pleasure.

In the military services, we consider it our duty to keep the leading national organizations apprised of the state of our defenses.

I am especially glad to see this group from our leading women's organization, and I'll tell you why. I have a favor to ask you, but first let me tell you a story that one of my young officers related to me.

He went to his parent's home in the Midwest for the Christmas holidays. While he was home his mother invited the members of her garden club in for tea to meet her son, of whom she was so understandably proud. To please his mother, he wore his uniform.

One of his mother's friends said, "Oh, I see you're a flyer. I just think the Air Corps is wonderful."

The lieutenant replied, "It's the Air Force ma'am."

The lady said, "Yes, I know; but which air corps, the Army Air Corps or the Navy Air Corps?"

The lieutenant answered, "Neither, ma'am. I'm in the Air Force, the United States Air Force."

His mother's friend then gave him a blank look and murmured, "Oh?"

It is always surprising to me to hear stories like this, and I know that to you who keep yourselves well informed, it sounds incredible. Actually, it makes little difference whether the Air Force is called by its right name. The point is that stories like this are indicative of a lack of the public understanding and interest that our Nation's defenses deserve. It is true that too many Americans are only vaguely aware of the major reorganization of our Nation's defense from which the United States Air Force emerged as a full-fledged partner of defense.

The favor I would like to ask is this: In your work across our Nation, you have many contacts with those whose knowledge of our defense is hazy. I believe you could perform a real public service by helping to keep others informed on matters concerning the defense and safety of our country.

Although you are familiar with our present defense setup, I think that in discribing the state of our defenses today a very good starting point would be August 1945.

You all remember the historic atomic bomb explosion that took place then. An atomic blast brought the war against Japan to a quick and merciful end. It saved tens of thousands of American lives that surely would have been lost in an invasion of Japan.

This atomic blast had other far-reaching effects. It forcibly brought home to the Nation a new idea. All of us who had been born and raised to understand traditional forms of military power suddenly realized that we had achieved a new and mighty power for defense. During World War II air power emerged as a dominant force, and the atomic bomb emphasized this fact.

Before this time you will remember the Nation's military services were organized under two separate and independent departments.

On the President's Cabinet sat a Secretary of War and a Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of War directed the Army, which consisted of several branches. One of the branches was the Infantry, one was Artillery, and among the several others was the old Air Corps, which became known as the Army Air Forces.

After World War II the American people and the Army recognized that the Army Air Forces could no longer be considered as merely a supporting force. As a result, the Army Air Forces were reorganized into the United States Air Force, coequal with the United States Army and United States Navy.

However, instead of adding another independent service to our defense structure and another Secretary to the Cabinet, all the services were unified under a single Department of Defense. This has eliminated much duplication of effort and has saved time and money. Since then the Defense Department has been reorganized several times. The present organization is not perfect, but few deny that it is going in the right direction.

After the National Security Act of 1947 created this new organization our civilian and military leaders met in 1948 to work out what became known as the Key West agreement. This agreement simply emphasized that the Army's role was on land, the Navy's at sea, and the Air Force's role was in the air.

I would like to emphasize that this reorganization followed, as is characteristic, in our democracy, the desires of the American people. They saw in airpower the unparalleled opportunity to capitalize on American ingenuity, resourcefulness, and technology so as to have an effective defense when needed at far less cost of American lives.

This was borne out in Korea. Our allied air forces, even though operating under restrictions which prohibited efficient use of airpower, accounted for 187,000 Communist troops at the cost of less than 1,200 American airmen.

Of course, the main purpose of the Air Force is far more than using our military airmen efficiently—it is to provide protection to the United States.

Now the best way to provide protection is to prevent war. As I said last year, the best way yet found to prevent a war is to be able to win one. We face a potential enemy who respects none of the Christian ideals for which we stand. He is no respecter of human lives. He only respects one thing—force. He covets one prize—the world.

To achieve their ambitions, the Soviets are building a powerful war machine—the largest in the world. Even more important than size is the fact that the Soviets are equipping this force with modern, high-quality weapons.

We are concerned primarily with the Soviet Air Force because that is the only direct threat to our people, our churches, our schools, and our cities.

The Reds now have the means to hit these targets. For instance, they are now building a long-range jet bomber. It compares favorably with the best we have in the United States.

That bomber cannot reach all our cities because it does not have the ability to fly far enough. However, the Soviets are now building a turboprop bomber that can fly a long way. It is called the Bear—a very apt name, I think.

They could use their smaller bombers against targets in Europe, Africa, or Asia. Obviously they built these bigger bombers for only one reason—to be able to hit us here on this continent.

While they have been building these big bombers, they have also been building up their stockpile of nuclear weapons. Recently, as you all read, they exploded a thermonuclear bomb with the power of millions of tons of TNT. It is inconceivable to most of us even to imagine a million pounds of explosive, to say nothing of 1 million tons.

A third area of Soviet effort to build up striking power has been in the field of missiles. We know they are working hard on these, and if they get them, our defensive problem will become much greater.

Our defense problem is great enough now. We know from our own experience that a determined bomber attack has never been completely stopped, and you can be certain that if the Soviets ever decide to gamble everything on an attack, it will be a determined effort.

Air defense is then logically enough, one of the Air Force's main missions.

To detect the approach of hostile bombers, we will have several lines of radar stretched across the possible approach routes. If the enemy were detected at the northern radar line, at the top of Canada, we would have only 5 to 7 hours warning. If he slipped through to the warning line at the northern border of the United States, our warning time could run from a few minutes up to 3½ hours.

This does not give us much time to act.

If this warning were ever received two things would happen.

First, the interceptors of the Air Defense Command would be directed to take off to engage the enemy bombers.

We now have interceptors that can perform this mission during any conditions of weather or darkness.

I think you would be interested in seeing our best interceptors.

The fastest one we now have in service is the F-86D. It is an all-weather version of the famous destroyer of Communist Migs. Coming into our air defense is a new interceptor, the F-102. This is a supersonic, hard-hitting interceptor and it will add much to our defenses.

At the same time our interceptors are out to stop the enemy attack, our bombers will be on their way. They will be hitting enemy air bases and concentrations of airplanes. This would really be our best defense because it would prevent him from launching new attacks at us.

Here are the principal United States Air Force airplanes that would be involved in this counterattack.

There is the B-47. It is our medium jet bomber. It does not flay as far as the heavy jet bomber. However, by using our bases overseas, or by using aerial refueling, this bomber can strike anywhere.

Our largest bomber is the B-36. It was our first intercontinental bomber and it is still a good one. The B-36 may go down in history as an outstanding example of a powerful weapon that did its job without ever fighting. I believe that more than any other one factor, the B-36 has kept our potential enemies from attacking us. We are all grateful for the part this airplane has had in guarding the peace.

To replace the B-36, we are now getting the B-52. This is the first intercontinental jet bomber, and it is proving to be a fine airplane. We all hope that it will continue to keep aggressors at a respectful distance.

I have showed you a few pictures of the airplanes now in your United States Air Force. These are the weapons that allow us to perform the Air Force mission. They are the latest products of the finest technology in America.

Fine as they are, they would be worthless without an even more priceless asset, our men. Although the Air Force cannot be bound by tradition in devising new weapons and tactics, we follow the national tradition of valuing and caring for our men. Here in America, our most prized possession is people.

This is a contrast to Communist values. Peo|le are cheap commodities in Red China and in the Soviet Union; cheap commodities that have no control over their destinies.

In America, individuals do control their own lives, protected by certain rights. They cannot be forced to a lifetime of military service. We must make military service desirable enough to attract and hold our people.

Last year I reported to you that keeping good airmen in the service was our No. 1 problem, and one that threatened the ability of the Air Force to perform its mission.

I am happy to be able to tell you that this picture is somewhat brighter now.

There are several reasons for this.

After our meeting last year, our Congress approved a pay raise for all servicemen. This helped considerably.

Also, under a completely reorganized recruiting effort, Air Force enlistments and reenlistments climbed.

We knew that the pay raise and the intensified recruiting effort would cost money. However, we were convinced that the cost would be small compared to the possible savings in retraining costs.

Let me tell you what happened between July and October. During this period, there was an increase of 11,000 reenlistments over the number of reenlistments during the same period in 1954. This saved the Air Force over $100 million in retraining costs.

Although this is a big improvement we still have a long way to go. As our equipment becomes more complicated we have the need for more highly skilled men.

The pay raise last year was but a partial solution to the problem of making the service sufficiently attractive. Outstanding among our needs are more and better housing for our men, medical care for their dependents, and adequate survivor benefits.

Respected national organizations like yours are quite properly interested in the state of our defenses. Your opinions are listened to by our policy makers.

We, in the service, are convinced that one vital key to better defense is getting and keeping people of high quality. We, therefore, would welcome your support of measures designed to increase service attractiveness.

Personnel Management in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Miss Jane Taylor before the Bay Area—California—Personnel Women.

Miss Taylor is personnel officer for region 9 of the General Services Administration, in which position she has distinguished herself.

She is a fine public servant and a credit to our civil-service system:

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Address by Jane Taylor)

I accepted the invitation to speak to this group of experts in personnel management with humility. I prefer to sit at your feet and learn, to being on my feet to talk, but what better assignment than to talk about a subject to which I am dedicated, to a group who is as interested as I.

It is my pleasure and my responsibility to report to you on the development of personnel management in the Federal service. Until you give this some thought you probably aren't aware of the fact that the Federal Government is our largest single employer, and as such its very complexity is a challenge for the development of effective personnel administration. We have more Federal employees in California than we have in any other State in the country, and more than are located in Washington, D. C.

You can appreciate, then, how much they contribute to the economy of this State. The importance they have as consumers of goods and services your companies produce. It is important that these be effective and representative employees.

There are some basic requirements in the field of personnel management that are common to all Federal agencies. These are required by law or civil-service regulations. Some of them are commonly referred to by you as redtape. For instance, we have to follow certain rigid requirements in hiring for our jobs. This may be tedious and cumbersome—but—in our business it's important that every single citizen of this country have equal rights to a job for which he is qualified, regardless of race or creed, and this is as it should be. If these requirements can help to make a strong merit system where you have a right to compete with everyone else, you should continue to insist on it, and I have learned to live with it. But we have handicaps in recruiting you couldn't begin to imagine. We cannot pay money to advertise our vacancies. You who place want ads regularly in the classified ad section of the papers can well wonder how we can hope to compete for available talent. So do I. I think it is wrong. We should be permitted to compete with all employers in the most effective way possible. We are handicapped in recruiting for the best available college gradnates. You can go into the colleges in the spring and make firm offers to potential graduates. We are never sure what our appropriations for personnel will be from one fiscal year to the next. This is an obstacle—maybe it will be changed eventually by enlightened congressional representatives.

Our jobs are established against standards that are applied from coast to coast. The customs inspector on the border of Canada draws the same pay as the customs inspector on the border of Mexico who is doing the same job. In my opinion this is wrong. There should be consideration of various cost of living variances for the white-collar worker as for the blue-collar worker. Maybe it will be changed. You can appreciate the need for it.

Our promotions are controlled by law to some extent. It is regrettable when controls are enforced as a result of some legislators attaching an amendment to an appropriation bill with no consideration of the effect it may have on sound personnel management. So, I have to alter my promotion program to conform overnight, literally. You have an interest in this.

And there are laws that control firing employees—but don't you believe it when you read in the well-known magazines that we can't fire a bum employee. We can. Sometimes it takes a personnel officer who is fearless and not concerned about criticism of pressure groups. But if the facts are established, and it is justified, an employee can be fired. Regulations prevent the discharge of employees by a capricious boss. I understand your union employees have the same safeguards, and any sound personnel program insures this.

Now within this framework of legislation and regulations, each agency devises its own personnel program. The General Services Administration exists to service other Federal agencies. GSA was established as a result of recommendations made by the first Hoover Commission and is charged with responsibility for effecting efficiency and economy in all our operations. For instance, we are the largest landlord in the world; we do a supply business larger than Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward combined; we have in our National Archives the most precious documents pertaining to the history of our country; we direct a records program responsible for streamlining paperwork and eliminating files in other agencies; we stockpile strategic materials; and we now have responsibility for traffic management.

I think we, in GSA, are extremely fortunate in having what in my experience is the most effective personnel management in the Government service. Under the direction of Edmund F. Mansure, the Administrator, our Washington office provides all the leadership we could desire, but it decentralizes authority with responsibility. I work directly under the regional director, Bob Bradford, who gives strong support of management to the program. You can't do the job without this.

Now, I am sure there are many different concepts of good personnel management reflected in the thinking of this group, but I think I should make clear the basis against which all of our program is designed. I believe in the absolute importance of preserving the dignity of the individual. I believe that all we do must be directed toward strengthening the relationship between the supervisor and the employee. This pinpoints the need to develop the supervisors to handle this relationship effectively. I am becoming more and more convinced that there is a definite limitation to what can be accomplished through group meetings with supervisors, role playing, panels, workshops notwithstanding. I think the investment that pays the biggest dividends is contact on the individual basis—the person-to-person approach on a real case here and now. It's worth it.

We start the potential employee with the idea that the supervisor is actually offering the job. We do the screening and the recommending, but we let the man who is going to be his first-line supervisor make the offer of the job. This sets the stage for a good relationship with his boss. We recognize that there is a limit to the validity of tests and interviews, and we consider actual performance on the job the essence of the employment examination. This is measured through a close followup on placement. We send a checklist to the supervisor on each new employee. The first 30 days he is to cover all the essentials, chain of command, duties of the job, etc. The second 30 days there is close evaluation of performance and attitudes, and the form is returned to personnel within 60 days. Shortly thereafter, but no later than 90 days, there is a followup on the job by a personnel technician. We talk to the supervisor and the employee. We do not ask anything so obvious as "Are you happy on your job?" But, rather, "As a newcomer, you can probably see us more clearly than we can see ourselves. I'd be interested in your impression as to how we can do things better. Do you understand the importance of what you're doing?" By a series of such probing questions we can determine whether he is getting job satisfaction and is well placed in his own mind. From the supervisor we get his evaluation of the attitude and ability of the new employee.

When friends ask me, "What do you do in your job, hire and fire?" I tell them, "As a matter of fact, that's the least of my job. We are more interested in the people we have on the job, and in developing them to maximum capacity."

Through our classification office we have made a chart of all our jobs—those which are feeders for more responsible positions, and those which are deadends. We face the fact that most of us have a ceiling on our ability and capacity, and it is up to personnel to help recognize this and to not err in advancing employees beyond their depth, where they fail.

We consider our training program one of the most vital of all our programs. Our training officer does not have the easily recognized, stereotyped approach to training. He is so close to employees and supervisors on their jobs that he is as readily available as if he'd climbed into their hip pockets. The training given is pitched to meet the need. We used to try projecting a training schedule quarterly, but we found that we usually abandoned it after a few weeks. We want to be flexible enough to meet the need here and now.

At the same time we started training, our regional director gave a course in public speaking to top officials who may be called upon to speak before a group and who lead staff meetings. The men were attracted to this as if magnetized, and how more effective a way to demonstrate there is a time for training? If your top executive and his responsible supervisors can take time to attend a training meeting there will be no complaints that "there isn't time for the little people to be trained."

A while ago there was trouble on our packing table; things weren't moving as they should. We seemed to be stymied, and em-

ployees were disgruntled. So the training officer joined the packers on planned trips to various warehouses run by your industries to observe, ask questions, and get new ideas from men in the same line of work. And the men learned that some of their ideas were better than those they saw, but some of your techniques could be used by us. This took an afternoon a week for several weeks. They wound it up with a workshop, adopted each other's suggestions, and are now proud of the national record they are setting.

The personnel officer can be the sparkplug of the program, and the job can't be done sitting behind a desk. No matter what the workload is on your desk, believe me, if you will break away and spend about 5 hours a day out where the people are you will cut down the stream of people and problems and paperwork that flow into your office. Go through the offices, listen to the people, talk with the elevator operators, the mechanics in the boilerrooms, the telephone operators on their relief, and listen to what they have to say. You can't run a personnel program in a vacuum, and these employees are the reasons for the existence of a program. People are the most priceless and most productive commodities we have. They and their performance are your products. They are the best springboard for the strong points and the weak spots of your program.

If they know you as a person, they hear you talk, listen to you think through a problem, they will be secure in the knowledge that you are running a program that equates them as an individual. They won't be suspicious if Charles gets a promotion ahead of them, because on one of your visits you talked about the promotion program and answered their questions. You will have answered their questions over the plumber's bench as to how you let people go when the funds are cut. The executives won't plan a reorganization without talking with you in advance and getting your ideas as to what will be efficient, and how it will affect the people.

You can do these things away from your desk, not behind it. It takes energy, time, and enthusiasm, but it makes the difference between a personnel program that is dynamic and one that never gets off the ground. I have confidence that we are doing the job in GSA that you would want and hope we would be doing.

Just as I keep my ear to the ground on the job, so do I come to these luncheons to listen and learn. I realize that I can never leave with you this afternoon the inspiration that I get from you, but may I thank you for this opportunity given me to express some of my ideas.

The Fifth Amendment: Shield or Sword—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1955, Mr. Louis Waldman, of the New York bar, delivered an address on the fifth amendment before the Men's Club of Temple Beth Emeth, of Flatbush. I direct the attention of our colleagues to this address as republished in the official monthly publication of the Brooklyn bar. The first part of the address appears in the January 1956 issue and is as follows:

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT: SHIELD OR SWORD—PART I

(By Louis Waldman)

On the 27th day of June 1953 the New York State Bar Association at its semiannual meeting at Saranac Lake unanimously adopted a report of its Committee on Civil Rights embodying the following resolution:

"That the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination continues to be a vital safeguard of individual freedom and the bar should educate the public as to its importance and discourage both those who would restrict its application and those who would abuse it by asserting it improperly."

The New York State Bar Association took this extraordinary action because great confusion and misunderstanding concerning the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination had developed in the public mind to the point where it was felt that the fifth amendment was rapidly falling into popular disfavor. Some had even expressed doubts as to whether there was a continuing need for this privilege or of preserving it.

My purpose in speaking out on the subject, "The Fifth Amendment—Shield or Sword," is to further the objectives of the resolution of the State Bar Association of explaining to the public the importance and the meaning of the fifth amendment and of discouraging those who would minimize or restrict this vital constitutional privilege.

Confusion and uncertainty has come from two diametrically opposite sources:

On the one hand, there was the long procession of witnesses in the ever-growing investigations of subversion and crime by congressional and State bodies who repeated, as if by rote, "I stand on the fifth amendment" or "I decline to answer on the ground that it may incriminate me."

On the other hand, some men in high places and enjoying high public authority felt that in the hands of subversive elements and the criminal underworld the fifth amendment provided a sword held at the throat of law enforcement and national security. From these high sources came the familiar headlines in the daily press with deadly monotony: "Fifth Amendment Communists," "Fifth Amendment Lawyers," "Fifth Amendment Teachers," "Fifth Amendment Gamblers," and "Fifth Amendment Racketeers."

But I insist that our abhorrence of communism and our opposition to crime should not blind us to the important place of the fifth amendment in the struggle for human liberty. It is my contention that in our free society, neither in fact nor in law, are there such people as fifth-amendment Communists, fifth-amendment lawyers, fifth-amendment teachers, fifth-amendment gamblers, or fifth-amendment racketeers. The use of the fifth amendment as a means of convicting people in the public eye is disturbing and frightening and is doubly wrong. It does a great injustice to the person so described. And at the same time it degrades this constitutional privilege in the minds of the public.

Those who seek to justify the doctrine that persons who invoke the constitutional privilege of the fifth amendment can be condemned as guilty by implication have misread the history of this amendment and the legal thinking and philosophy upon which it is based. Included among those who have unfortunately misconstrued the meaning of the fifth amendment, unintentionally I am sure, are such persons in authority as senators, congressmen, prosecutors, administrative officials, and even some judges. They reason that a person who invokes the fifth amendment does so because, if he answered "Yes" to the question put to him he would admit the truth contained in the question; if he answered "No," he would commit perjury. Thus, they say, by invoking the fifth amendment the person has condemned himself.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

A person who instead of answering a question pleads the privilege against self-incrimination does not admit by that plea that he is guilty of any criminal activity implicit in the question. Again and again it has been held by our courts that when a person feels that his answer might supply a link in the chain for his prosecution he is entitled to plead the privilege. This meaning of the fifth amendment is not a new and startling doctrine enunciated by the present Supreme Court with its emphasis on civil liberties and civil rights. From earliest times the Supreme Court has consistently held to this view. The most celebrated case, which came on within 15 years after the Bill of Rights was adopted on December 15 1791, was the treason trial of Aaron Burr. This trial was presided over by the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall. When Burr invoked the fifth amendment, Judge Marshall, in his ruling, said:

"It is the province of the court to judge whether any direct answer to the question which may be proposed will furnish evidence against the witness. If such answer may disclose a fact which forms a necessary and essential link in the chain of testimony, which would be sufficient to convict him of any crime, he is not bound to answer it so as to furnish matter for that conviction. In such a case, the witness must himself judge what his answer will be; and if he says on oath that he cannot answer without accusing himself, he cannot be compelled to answer."

One hundred years later, in 1915, the Supreme Court sustained the use of the privilege in these words:[1]

"It [the invocation of the privilege] supposed only a possibility of a charge of crime and interposed protection against the charge, and, reaching beyond it, against furnishing what might be urged or used as evidence to support it."

And so it is clear that it is not necessarily a sense of guilt that entitles a person properly to plead the privilege. Fear of prosecution is sufficient. Prosecution in and of itself, even if it later results in acquittal, is a menace to a person's peace, dignity, and well-being. For one thing, there is an implication in the public mind—however unjustified—"that where there is smoke there is fire"; then, there are the problems of great inconvenience and costs; and, finally, there are the hazards in a prosecution, particularly when the public mind is inflamed against a particular type of defendant, though innocent. In many cases the sole ground for pleading the privilege is one of these considerations and not a feeling of guilt.

This was well stated as recently as 1954 by the United States court of appeals for our own second circuit.[2] Judge Hincks, writing for a unanimous court, said:

"But whatever the underlying motivation, an invocation of the fifth amendment is no ground at all for an inference of guilt or of criminal proclivities. The privilege created by the amendment 'is for the innocent as well as the guilty and no inference can be drawn against the person claiming it that he fears that he is engaged in doing something forbidden by Federal law.' "

History and experience has taught us that innocent men plead the privilege as well as guilty ones. But the guilty ones are entitled to its protection as well as the innocent, because no one is guilty until so proved in accordance with due process and the law of

---

[1] *Burdick* v. *United States* (236 U. S. 79, 94 (1915)).

[2] *United States ex rel. Belfarge* v. *Shaughnessy* (212 F. (2) 128 (C. A. 2, 1954)).

the land. This principle must be enshrined in the hearts of all Americans if our Bill of Rights is to live.

The privilege against self-incrimination does not stand alone and is not an isolated right. The full text of the fifth amendment reads as follows:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentemnt or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

It is thus seen that the provision that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself is only one of the many civil rights incorporated in the fifth amendment. So strong do the American people feel about the right against self-accusation that 46 States have incorporated this safeguard into their constitutions; the 2 remaining States, New Jersey and Iowa, protect the privilege by judicial decision.

And the fifth amendment itself is a vital part of that catalog of rights enumerated in the first 10 amendments and known as the Bill of Rights. This Bill of Rights was not granted to the people by any government but came into our Constitution as a result of the people's demand to have their rights enumerated and made a limitation on government and public authority. The Bill of Rights was intended to be a denial to government of any power to interfere with these rights and liberties which inhere in a free people.

The rights thus secured, where they apply to the Federal Government, are beyond the reach of Congress, the President, or the other organs of the Federal establishment; and where by the 14th amendment action by the States is precluded, they are beyond the reach of legislatures, governors, or other State agencies.

The Fifth Amendment: Shield or Sword—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have previously directed the attention of our colleagues to the address of Mr. Louis Waldman on November 16, 1955, before the Men's Club of Temple Beth Emeth on the subject of the fifth amendment. The second part of the address, which appears in the February 1956 issue of the official monthly publication of the Brooklyn bar, is as follows:

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT: SHIELD OR SWORD—PART II

(By Louis Waldman)

The protection against self-incrimination provided for in the fifth amendment has roots going back to Magna Carta. It has an ancient history and its crystallization in England took place in the 17th century. In that country in 1637 the court of the star chamber condemned a man by the name of John Lilburne to be whipped and pilloried because he refused to take the oath and be a witness against himself on a charge that he had imported certain heretical and seditious books. In the year 1638 the sentence was carried out. Three years later, in 1641, the House of Commons, the champion of British liberties, voted that the Lilburne sentence was illegal and against the liberty of the subject. The House of Lords, concurring in the view of Commons, ordered an indemnity paid to Lilburne of 3,000 pounds, an enormous sum for those days.

Thus was born the principle in the English-speaking world that no man shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

It has sometimes been said in criticism of the fifth amendment that it makes discovery of subversion and effective enforcement of the criminal law more difficult. Let me concede: that may be so. Yet, it does not justify condemnation of the fifth amendment and those who invoke that privilege.

The presumption of innocence to which our Nation is committed also makes it a little more difficult to convict criminals and to expose potential criminals. Yet we do not suggest that the presumption of innocence be scrapped.

The burden of establishing guilt beyond a reasonable doubt is still on the prosecution. Other basic human rights may handicap the police in their work and make prosecution of crime and subversion more difficult, but under our humane and civilized system of justice—and that is what it all comes down to—these and other safeguards which surround the individual are still regarded as among our most precious possessions. And just as we do not resort to torture, to the whip, to the pillory as a means of getting evidence, so we ought not use legal and moral compulsions to extract self-accusatory evidence from people.

This view has been stated time and again by our Supreme Court and by many of the high courts of the States. Thus the Supreme Court of Florida expressed the moral and ethical basis for the fifth amendment in an opinion rendered in 1954[1] in these words:

"* * * the privilege against self-incrimination is one of the great landmarks in man's struggle to make himself civilized. It is the handmaid of the abolition of torture and has its roots deep in 12th century legal thinking. Its fundamental thesis is that you cannot extract evidence from one charged with a crime on which to convict him. It is contrary to every principle of legal philosophy to coerce one to reveal his guilt."

And Lord Camden, in 1765, stated the philosophy behind that great right which we in this country later embodied in the fifth amendment in these words.[2]

"It is very certain that the law obligeth no man to accuse himself; because the necessary means of compelling self-accusation, falling upon the innocent as well as the guilty, would be both cruel and unjust."

Illustrative of current applications of the privilege against self-incrimination is the case of Harry Slochower, who, while an associate professor of literature and German at Brooklyn College was called as a witness in 1952 before a Senate Judiciary Committee. When asked whether he had been a member of the Communist Party in 1940 or 1941, Professor Slochower refused to answer on the grounds of self-incrimination. Since section 903 of the New York City charter provides that any officer or employee of the city who refuses to answer questions on the ground that the answers might tend to incriminate him must be dismissed, Professor Slochower was dismissed as a teacher.

Also in the news recently is the Sheiner case in Florida which involved a lawyer who pleaded the fifth amendment before a congressional committee and in open court in his own State. He was disbarred for such plea. On appeal to the Supreme Court of Florida Mr. Sheiner was reinstated to the bar.

Lawyers have disagreed on the Sheiner, the Slochower, and other cases as to whether the person described as a fifth-amendment teacher or a fifth-amendment lawyer should not be prevented from practicing his profession for invoking his constitutional privilege It is my view that the community is not well served when a person is so punished for standing on his constitutional rights. The far greater good is the preservation of our constitutional liberties.

I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that I have no sympathy for those champions of the Bill of Rights who apply a double standard for its users. An example of the application of such double standard is the views expressed in a letter by Paul Blanshard, commissioner of the department of investigations and accounts in the LaGuardia administration published in the New York Times of October 14, 1955, concerning the Slochower case and section 903 of the city charter. According to Mr. Blanshard the provision in the city charter to punish civil-service employees for invoking the fifth amendment by firing them was to prevent grafters from holding city jobs. Said Mr. Blanshard:

"I know that Mayor LaGuardia, in originally suggesting such a punitive section, had no thought that it would ever be used to punish men for past political opinions or to compel them to become informers against their associates in ideological matters. * * *

"Now, 20 years later, the instrument which Mayor LaGuardia conceived of as a weapon against grafters is being used to punish left-wing intellectuals."

Mr. Blanshard is not alone in using a double standard when judging the usefulness of the Bill of Rights. There are many such.

In 1938, when the city charter was adopted, I opposed LaGuardia's section 903 because it was an unnecessary limitation of the civil rights of municipal employees of whatever category. I am still opposed to that section.

I cannot help emphasizing the principle that there cannot be one Bill of Rights for left-wing intellectuals and another Bill of Rights for grafters. There is either a Bill of Rights for all or for none. This great lesson must be learned and its meaning understood by all who cherish liberty. A free society cannot and does not hand out its freedom as a gift to the good, denying it to the bad. That philosophy leads to tyranny. And liberty and tyranny are natural enemies. Tyranny is the exercise of power in the name of the state in an arbitrary and capricious manner. It is the exercise of authority in a manner that violates the morals, ethics, and aspirations of a given society, wherein all are equal before the law.

There is no fifth amendment in totalitarian Russia, and there was no fifth amendment in Hitler's Germany or Mussolini's Italy. The fifth amendment, like the rest of the Bill of Rights, is the symbol of our civilization, the democratic civilization.

There is a further vital question concerning the fifth amendment about which the public should know and to which students of government should address themselves.

On August 20, 1954, the Compulsory Testimony Act, sponsored by Attorney General Brownell, went into effect. Under this statute the Attorney General, or a congressional committee, or a United States district court may, after a witness has claimed the privilege against self-incrimination, order such witness to testify provided that the order grants him immunity from prosecution for any matter covered by his required

---

[1] *Boynton* v. *State* (75 So. 2d 211, 215–216 (1954)).

[2] *Entick* v. *Carrington* (19 Howell's St. Tr. 1029 (1765)). See also *Boyd* v. *United States* (116 U. S. 616 (1886)) for approval of Lord Camden's words by Supreme Court.

answers. This statute does not meet the human problems raised by the use of the fifth amendment though it may be sufficient in a legal and technical sense.

The law is that when the Government grants immunity to a witness for giving certain testimony, the privilege against self-incrimination is no longer available to the witness. Two important difficulties present themselves with granting immunity.

The first problem, and this is basic, is that we live under a Federal system where we have not only separate but dual jurisdictions, each operating in the same physical territory. An individual called upon to testify before a Federal body on a matter which may also incriminate him under State law does not get protection from the Compulsory Testimony Act as far as State prosecution goes. Federal statutes cannot give immunity to an individual subject to State jurisdiction and State laws do not give immunity from prosecution under Federal law.

This dilemma was pointed out clearly in a very recent case by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit,[1] which said:

"It appears as futile * * * to expect an individual to feel that his constitutional privilege has been safeguarded because the penitentiary into which his answer may land him is under the supervision of the State instead of the Federal Government."

The second difficulty of course is the moral one which requires a person by means of a statutory immunity to accuse himself under oath, so that, though he may not be sent to jail, he is required by law to destroy himself. This is precisely the protection against the cruelty and inhumanity for which the fifth amendment was set up. This is what Lord Camden meant when he said almost 200 years ago:

"That the law obligeth no man to accuse himself."

In other words, unless the immunity that is granted is as broad as the privilege, we provide no real protection to the individual.

Another thing to remember is that debate over the fifth amendment, its uses and abuses, cannot and should not be limited to lawyers and bar associations, but must be taken up by educational and civic bodies, trade unions, fraternal and religious circles, and other organizations. It must go on in the press, over the radio, and over television. The people must be apprized of all facets of the problem for in the final analysis lawyers and courts alone cannot settle the moral and ethical issues that develop from the exercise of this great legal privilege. The courts can only settle the legal and constitutional issues.

I am convinced that the constitutional protection against self-incrimination is a vital safeguard of freedom and is as useful and necessary today as it ever was. Perhaps even more so today because of the increase in the powers of Government which arise out of our progressive collectivism, a product of our complex industrial and machine age. With the great multiplicity of governmental agencies, Federal and State, armed with subpena powers to investigate all sorts of economic and social activities, no person and his family is safe from official snooping. The danger is the greater when it is realized that many little men in official positions, seeking headlines in the hope of advancing their political positions, do not hesitate to use the power of subpena even though it may tear to shreds the lives of innocent people. The tragic effects on the lives and fortunes of people—from banker to bricklayer—from this indirect unlawful search and seizure should be a grave warning to the American people not to let matters go much further.

I urge all thoughtful Americans to take a more hospitable view of the fifth amendment and those who properly invoke it. The fifth amendment privilege may yet be the broad shield to protect the American people in their fundamental rights to privacy and individual dignity.

[1] *Marcello* v. *United States* (156 F. (2d) 437, 442 (C. A. 5, 1952)).

Study Now, Pay Later—A Business Solution to College Finance by Dick Mestres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether the below cited article entitled "Study Now, Pay Later," which appears in the February 3, 1956, issue of the Princeton Alumni Weekly contains an idea which could find wider application in the United States?

When one considers the phenomenal success of the techniques used to finance the sale of American automobiles, one wonders why similar techniques could not be used to finance, when needed, an education, with payment for it spread out over the expected span of a lifetime?

The question is, Do we approach education, its purchase and use, with the money techniques of our forefathers? In their time it was, for anything you bought, cash on the line, else go without. Not so today, not so except in education. Today we say, generally, if in need, "Buy now, pay later." Time payments have spurred production and helped make our economy hum. There are few, if any, time payments in study. Scholarships are insufficient to the demand for them.

The question is, How soon in America can one say, if need be, "Study now, pay later"?

Perhaps the article which follows, by Ricardo A. Mestres, gives us a clue:

"STUDY NOW, PAY LATER"—A BUSINESS SOLUTION TO COLLEGE FINANCE

(By Ricardo A. Mestres)

(With the same head-on approach he used as football captain in 1930, Dick Mestres, treasurer of the university, suggests higher tuition and an installment plan as the solution to the financial crisis of American universities. This was a provocative speech to fellow captains of finance, he hastens to add, and is not proposed for local adoption.)

I sail under false colors. These have been the traditional colors under which most of us treasurers sail—maybe we are financially wet and uncomfortable but they were good enough for our fathers and they seem good enough for us. We like our system—we don't depreciate buildings because they were given to us and how can you depreciate a zero cost? We don't set up reserves to replace those buildings because someone will give us a new one when the old place falls down. And it will fall down because we don't maintain it the way we should. We will sweat and strain and produce a fictitious balanced budget—we may be broke but our hearts are pure, our cause is just, and we will prevail—we always have.

We have prevailed but at what cost?—name me the institution that is paying its faculty, administration, and nonacademic personnel salaries commensurate with the importance of their contribution to society. Name me an institution that has a well-maintained and efficient plant. Name me an institution that could not use funds to improve its libraries, laboratories, and educational system.

We sit in dread of this so-called impending wave of students in the next few years. We wonder where the buildings are going to come from. Where are the teachers going to come from? Where are the administrators coming from? Why should any young man or woman place their families at such an economic disadvantage? The traditional answer will be because this has always been true and they are dedicated. President Lowell is supposed to have said that teachers should not be paid decent salaries to encourage only the dedicated ones to enter the profession. With all due deference to that learned gentleman, this proposition will not produce the number and type we want and need.

Now as I strike my false colors, let me say the Jolly Roger I hoist is not my personal flag. By that I mean the idea has been advanced in different form by different people. No institution could do it alone. Adjustments would have to be made.

In its simplest form, the proposition I submit is that each student should pay the full direct and indirect costs of his or her education. Now don't jump to conclusions—I am not advocating education only for the elite and wealthy. In suggesting that each student pay his or her total direct and indirect costs of education, I realize that this is contrary to the traditional American concept of education, both from the standpoint of the privately supported as well as the publicly supported institution. I think this traditional concept will bear analysis.

In the case of the private institutions, it is a well-known fact that the alumni or alumnae are on a perpetual mailing list of supplication to keep dear old X, Y, or Z solvent and strong. The American Alumni Council each year reports ever-expanding and increasing totals of alumni fund drives. The publicly supported institution not only has its alumni fund but also income from tax revenues and I am sure everyone will agree that you continue to pay taxes in one form or another until you die when many States really take it from you. It would seem therefore, that everyone probably pays something more than the tuition and fees levied while in college.

If we can assume for the moment that the principle of my proposition of paying the full cost is approved, we can turn to the question of how it is to be paid.

COLLEGE DEGREE WORTH $100,000

Dr. Pusey, of Harvard, in the September issue of Fortune, states that it is estimated that a college degree adds an average of over $100,000 to the lifetime earnings of the individual. I would like to interject Dr. Pusey's article does not deal with the material benefits of a college education. The sum quoted is merely a figure in the article. Let's assume this $100,000 average figure is correct—and I believe it is conservative. The average age at graduation is 22 and the average life expectancy is about 67, or 45 years of postgraduate life. Thus, we have an average increment of $2,222 per year for life. Doesn't it seem almost immoral for anyone to accept this bounty and pay on average about one-half the cost of the very thing that made it possible? The saying "You only get what you pay for" applies to everything except your education.

"HARVARD BLOCKING BACKS"

There have been several suggestions of how this cost might be charged. One suggested by Dr. Seymour Harris, professor of economics at Harvard—I hope you will ap-

preciate, as a Princetonian, my use of my friends at Harvard as blocking backs—Dr. Harris suggests that, in addition to tuition, each student at matriculation sign an agreement to pay 1 or 2 percent of his or her gross income each year to the college for life. At 1 percent, a very rough but conservative estimate would mean about $100 per year per alumnus. On my previous calculation of 45 years of postgraduate life, this means the graduate would pay only $4,500 extra for the $100,000 benefit gained from the college education. This does not seem an excessive charge and maybe 2 percent is the right figure.

INSTALLMENT BUYING

Another suggestion stems from our modern concept of installment buying. Fifty years ago, we saved up the money to buy the piano, the furniture or the new stove. You could get a mortgage on the house and the insurance companies had worked out actuarial tables whereby you paid now and they paid later; a nice business. The rapid growth and development of our economy has in large measure depended on the reversal of the concept that you had to have all cash before you could buy a single consumer's article. The only thing which remains back in the horse and buggy days is the system of paying for our education. Our expanded credit system is one of the contributing factors to inflation. This inflation is what is squeezing us and yet we hang on to the old traditional system. Now what's wrong with study now, with a downpayment, and pay later. Here's how it might work:

Let's take an average university from Ike French's compilation. We find this average of 60 institutions has an average income of $1,376,000 of which $782,000 is for educational and general purposes. Its expenses totaled $1,342,000 of which educational and general accounted for $766,000.

LET'S DOUBLE TUITION

Believe it or not, our theoretical institution balanced its budget. On examination, we find that the average instructional salary figure amounts to $295,000 and the total instructional expense amounts to 50.2 percent of the educational and general expenses. Now this average institution has about 700 students who paid about $700 in tuition and fees. Thus the $490,000 tuition income amounts to about 55 percent of the total expenses exclusive of auxiliary enterprises. Let us assume we double tuition and fees which will produce $490,000 more income. How would we use it?

Let's consider faculty salaries first. Bulletin No. 1 of the Fund for the Advancement of Education entitled "Teaching Salaries Then and Now," edited by Beardsley Ruml and Sidney G. Tickton, gives some interesting comparisons. The average 1904 salary of a full professor was $2,000, and in 1953 $7,000. The 1953 salary, deflated to real purchasing power, amounts to $1,956, or a 2-percent loss from 1904 on an absolute basis. To restore him to a relative economic position of 50 years ago, he would have to be paid $12,070 a year, or a 72-percent increase over his present average $7,000 salary. However, this restoration to his relative economic position of 50 years ago does not correct the inequity which existed then nor which exists to a greater degree today by reason of the relative advances that have been made in other professions such as law and medicine, not to mention workers in the automobile and other industries.

INCREASE SALARIES 72 PERCENT

I suggest we at least increase our faculty salaries by 72 percent. This will use up $222,000. I would increase administrative and nonacademic salaries by about 50 percent, which I must guess-estimate would cost about $150,000, leaving about $128,000 to improve the library, add to research funds and facilities, and step up plant maintenance and repairs.

The money has been spent—now let's collect it. Since we are practically on a cash basis now, I assume that our main problem is the extra $700 per year times the number of years the student is in college. For 4 years he owes $2,800. A 10-year note for a $2,800 loan at 4 percent interest would cost $28.35 a month, or $340.20 a year; $51.57 a month will pay off the debt at 4 percent in 5 years.

In order to simplify collections and reduce administration costs for all the institutions following this procedure, we will establish a general education acceptance corporation. This will be a nonprofit national corporation chartered to do business in all States. Its original capital will be solicited from major foundations, corporations, and individuals. Our college will discount its notes to this corporation at say 95 cents on the dollar. This would be a cheap price to pay to get those dollars in hand.

The General Education Acceptance Board would suffer some losses. It might consider group insurance which would be a nominal expense. After experience has been gained and proper reserves established, dividends might be declared to the participating institutions on the basis of their business with appropriate debits for losses incurred. Based on our own experience with educational loans and a report of the MIT loan fund; I am confident that in time the original discount of 5 percent could be abolished.

I realize that some problems would develop for those students who decide to continue into postgraduate work, enter the ministry, teaching, or social work, but I think these hurdles can be overcome. One possible way is postgraduate retroactive scholarships. Let me give you an example of how it might work. We have at Princeton a fund established to help students who elect the ministry, teaching or similar type of work. Instead of being a scholarship, this aid is offered in the form of a loan. We have the right, however, if the student does continue in these nonprofit endeavors, to cancel the loan retroactively. Any institution that has scholarship endowment might use some of its income for this purpose, or we could set up reserves out of current increased tuition income to provide for some relief in extreme cases. I might point out that if we could bring the teaching profession pay up to decent standards, then they might be able to pay off their own loans at more lenient amortization terms.

ATTRACT MORE TEACHERS

There are many ways of solving this problem if we want to. My premise is simple. We must attract a greater number of qualified people into the teaching profession. To do this, we must meet our competition for these people. Allowing some advantage for the desire to teach and pursue scholarly research, we must nevertheless narrow the financial gap between the teaching profession and other professional or lay employment.

A GREATER ROLE FOR TUITION

I apologize for appearing under false colors. The Changing Role of Endowments might better be called A Greater Role for Tuition or Study Now, Pay Later. I would like to add one thought to an obvious conclusion that may be drawn. If a person pays the full cost, will there be any urge to make contributions later on? I believe there may be some diminution in current support but, in the main, I believe bequests and other gifts will continue and can be cultivated. The average thoughtful donor does not measure what he gets from his college in exact dollars. You would be surprised how many alumni who paid full tuition think they did just that and still are generous contributors. Loyalty and appreciation will continue to exert their influence. If we can add "respect" to those two qualities, our futures are assured. The most effective way to gain that respect is to experiment constantly and improve on the job we are doing. If we can take some of the current pressure off our endowment, then its role will indeed be changed—it will provide the vital venture capital so necessary for our development and improvement.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Some of the Great Sayings and Writings of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present certain selected statements made orally or in writing by Abraham Lincoln in his lifetime. They came to me from the Library of Congress in response to my request that said Library furnish to me the text of statements made by Abraham Lincoln which were generally considered, in their experience, the most significant. I have made a few selections of the great statements and writings which to me have always been significant and inspiring and which I was reasonably sure all patriotic American citizens would be pleased to have to their attention for review and refreshment as to some of the great words and writings made by this great American, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln has always been my ideal of American statesmanship and of great indelible service rendered to the cause and the dignity and the freedom of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a fact that on the occasion of each or most of the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln, to wit, February 12, the 9 years I have already served in this great legislative body, it has been my privilege and pleasure to either speak or write something of my admiration of what Abraham Lincoln's life has meant to me in my boyhood years and then in my years as a practicing lawyer in California at the bar of the California courts and at the Supreme Court of the United States and now later as a Member of this great legislative body, to wit, the House of Representatives, of which great legislative body Abraham Lincoln was also a Member.

The statements follow:

SELECTED STATEMENTS ABOUT THOMAS JEFFERSON BY ABRAHAM LINCOLN

LETTER TO H. L. PIERCE AND OTHERS

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *April 6, 1859.*

But, soberly, it is now no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this Nation. One would state with great confidence that he could convince any sane child that the simpler propositions of Euclid are true; but nevertheless he would fail, utterly, with one who should deny the definitions and axioms. The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society. And yet they are denied and evaded, with no small show of success. One dashingly calls them "glittering generalities." Another bluntly calls them "self-evident lies." And others insidiously argue that they apply to "superior races." These expressions, differing in form, are identical in objects and effect—the supplanting the principles of free government, and restoring those of classification, caste, and legitimacy. They would delight a convocation of crowned heads plotting against the people. They are the vanguard, the miners, and sappers of returning despotism. We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us. This is a world of compensation; and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it. All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

Your obedient servant,

A. LINCOLN.

(Source: Nicolay and Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. 5, pp. 126–127.)

SPEECH AT COLUMBUS, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 16, 1859

This is an idea, I suppose, which has arisen in Judge Douglas' mind from his peculiar structure. I suppose the institution of slavery really looks small to him. He is so put up by nature that a lash upon his back would hurt him, but a lash upon anybody else's back does not hurt him. That is the build of the man, and consequently he looks upon the matter of slavery in this unimportant light.

Judge Douglas ought to remember, when he is endeavoring to force this policy upon the American people, that while he is put up in that way, a good many are not. He ought to remember that there was once in this country a man by the name of Thomas Jefferson, supposed to be a Democrat—a man whose principles and policy are not very prevalent amongst Democrats today, it is sure; but that man did not take exactly this view of the insignificance of the element of slavery which our friend Judge Douglas does. In contemplation of this thing, we all know he was led to exclaim, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just." We know how he looked upon it when he thus expressed himself. There was danger to this country, danger of the avenging justice of God, in that little unimportant popular-sovereignty question of Judge Douglas. He supposed there was a question of God's eternal justice wrapped up in the enslaving of any race of men, or any man, and that those who did so braved the arm of Jehovah—that when a nation thus dared the Almighty, every friend of that nation had cause to dread His wrath. Choose ye between Jefferson and Douglas as to what is the true view of this element among us.

(Source: Nicolay and Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. 5, pp. 158–160.)

LETTER TO J. H. REED

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *October 1, 1860.*

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of September 21st was received some time ago, but I could not till now find time to answer it. I never was in McDonough County till 1858. I never said anything derogatory of Mr. Jefferson in McDonough County or elsewhere. About 3 weeks ago, for the first time in my life did I ever see or hear the language attributed to me as having been used toward Mr. Jefferson; and then it was sent to me, as you now send, in order that I might say whether it came from me. I never used any such language at any time. You may rely on the truth of this, although it is my wish that you do not publish it.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

(Source: Nicolay and Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. 6, p. 60.)

There are 13 other instances according to the index to Lincoln's Works where he quoted Jefferson or named him incidentally in connection with other early American statesmen. They could be considered statements about Jefferson only by implication.

LETTER WRITTEN BY PRESIDENT LINCOLN TO MRS. BIXBY

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, November 21, 1864.

MRS. BIXBY,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully,

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

(Source: Abraham Lincoln: Complete Works. Edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay, vol. 2, p. 600, 1894 ed.)

SELECTED STATEMENTS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON CIVIL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS

ADDRESS TO THE MAYOR AND CITIZENS OF CINCINNATI, OHIO, FEBRUARY 12, 1861

I am reminded by the address of your worthy mayor that this reception is given not by any one political party, and even if I had not been so reminded by his honor I could not have failed to know the fact by the extent of the multitude I see before me now. I could not look upon this vast assemblage without being made aware that all parties were united in this reception. * * * Allow me to say that I think what has occurred here today could not have occurred in any other country on the face of the globe, without the influence of the free institutions which we have unceasingly enjoyed for three quarters of a century.

There is no country where the people can turn out and enjoy this day precisely as they please, save under the benign influence of the free institutions of our land.

I hope that, although we have some threatening national difficulties now, I hope that while these free institutions shall continue to be in the enjoyment of millions of free people of the United States, we will see repeated every 4 years what we now witness.

(Nicolay, John G. and John Hay, editors. Abraham Lincoln: Complete Works. New York, the Century Co., 1894, 2 volumes, vol. I, p. 674–675. E457.9, 1894.)

RESPONSE TO EVANGELICAL LUTHERANS (MAY 6?), 1862

GENTLEMEN: I welcome here the representatives of the Evangelical Lutherans of the United States. I accept with gratitude their assurances of the sympathy and support of that enlightened, influential, and loyal class of my fellow citizens in an important crisis which involves, in my judgment, not only the civil and religious liberties of our own dear land, but in a large degree the civil and religious liberties of mankind in many countries and through many ages.

(Work cited, vol. II, p. 148.)

LETTER TO ERASTUS CORNING AND OTHERS, JUNE 12, 1863, IN ANSWER TO RESOLUTIONS CENSURING THE ADMINISTRATION FOR SUPPOSED UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, SUCH AS THE MAKING OF MILITARY ARRESTS

Thoroughly imbued with a reverence for the guaranteed rights of individuals, I was slow to adopt the strong measures which by degrees I have been forced to regard as being within the exceptions of the Constitution, and as indispensable to the public safety. * * *

The provision of the Constitution that "the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it" is the provision which specially applies to our present case. This provision plainly attests the understanding of those who made the Constitution that ordinary courts of justice are inadequate to cases of rebellion—attests their purpose that, in such cases, men may be held in custody whom the courts, acting on ordinary rules, would discharge. Habeas corpus does not discharge men who are proved to be guilty of defined crime; and its suspension is allowed by the Constitution on purpose that men may be arrested and held who cannot be proved to be guilty of defined crime, "when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it."

(Work cited, vol. II, pp. 347–348.)

EXCERPTS FROM LINCOLN'S WORKS RELATING TO HARMONY, UNITY OF PURPOSE, ETC.

December 10, 1856—Fragment of speech at a Republican banquet in Chicago:

"All of us who did not vote for Mr. Buchanan, taken together, are a majority of 400,000. But in the late contest we were divided between Fremont and Fillmore. Can we not come together for the future? Let everyone who really believes, and is resolved, that free society is not and shall not be a failure, and who can conscientiously declare that in the past contest he has done only what he thought best—let every such one have charity to believe that everyone can say as much" (p. 226).

February 27, 1860—Address at Cooper Institute, New York:

"A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them" (p. 611).

March 5, 1860—Abstract of speech at Hartford, Conn.:

"All portions of this Confederacy should act in harmony and with careful deliberation" (p. 616).

March 6, 1860—Speech at New Haven, Conn.:

"It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them" (p. 628).

(Abraham Lincoln, edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay, vol. I (E457.91).)

July 4, 1861—Special session message:

"As a private citizen the executive could not have consented that these institutions shall perish; much less could be in betrayal of so vast and so sacred a trust as these free people had confided to him. He felt that he had no moral right to shrink, nor even to count the chances of his own life, in what might follow. In full view of his great responsibility he has so far done what he has deemed his duty. You will now, according to your own judgment, perform yours. He sincerely hopes that your views and your action may so accord with his as to assure all faithful citizens who have been disturbed in their rights of a certain and speedy restoration to them under the Constitution and the laws.

"And having thus chosen our course, without guile and with pure purpose, let us renew our trust in God and go forward without fear and with manly hearts" (p. 3232).

A proclamation:

"And I do further recommend to my fellow citizens aforesaid that on that occasion they do reverently humble themselves in the dust and from thence offer up penitent and fervent prayers and supplications to the great disposer of events for a return of the inestimable blessings of peace, union, and harmony throughout the land which it has pleased Him to assign as a dwelling place for ourselves and for our posterity throughout all generations" (p. 3430).

(Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. VII (J81.B97).)

LINCOLN'S STATEMENTS CONCERNING SECESSION

(Volume and page numbers which appear at the end of the following quotations refer to the Gettysburg edition of Lincoln's Complete Works, published by Francis D. Tandy Co., New York, 1905.)

Speech, Cincinnati, September 17, 1859:

"I want to know what you [men of the South] are going to do with your half of it [the Union]? Are you going to split the Ohio down through, and push your half off a piece? Or are you going to keep it right along side of us outrageous fellows? Or are you going to build up a wall some way between your country and ours, by which that movable property of yours can't come over here any more, to the danger of your losing it? Do you think you can better yourselves on that subject [slavery] by having us [of the North] bear no obligation whatever to return those specimens of your movable property that come hither?" (vol. V, p. 219).

"Will you [after the Union is dissolved] make war upon us [Northerners] and kill us all? Why, gentlemen, I think you are as gallant and as brave men as live; that you can fight as bravely in a good cause, man for man, as any other people living; that you have shown yourselves capable of this upon various occasions; but man for man you are not better than we are, and there are not so many of you as there are of us. You will never make much of a hand at whipping us. If we were fewer in numbers than you, I think you could whip us; if we were equal it would likely be a drawn battle; but inferior in numbers, you will make nothing by attempting to master us" (vol. V, p. 219).

"You [will] have divided the Union because we would not do right with you, as you think, upon that subject [slavery]; when we cease to be under obligations to do anything for you, how much better off do you think you will be?" (vol. V, p. 221).

Speech to Ohio Legislature, February 13, 1861:

"There is nothing going wrong. It is a consoling circumstances that when we look about there is nothing that really hurts anybody. We entertain different views upon political questions, but nobody is suffering anything" (vol. VI, p. 122).

Speech, Cleveland, February 15, 1861:

"What is happening to hurt them (men who seek to destroy the Union)? Have they not all their rights now as they ever have had? Do not they have their fugitive slaves returned now as ever? Have they not the same Constitution that they have lived under for seventy-odd years? Have they not a position as citizens of this common country, and have we any citizens of this common country, and have we any power to change that position? What then is the matter with them? Why all this excitement? Why all these complaints?" (vol. VI, p. 130).

First inaugural, March 4, 1861:

"All the vital rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them (men of the South) by affirmations and negations, guaranties and prohibitions, in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them (vol. VI, p. 177).

"If a minority * * * will secede rather than acquiesce (in the rule of the majority) they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them, for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy a year or two hense arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this. Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new union as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession?" (vol. VI, p. 178).

"Plainly the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left (vol. VI, p. 179).

"Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse (between the sections) more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old terms of intercourse are again upon you" (vol. VI, p. 181).

Message to Congress, July 4, 1861:

"It might seem at first thought to be of little difference whether the present movement at the South be called secession or rebellion. The movers, however, well understand the difference. At the beginning they knew they could never raise their treason to any respectable magnitude by any name which implies violation of law. * * * Accordingly, they commenced by an insidious debauching of the public mind. They invented an ingenius sophism, which, if conceded, was followed by perfectly logical steps through all the incidents to the complete

destruction of the Union. The sophism itself is that any State of the Union may, consistently with the national Constitution, and therefore lawfully and peacefully, withdraw from the Union without the consent of the Union or of any other State. The little disguise that the supposed right is to be exercised only for just cause, themselves to be the sole judge of its justice, is too thin to merit any notice. With rebellion thus sugar-coated they have been drugging the public mind of their section for more than 30 years, and until at length they have brought many good men to a willingness to take up arms against the Government the day after some assemblage of men have enacted the farcical pretense of taking their State out of the Union who could have been brought to no such thing the day before" (vol. VI, p. 312).

"The Nation purchased with money the countries out of which several of these [seceding] States were formed. Is it just that they shall go off without leave and without refunding? The Nation paid very large sums—in the aggregate, I believe, nearly a hundred millions—to relieve Florida of the aboriginal tribes. Is it just that she shall now be off without consent or without making any return? The Nation is now in debt for money applied to the benefit of these so-called seceding States in common with the rest. Is it just either that creditors shall go unpaid or the remaining States pay the whole? * * * If one State may secede, so may another; and when all shall have seceded none is left to pay the debts. Is this quite just to creditors? Did we notify them of this sage view of ours when we borrowed their money?" (vol. VI, p. 317).

"A part of the present national debt was contracted to pay the old debts of Texas. Is it just that she shall leave [the Union] and pay no part of this herself?" (vol. VI, p. 217).

"If all the States save one should assert the power to drive that one out of the Union, it is presumed the whole class of seceder politicians would at once deny the power and denounce the act as the greatest outrage upon State rights. But suppose that precisely the same act, instead of being called 'driving the one out,' should be called 'the seceding of the others from that one,' it would be exactly what the seceders claim to do, unless, indeed, they make the point that the one, because it is a minority, may rightfully do what the others, because they are a majority, may not rightfully do. These politicians are subtle and profound on the rights of minorities" (vol. VI, p. 318).

"The principle [of secession] itself is one of disintegration ,and upon which no government can possibly endure" (vol. VI, p. 318).

"Whoever in any section proposes to abandon such a government [as that of the United States] would do well to consider in deference to what principle it is that he does it—what better is he likely to get in its stead—whether the substitute will give, or be intended to give, so much of good to the people?" (vol. VI, p. 320).

"No compromise by public servants could, in this case, be a cure" (vol. VI, p. 324).

SOME OF THE SAYINGS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

"If the good people, in their wisdom, shall see fit to keep me in the background, I have been too familiar with disappointments to be very much chagrined." (Address, New Salem, Ill., March 9, 1832.)

"I go for all sharing the privileges of the Government who assist in bearing its burdens." (Letter to editor of the Sangamon Journal, New Salem, Ill., June 13, 1836.)

"If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide." (Address, Young Men's Lyceum, Springfield, Ill., January 27, 1838.)

"I am not a Know-Nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can any one who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we begin by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure and without the base alloy of hypocrisy." (Letter to Joshua F. Speed, August 24, 1855.)

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South." (Speech, Republican State Convention, Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1858.)

"Nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out." (Second campaign speech against Douglas, Springfield, Ill., July 17, 1858.)

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." (Fragment (August 1, 1858?) in Roy P. Basler: The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln (1953).)

"This is a world of compensation; and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it." (Letter to H. L. Pierce and others, April 6, 1859.)

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." (Address, Cooper Union, New York, February 27, 1860.)

"It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination." (First inaugural address, March 4, 1861.)

"Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1861.)

"It is difficult to make a man miserable while he feels he is worthy of himself and claims kindred to the great God who made him." (Address on colonization to a Negro deputation at Washington, August 14, 1862.)

"I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views * * * and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free." (Letter to Horace Greely, August 22, 1862.)

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final restingplace for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Address at Gettysburg, November 19, 1863.)

"It is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospital, and more prayers to Heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church. Bless all the churches, and blessed be God, who, in this our great trial, giveth us the churches." (To a Methodist delegation, May 14, 1864.)

"It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not, that we be not judged." (Second inaugural address, March 4, 1865.)

Nomination of Hon. Walter F. George, of Georgia, for 1956 Nobel Peace Prize

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article written by Col. Hubert Lee, sent to me from the Dixie Business Magazine, in regard to the nomination of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], by the organization of which Mr. Lee is the head and manager, to receive the Nobel peace prize. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WEEK

(By Col. Hubert Lee, editor, Dixie Business magazine)

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE is to be nominated for the 1956 Nobel peace prize.

Time for nominations for the 1955 award was February 1, 1955, or sooner.

Those nominated on or before February 1 are considered and the announcement made each December 10.

Through the courtesy of the Department of State, I have received the official announcement about how to go about entering a nomination. Here is the way:

"Det Norske Stortings Nobelkomite, Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament. Nobel peace prize."

All proposals of candidates for the Nobel peace prize, which is to be distributed December 10, 1955, must, in order to be taken into consideration, be laid before the Nobel

Committee of the Norwegian Parliament by a duly qualified person before the 1st of February of the same year.

Any one of the following persons is held to be duly qualified: (a) Members and late members of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, as well as the advisors appointed at the Norwegian Nobel Institute; (b) Members of Parliament and members of the government of the different states, as well as members of the Interparliamentary Union; (c) members of the International Arbitration Court at the Hague; (d) members of the Council of the International Peace Bureau; (e) members and associates of the Institute of International Law; (f) university professors of political science and of law, of history, and of philosophy; and (g) persons who have received the Nobel peace prize.

The Nobel peace prize may also be accorded to institutions or associations.

According to the Code of Statutes, paragraph 8, the grounds upon which any proposal is made must be stated and handed in along with such papers and other documents as may herein be referred to.

According to paragraph 3, every written work, to qualify for a prize, must have appeared in print.

For particulars, qualified persons are requested to apply to the Office of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Drammensvei 19, Oslo.

Enforcement of Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business.

I have observed with considerable interest, as many of my colleagues must also have noted, the splendid action of this small business organization over the years to protect small business and the free-enterprise system by making as their principal objective all-out, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The statement relates to a serious situation caused by the attempt of the big rubber manufacturers and the major oil companies to monopolize the distribution of tires, batteries, and accessories. It is an alarming situation, and arouses my interest in view of the fact that during my chairmanship of the Senate Small Business Committee, one of the first major actions of the committee in 1942 was to study the small business problems of the tire and rubber manufacturers and retailers. The complete report is embodied in Senate Committee Print No. 3, 77th Congress, 1st session, and I read from the report:

Despite the fact that the major petroleum marketers proclaim their stations are largely operated by independent businessmen it is not difficult to discover that so far as having the right to select a brand of tires is concerned, this independence is in reality nonexistent.

This was in 1942, Mr. President, and here some 14 years later the Federal Trade Commission issues a report which discloses, in substance, a $12 million override of $147 million in tire, battery, and accessory sales through 74,000 gasoline service stations, by Firestone with Shell, Texas, and Atlantic; by Goodyear with Shell and Atlantic; and by Goodrich with Texas. This all happened within a 2-year period, and I am just wondering what happened in the preceding years. In other words, it is self-evident that independence of free enterprise ceased to exist due to these combines.

There is pending before the Congres a bill I have repeatedly introduced, which would break once and for all time the hold by big rubber and oil interests established in an effort to monopolize that industry, and I am referring to my bill, S. 50. I shall urge the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to start hearings at the earliest possible moment.

I have also been advised that the National Federation of Independent Business has recently polled its nationwide membership, comprising approximately 100,000 independent business and professional men—all individual voting members—and the poll discloses: 56 percent for S. 50, 37 percent against, 75 percent no vote.

It is because of the conditions I have related that I believe it is important for my colleagues and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to note that my remarks are confirmed by the nationwide small business organization whose statement I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The action of the Federal Trade Commission, now headed by the Honorable John W. Gwynne, in its findings as to alleged violations of the antitrust laws by three rubber and three oil companies—Goodrich-Texas, Goodyear-Atlantic Refining, and Shell-Firestone—to attempt to monopolize retail tire distribution was hailed today by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, as the "removal of a major roadblock from the path of small business after a 15-year-old exposé made by the Senate Small Business Committee in its report to the 77th Congress, 1st session, 1941."

The committee at that time came to its conclusions after a national survey was made of the small business problems of the tire and rubber manufacturers and retailers which discloses there was no real free enterprise due to the ties existing between major oil and major rubber companies.

"The big question in the minds of independent business," Burger added, "was what was the contributing cause for the delaying action these past 15 years in coming to definite findings?" And, he further states that the recent actions of the Small Business Committees of the Congress in exploring the operations of the Federal Trade Commission in its enforcement of the antitrust laws were long overdue, and it is apparent that the present leadership recognizes this and now is taking more aggressive action in the inforcement of the laws.

Burger concluded: "Small business in all lines of industry will now watch with considerable interest that this case receives top priority over any and all other actions of the Federal Trade Commission to follow through."

The Late Governor Patterson, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Pendleton East Oregonian, an independent newspaper published in the great eastern expanse of my State, has printed a most thoughtful and touching editorial about Oregon's late distinguished Governor, the Honorable Paul L. Patterson, who died in Portland on January 31, 1956. This editorial, written by Mr. J. W. Forrester, editor and publisher of the East Oregonian, appeared in that newspaper on February 2, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a tribute to the late Governor of my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL PATTERSON

The most appealing of Paul Patterson's many attributes was his humility. We shall never forget his modest version of how an accumulation of circumstances took him from the practice of law in Hillsboro to the Governor's office; the deep sense of humility that had come upon him when he, "a little country lawyer," was called upon to serve the citizens of Oregon in the State's highest office; his complete feeling of inadequacy when the wand of fate touched his shoulder.

Paul Patterson soon proved himself completely adequate in the Governor's office. Newspapermen of all shades of political thinking were almost unanimous in saying, after Mr. Patterson had had an opportunity to get a firm grip on the reins dropped by Douglas McKay, that he was one of the best governors in Oregon history. The people showed conclusively at the general election of 1954, when Mr. Patterson asked a 4-year term as Governor, that they agreed.

Because Paul Patterson had been years in a small community and because he had been very active in the affairs of that community—he had been president of the Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce—he had an understanding of and sympathy for community projects of all sizes and descriptions. When the proponents of those projects took them to the Governors office, Mr. Patterson listened will and counseled well. He fully understood the cases placed before him because he had lived and worked with many of an identical nature in his own community.

Governor Patterson had a sincere interest in the Pendleton Round-Up. Many will recall the memorable remarks he made to a roundup audience in 1953 about the meaning of the historic show to the State of Oregon. No finer words ever were spoken in behalf of the Pendleton Round-Up. When it became apparent the roundup and Happy Canyon would face a conflict of Saturday

night shows after the canyon moved into a new plant the Governor took time to write a lengthy letter to the boards of both organizations, suggesting ways to put the shows together on Saturday night.

Paul Patterson didn't avoid any of the problems that faced his State. He didn't, for political expediency, sweep them under the rug. His message to the 1955 legislature stated clearly the fiscal problems that had come upon the State and presented a definite approach to solution of those problems. He felt he had as much responsibility as the legislature to find a way out. He didn't consider for a moment crawling from under that responsibility, as his predecessor had.

Although he was a successful lawyer, Paul Patterson was not an eloquent speaker who could excite an audience. But he always got through to an audience and held its attention because of his obvious sincerity. What he had to say his listeners knew he sincerely believed.

No one could stampede Paul Patterson into making a decision. True to his training in the law, he demanded all the facts and then carefully weighed them. When he had done that he showed no fear of giving his decision and standing behind it.

Oregon was exceedingly fortunate that Paul Patterson stood at the head of the line of succession when Douglas McKay went off to Washington. He was far better than a substitute. Oregon will have few Governors who serve as well. The State has lost a valuable citizen, one who gave wisely, unselfishly, and always humbly in the best interests of all Oregonians, whose hopes and dreams a country lawyer understood.

No More Money for ILO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he raises the question as to whether or not Congress should appropriate any more money to support the International Labor Organization. Here, indeed, is an opportunity for Congress to save more than $1½ million. The article by Mr. Lewis follows:

WHY SHELL OUT FOR ILO?

WASHINGTON.—If Congress is really sincere in trying to reduce Government expenditures, it could start by cutting off the American contribution to operating expenses of the welfare-statist International Labor Organization.

The savings in itself would be small—only $1,650,000 this year, although the administration has asked Congress to increase from $1,750,000 to $3 million, the maximum authorized annual payment.

But small as it is, many Members of Congress feel the United States would profit by cutting off its payments to the upkeep of what they regard as a Communist-dominated organization engaged only in propagandizing socialist theories.

In the post-World War II era, the ILO has adopted conventions which would outlaw all privately operated employment agencies and put them under government control; give government power to negotiate labor-management collective-bargaining agreements; compel governments to provide maternity benefits for working mothers, and many other out-and-out socialistic programs.

A convention, of course, is not effective in any country unless and until that country ratifies it. Fortunately, the United States has ratified only seven innocuous conventions, but the others are pending and conceivably could be adopted by the Senate.

In any event, there can be no logical justification for this country to shell out one-fourth of the cost of operating an international setup which is actively campaigning against all that the United States stands for.

The International Labor Organization originally was established in 1919 as an offshoot of the League of Nations, with the eminently laudable objective of improving the lot of working men and women throughout the world.

The United States did not join it until the advent of the New Deal; in 1934, at the request of the late President Roosevelt and over the objections of critics who even then claimed the ILO was merely a promoter of state socialism, Congress voted United States affiliation.

After World War II, the ILO was taken over by the U. N. as a specialized agency, and its actual operations went from bad to worse, like those of so many other U. N. subsidiaries, such as the notorious UNESCO—another very apt spot for Congress to do a job of appropriation paring.

The Soviet Union did not move into the ILO until 1954, when, with two of its constituent "republics"—the Ukraine and Byelorussia—it suddenly assumed a full membership role. The result has been that, with the slavish following of four Red satellite members and various so-called neutral countries, the Communist bloc has been able to overrule the United States on almost every issue brought up during the last 18 months.

The ILO is supposed to be organized on a tripartite basis, with each member nation sending delegates representing the government, labor, and management, to its annual meeetings in its huge, ornate marble home in Geneva.

The United States employer delegate, W. L. McGrath, prominent Cincinnati industrialist, has been battling against acceptance of Soviet employer delegates on the very valid grounds that there can be no employer class under the Communist system, that any Red delegates in this category therefore are per se nothing more than agents of their government and of the Communist Party.

McGrath was named to his post at the recommendation of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Both organizations have been strangely loath to take up the cudgels in his behalf, but the chamber's board of directors now has finally adopted a resolution urging Congress to investigate the ILO's "activities and structure * * * (to) determine whether the United States should continue its support of and continuation in that organization."

A special NAM committee has made a similar recommendation, but neither organization is willing to support McGrath's proposal that the United States get out now.

Expensive Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now being subjected to its annual program of plea and pressure from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield for an increase in postal rates.

From now until sometime in the distant future we will be hearing of the great improvement in the postal service. The fact is that postal operation cost is more today than ever before and, in my opinion, the rate increases requested are not fair and avoid many basic important policy decisions. Much can be done to improve management of the Post Office Department. Much should be done to improve morale of the postal worker. This cannot be achieved through the programs of speed-up which have been inaugurated by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Summerfield is a man of very interesting and diverse facets. He seems to have an uncontrollable desire to experiment with gadgets of various types. Recently, the press carried an announcement that stamp-selling machines would thank each patron for the dimes, nickels, or pennies fed into it. My views as to the value of such a gadget are best contained in the following item from the Tulare Advance-Register in California:

EXPENSIVE THANKS

We can't say that we're much taken with the Postoffice Department's latest stunt to curry favor with its patrons.

Postmaster General Summerfield and his inventive aides have come up this time with a little gadget which says "thank you" when a customer pops coins into a stamp vending machine.

Well goodie, goodie for the Postoffice Department. Now even the machines around the postoffices of the United States are going to be real polite to us.

Courtesy is a nice thing, all right, but the catch to this latest postoffice gimmick is that the 7 machines built so far cost about $4,000 each. Others to be built will cost about $1,000 apiece, say the wizards of the Postoffice Department.

Well, fine and dandy, but for a Department that's constantly hollering to the high heavens about its deficit, the whole idea of talking stamp machines seems to us to be a pretty extravagant thing.

Sure, we suppose it will be real cute the first time we hear the stamp machine in the postoffice lobby tell us, "Thank you for buying stamps." It will be, that is, until we realize that this little bit of etiquette is costing us a big hunk of money that could be used to help get the Post Office Department into the black for a change.

Outstanding Bibliography on Estonian Publications of Dr. Salme Kuri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this distinguished body at times has the occasion to perform certain research that is essential to the duties of our office.

Depending on which committee we serve upon, our ability to legislate more intelligently—thus to fulfill the responsibility for which we were summoned by

the people of America—is largely dependent upon our accessibility to facts about many matters and categories with which we must be well acquainted.

In this terrifying age—when more than 900 million innocent human beings are held in cruel Soviet bondage—there is compelling need for factual and up-to-date information about the various satellite and Baltic States that are bound by the heavy chains of Communist slavery.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my duties on the House Armed Services Committee, I recently took upon myself the task of acquiring certain late and current information about the unfortunate Baltic States, particularly about that northernmost country that borders the Baltic Sea—Estonia.

Searching vainly through the gigantic catalog of our Library of Congress, I was unable to find a single bibliography on publications concerning the Baltic States that would provide me with a shortcut to the information that I sought and needed.

It was only good fortune, Mr. Speaker, that finally led me to the library of our Catholic University in Washington where I found a complete and up-to-date bibliography on Estonian publications that had recently been submitted as a dissertation for a master's degree by Dr. Salme Kuri—herself a naturalized American citizen from Estonia who is an employee at the Library of Congress.

This bibliography of Dr. Kuri is unique in many respects. The hundreds of publications contained therein are broken down in various fields of interest, and it contains an extensive index. This work of Dr. Kuri is indeed a masterpiece and without doubt the most outstanding product of extensive research on the Baltic area.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Library of Congress now contemplates publishing this outstanding work of Dr. Kuri; and if so, it will certainly be a useful and noteworthy contribution to the legislative branch of our Government. If published, I wholeheartedly recommend this bibliography to any of my distinguished colleagues who are desirous of obtaining a shortcut to information on all aspects of Estonia. It would be an asset to the Nation if a similar publication existed that covered the entire Baltic area.

Mr. Speaker, this outstanding contribution of Dr. Kuri only bears out a contention that I have held for many years: That is that the United States is fortunate to have among its citizenry so many of the good, progressive and industrious peoples from East Europe and elsewhere. It is my good fortune to represent a district in which a number of Connecticut's finest and most progressive citizens are of Polish descent. Also, we have in the fifth congressional district many excellent citizens that are of Czechoslovakian, Hungarian, and Italian descent. These good people are constantly striving, in their respective ways, to make America a greater nation and to maintain the flame of liberty that they knew they would find when they reached the shore of the United States.

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the November 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENSORSHIP IN WASHINGTON

Not long ago a reporter queried a Government agency to find out how much peanut butter our men in uniform consume in a year.

His request was turned down cold. "This information," snapped the Government press officer, "is classified top secret. A potential enemy might get valuable clues on our armed strength if we were to release these figures."

This, unfortunately, is a true story which Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat, California, tells to illustrate to what absurd lengths secrecy and coverup in Government have gone. (As just about everyone knows, the armed services regularly publish up-to-date reports on the number of men in service, so spies don't need to estimate the per capita consumption of peanut butter.)

"Secrecy in Washington," Dr. Gerald Johnson, noted historian and commentator, wrote recently, "is more than an administration policy. It has become a disease." This is a view shared, incidentally, by the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the Association of Newspaper Publishers, both of whom have called for a halt to the spreading contagion.

Although the various department heads deny it, the record shows a definite trend toward coverup Government involving far more than the press. At this writing, the administration seems bent on erecting a paper curtain of censorship not only between itself and the public, but against the Congress as well.

The administration philosophy on blacking out information was clearly enunciated this summer by Boston banker Robert Cutler, former secretary of the President's National Security Council, who still serves as a part-time White House consultant.

Speaking to the Associated Harvard Clubs, Cutler declared the right to decide what information shall be made public—not just military information but all the vast paraphernalia which lies behind any policy decision—belongs to the President alone. In this complex, atom-dominated age, free speech, not secrecy, must justify itself, and the people need learn of decisions only after they have been implemented. So runs the Cutler thesis.

According to David Lawrence's magazine, U. S. News & World Report, Mr. Cutler's views were especially commended to White House aids by Mr. Eisenhower himself.

The press generally took a dim view of the speech. "Secrecy a la mode" and "Creeping Aunty-Knows-Bestism" the Washington Post called the Cutler philosophy. As Cutler sees it, the Post commented, information is no more than "a commodity to be manipulated to Government's advantage."

Wrote the Alsop brothers in their June 21, 1955, column: "the Cutler system, which is also the Eisenhower administration system, is not merely antidemocratic. Worse still, it is plain silly, unless its real purpose is to prevent those political embarrassments which officials have always wished to avoid."

Some of the concealment, like Topsy, "just growed," as officials found it more and more expedient to cover up errors of omission and commission.

But some of the coverup has certainly been deliberate from the outset—designed to mask unpopular proposals from the public or to distort the facts in a potentially flammable situation for political effect. The first consideration undoubtedly was behind the interagency conspiracy of silence and evasion which surrounded the Dixon-Yates and Hells Canyon deals. And one has only to read the newspapers now to see that no censorship could have been more self-serving than the administration's persistent refusal to submit its loyalty-security program to public analysis.

The businessmen now running the Government see nothing unusual about the secrecy they impose. After all, in the business world from which they came they were not used to sharing their affairs with the press or public. No one, certainly not President Eisenhower, has pointed out to Cabinet officers that as appointed representatives in a democratic government they now have responsibilities to the public which have no parallel in the business world.

The Washington press conference, a Chicago Tribune writer mourned recently, is a vanishing institution. In June, no Cabinet officer met the press more than once; in July, only 3 and in August 5 of the Cabinet held conferences.

The Defense Department's paper curtain has become almost as impenetrable as armor. Although 70 cents out of every tax dollar goes for defense, Secretary Wilson will release only information he feels "makes a constructive contribution to the mission" of his Department. His new press deputy has gone a step further and favors releasing only useful information. As Gerald Johnson commented, conceivably the public might find incompetence on the part of a Defense official useful information but certainly the Defense agency would not.

All last spring, Secretary Wilson argued for a reduction in ground forces by reason of our alleged air superiority over the Soviets. He had to make a quick about-face when Moscow staged a public demonstration of its new jet bombers on May Day but even when he upgraded his budget estimates, he refused to release any information whatever on Soviet air strength. Not until the foreign press and technical journals here had published eye-witness accounts of what they had seen was the Secretary persuaded to make a belated and inadequate public announcement explaining his position.

Then, of course, the Congress moved swiftly to vote increased appropriations for the Nation's defense.

Several times, Mr. Wilson has shown he believes only information helpful to the administration is good for the country. When Gen. Matthew Ridgway retired in July, he wrote the Defense Secretary protesting cuts in our Armed Forces. Wilson promptly classified the letter. Then 2 weeks later, the New York Times happened on a copy, and finding nothing secret, published it. This forced Wilson to dig his copy out of the safe and release it. He explained sheepishly he had suppressed the information so as not to complicate the work of President Eisenhower at Geneva.

Agriculture Secretary Benson is another administration official who on not 1 but 2 occasions has stated publicly that sometimes "information should be withheld which might do harm to the Government"—Government being synonymous with the administration.

When did Mr. Benson withhold information, for instance, which might harm the Government Notably in refusing to discuss

any of his now discredited security charges against Wolf Ladejinsky.

His philosophy may also explain why, when he raised interest rates on Commodity Credit Corporation price-support loans, and again last January when he upped the interest rate farmers pay for disaster-relief loans, he conveniently forgot to make any public announcement.

Consider the pattern of evasion and concealment which marked the administration's handling of Dixon-Yates:

For almost 2 years—until a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee under Senator KEFAUVER blasted out the facts—the administration concealed the role of Adolphe Wenzell, an ambidextrous gentleman who attended 25 separate meetings at the Budget Bureau as a consultant to the Government on Dixon-Yates. At the same time, he worked as vice president of the First Boston Corp., which, by happy coincidence, had agreed to finance Messrs. Dixon and Yates.

In releasing detailed chronologies in August 1954, the administration assured the public they contained the whole story on Dixon-Yates. But it was later revealed that Mr. Wenzell's name was conspicuously missing.

When Senate investigators sought the working papers from the Budget Bureau Director, they were refused the information.

Although Mr. Wenzell testified he himself had some doubts about the propriety of his dual role, there was no criticism of him within the administration.

This past August, the press was told that the Dixon-Yates records could not be dragged out with justice to the public—although it is hard to see how their publication could have hurt anyone except the administration and Dixon-Yates.

Although he admittedly ordered the Securities and Exchange Commission to recess a hearing on Dixon-Yates until after Congress cast a crucial vote on the matter, Assistant President Sherman Adams took a quick dive under the cloak of presidential immunity when asked to testify.

Time and again the administration has followed a pattern for refusing to give Congress information—notably when it declined to give the joint congressional committee investigating the Army-McCarthy copies of high-level memoranda within the executive agencies.

In recent month, administration officials have clammed up more and more in the face of congressional investigations.

Commerce Secretary Weeks, acting on White House advice, has refused to cooperate with a House Judiciary Subcommittee's probe of the Department's business advisory commission and the role of businessmen serving without compensation (WOC's they are called) at Commerce. Representative EMANUEL CELLER's subcommittee sent eight separate requests for the WOC files. The only material they have received is published speeches and press releases. In 1951 Commerce Secretary Sawyer supplied the same committee with all WOC files.

Secretary Weeks has stiff-armed three requests to testify. He has, however, angrily labeled the investigation "a massive attack on free enterprise" and concluded irrelevantly, "I don't think the American people want anyone to play politics with defense or prosperity."

(Mr. Weeks' penchant for playing it close to the chest got him in hot water once before. To a reporter for the Detroit News he hotly denied an exchange of letter with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, on the St. Lawrence seaway. The Detroit News printed his denial side by side with the verbatim letters.)

Federal Power Commission Chairman Jerome Kuykendall was less than frank with Congress in his testimony on Dixon-Yates. Again this summer he assured a House committee that FPC had taken no action to license the private Idaho Power Co. to build dams at Hells Canyon. The FPC order junking plans for a big Government dam at Hells Canyon, was dated the day before Kuykendall testified. The Administration, it seems, wanted no announcement made until Congress got out of town.

Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of a House Government Operations Subcommittee, has charged Interior Secretary McKay with deliberately withholding information on the Government's agreement with the Georgia Power Co. to ransmit Government power to rural electric co-ops in the State. CHUDOFF's committee is investigating whether preference users like REA co-ops are getting their fair share of Government power.

Agriculture Secretary Benson several times has refused to testify on the circumstances within his Department which enabled private operators to make windfall killings in cheese and butter last year.

Mr. Stassen, when head of FOA, steadfastly refused to turn over documents to a Senate operations subcommittee. The group was inquiring into an FOA contract with a Los Angeles firm—the highest of five bidders—to build grain storage facilities in Pakistan. Mr. Stassen never let loose the documents, but admitted error, cancelled the contracts, and asked for new bids.

A House Operations Subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat, of California, expects to open hearings in November on the spreading web of Government secrecy. With over 100 cases of withheld information now under study, he will probably spend sometime trying to pierce the silken curtain with which Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby surrounded the Salk vaccine controversy, and also look at the all-important question of why the full story on the effects of radioactive H-bomb fallout has been withheld by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Carroll Binder, editor of the Minneapolis Tribune editorial page, was especially concerned over this latter aspect of Government secrecy when he addressed the Harvard clubs this summer. He took issue on the subject, incidentally, with Presidential consultant, Cutler.

Said Mr. Binder: "Under the policy of secrecy pursued by the AEC, our civil-defense authorities know less about the effects of H-bomb damage than the Russians know. The AEC waited almost a year before it released information about the fallout of the H-bomb explosion at Bikini Island on March 1, 1954, and then it released less information than physicians need to know to treat H-bomb injuries or civil-defense officials need to know to make wise plans for coping with a possible attack."

The full extent of Government coverups can only be imagined. They generally start small and get bigger. The pattern begins with censorship of information, then hush-hush treatment of small mistakes and inefficiencies. From there, it is only a matter of time and degree for some grave blunder or failure to be hidden from sight in the ordinary course of business.

For example, the absurd classifying of peanut-butter statistics probably grew out of the embarrassment suffered by the Navy last spring when Hoover Commission investigators uncovered what they claimed was a 60-year supply of canned hamburger lying in Navy warehouses. Coverups on peanut butter and hamburger are not necessarily important in and of themselves. But the deliberate concealment of lagging defense or failing to tell the public about radioactive fallout can be as important as survival itself.

The Dayton Daily News warns just how serious the coverup has become: "Censorship at the well can choke off the flow of information to the public as surely as censorship at the spigot." And, the News continues, "It's past time * * * to take forceful measures to reverse it."

Scientific and Technical Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the success or failure of our effort to keep ahead of the world in scientific and technological development may to a considerable part depend on our ability to retain the very best in trained scientific and technical personnel in the service of our Government. This applies to no small extent to the fields of activity engaged in by the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

I have, therefore, asked the Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission for a report on the effect which Federal pay has upon the recruitment of scientific personnel. He has answered my inquiry with the letter which I submit herewith:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: This has further reference to your letter of December 21, 1955, in which you inquire about our experience in hiring and retaining employees, particularly for scientific positions.

Although the number of employees we recruit for the lowest levels of scientific and technical positions is relatively small, those we need for such positions must be outstanding and possess unusual capacities for growth into more responsible positions. These, of course, are the very ones who are much sought after by private industry, with salary offers we frequently are unable to match. However, we are in a somewhat favorable position in that many high-caliber people are attracted to our agency because of the nature of the work and the opportunity to be associated with outstanding scientists and leaders in atomic energy.

With respect to your question about the retention of employees in the higher salary levels, our current cumulative separation rate (separations per 100 employees of the same grades) for employees at grade GS–14 and above (of which we have approximately 600) is 10 percent a year. Of this group, about three-fourths resign from the Federal service. These resignations are sometimes due to an offer of compensation much higher than we are able to pay. In the case of scientific and technical personnel, we have some measure of relief from this situation afforded by our authority to pay such personnel in excess of Classification Act rates. We have used this authority very sparingly, however, because we must try to keep salaries of such personnel properly alined with those of nonscientific and technical employees.

In competing with private industry for highly qualified personnel, we also find that Government is sometimes at a disadvantage with respect to special fringe benefits. One notable example, which is a continuing problem for us, is our inability to pay for travel and transportation of household effects for

newly hired key employees to their first duty station.

With rapidly increasing participation of private industry in civilian applications of atomic energy, its interest in AEC employees, particularly those with scarce specialized scientific and technical skills, is likely to increase in the future. In some cases, this will not be undesirable, since it will help in the promotion of increasing private participation contemplated in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, but is likely, also, to increase the turnover rate for our key employees.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and hope our comments are helpful.

Sincerely yours,

K. E. FIELDS,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is too serious to trifle with. I have introduced legislation which will correct this problem, and I urge the House to consider it or any other legislation which will make it possible to immediately recruit sufficient and adequate scientific personnel and retain it for a satisfactory period.

Demagoguery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 7, 1956, the Democratic State central committee, controlled by the UAW-CIO, sent out a letter stating that it intends to defeat the six Michigan Republican Congressmen—and I am one of them—who voted for the gas bill.

The letter charges that those who voted against the bill "sold out the people back home," undoubtedly meaning those who purchase gas. It asks whether the six accepted or intended to accept campaign contributions from the oil and gas interests.

Those who voted for the bill did not directly or indirectly sell out anyone nor will their action in any way contribute to an increase in the price of gas as used by the consumer.

The transportation of gas from the well to the consumer is now regulated by the Federal Government. The price paid by the consumer is regulated in Michigan by the State Public Service Commission.

There is no more reason why the Federal Government should control the production of gas at the well than there is that it should control the making, sale, and transportation of automobiles.

Always I have voted against an extension of the power of the Federal Government, against measures designed to limit the rights of the people or of the States.

In answer to the CIO's Democratic State central committee's inquiry as to whether I accepted or intended to accept contributions from the oil and gas interests, my answer—as the CIO well knows—is that I never have and I never expect to get any.

No part of the $1,035,958 spent in 1954 by labor organizations in political activities came to me. Nor was a dollar of the $272,714 political fund of the UAW-CIO-PAC spent in my behalf.

The sworn statement of the CIO on file with the Clerk of the House shows that over the years the CIO has, as it did last year, made political contributions to my political opponent. Undoubtedly, the reason was that they expected he would be their "rubber stamp," their "yes man," vote for their legislative program here in Washington.

The current press carries the statement that the political bigwigs of the AFL-CIO, meeting at Miami Beach, are contemplating spending some $2 million to defeat Congressmen who do not bow to their will. Looks as though the labor bosses, with their campaign millions, have congressional candidates who will not kiss the collective labor "foot," over a barrel.

Apparently, the CIO intends to continue to use funds paid in by its members—even though they are Republicans—to support its hand-picked candidates running under a Democratic label. This money, according to the union announcement, comes "from two sources, voluntary contributions from union members and from union treasuries."

Campaign Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed alarmed to read in this morning's paper an article by Drew Pearson wherein he enumerated the fabulous sums of money contributed by the Rockefeller, Pew, Mellon, du Pont, and other families toward the Republican 1952 campaign. He elaborated in this article how various members of the family circumvented the true intent of the Corrupt Practices Act by the parents and children, cousins, uncles, and aunts all contributing sums of money in order to break down the total amount to avoid the intent of the election law dealing with unreasonable contributions.

I think it is highly necessary for the House to establish a special committee in the 1956 campaign as a watch-dog committee to prevent evasion of the Corrupt Practices Act and avoid the repetition of the millions that were spent by the Republican Party in 1952 and other campaigns. The chairman of the senatorial Campaign Committee, Senator GOLDWATER, and several other leading Republican politicians have been cleverly sending out misleading propaganda alerting the American people against large expenditures from labor organizations.

Let us get the record straight regarding the relative contributions of labor organizations as compared with the Republican Party's financial sponsors. In 1954 the Republican Party received from 738 individuals and families, a sum equal to the total voluntary contributions from 18 million members of organized labor. This amount was $1,434,000. In other words, for every voluntary contribution from a labor-union member of $1, the Republican Party received $1,943 from each of 738 wealthy contributors.

In the 1950 campaign in Ohio, the Hennings investigating committee revealed that the Republican political groups, organizations, and clubs supporting Senator Taft, spent $1,800,000. It was also revealed in the Hennings committee report through the testimony of Ohio senatorial candidate Joe Ferguson and others, that groups made up of Republic Steel, Timken Roller Bearing, NAM, American Medical Association, and so forth, spent approximately $1,200,000 in cleverly written newspaper, magazine, billboard, television, and other forms of advertising for the Republican Party in Ohio. This sum, coupled with the above, placed the cost of the Ohio Republican campaign in 1950 at approximately $3 million. Compare this with the $220,000 voluntary contributions spent in Ohio by all branches of organized labor during the 1950 campaign.

From reports in the newspapers and over radio and television, the American voters have cause to fear as to what might happen in 1956, if the special interest groups follow the same policy of election expenditures as in 1950, 1952, and 1954. No greater cloud hovers over the American system of free elections and representative Government than the fact that money is beginning to play such an important part in the elections of Presidents, Congressmen, governors, and other State officials. I read where Chairman Hall, of the Republican National Committee, has already admitted that $2 million worth of television time has already been signed. Five million dollars in addition has been raised by the Salute to Eisenhower meetings. There has not been revealed the added millions that will be derived from sources which brought about the great Republican campaign expenditures of 1950 and 1952. As of now, the Democratic Party has been unable to even talk to broadcasting companies regarding television and radio time because of a barren campaign budget.

I know the farmers of Indiana and America are very anxious to get the true facts as to why the Republican campaign promises of 1952 were completely reversed and they received the rural bankruptcy plan of Benson in 1953 and 1954. Apparently in the fall campaign the only television and radio time the Democratic Party will have available to inform the farmers of the true facts involved will be during the 6 a. m. milking hour. On the other hand, the only factual information labor can receive over television and radio as to why the Eisenhower promises of 1952 were not carried out will be the broadcasts at the 4 a. m. change of shift in factories throughout America. National Democratic

Chairman Butler's plan to equally divide radio-television time would be a great step forward in enabling the American voter to decide this election on factual information in the true record of both parties. It is highly necessary that to preserve this free republic the Congress take steps to prevent buying of elections through tremendous campaign funds. The American people must know the true facts and issues in this coming campaign and unfortunately, it costs millions to bring this information to the people. The public is entitled to know what is going on in their Government and one of the unfortunate ways to prevent this information from going into the precincts are the fabulous campaign expenditures provided by special privilege groups to buy up radio, television, newspaper, magazine, and all other forms of advertising mediums.

Congress should take steps and take steps now to prevent money from being the deciding factor in the presidential and congressional elections of 1956.

Foreign Aid Report From the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of foreign aid continues to be a much-discussed and much-misunderstood question. A recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, reprinted below, puts this program in sharp perspective.

The editorial follows:

AID REPORT FROM THE PHILIPPINES

One of the most frequent questions asked about American foreign aid, point IV, and so on is, "What good does it do?"

Item: Three hundred and fifteen farmers' cooperative credit and marketing associations organized with 139,000 members in the Philippines, where usury and tenancy were the rule. Item: Subdivision of public lands creating 170,000 new family-sized farms in the islands. Item: Thirty-eight agricultural, 33 trade, and 9 normal schools organized. Item: Malaria reduced 80 percent in 3 years; 59 hospitals rehabilitated since the war, 244 rural health units equipped. Item: An Industrial Development Center is advising Filipinos on diversification and modernization of industry. Item: New liberal labor legislation passed and a labor education center set up for union leaders. Item: Nine new coal districts surveyed and coal production increased 60 percent. Item: A new modern budget system established for the Philippine Government. Item: Two hundred and ninety-five miles of new roads ready, 1,000 miles being improved.

These are only some of the measures established or promoted by the United States International Cooperation Administration with the help of the Filipinos. To this program, America has contributed $110 million; the Filipinos $145 million.

What good is foreign aid? Ask our friends, the Filipinos.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

1847

Appendix

"Four Cents"

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing a subject here which more nearly touches and more nearly interests every man, woman, and child in the United States than any other of the appropriation bills or any other bill which could be introduced or considered in the House. The postman makes his appointed round 6 days a week to the remotest corner of the Nation and the smallest school child writes and receives letters and counts out the pennies for postage.

I regret that the bill is so liberal. Frankly, it is a surprise. We were promised retrenchment and decreased Federal expenditures, and for years we have listened to criticisms of profligacy on this floor every time an appropriation bill was reported. And yet the Budget Bureau sends up this bill with estimates and recommendations for the largest amount ever spent for the purpose in the history of the Nation. And no one over there on the other side of the aisle uses the old time-worn phrase we used to hear so often, that "it is ridiculous."

Speaking very seriously, Mr. Chairman—and it is a time for serious speaking—the bill is too large. It is swollen in every section—almost in every paragraph, and the aggregate is the largest ever before estimated or spent for this purpose by any administration. Surely if there ever was a time when the assurances that have been given us so often of reducing expenditures in the Department should have been carried into effect, this is the time.

The bill is too large. Many items instead of being increased should have been reduced below those of the current year. But I want to correct an impression which seems to be abroad to the effect that the increase in the bill is due to increases in the pay of the employees of the Department.

The bill itself disproves any such idea. The increase in this bill over last year is in excess of $317 million. But the total budget estimate for statutory pay increase is only $170 million—and even at that it should not have been more than $150 million as the Department in a bill of that size should have absorbed $20 million or more.

So it is evident on the face of the bill that the increase is not chargeable to warranted adjustment of postal salaries already too long delayed. But that is one of the stock arguments always advanced when they want to raise the rate of postage on any class of mail.

And they also want to hold the postal employees responsible for the recent order requiring a complete name and address on circular mail which they want us to believe is junk mail. There is no such thing as junk mail. That is merely a smear word used as a term of opprobrium in an effort to create prejudice. It is propaganda, pure, and simple. And again they try to hide behind the mailman.

Postmaster General Summerfield is a practical businessman and saw the absurdity of requiring individual addresses on this class of mail, and directed its discontinuance. The results obtained justified his good judgment. Without knowing very much about it here in the House we suggested its resumption last year and now it is costing the businessmen of the country an aggregate of millions of dollars a year without any compensating advantage to anybody and rendering vastly reduced service.

Let us drag this thing out into the open and take a look at it. If a street address is not required—if it is addressed to Boxholder, Occupant, or to any other impersonal addressee, the carrier does not have to sort it before leaving the office. All he has to do is put in one copy for each patron. And when he reaches the point of delivery he does not have to scrutinize it to be certain it is the proper address. He merely drops one copy—any copy—in the slot. And when he finds the patron has moved or died or the address is imperfect he does not have to follow up and redirect or redeliver. Such mail requires less time and attention than any other class of mail.

And what about the service rendered the sender? Let us not overlook the fact that the Post Office Department is a service department and is intended to render the most efficient service at the lowest possible legitimate cost. When mail must be individually addressed the cost of securing lists and of addressing each piece is heavy and then the sender misses anywhere from 10 to 25 percent of the patrons along the line. He is subjected to a heavy expense and then gets less service. And the mailman works harder and with less efficiency. Everybody concerned is penalized and nobody is benefited. And the Department does a 10 percent to 25 percent poorer job.

But they claim the recipient is burdened with a plethora of unwanted mail. "The patron doesn't want it." That statement belongs under the classification of "interesting if true." This mail is welcome everywhere except in the Congressman's office and requiring an address would not protect the Congressman. His wastebasket is always full anyway. Out on the delivery line—and especially on rural delivery—many patrons receive less than a letter a week. They like to have the mailman stop—even with a circular—rather than pass them by. I can say positively that in the rural mailbox the circular is welcome. And the proof of that is the fact that even when an address is required this class of mail is heavier this year than last. The Wall Street Journal this week called attention to the increasing use of this class of mail. And the senders of such mail find that the patrons read it and answer it and both find it profitable or it would not be on the increase. So the last argument against "junk" mail goes glimmering.

If the Congressman does not like it, a push of his elbows drops it into the wastebasket. And if it costs too much to deliver it, just add the cost of service. But the patron wants it and answers it and will pay cost of delivery. Permit me to say again that the Post Office Department is a service department and both the sender and the patron want this service and are willing and glad to pay for it.

But Mr. Chairman, when it comes to this pious tongue-in-cheek sob story about first-class mail not paying its way, and an attempt to add another cent to the cost of delivery, that is another matter. Charging 4 cents for delivering a 3-cent letter would be an outrageous imposition on every family in the country. Never before has it been claimed that first-class mail did not pay its way and I do not believe it now. If any such claim is seriously made it is due either to inefficiency in administration or to faulty bookkeeping.

During the war it was decided—merely as a war revenue meaure—to increase the cost of letter postage from 2 cents to 3 cents. And we were promised that as soon as the war was over the cost of postage would go from 3 cents back to 2 cents. That promise has never been kept. And now they propose to further mulct the public by charging 4 cents.

Somewhere between 3 cents and 4 cents the law of diminishing returns will clamp down. And you will get less profitable revenue at 4 cents than you would get if

you went back to 2 cents. And the Post Office Department is no longer a service department.

I am opposed to it. My constituents are opposed to it. The American people are opposed to it.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department is the one department of government in which a deficit is not an unmixed misfortune.

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1789 there were many, including Patrick Henry, who seriously doubted its success. And the criticism most frequently made was that the average citizen was not sufficiently informed to vote intelligently on issues with many of which he naturally lacked familiarity. The Founding Fathers, appreciating the logic of this objection, early adopted two measures to meet it. They organized a public school system with a little red schoolhouse on every hill. And they provided free postage at Government expense of newspapers in local and adjacent counties in order that news, information, and official opinion might be disseminated as widely and as cheaply as possible. So successful have these two measures justified the expectations of the founders, that they are continued to this day. And in addition congressional speeches are mailed free of postage in order that the voters may know what the issues are and may understand the position of their representative on the questions of the day and have opportunity to judge whether he represents their views.

No money spent by the Federal Government is so well and so wisely spent as that expended by the Post Office Department for the diffusion of knowledge for these purposes.

And when any one proposes to lay profane and impious hands on the delivery of first-class mail under a 3-cent stamp, let us again remember that the Post Office Department is a service department. Let us not lose sight of the high ideal of service envisioned by Woodrow Wilson when he indited the inscription for the facade of the post-office building here in Washington:

"Messenger of sympathy and love,
Servant of parted friends,
Consoler of the lonely,
Bond of the scattered family,
Enlarger of the common life."

"Carrier of news and knowledge,
Instrument of trade and industry,
Promoter of mutual acquaintance,
Of peace and of good will,
Among men and nations."

Tribute to Senator Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial which was published in the Washington Post of February 13. The editorial is entitled "Mr. Health"; and it justly compliments our associate and colleague in the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The Senator from Alabama received the first annual award of the National Mental Health Committee.

Mr. President, I think all of us are deeply indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama for his very able leadership in the field of health legislation. He has become known throughout the Nation as one of the proponents of constructive, progressive, health proposals, such as the Hill-Burton Act; and of course he also outstanding for his very splendid work and leadership in the field of the National Health Institutes and the research programs under those institutes. We are very grateful for the leadership of the Senator from Alabama; and I desire to compliment him, and to join the editor of the Washington Post in saluting the Senator from Alabama for work well done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MR. HEALTH"

Dr. Joseph Lister was one of England's great surgeons of the last century. In the 1890's an Alabama doctor named his son for him. Senator LISTER HILL, who Friday night received the first annual award of the National Mental Health Committee, has a record of crusading for health legislation that reaches far into American life.

The award, given for outstanding contribution by a public official during 1955 in the fight against mental illness, is a reminder of how much the Nation owes "Mr. Health," as Senator HILL is known on Capitol Hill. From the Hill-Burton Act of 1946, which made possible some 100,000 more hospital beds and 500 community health clinics, to the Mental Health Study Act of 1955, Senator HILL has worked constantly to expand health resources. Ten years ago he sponsored legislation creating the National Institute of Mental Health, and each year as ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee he has sought to make expansion of its activities possible. Appropriately the award given him is in the form of a key, symbolizing the liberation of the mentally ill from former bondage.

Vote First—Investigate Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bipartisan Giveaway," which was published in the Chattanooga Times of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIPARTISAN GIVEAWAY

Memories of the day when railroad and electric power lobbies controlled legislatures and had the support of even the most respectable statesmen were evoked by the passage of the natural-gas bill by the United States Senate. Senators JOHNSON of Texas, MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas are highly respected men, but when it came to fighting for special interests of their home States against the welfare of natural-gas consumers in the rest of the country they stood four square for the gas producers, including the 100 big oil companies which produce 80 percent of the natural gas.

When the President signs the bill, the producers, having a captive market tied in with pipelines, will decide whether to be discreetly patient before making the consumers pay higher prices or whether to proceed with the gouge at the earliest possible moment.

Enough Democrats joined with Republicans to pass the bill by 53 to 38. The difference might well have been the amiable prodding of Senators by the Democratic leader, JOHNSON; and other Democratic Senators from the gas-producing States, as in the House the popularity of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, was a determining factor.

The alarming possibility that cash from the gas lobby might have influenced the vote will not be dismissed by the public, however lightly it was treated by the Southwestern Senators. An oil company lobbyist sent $2,500 to Senator CASE of South Dakota, and approached at least 2 other Senators on behalf of the bill, though not offering them money. That might have been naughty, the Southwestern Senators admitted, but they took the oblique position that it did not have any bearing on the prearranged time limit for the Senate showdown. They would pass the bill and investigate later. Again the old days are recalled for pressure-passing of legislation was a familiar technique in the era before regulation was imposed.

And thus the Democrats, who planned to stress the giveaway issue and the alleged devotion of this administration to special privilege, have blunted that issue insofar as this campaign is concerned. It is just barely possible that the highly respectable Democratic Senators from the Southwest may have cost the Democratic Party victory in the Presidential race. But peace and prosperity is assured the gas producers and the Southwestern States, which are oil and gas rich.

Senator KEFAUVER flew back from California to vote against the bill, which was commendable. Senator FRANCIS CASE, conservative Republican of South Dakota, struck a blow for decency in a cynical age when decency certainly needs supporters. Many Senators, however, turned away and went by on the other side.

The power of righteous indignation, once so strong in Congress, has gone into eclipse and the people lack protection in the one place where they cannot afford to lose it.

Water Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the able and outstanding men who have been called to public service by the Eisenhower administration is the Honorable Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior. Many difficult problems have been handled by him. His every public action has been marked by thorough consideration, fairness to all the parties, and absolute integrity. He has made a record of which all friends of good government can be proud.

One of his special assignments consisted of carrying the principal responsibility on the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. The report of this Committee will have a far-reaching effect upon the public, upon the Government of the United States, and upon State and local governments. I desire to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Davis before the United States Chamber of Commerce at St. Louis on January 24, 1956, wherein he spoke on the report of this Presidential Committee.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make 4⅔ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $374, but because of the valuable material contained in the address, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding its length, it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR CLARENCE A. DAVIS BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER RESOURCES POLICY, CHASE-PARK PLAZA HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO., JANUARY 24, 1956

I feel signally honored by being permitted to address you with the distinguished list of authoritative speakers which comprises your program. I am doubly honored by the privilege of being the first to discuss this report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy after its submission to the Congress.

There is also another reason why it is appropriate for someone from the Interior Department to discuss this very controversial subject of water. That is because Interior lives in a constant conflict not only over water but over all other natural resources.

There are inherent conflicts in the development and preservation of natural resources. No matter what you do, you will be wrong in some people's eyes.

We are charged with the development of hydroelectric power on many of our streams, but we are also charged with the protection of fish and wildlife, the creation and protection of national parks and monuments, of mineral resources, and of recreational areas.

You can't flood a canyon to get hydroelectric power without affecting scenic values—sometimes for the better. You can't take water for irrigation purposes and at the same time have that water available at all times for the fish and wildlife and for domestic uses.

You can't maintain wildlife refuges in many cases without having adjacent landowners drain the oil out from under your refuge.

You can't maintain an elk herd of 12,000 elk in a park where there is not sufficient grass raised in the region to feed them in the winter, but if you undertake to thin down the herd, you are guilty of atrocious inroads on the Nation's wildlife.

You are the protector of the ducks, but when they settle by the thousands over the lands of farmers you have to make decisions on whether you will ruin the farmers or permit a moderate amount of shooting.

And lately, I have even understood that you can't have mining claims without interference with the forests, and you can't totally protect the forests without denying the miners' claims.

So, whatever you may do, I have learned, is a necessary disappointment to some organized and vocal group. Whatever you may do, you may prepare to read in the press that you are doing something wrong about the natural resources of the country, and you will find echoes in the political, partisan press and their kept or fed columns.

With that introduction, let me talk about the conflicts in water resoures.

The importance of water resources to the economy of the United States can hardly be overstated, and if I may be permitted before entering upon the details of the report itself, I should like to convey some notion of the widespread variety of the problems that are involved and of the implications of their solution upon our economy and upon the Government.

When we are dealing with water, we are dealing with one of the fundamental human wants. Along with land and air and food it is one of the necessities of life. Here in the United States, blessed with a continent of virgin soil, we lived more than 200 years before the water problem became generally acute, but we must remember that many ancient civilizations disappeared because of the absence or mismanagement of land and water.

The increase of our population, the raising of our living standards, the coming of our industrial era, and the increased application of water to land have now highlighted the problem until, in much of the Nation, there is a grave and increasing concern over water resources.

I should like to impress four things in the beginning: First, there is not a water problem, but there are many water problems; second, while these problems are nationwide, they are not necessarily national; third, that there is no magic formula which can be applied nationwide as a solution of these problems. Lastly, the policies we adopt go to the heart of our national economy and ultimately to our very form of government.

The water problems confronting us have three aspects: physical, financial, and organizational.

Physically, we have the problem of water shortages, irrigation, floods, pollution, and navigation. In the Southwest, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, and Texas, we have the problem of inadequate supplies to maintain agriculture and grazing and in many cases to even provide domestic supplies. The great metropolitan region of southern California, with its recent influx of millions of people, despite large transfers of water from the lower Colorado, still anticipates the most serious problem for even domestic water supplies.

The entire east slope of the Rockies, including the cities of Denver and Colorado Springs and their environs, are in an area where the natural water supply of the region, except as water may be diverted from the west slope of the mountains, threatens to become inadequate for domestic uses and is a serious handicap to agricultural development. In New York but 5 years ago water supplies had decreased to the point where the whole metropolitan area was imperiled. We were trying to shave on a pint of water a day, and even drinking water was carefully hoarded. Additional sources and reservoirs have been constantly necessary.

We have vast supplies of underground water, the exact extent of which is unknown, but water uses in many areas are pulling down underground water tables faster than nature replenishes them. In some productive areas in California the underground water table is falling as much as 25 feet per year. Irrigation wells are now as much as 600 feet deep, and the water level is still declining. There is a constant but consistent decline in underground levels in many other parts of the country.

There are larger numbers of local areas throughout the United States in which the problem of a domestic supply is becoming acute.

At the same time, many areas are suffering from devastating floods. The New England and California floods are so recent that we are all familiar with them, but throughout our history the lower Mississippi has wrought millions of dollars of damage each year. The Missouri and its tributaries have frequently brought great devastation to the Middle West. Within 10 years the Columbia has devastated wide areas, and the whole Southeast region suffers from occasional floods.

At the same time, in our congested areas we are rendering much water useless by reason of industrial and municipal pollution. The Potomac is one example, but there are serious pollution problems along the Ohio below Pittsburgh, in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania. The Missouri below Omaha is affecting Kansas City, St. Louis, and the lower river. Chicago and the other cities adjacent to the Great Lakes have serious pollution problems, and there are innumerable individual communities throughout the country whose domestic water supplies will require pollution abatement in the foreseeable future.

Meantime, our needs and uses of water climb to astronomical figures. It is estimated that the average urban dweller uses more than 145 gallons of water per day, and if you include the water uses that go into the manufacture of the things that he eats and wears and uses, his individual needs climb to some 1,200 gallons per day. New industrial uses, air conditioning, and kindred uses, bid fair to double that requirement in the next 20 years.

Industrial uses have grown to even greater proportions and the concentration of population in the cities has magnified the problem of providing a concentrated supply of water as against a supply that was adequate when population was more widely dispersed. These are some of the physical aspects of the problem.

The financial problems are of equal magnitude. No one has been able to estimate the total financial requirements necessary to meet the various water problems in the years ahead. It will suffice to say that it involves billions of dollars between the various levels of Government. It may perhaps be best illustrated by the estimate of HEW that keeping abreast of only the relatively small problem of pollution will require some $750 million a year of somebody's money.

To give you a further glimpse, it is estimated that it will require $3 billion just to keep abreast of the hydroelectric requirements of the Columbia Basin alone during the next 10 years. The Tennessee Valley Authority indicates a need for at least $150 million a year for an indefinite length of time to keep abreast of the growing electric needs of that area. How many hundreds of millions may be necessary for flood-control structures in New England or for similar structures in California, the Missouri Basin, and elsewhere, it is impossible to say, but I should like to impress you at this point with the fact that the dollar requirements are so great that a Federal assumption of responsibility for all of them will have a definite effect upon the Federal budget, even in these days of budgets and debts of billions.

The problems are further complicated organizationwise. In addition to private persons and cities and local public agencies, there are three great Federal agencies, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture actively engaged in various phases of water resources development. Each of these agencies deals with a particular phase of the problem, and between them there has been inadequate cooperation and in many cases intense rivalries and jealousies throughout the years.

It is less than 20 years ago that any general Federal responsibility in this field of water resources was assumed. There has never been and is not now any general Federal assumption of responsibility for the

supplying of water for domestic and industrial water uses. Water supplies for domestic uses have always been an assumption of individual or local responsibility. Industrial supplies have been the responsibility of communities or of industry.

Even in the field of irrigation it is interesting to note that while there are approximately 28 million acres of irrigated land in the United States, only about 7 million acres of that have been irrigated under Federal sponsorship, and that prior to very recent years the hydroelectric potentialities of our rivers have been entirely developed by industry. Despite widespread Federal activity in recent years, this activity still constitutes only a very minor percentage of water resources development.

Much of this Federal participation has been on a hit-and-miss basis; much of it is represented by what has always been known as pork-barrel legislation; a great deal of it has been done under political pressures with small regard to national needs.

The Corps of Engineers, beginning 120 years ago when inland navigation was a more vital form of transportation than it is today, was charged with the responsibility of the development of rivers and harbors for navigation, but today, under the theory of the protection of navigation, has assumed the functions of flood control and so has extended its activities upstream until in many cases it is in direct conflict with the activities of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture.

The Bureau of Reclamation, originally designed to make productive the arid public lands of the West, has extended its activities until it is an active public power agency and is supplying supplemental water to thousands of acres of privately owned land that are far from arid.

The Department of Agriculture, on the theory that water should be conserved and stored on the land on which it falls, has envisaged for itself a great program of small dams and local water controls which supplement and in many cases conflict with the engineers' conception of flood control and the Reclamation Bureau's conception of irrigation.

And into the thinking of all three of these agencies is intruded the theory that by the generation and marketing of hydroelectric power, revenue may be produced which justifies the further extensions of their programs.

The effect of the water policy determined by the Federal Government goes to the heart of our national economy and even to our form of Government. What we do with reference to creating supplies of water determines the locations of great industries, to many of which a water supply is of more importance than either raw materials or freight rates. It determines the location of population which follow these industries. Our policies with relation to water may be a definite part of either the advancement or the liquidation of substantial areas of our country, especially if the Federal development contains elements of subsidy.

The control of water means the control of the land and people which depend upon the water. Hydroelectric power controls not only the location of industry, but through the rate schedules it establishes and the selection of its customers controls the economy of the region.

The concentration of the control of water in the Federal Government means ultimately the control of the land, the power, and consequently, the whole economy of the region. This of necessity, therefore, places large areas of the United States under the practical domination of Federal departments.

The President has been keenly aware of the vast importance of water in our economy. The establishment of a sound water policy stands well up the list of our numerous domestic problems.

In his letter appointing the Cabinet Committee, which consisted of the Secretary of the Interior, chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, and as ad hoc members, the Secretaries of Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President outlined his view of the problem as follows:

"The conservation and use which we make of the water resources of our Nation may in large measure determine our future progress and the standards of living of our citizens. If we are to continue to advance agriculturally and industrially we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil, or which can be extracted from the oceans. It is my desire that this administration furnish effective and resourceful leadership in establishing national policies and improving the administrative organization needed to conserve and best utilize the full potential of our water resources.

"During the more than a century in which the Federal Government has played a vital part in the harnessing and development of water resources, our policies have been modified repeatedly to reflect changing needs and priorities. Unfortunately, we have often relied on piecemeal or stopgap measures. In other instances the policies covering different Federal agencies concerned with similar water resources have been inconsistent. Accordingly, it is both fitting and necessary for us to undertake a comprehensive review looking toward modernization of Federal policies and programs in the field of water resources. We must do this with a full realization that the States, communities, and private citizens are vitally concerned with the policies and actions of the Federal Government."

He then directed the committee to undertake an extensive review of all aspects of water-resources policy and to make its recommendations for the strengthening, clarification, and modernization of these policies.

The problems are so great and numerous that your organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Reclamation Association, the Joint Council of Engineers, the Materials Policy Commission, and the reports of both of the Hoover Commissions, and numerous recreation and wildlife organizations, have made recommendations for programs relating to the development and conservation of water resources.

The most interesting thing to me in the study of the recommendations of all of these great national organizations is not how much they differ but how much they agree.

The Government has not been idle in this field. We have dozens of reports of executive agencies and congressional committees on various phases of the problem of water, and we have within recent years the report of the Presidential Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950, representing three great volumes of a careful and detailed study.

There has been a period of years, now largely past, in which the big river-big dam conception has dominated our thinking, but no one now familiar with the field should minimize the great desirability of water conservation on the land, of small storage reservoirs, of soil conservation and erosion prevention that are within the conception of the Small Watershed Act of 1954 and which are quite in contrast with the big river-big dam concept of the preceding period. And, yet, any fair appraisal of the field must recognize merits in both of these conceptions, each in their proper place, as a part of a unified whole.

Everyone who has examined the field of Federal operations with reference to water has been impressed with the divergent programs of the various Federal departments and the widely differing concepts that have motivated them. This is the first time that a committee has been established which brought together around the council table the three great water-resources agencies of the Federal Government, that is, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture.

I have been greatly honored by presiding over the deliberations of that committee, which, also has been supplemented on an ad hoc basis by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, the International Joint Commission, dealing with Canadian relationships, the Department of Justice, and other agencies from time to time.

This is the first time that these agencies have been directed to sit down together and to evolve a rational and a practical policy, reasonably acceptable to all of the potentialities of all the agencies, wherever they were best suited to meet the practical conditions that arise.

I need hardly point out to this group that there is no single uniform water policy, no magic formula relating to water resources which can be applied to all parts of the country at all times and in all places. The problems involve particular needs and uses of water which vary from State to State and region to region. In one place the problem may be flood control; in another navigation; in another inadequate domestic supplies; in another inadequate agricultural supplies; and in still another stream pollution. Frequently water needs and uses are in conflict with each other. The changing pattern of the economy of the regions, and shifts and growth of population, require flexibility in policy, so that the plans may be adjusted to the realities of the economic requirements of an area.

The conception, therefore, of utilizing those tools at hand best fitted to meet the need of the region or the area or the locality is a conception which I believe to be sound.

I wish I could convey to you the thrill that comes from having the representatives of these great agencies sit about the council table, week after week, and month after month, discussing their mutual problems, the variations in their methods of appraising, constructing, and evaluating projects, and witness the steady progress of logic and reason against long-standing practices.

Many generalities become apparent in long-extended conferences of that nature.

First, the greatest single weakness in the Federal Government's activities in the field of water resources development is the lack of cooperation and coordination of the Federal agencies with each other and with the States and local interests. This has been occasioned by the fact that the Federal interest in water resources development has been expressed in different laws empowering different agencies to pursue particular programs for different purposes. There has been inadequate coordination of the program of one agency with that of another, and inadequate consultation with and consideration of the interests of the States, local communities, and individuals most vitally affected.

Second, it is not practicable, and certainly not desirable, for the Federal Government alone to assume responsibility for the complete development of the Nation's water resources. This reasoning stems not only from the practical impossibility of assuming the financial burdens which such a policy would require, but also from the fact that such complete Federal assumption of responsibility would tend to create local and regional dependence upon Federal action, to destroy individual and local initiative, to destroy the effectiveness of the Government of the States, and to work a profound and undesirable change in our traditional plan of Government. Lack of funds and regional rivalries have delayed for years many meritorious projects in the expectation of Federal action which has not been forthcoming. Such a pattern may be expected in the future if

complete reliance is placed upon Federal action. In some instances also there have been serious delays in badly needed projects because Federal agencies were reluctant to agree with local efforts to proceed.

Third, it is believed that the principle of equal contribution for equal benefits received should be applied to the beneficiaries of all Federal water-resources developments, although it is recognized that historically the programs of the Federal agencies have differed widely as to the contribution required from the beneficiaries of such project.s

This is, indeed, a touchy subject, because historically we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars over the years in the development of some types of water-protection projects in which the contributions of people directly benefited from them have been rather meager, or have differed widely.

On the other hand, we have developed projects for the reclamation of land in the West in which the beneficiary of the project has been required to pay to the utmost extent of his ability, and we are now embarking under the program of the Small Watershed Act of agriculture upon a program which permits considerable flexibility by the Secretary of Agriculture in the amount of contributions received from the direct beneficiaries.

Distasteful though it may be to some of these groups, it is very difficult to see why the direct and identifiable beneficiaries of Federal activity in the development of water resources should not all pay equally in proportion to the benefits they receive, whether the land is irrigated, whether it is drained, whether the water is stored for summer use, or whether it is protected from annual floods. In any case, simple equality of treatment to those immediately benefited would seem to indicate that they should all pay on an equal basis.

Fourth, and last, we have a great controversy raging over those persons who feel that they have vested water rights—property rights—lawfully acquired under the laws of States, and those who believe that the Federal Government has a superior right to all of the water in all of the streams of the United States.

These constitute some of the fundamental observations that will necessarily occur to anyone who has the privilege of reviewing at close range the activities of the various Federal agencies. One problem of the committee, therefore, was to correct as far as possible the disagreements and discrepancies between their programs.

I should now point out to you that this is a Cabinet committee of an administration which is in control of the executive branch. It is a committee primarily charged with practicable and attainable solutions to these problems and recommendations which are as realistic as possible, and that, of course, includes the practical facts of life.

It is possible from an idealistic and theoretical standpoint to completely rearrange the Government of the United States to pick up bureaus here and functions there and redistribute them into a pattern which one believes to be more efficient. But being realistic, one cannot overlook the fact that such major changes represent long years of legislative struggle, with the outcome continuously in doubt.

Therefore, the feeling of the President's Advisory Committee has been that if the various Federal programs themselves could be brought to common understanding and could proceed upon a fixed and a uniform pattern, that achievement would be as great as it is reasonably possible to expect to achieve at the moment.

With this general idea in mind, therefore, the committee has approached the numerous problems in the field of water resources development. No one realizes better than I that the program laid out will be attacked from both the right and the left.

Because it is not exclusively a Federal program it will be condemned as an abnegation of what will be said to be "Federal responsibility." On the other hand, because it does advocate some continuous Federal activity in this field, where other agencies by reason of physical, financial or legal complications are not able to proceed, it will probably be condemned by those who would have the Federal Government cease many of its activities in water resources.

No program can be devised which will be satisfactory to the extreme views of many of our people.

The committee has only undertaken to do that which it believes is sound, is reasonable, and is presently practicable.

No approach to the problem is possible without being confronted immediately with the fact that in many cases the fundamental and basic physical facts have not been available or have been ignored.

We have cases in which the water supply available has been overestimated due to lack of adequate scientific information. We have a woeful lack of knowledge of our underground water supplies, with the result that in some cases we are pulling down underground water tables 20 times as fast as they are being replenished.

We have cases in which we have built water projects dedicated to a single purpose, only to find that within what should have been the foreseeable future other uses and demands for the available water have proven to be more important than the uses devised in the projects.

We have cases in which substantial interests in water resources have been largely neglected or ignored for the purpose of carrying out a political ideology.

Many of these arise from our lack of fundamental basic data regarding our streamflows, our rainfall, our soil conditions, our hydrology, our meteorology, and other elements which control the quantity, the usability and the desirability of water uses.

For that reason, the first section of the report elaborates substantially upon the absolute necessity of increasing the appropriations to the scientific agencies for the production, correlation, and evaluation of basic data.

We have apparently collected tremendous volumes of physical facts, but we have not studied and correlated these facts into usable form. For example, only about one-third of the area of the United States and Alaska has been covered with adequate topographic maps. We have had fat years when appropriations were adequate to carry forward this program. We have had lean years where, under the needs of economy, we have curtailed these scientific agencies and consequently have broken the continuity of our data collection, rendering much that has gone before unusable.

The committee has recommended not only increased appropriations for the basic data agencies, the Weather Bureau, the Geological Survey, and the data collection functions of other agencies, but it has recommended that whatever else Congress may do, that it adopt a program of consistency so that the program may be fitted to the cloth year after year and consistently maintained regardless of the magnitude of the program.

This is unspectacular. There are no votes in it, but it is a thing which appears of vital importance through the years ahead if we are to proceed intelligently. This is section 1 of the report.

It should next be made clear that there is no one national water problem; that there are dozens of problems; and that they differ from State to State and from area to area. That a uniform national blueprint for water resources development is neither practicable nor desirable; and that each area must be considered in the light of its own present and anticipated problems which can only be solved by utilizing the best collective judgment possible as to what is most needed for the river basin, the State, the region, and the Nation.

For that reason, much of the time of the committe was spent upon the evolution of some organizational plan which would be adequately localized to give full scope to local needs, local initiative, and local conceptions, while at the same time being certain that it conformed to the general national welfare.

Superficially, we have had some coordination of activities in the past. Reports of one agency have been submitted to other agencies, to States, and local interests for comment, which would appear to have given them a voice in the determination of the ultimate plan. But it is believed that because of the relatively short time permitted for comment by States and local groups (usually 90 days), the magnitude of the complex reports submitted, that too frequently the originating agency's plans, motivated by a single or at most a limited objective, have been approved without consideration of other factors and other water uses necessary to full utilization of the resources.

The committee felt that no plans can ultimately be the most efficient unless they have been participated in from the beginning by all of the various interested groups, and these include the groups interested in flood control, in irrigation, in fish and wildlife, in recreation, in pollution, in land well-being, and others; and that only by sitting around the conference table as the plans and projects develop can all of these sometimes divergent interests be utilized to the maximum.

For that reason, the committee recommends that at regional or river basin levels water resources committees should be established from time to time for such purposes and duration as required; that the President should appoint a permanent nonvoting chairman of each committee; that in so doing, he should give consideration to individuals proposed by the governors of the participating States; and that the membership of the committee should include representatives of each Federal department having water resources responsibilities and qualified representatives of each of the affected States appointed by the governors, all on an equal basis.

Advisory participation by the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Justice on specific problems is recommended. The total number of either Federal or State representatives is not regarded as material.

The conflicts should be resolved by cooperation and not by voting strength, and both the Federal departments and the States should recognize that permanent personnel is necessary to successful development of water projects. These water resources committees should be the principal and continuing medium through which the various departments, State and Federal, coordinate resources planning and development activities. The committee should serve as the mechanism through which the several agencies would prepare and publish joint plans for water resources development, and each committee should prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive plan which will best serve the region and the Nation in the development of water resources, giving effect to all of the various interests which may be concerned.

So much for the organization at the grass roots, which we feel greatly broadens the scope of our investigation of water resources and greatly broadens the plans which will be evolved. It should go far to prevent the extreme development of one aspect of water resources to the serious neglect of the others which has sometimes occurred.

The Chairman of these local resource committees should at all times be guided by the policies and procedures of the President and should be responsible in general to the Coordinator of Water Resources, to which I will come in a moment.

As an intermediate step we suggest that there be made more permanent the Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources,

which consists of a representative of each and all of the affected departments having an interest in water, the representatives being of not less than assistant secretarial rank to whom local disagreements over the importance of water resources may be referred by the local committees in the event of disagreement.

I can tell you from experience that within the last 2 years there have been many serious disagreements regarding the relative importance of water users which have been successfully resolved by this Inter-Agency Committee. These conflicts have arisen quite normally and naturally. People interested in a single agency instinctively and quite properly see their agency and its purpose as the most important use for water, and yet divorced from the immediate problem, considered at a subcabinet level, many of these disagreements actually tend to solve themselves, decisions to be made and plans to proceed.

The next step in the planning procedure is the committee's suggestion that there should be established in the Executive Office of the President an office of Coordinator of Water Resources. The committee feels that the water problem is of sufficient importance to warrant definite presidential interest and guidance.

It is suggested that this official be the permanent chairman of the Inter-Agency Committee; that he cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers; and that he set forth the criteria by which these projects may be judged, as well as working on long-range programs of water development.

The appointment by the President of an officer specifically charged with responsibilities in the field of water resources development will give stature to a field that badly needs unification and guidance.

The next section of the report deals with a matter about which this Chamber and most of the large organizations which have studied the water problem have recommended, the appointment by the President of a Board of Review through whose hands the plans for these projects should pass.

It is recommended that this Board be chosen from leading engineers, economists and other experts in the resources field who have had no connection with the planning of the projects submitted to them and who can have no personal interest in the construction of the projects of what agency may be designated to build them.

It is felt that this Board should evaluate in the light of policy enacted by Congress and criteria established by the Coordinator of Water Resources all the water resources reports proposing Federal participation, whether as builder or contributor.

The resolutions of your organization and many others recommending the creation of such an impartial Board of Review have been based upon the same general thinking which I have discussed here, that is, to get the viewpoint of someone who is a little apart from the proposals of any particular agency.

The next section (4) deals with the problem of water rights. This is a subject on which, as many of you know, I can talk for an hour with little difficulty. I shall express it very briefly again tonight.

The legal problems that grow out of water resources development are numerous and complex, from the riparian rights theory of many of the Eastern States, now modified somewhat, to the appropriation theory of the Western States, on over to the theory of Federal control of waters. These create legal complications as yet unsolved.

The committee is much impressed with the belief of the landowners of the country that they have property rights in the waters adjacent or used on their lands, and in many cases those property rights are as valuable as the land itself, because without them the land is worthless. The report says, and I quote:

"The principles which recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted. Determinations as to the disposition of water should recognize such rights."

These are fundamental statements, but the committee goes further and recommends that there be a joint Federal-State study of this problem of water rights to determine the relationship between the establishment of property rights to water and the economic and social development of the Nation as it is projected into the future. It is believed that from such a study the rights of the respective parties may be clarified, and that as an outgrowth of it, legislation may be possible, regardless of the party in power, which will clarify this subject about which there is so much contention.

The committee recommends that the use of underground water is so closely related to surface land titles that regulations relating to it should remain a matter of State concern, but it points out definitely that the States in most cases have not taken any action with relation to underground waters; that there are excessive draw-downs in many places which will ultimately restrict agricultural and industrial growth; and that in other cases there are vast reservoirs of underground waters which might be put to better use if appropriate permission were given.

The committee also believes that every encouragement should be given to the formation of interstate compacts, and that matters so adjusted between the States and local people may be done more fairly than is possible by legislation, no matter how wise.

In the next section (5) the committee makes a recommendation against any Federal attempt on a nationwide basis to dictate priorities in water use, pointing out that the importance of the various needs differ so widely from area to area, and in some cases from State to State, that no uniform pattern can or should be evolved if we are to make the maximum beneficial use of available water supplies.

The next section (6) deals with the evaluation of water resources projects. The matter of the evaluation of these projects is largely a technical matter, and I doubt the advisability of discussing it in this type of an address, but let me say that the committee feels that there has been far too wide a discrepancy between the Federal agencies in their methods of evaluation; that quite naturally, in many cases they have adopted an optimistic view; and that projects evaluated by one agency would not meet adequate standards under the methods of another, and vice versa.

The committee recommends that all costs be set up in the evaluation procedure except those of general investigation, which should at least be pointed out; that in the relative comparison of the merits of projects built between agencies or States or private individuals, to achieve comparable figures of any value, interest and taxes must be taken into account.

It recommends that the evaluation period be the economic life of the project or not longer than 50 years. Whatever arguments may be made to the effect that the life of a project may be much more than 50 years, and that its benefits will extend far beyond that date, may appropriately be set forth in a supplement to the report but can hardly be considered as a basic justification of the project in view of what the committee believes to be the impossibility of prognostication of the value of any project more than 50 years from now. We need only to look at the tremendous advances in agricultural production or the advances in the field of atomic energy which have occurred within our lifetime to make us feel insecure in prophecies beyond a 50-year period.

The committe is reluctant to recommend the use of secondary benefits as a primary justification for projects. There is no question that tremendous secondary benefits flow from many water resources projects; that sizable towns and cities have arisen which enhance the natural welfare and which will contribute greatly in increased income taxes, and so on. On the other hand, in many cases similar secondary benefits would arise from the expenditure of equal sums of money in completely different Federal activities, and the committee feels, therefore, that while it is appropriate that estimated secondary benefits be shown in the report, they not be used as a primary benefit to enhance the payout of a project, recognizing fully, however, that in many cases they will do so and that individual projects must be considered on their merits.

The next section (7) goes to the authorization of projects, and much may be said on that point. The Corps of Engineers cannot even investigate a project without congressional authorization. The Interior Department has authority, under some circumstances, to authorize its own projects, a practice which the present administration has refused to do. Agriculture, under the Watershed Acts, has authority of self-authorization, subject to congressional disproval. The committee recommends that all of these be unified, and that none of the agencies proceed without congressional authorization.

This brings me to the last section on participation in costs. This, I realize as well as you, is a section about which there will be much disagreement. If water resources projects generated benefits that were all primarily of national significance, with only incidental direct benefits to particular individuals and communities, then perhaps the cooperative principle of cost sharing might not be appropriate, but this is not generally the case. Will any of us dispute the fact that the major share of the direct benefits of these projects accrue to particular individuals and particular communities and that a substantial portion of the indirect benefits accrue to particular areas? Many of them, of course, have a long-run benefit to the total economy of the Nation which provide justification for the Federal Government's bearing some share of the cost.

The principle of cost sharing ought not be limited to projects constructed by the Federal Government. It should also apply to projects constructed by non-Federal interests. The committee states its belief that when the States and their agencies construct projects contributing to Federal functions or which protect Federal interests, the Federal Government should pay those costs just the same as the reverse is true when the Federal Government constructs the project.

Here again is a field in which it is not possible to lay down mathematical formulae. The Committee states that identifiable beneficiaries should pay an appropriate share of the cost of the projects. In most cases it would facilitate the construction of the projects if they paid more than they now do. The Committee also suggests that substantial portions of the non-Federal share might be appropriately collected on the basis of equitable assessment, spread over the area in which these benefits occur, and that in any event responsibility for sharing the cost of maintenance and operation of Federal projects should be shared by the beneficiaries of the projects.

The Committee believes that the cost of providing vendible products in these resources developments should be repaid in full by the sale of the products or services, and that all of the Federal agencies should adopt a uniform approach to cost-sharing, so that the division of the costs between the Federal interests and non-Federal interests will be uniform and, therefore, not permit

project sponsors to go "shopping around" between Federal agencies. The Committee deals specifically with particular problems in the field of cost-sharing, which I will not take time to discuss.

There are numerous special problems which simply do not fit into a uniform pattern. One of these is the use of electric revenues from Federal hydroelectric projects to pay a part of the cost of reclamation of adjacent land. This theory is well recognized by numerous precedents over a long period of years.

Admittedly, the reclamation and utilization of land—providing homes, a means of livelihood and a stable type of living—is a highly desirable national objective. Admittedly also, the use of power revenues for the reclamation of land offers possibility of its extension to an undue point. It should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenues from hydroelectric projects for the development of other projects which are in no way related to the project from which the revenues come, boils down to being merely the operation of a business by the Government to make a profit, to have some money with which to do something else.

Thus stated, there are probably few people who would endorse the principle. Stated the other way, however, the land and the power generated by falling water in a river valley are closely related. We are merely giving the water a double duty, that of irrigating the land and, in the course of its flowing to the land, of getting revenues which help pay the over-all cost. Stated that way, few people will object.

The Committee has in substance pointed this out and contents itself merely with calling attention to the point to which we could be led by the unwarranted extension of the theory.

For the same reason and because of the vast national benefits which accrue to the economic life of the Nation, the Committee has recommended that the provision of interest-free money for irrigation be continued, limiting it, of course, to the family-sized farm, but suggesting that we need a new definition of that elusive term.

The Committee closes its report by recommending Federal participation in non-Federal projects built by the States and their agencies. There are many cases in which a relatively small Federal payment, proportioned to the Federal benefits received, will enable the States and their agencies to construct equally meritorious projects. We must remember that throughout the country there are many State and local public agencies which through sound operation have established credit ratings that enable them to borrow money and finance projects substantially as cheaply, and in some cases fully as cheaply, as the Federal Government itself.

There seems little reason why all of the power and authority that go with the control of a great universal natural resource like water should be concentrated in the city of Washington. If it were so, the financial burden would become intolerable. The political power that goes with such centralization in itself is a fearful thing, and the lack of local control of local resources and situations is greatly to be regretted.

After all is said and done, the people who live in the region, who live close to these projects, are the ones primarily affected. It is their lives and their children and their future economic success which depend upon the wise management of this resource called water. The more plainly, therefore, their voice may be heard, so long as it is not inimical to the national interests, the more contented people, and the better government we will have.

President Eisenhower expressed it well in a campaign speech in which he said that these resources might much better be controlled by the people who live near them and depend on them than by any long-haired bureaucrat behind a desk in Washington.

This report is in keeping with that general philosophy.

I should repeat that no report can gain universal acceptance because of the greatly conflicting interests of various groups of our people, but we have made progress, at least, in bringing together on a somewhat uniform basis the Federal activities. We believe this is a great step forward. We believe it is the most presently practicable step. There are doubtless many more to be taken before we achieve our goal of the maximum utilization of all of our water resources.

Labor-Management Relations in the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most remarkable labor-management relationships has been achieved by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. The labor-management relationship in this company has been so successful that it has attracted attention far beyond the boundaries of the State of Minnesota. Last week, a special series of articles appeared in the Chicago Daily News. I am proud to invite the attention of my colleagues to them. They relate, of course, to the great increase in the productivity of the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co. and its outstanding record of labor-management relationship. The headline of one of the articles is "Company and Union Team Up for Success." Mr. President, let me say this is a standard to which many others could well rally.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 8, 1956]

COMPANY AND UNION TEAM UP FOR SUCCESS—MINNEAPOLIS-HONEYWELL PLAN INCREASES OUTPUT, CUTS WASTE

(By Robert M. Lewin)

MINNEAPOLIS.—There's a company and a union up here that get along like friends. No strike in the 14 years the union has been in the plant.

High wages (from profits) average $1.85 to $1.90 an hour.

Fifteen months ago the company, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., and the union agreed on a plan to increase production and decrease waste.

Gerry E. Morse, 47, Minneapolis-Honeywell vice president of employee relations, said Wednesday:

"The program definitely was a factor in our company winning new contracts.

"It also has contributed definitely to the success of the company because the success has stabilized employment and given us the power to raise wages."

Minneapolis-Honeywell is Minnesota's largest industrial employer, with 12,000 employees in three major plants and 20 other manufacturing and warehousing units here.

Robert I. Wishart, 42, Minneapolis, secretary-treasurer of Honeywell Local 1145, representing 7,271 production-maintenance employees here (50 percent of them women), says:

"The union-company cooperative program, called POP—Plan Our Progress—has been a very significant factor in providing jobs, raising wages, increasing productivity, and improving working conditions."

Wishart emphasizes that "no union is worth its salt that loses jobs for its members by a stupid position on quality and quantity of production."

In one department, when the program went into effect October 3, 1954, productivity of the workers was 40 percent of the company standard.

Wishart called the workers together, lectured them, ordered union stewards and committeemen to get after laggards.

He declared:

"Pegging [limiting] production is loafing. We are unalterably opposed to pegging production. The union will not stand behind anybody guilty of it."

The company said that production today has risen to 86 percent. The rate in that department is $2.29 an hour.

In another department productivity was 72 percent of standard in 1953, when the company and union saw the need to tackle the problem.

The company said that production in the department was pushed to 88.1 percent when the cooperative program began.

Today, the company added, productivity is 93.7 percent.

The hourly wage in that department is $2.06.

Wishart emphasizes that the program has contributed substantially to—

Reemployment of 518 (out of 662) union members who were on layoff when the program was "kicked off."

A general 7-cent-an-hour pay raise February 1, 1955, and another 7 cents December 15, 1955, plus fringe benefits.

In addition, both increases were accompanied by adjustments of wage inequities ranging up to 26 cents an hour for certain workers.

The second 7-cent increase was effective December 15, 1955, though the contract did not expire until February 1 this year.

H. Skidmore Olsen, 36, company director of industrial relations, and Stanley J. Nelson, 41, factory manager, agree that the program has been "a demonstration of union-management cooperation."

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 9, 1956]

LABOR LEADER AGITATES—AND BOSS LIKES IT—NEW STYLE UNIONIST STIRS UP MEMBERS TO WORK HARDER

(By Robert M. Lewin)

MINNEAPOLIS.—A union chief here is stirring up his membership to work harder for the boss.

The labor leader told his union Thursday:

"No union ever negotiated a wage increase with a company that made no profit."

The labor leader, Robert I. Wishart, 42, emphasized that his union's cooperation with the employer has paid off in job protection, higher wages, and better working conditions.

That's why he's stirring up his membership, local 1145, at the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Local 1145 is an affiliate of the industrial union section of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Minneapolis-Honeywell is the largest industrial employer in Minnesota, with 7,271 local 1145 members on the payroll.

Wishart wants the whole community to know how beneficial labor-management cooperation can be for all.

Gerry E. Morse, 47, Minneapolis-Honeywell vice president in charge of employee relations, calls the union's cooperation one of the most valuable things we have.

The cooperative program—called POP, Plan Our Progress—has operated effectively for Minneapolis-Honeywell and local 1145 since it began October 3, 1954.

Though the company and union get along like friends under the program, friends sometimes disagree.

Between October 1, 1954, and October 1, 1955, virtually the first year's operation of the plan, the union filed 222 written grievances against the company.

Minneapolis-Honeywell records show that all except 48 were settled at the various company-union stages of conferences.

The 48 had to be submitted for decision by the arbitrator, Prof. Nathan P. Feinsinger, of the University of Wisconsin Law School.

In the year before the program, October 1, 1953, to October 1, 1954, there were 293 written grievances.

Forty of them went the whole route, to arbitration and Feinsinger.

"No one at Honeywell is expected, nor does local 1145 advocate or support a policy where people are going to be driven beyond a fair day's work,' says Wishart.

Wishart has asked the company for meetings to expand and intensify the cooperative program.

He says:

"It should be borne in mind that the fundamentals of the program are based upon team play * * * teamwork between the officers of the union and the company * * * teamwork to eliminate misunderstandings, grievances, and log jams in production * * * teamwork to eliminate scrap and evils that cut down on production, profits, wage increases, and jobs."

What kind of man is this rare type of labor leader?

He's the second of the four Minneapolis-born Wishart brothers.

His older brother, Arthur W., 44, has a doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Minnesota and is president of the Knox Glass Co., with headquarters in Knox, Pa., and 3,000 employees.

Brother William, 40, is a surveyor for Hennepin County, Minn., and brother Edward, 28, is a Minneapolis policeman.

"I didn't go to the university," explains Bob. "I got married instead."

He is a medium to thickly built man with wavy light-brown hair and a wisp of mustache.

His office in a downtown Minneapolis union building is cramped.

When he talks he goes through a routine of speaking, puffing on a fat cigar, and then sipping coffee from a plastic cup.

The union pays Wishart $165 a week and reimburses him for expenses actually incurred in work for local 1145.

"Guys in the shop earn more than I do, with their overtime," he adds.

But Wishart cares more about his membership than about himself.

Gas Probe Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Probe is a Bit Late on Gas Bill Charges," which was published in the Atlanta Constitution of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBE IS A BIT LATE ON GAS BILL CHARGES

The United States Senate voted yesterday to investigate an "alleged improper attempt" to influence the vote of Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican of South Dakota, on the natural gas bill. The attempt involved an offer of $2,500 to the Senator's campaign fund. How many other Senators were influenced the same way?

The probe comes a little late. The Senate already had passed by a vote of 53–38 the measure to remove Federal price regulation from natural gas producers. Spearheaded by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat of Texas, the bill went through on schedule even after Senator CASE had made his accusations.

By all means the charges should be investigated. Few times, if ever in history, has a lobby so blanketed the country. The big oil companies, who stand to profit most from this bill, have been quite frank about it. They want gas production unregulated and have waged a persistent battle dating back for years. One such bill was vetoed by President Truman.

The ultimate cost to consumers has been estimated at hundreds of millions of dollars. Opponents call it a bigger giveaway than tidelands oil.

Georgians are grateful to Senator RUSSELL, who voted against the bill, and to Senator GEORGE, who paired against it.

Meanwhile, another Presidential veto is in order, although doubtful.

Address by Mr. Alexander Purdon, Executive Director, the Committee of American Steamship Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding speech made by Mr. Alexander Purdon, executive director, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, before the Minneapolis-St. Paul Propeller Club on January 11, 1956.

In particular, I call the attention of all Members of the Senate to the section of Mr. Purdon's remarks dealing with the effect of the cargo preference law upon the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. To my way of thinking, Mr. Purdon has clearly, fairly, and objectively discussed this very important problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ALEXANDER PURDON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN STEAMSHIP LINES, BEFORE THE MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL PROPELLER CLUB, JANUARY 11, 1956

Gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to meet with you this afternoon. I work in Washington, D. C., where the competition to be heard is exceeded on occasion only by the difficulty of being understood. Therefore, I particularly appreciate the chance to lay down my weapons, loosen my armor, and relax in a totally friendly camp.

On the other hand, a challenge still remains—and that is to arrest the attention of an audience as well informed on my subject as this one is. Nevertheless, you may be interested in some personal views regarding recent shipping developments, something of its future, and a singularly important legislative problem that it will soon face.

Several factors directly or indirectly affecting shipping have combined in the past year to justify a favorable outlook for the industry. Some of these factors include increased world trade; new developments in propulsion; improved public relations; better acceptance in Congress; new and improved ship design; the emergence on a long range ship replacement program; and rising population and consumer demand.

These factors offer encouraging indications that our merchant marine may be entering a new era. It may very well be that just as the United States has achieved a position of world leadership, so may its merchant marine recapture within a reasonable period of time its former title as the world's ranking merchant fleet.

Certainly the most significant element influencing shipping during the last year was the continuing surge in foreign trade. Prosperity at home and abroad pushed our commercial exports over the $14 billion mark—a jump of more than 10 percent over their 1954 value. These totals exclude military aid.

American imports, meanwhile, totaled $11.5 billion last year, or 9 percent more than the year before. Prospects are that this upward trend will continue during 1956, although perhaps not at the same rate. This, of course, depends on a continuation of the current domestic business activity—but that, according to most business indexes and most economists, shows no signs of flagging.

Foreign trade will get another boost this year from the administration's request that we continue our huge overseas aid program.

But our merchant marine is still carrying far less United States trade than was envisioned by the Merchant Marine Act that is 20 years old this year. American-flag ships carry but 25 percent of our total foreign trade; half that intended by the act.

The other side of the coin, of course, is the room for growth in shipping, shipbuilding, and allied industries. This is a particularly exciting opportunity when you consider the seemingly limitless capacity of this country to produce more and more. Our dynamic, expanding economy must continue to seek fresh and growing markets for accelerating industrial and agricultural production. Shipping will benefit from this search—as will our manufacturers and farmers profit from shipping's continuing trade development programs.

Naturally enough, any discussion of foreign trade in this part of the country invites speculation on the St. Lawrence seaway and what the impact may be of adding 8,300 miles of deep-water coastline to the United States. Members of the Committee of American Steamship Lines that will be affected by the seaway are actively studying its traffic potential, the most suitable type ships for the route, and whether or not the great things anticipated so soon from the seaway may have been exaggerated.

While there is considerable opinion that it may be 1970 before the full benefits of the seaway are realized, there is no doubt but that they will be substantial ones even though they will probably bring about economic dislocations in other areas of the country.

The seaway has already stirred activity in many communities along its route. They have undertaken studies and financing arrangements leading to harbor improvements

and the expansion of dock and warehouse facilities.

Chicago, for istance, has issued $24 million worth of bonds to help develop a first-class port. And in Duluth, according to a recent Associated Press report, the original uneasiness about the seaway has given way to general enthusiasm. Some have even called the city a natural gateway to the entire West.

One Great Lakes shipping operator is already inquiring after an operating subsidy into the lakes. At the same time, the Maritime Administration is studying whether an essential trade route can be established through the seaway into the lakes.

Heartening progress can be seen, too, in new designs to keep shipping abreast of the growing need for more efficient forms of transportation and distribution. The roll-on, roll-off ship-construction program, for instance, could potentially revitalize our depressed coastwise and intercoastal trade by reducing cargo-handling costs.

You have undoubtedly heard of the projected group of ore-oil ships for year-round use. They would carry ore during the ice-free season and, after freezeup, take to the open sea as tankers. This development will be of particular interest to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee if, as expected, it discusses during this session our ability to meet our ore import requirements. It is thought by some that too large a proportion of United States bound ore is being carried on foreign ships.

Encouraging technical advances are being made in other areas, too; most notably in efforts to increase the effectiveness of our Reserve Fleet. Gas turbines have been developed for use in Liberty ships; geared diesels have been installed in another Liberty; and a controllable pitch propeller will be provided still another. These and other experiments on the workhorses of World War II promise not only to increase the value of the Government's investment in these ships but, as with all research, to produce supplementary developments for the benefit of the entire shipping industry. It may be that they will enable America to capture the lead in the field of marine propulsion, as we did when the *United States* won the blue ribbon on the Atlantic.

Joint efforts of industry and Government have resulted in an improved congressional understanding of the need for a modern, effective merchant marine. Continuing evaluation of the industry's public relations efforts also indicate increased public recognition of our merchant fleet's contributions. But there is certainly no indication that this is the time to reduce our efforts to explain to Congress and the public the vital commercial and defense aspects of merchant shipping.

Presently, for example, confusion and misunderstanding surround the Cargo Preference Act—also called the 50–50 law. There is little doubt but that this law will come under severe attack early in this session of Congress. There is an urgent need for energetic missionary work in explaining the true facts of this law to the American people. I am confident that when the facts about 50–50 are known and when its provisions can be examined unbefogged by distortion, misunderstanding and misstatement, the merits of 50–50 will become self-evident and its critics will be converted or silenced.

I would hope that each of you here will contribute in whatever way you can to the defense of this law. Because of its importance to our industry, I would like to discuss it in some detail.

As you know, the Cargo Preference Act, or 50–50, provides that when our country sends aid or other Government financed cargoes overseas, 50 percent of those cargoes must go in American ships—if they are available at reasonable rates.

Greatest opposition to this bill has centered on its applicability to Public Law 480, also known as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Under Public Law 480, the Government was authorized in 1954 to dispose of $700 million worth of farm surpluses over a 3-year period—providing that these goods are above normal commercial requirements.

On nine separate occasions since 1948, Congress wrote the 50–50 provision into similar programs. The Cargo Preference Act of 1954 simply made it unnecessary to repeat this procedure each time a similar program was authorized.

Why, then, the sudden hostility to 50–50? And what was its source?

As might be expected by those familiar with the competitive shipping industry, opposition to 50–50 is encouraged by foreign shipowners. Their objective in attacking 50–50 remains clear and unvarnished. They would like to carry every pound of cargo they can get into their holds. You cannot blame them for that. Understandably enough, they were most unhappy when the 50–50 provision was made, as it should have always been, a permanent feature of our national maritime policy.

I can understand the motives and ambitions of the foreign shipowners, even if I don't agree with them. I admire many things they do and acknowledge their splendid contributions to the security and commerce of the free world. Moreover, I can appreciate their governments' dependence on their maritime industries. I just wish they would acknowledge our Nation's dependence on our merchant marine.

Our oversas competitors have practiced international politics far too long to risk a bold, frontal assault on one of our country's laws. They chose, rather, to divide, confuse and conquer. By threatening to refuse to purchase surplus commodities shipped under Public Law 480 unless they were granted the right to use their own vessels, they deliberately encouraged the fear that the 50–50 law was impeding the disposal of farm surpluses. This, they planned, would turn the American farmer and the surplus-conscious public against the American merchant marine and the 50–50 principle.

Actually, of course, our foreign friends are playing for far bigger stakes than merely the right to carry the United States surpluses they import themselves. Those cargoes are insignificant compared to United States surplus shipments to other countries that do not have merchant fleets. It is this enormous third country trade that foreign shipowners covet—despite the United States merchant marine's willingness to share it with them 50–50.

Here are some of the arguments our foreign competitors have encouraged in seeking the defeat of 50–50. Here, too, are the facts.

It is charged, for instance, that 50–50 has impeded the disposal of farm surpluses under title I of Public Law 480.

The facts are that two-thirds of the $700 million authorized for surplus disposal during the 3 year program was exhausted in the first year and the authorization was more than doubled to $1.5 billion. We supported that increase.

Opponents of 50–50 have also charged that it should not apply to surplus commodities because transactions under these programs are normal commercial movements to which 50–50 was not intended to apply.

The facts are that 50–50 does not apply to normal commercial transactions. As you well know, foreign shipowners compete freely for our commercial foreign trade. But they can scarcely call movements under Public Law 480 "normal" transactions. By definition, a surplus commodity under Public Law 480 is one "in excess of anticipated exports for dollars." In other words, to be eligible under the program, transactions must be beyond those that would normally take place in day-to-day commercial trade.

In addition, these transactions are between governments, although commercial channels may be used. Uncle Sam as the seller is not interested in making a profit. As a matter of fact, the sales are made, almost without exception, at losses that must be borne by the American taxpayer.

Moreover, prices are supposed to be set, not by commercial standards, but at levels that will not disturb prevailing world market rates.

Finally, transactions under this program cannot be called normal because the United States not only accepts payment in nonconvertible currencies, but has been either giving back or loaning back from 60 to 70 percent of the foreign currencies received.

These are terms that would be completely unacceptable in any truly normal commercial transaction.

Opponents have also attacked 50–50 by charging that it increases the cost of farm surpluses to purchasing countries.

The facts are that when cargo is carried in United States-flag ships, the dollar cost of ocean transportation is financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The importing country pays, in local currency, only the freight rate prevailing in the world market. Its cost for ocean transportation, therefore, is the same whether its own ships or United States ships are used.

Fifty-fifty opponents also charge that this law reduces the amount of total surplus sales that can be made under appropriated funds.

The facts are that the freight rate differential attributable to 50–50 is just slightly over $2 million out of a total program authorization to date of more than $468 million.

This added cost is small when compared with the total losses absorbed by the American taxpayer when the commodities themselves are sold below their acquisition cost.

This is basically a tramp rate differential and will be correspondingly reduced as the program advances because a higher proportion of commodities scheduled under future programs will be carried by liners than before. The differential will drop because of the little recognized fact that American berth-line operators almost invariably ship at the same rate as foreign berth lines as a result of the international freight rate conference system. In a number of instances, in fact, American liner rates have been not only less than American tramp rates, but also less than foreign tramp rates.

There have also been claims that 50-50 requires the American farmer to bear the burden of supporting the American merchant marine so far as Public Law 480 sales are concerned.

The facts are that the American farmer is benefiting 100 percent from Public Law 480 sales—as are farm equipment manufacturers, railroads, truckers, warehouse operators, and others. But the merchant marine asks only that it be permitted to participate 50 percent from these Government-generated sales.

Essentially, then, those are the arguments that have been raised against 50–50—and there, too, are the facts that destroy them.

Any dispassionate consideration of the shipping business, it seems to me, would clearly reveal the basic mutual interests of American shipping and American farming.

With farm products 20 percent of our total exports, it is clear that the ship operator needs the farmer.

The farmer's reliance on an adequate American merchant marine should be equally apparent. Only such a fleet can guarantee him access to world markets and sources of supply. Neither could be assured if foreign maritime powers were to dominate our trade.

Farmers perhaps forget that the merchant marine lives on foreign trade. Its worldwide network of agents and representatives are constantly at work for both American industry and agriculture seeking new outlets for

our exports and new sources of vital raw materials.

Conscious of the need to accelerate the disposal of surpluses, the maritime industry recently formed a special farm export committee to work with farm groups in redoubling the efforts of the shipping industry in its constant search for new and bigger markets for American farm products.

Let me remind you that foreign flags carry 75 percent of our total foreign trade. So it is somewhat difficult to sympathize with, even if we understand, their spirited efforts to increase this percentage.

Nor are we impressed by arguments that permitting foreign powers to carry more of our trade would increase their dollar earning capacity, enabling them to purchase more of our goods. Even staff studies presented as background for the so-called Randall Report stated, "It is fair to conclude that major concessions on our merchant shipping objectives would be required to produce relatively small increases in net receipts of dollars on shipping account by all foreign nations." Since our maritime objectives are modest, to begin with, major concessions would be impossible, and so another anti-50–50 argument is dropped in its tracks.

All in all, then, the 50–50 law is a fair and reasonable one. It is particularly fair to the American taxpayer. Subsidies for our merchant marine, inevitable because of our higher standard of living and higher operating costs, have limited value if our fleet is idle. The more business it does, the less subsidy it requires.

Though the retention of 50–50 is uppermost in the list of shipping-industry problems, it faces others almost as important.

One, ever with us, is how to replace our older ships with new ones that currently cost four times as much, yet have little greater earning capacity.

Another continuing industry objective is how to increase the use that American businessmen make of their own merchant marine.

Adequate appropriations and stable Government and congressional maritime policies are always an important consideration.

Despite these admitted problems, the American merchant marine is, on balance, a healthy industry and certainly what the Wall Street crowd would call a "growth situation," despite statistics which indicate a shrinkage in the number of vessels in our active fleet.

As America's dynamic economy continues to expand, breaking production records and acreage yields year after year, its reliance on foreign trade to absorb these excess products will increase proportionately. As foreign trade becomes of increasing concern to our national economy the merchant marine will inevitably profit not only through increased cargoes but through greater recognition and support by both Government and industry.

Our American merchant marine may be entering a new Golden Age. It can, and it will, if the reasonable objectives of our maritime policy are understood and supported by the public and our Government.

As the President said in his state of the Union message—"The vista before us is bright."

Gas Bonanza Now in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gas Bonanza Now in Sight," published in the Detroit News of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAS BONANZA NOW IN SIGHT

It is the conviction of this newspaper that the purpose and effect of the Harris-Fulbright bill now passed by the Senate is to place natural gas consumers at the mercy of an unregulated monopoly.

By monopoly we do not mean a conspiracy actionable under the antitrust laws. We mean simply a situation denying to consumers of a bulk commodity the price protection normally afforded by competition.

The production of gas in the oil fields is as inevitably a monopoly as is its distribution to the consumer, and equally a proper subject of public regulation. If the bill now becomes law, that statement will have its testing. So will the bill's provision by which the Federal Power Commission may require pipeline companies to pay a "reasonable market value" for gas.

It is our conviction that in an application denying the regulatory body the usual criteria of reasonableness the phrase quoted is meaningless. The market price will go up. It may not go up spectacularly, because the producers will know that at the outset the public will be watching. But in time it will creep upward toward the multi-million-dollar addition to consumer costs forecast by opponents of the legislation.

Does anyone believe the oil and gas industry's investment in promoting this bill was made for any other purpose? The investment was not confined to the $100 bills offered by one naive servant of the industry's interests, nor to the reputed outlay of a million or so for lobbying incidentals. The extent of the investment is to be measured in years of patient nursing of political ambitions, of timely assistance to political causes in cash or kind. It was thus that, when the chips were down, a bipartisan majority of Congress could be delivered for this bill offensive to millions of consumer-voters. The ability to deliver these majorities is as disillusioning as any aspect of the whole episode.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in advance of consideration by the Senate of the farm bill, I think it is of interest to Members of the Senate to review the editorial comment from newspapers throughout the country on the various phases of the proposed legislation.

In the Baltimore Sun of February 12, an editorial was published entitled "Repeating the Crazy Vote for High-Level Price Supports." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEATING THE CRAZY VOTE FOR HIGH-LEVEL PRICE SUPPORTS

The crazy vote putting high-level rigid price supports back into the farm bill has now been repeated by the Senate Agriculture Committee. Tacked onto the administration's soil-bank measure, the effect is like launching a battleship without any bottom. The battleship would sink at once, and so will a soil-bank scheme tied onto a high-level support program. The reason is that the soil-bank scheme aims to end present surpluses, while the high-level, fixed-price support program is what piled up the surpluses to begin with, and it would pile up more surpluses in the future.

But there is still a good deal of fight and of hope in the congressional defenders of the flexible-support plan with which the administration has managed to replace the old high-level scheme. For one thing, the high-level supports were beaten down in 1954 after the same Senate Agriculture Committee had voted for them 9 to 6. The vote this time is 8 to 7.

For another thing, backers of flexibility have a formidable argument in the behavior of dairy prices since April 1, 1954. That was when Secretary Benson junked high-level support prices in the dairy business as the one way to keep from getting buried alive in a surplus of butter, cheese, and powdered milk overwhelmingly beyond the market demand and the storage capacities of the Government warehouses.

In 1955, for instance, dairy farmers took in around $4 a hundredweight on milk, which was just about what they did in 1954. But they sold considerably more milk in 1955 and their overall cash receipts were above those of 1954. Prospects now are for even better income in 1956. And, most important of all, the surplus is melting away. In butter, cheddar cheese, and nonfat dry milk the on-hand supply in Government keeping is the smallest in over 2 years.

Logic, in other words, simple common-sense logic, indicates that when the price-support scheme is keyed flexibly to the market, supply will adjust more sensitively to demand, present surplus will ebb and new surplus will not appear. The flexible price support thus aids and abets the soil-bank scheme for reducing production by reducing acreage. On the other hand, a surplus-reducing program tied to a surplus-producing program is as crazy as the battleship without a bottom. That view will be heard on the floor of both Houses and it should in the end prevail.

Efforts of Woodrow Wilson in Behalf of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, which was established by the Congress, I have been highly gratified by the success of our efforts to make the world more conscious in these critical times of the ideals and philosophy of our great former President.

Wilson's efforts on behalf of world peace have been recalled and commended by many prominent persons who have made public statements in connection with the opening of the centennial year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three of these statements.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA ENVOY DESCRIBES LEAGUE AS U. N. MODEL

Ambassador Wellington Koo, of China, delegate to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 and a member of the Commissoin which drafted the league covenant, remembered President Wilson's contribution to the league:

"In Paris it was my privilege to be a member of the League of Nations Commission of the Peace Conference in 1919, which drafted the league covenant. Mr. Wilson's contribution to this work was prodigious. He personally presented the first basic text and put forward with a surprising readiness many specific suggestions and solutions for difficulties; he also kept the debates on the highest level and efficiency. The resultant document has well been called the first constitution of the world's nations.

"It was given life and great extension during the league's 20 active years between world wars, and it truly became the direct precursor and model for the charter of the United Nations. Its phrasing was much simpler and embodied only 26 articles in comparison with the 111 in the charter, but the basic principles remain very much those which President Wilson presented to the Paris Peace Conference 36 years ago. As he has been deservedly inscribed in Geneva as 'founder' of the League of Nations so he has a direct lineal share in the birth of the United Nations.

"In the discussions of the Shantung question at the conference at which I participated, President Wilson's sympathies were evidently with China. He wanted to do what was just and right. The settlement which he finally urged China to accept was not what he himself liked but was a compromise reached with the Prime Ministers of Great Britain, France, and Italy, who sat with him and leaned on the side of Japan. He believed it was the best that China could get at the conference, but he felt confident that the League of Nations, after its establishment, would, if appealed to by China, give careful consideration to her case and make adjustments for whatever injustices there might be. His faith in the projected world organization was unbounded and he looked to its impending emergence as an achievement of primary importance for the whole world.

"I wish that the Peace Conference had seen fit to respond fully to Chinese pleas for international justice but I was deeply impressed by President Wilson's broad vision and high ideals in his outlook and in his desire to serve humanity and the interests of his own country.

"It is an honor indeed to salute him in his centennial year."

WILSON IDEALISM STILL INSPIRES EUROPE—EDEN

Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Anthony Eden, said:

"We remember Woodrow Wilson for his decisive contribution to victory in the First World War and for the mark which his idealism left on international society. He helped to shape world events in his time. His writings and his speeches still bring inspiration. His influence on his contemporaries both in Europe and in the United States spread far and wide; it still endures."

LEAGUE IS MONUMENT, SAYS LAST PRESIDENT

Dr. Carl J. Hambro, President of the Lower House of the Norwegian Parliament, a delegate to the Paris Peace Conference of World War I, and the last President of the League of Nations, said:

"The name of President Wilson will go down in history as one of the greatest names of the 20th century. It is a tragedy for all nations that his ideas for a peaceful reconstruction of the world did not meet with full support in his own country and so could not be politically realized. But the League of Nations and what the League accomplished—thereby making possible the organization of the United Nations—will be the permanent monument over his vision."

Oil and Gas Lobby Scores a Coup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Oil Lobby Scores a Record Coup," which was published in the Denver Post of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL LOBBY SCORES A RECORD COUP

The oil industry, which has grown fat on special tax concessions not granted to most businesses, has emerged as a dominant influence in American political life.

Passage by the United States Senate of the Harris-Fulbright bill, to permit the jacking up of wellhead prices for natural gas, is the crowning achievement of a group of companies and individuals which has learned to use its wealth to bend government to do its bidding.

Purpose of the bill is to make it impossible for the Government to regulate gas prices so they will yield ony "just and reasonable" returns to the gas producers, most of whom are oil companies.

A vote for the Harris-Fulbright bill was a vote against "just and reasonable" returns and in favor of returns limited only by the estimate of the gas producers of how much the market will bear.

Passage of the bill is more than a "give-away." It is the greatest victory special interest lobbyists ever won in Washington, where the voice of the people is heard but faintly these days.

The significance of this accomplishment must not be underestimated. It is, in effect, a counterrevolution against the principle, established many years ago, that public utilities should be regulated in the public interest.

The railroads would like to be free for regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission but, with all their wealth and influence, they continue to be under regulation.

The giant and rapidly growing trucking industry frets under Government regulation but has been unable to extricate itself. Electric and telephone companies, with assets running into the billions of dollars, cannot hope to influence enough votes to get themselves exempted from regulation.

Gas pipeline companies and gas distributing companies cannot charge rates which give them more than "just and reasonable" profits.

Only the gas producers, among all the industries which have been subject to regulation, have been able to persuade a legislative body to give them immunity from "just and reasonable" charges.

No other special interest group could have hoped to win such a valuable concession.

Of course, the oil industry has been in training for this victory for a long time. In oil- and gas-producing States, the industry has been up to its ears in politics for years. It has supported political candidates who are themselves in the oil and gas business.

It has cultivated other candidates. It has obligated some public officials by making contributions to their campaigns. In States such as Texas, Oklahoma, Wyoming, and New Mexico the industry has promoted the idea that its prosperity is synonymous with State prosperity .

The result has been a feeling among many Senators and Representatives that they would be committing political suicide if they failed to vote for special privileges for oil and gas—"to keep the industry strong."

The dominant position the industry has attained in States where it is most active has given it the margin of votes it needed to free itself of Federal regulation on the basis of "just and reasonable" returns.

* * * * *

The phenomenal power of the oil lobby cuts across party lines. It also cuts across State lines as evidenced by the effort of a Nebraska oil attorney to contribute $2,500 to the campaign fund of a South Dakota Senator.

Some Members of Cogress are deeply disturbed by the power of the oil lobby to dictate legislation. Senator HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, would like to investigate the lobby's use of funds and influence but he is not likely to get far.

Senate leaders, both Republican and Democratic, want to limit any inquiry to the case of the Nebraska attorney. HENNINGS could find himself the most unpopular man among his colleagues if he began digging actively into all oil industry connections with Members of Congress.

Effects of the Harris-Fulbright bill will be immediate.

Among the first to feel its results will be consumers of the Detroit area. Those consumers recently won a decision in the United States circuit court of appeals that a multimillion-dollar rate increase which the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. wanted to make was illegal because the increase did not take into account the question of whether the higher rate would give the pipeline more than a just and reasonable profit.

Passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill cuts the ground out from under the protest of the consumers, because, under the bill, the yardstick of just and reasonable profits no longer has to be applied.

Similarly, the passage of the bill dooms any hope Denver and Colorado consumers may have had of using the just and reasonable yardstick to trim down a multi-million-dollar rate increase which Colorado Interstate Gas Co. put into effect a year ago, subject to possible refunds if the rate were later found to be exorbitant.

Since the rate increase went into effect, Colorado Interstate has admitted that its revenues have exceeded expectations and there may be a relatively small refund for that reason. But most of the increase was based on the company's contention that it was entitled to a market price for its gas regardless of whether the market price might give it more than a just and reasonable return. Passage of the bill automatically confirms most of the increase Colorado Interstate has made. It has added billions of dollars in the twinkling of an eye to the value of the gas reserves owned by oil and gas companies. Those billions will be paid by consumers on their monthly bills over the next 20 years or more.

No other bill ever passed by Congress has involved such a windfall for a single industry. The oil lobby has scored the record coup of all time.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed to Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of the votes I have received from the State of Iowa in response to my annual questionnaire.

On January 14, I mailed 41,886 questionnaires to the people of Iowa. I distributed similar questionnaires in the First Congressional District of Iowa for 5 years and this is my second statewide distribution.

The only statement accompanying the questionnaire was a letter printed thereon as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: The following questions are based primarily on President Eisenhower's message to the 2d session of the 84th Congress on the state of the Union, and his special message to Congress on agriculture. I am sending this questionnaire to every 20th householder of Iowa—both town and country. (I have used rural directories for each county, and all city directories. For towns without householder directories, I have used every telephone directory obtainable.)

In order to help us tabulate the returns, please check your answers but do not add any comments on this side. Use the back of this sheet for your comments if you wish. Your individual opinions will be kept strictly confidential.

I am also distributing yellow sample copies to other persons for their information regarding the poll we are taking. These yellow copies will not be tabulated but replies to them will be highly valued by me.

This questionnaire gives Iowa householders the opportunity to join together without regard to party affiliation in stating their views on the issues covered in the questionnaire. I plan to summarize and present to Congress the returns received during the next 4 weeks. Undoubtedly Congress will consider this summary as the prevailing view of Iowa on these issues. Later on I will send a copy of my report to each person to whom questionnaires and sample copies have been mailed. I hope my report will be of interest.

We have received a total of 6,393 replies which are included in the tabulation. This return of 15.26 percent is unusually high for this type of poll. When I first started these polls, Dr. George Gallup predicted returns of 8 to 10 percent.

The occupations listed by those replying were as follows:

Farmer	2,812
Labor	1,085
Business	623
Professional	588
White collar	650
Miscellaneous	635

Yellow sample copies were distributed freely and we received 5,588 sample-copy replies which are not included in our tabulation.

This year brought the largest number of good discussions I have ever received in response to my questionnaire. These special discussions are always of utmost value.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Questionnaire—Tabulation of total vote

	Total vote	Yes	No	Percentage Yes	Percentage No
1. Do you approve President Eisenhower's general foreign policy?	5,808	4,543	1,265	78.22	21.78
2. Do you favor continuing foreign military aid?	5,874	4,011	1,863	68.28	31.72
3. Do you favor continuing foreign economic aid for another year?	5,864	4,071	1,793	69.42	30.58
4. Do you favor putting foreign economic aid on a new long-term footing?	5,763	1,586	4,177	27.52	72.48
5. [Funds spent to date on atomic and hydrogen bombs have been primarily for their military use.] Do you approve additional expenditures by our Federal Government to develop and apply atomic and hydrogen energy to peaceful purposes?	6,131	5,462	669	89.09	10.91
6. Do you approve the transfer of unused immigration quotas to countries whose quotas are in short supply?	5,706	2,427	3,279	42.53	57.47
7. Do you favor basing immigration quotas on the percentage of the various national groups in the United States according to the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census, which is used now?	5,611	3,308	2,303	58.96	41.04
8. [The Organization for Trade Cooperation is proposed to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which the United States is a party.] Do you favor United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation provided it is strictly an administrative agency without power to control United States tariff policies?	5,403	4,630	773	85.69	14.31
9. Do you favor the following amendment to the United States Constitution: "No treaty or other international agreement shall of itself be law within the United States, nor shall it enlarge the power of the Congress to enact law?"	5,420	3,755	1,665	69.28	30.72
10. Do you approve the "soil bank" plan which will give farmers negotiable certificates for surplus commodities in exchange for taking already allotted acres out of crop production; and which will share costs of establishing and continuing conservation uses on lands most needing them?	5,936	3,942	1,994	66.41	33.59
11. Do you approve acreage allotments to qualify corn producers for the benefits available under the soil-bank acreage reserve program?	5,812	4,032	1,780	69.37	30.63
12. Do you approve price supports for corn to all producers on a basis comparable with other feed grains in lieu of acreage allotments?	5,590	2,927	2,663	52.36	47.64
13. Do you approve selling surplus farm commodities to "unfriendly" nations?	6,030	2,803	3,227	46.48	53.52
14. Do you approve sales of surplus farm commodities in domestic markets at prices lower than presently required, namely, 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charges?	5,745	3,541	2,204	61.64	38.36
15. Do you approve permitting farmers to raise and feed wheat outside their quotas?	5,892	2,072	3,820	35.17	64.83
16. Do you approve supports at the highest levels that will not encourage the accumulation of new surpluses, for farm commodities on which price supports are discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture?	5,701	3,960	1,741	69.46	30.54
17. Do you approve limiting the amount of price support loans to any one individual or farming unit?	6,094	5,083	1,011	83.41	16.59
18. Do you approve a rural development program to help low-income farm communities by attracting new industries to these areas?	6,108	5,589	519	91.50	8.50
19. Do you favor exemption from Federal gasoline tax, the gasoline used on farms?	6,219	4,078	2,141	65.57	34.43
20. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	6,096	1,274	4,822	20.90	79.10
21. When the Federal budget is balanced do you favor reduction of the Federal debt before reducing taxes?	6,049	4,050	1,999	66.95	33.05
22. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet Postal Department deficit and to provide better post-office buildings and equipment where needed?	6,098	3,618	2,480	59.33	40.67
23. Do you approve a 40,000-mile interstate highway system over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of $25 billion, if it requires an increase in Federal highway-user taxes?	6,090	3,260	2,830	53.53	46.47
24. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to help build schools?	6,020	4,012	2,008	66.64	33.36
25. Do you favor requiring registration of union pension and welfare funds and disclosure of financial transactions involving them?	5,859	5,168	691	88.21	11.79
26. Do you favor extending minimum wage law coverage to retail, chain-store, hotel, and service employees?	5,875	4,061	1,814	69.12	30.88
27. Do you favor private insurance for losses due to natural disasters such as floods, tidal waves, hurricanes, earthquakes, etc., with the Federal Government subsidizing private companies for excessive losses on insurance issued by them?	5,875	2,990	2,885	50.89	49.11
28. Do you favor direct Federal insurance covering losses caused by natural disasters, provided such insurance is sold on a commission basis by private individuals or firms?	5,645	2,545	3,100	45.08	54.92
29. Do you approve extending social security old-age insurance to all groups of workers not presently covered by social security insurance or some equivalent plan?	6,077	5,081	996	83.61	16.39
30. Do you approve making women eligible for old-age insurance benefits at 62 years of age instead of 65 years, and disabled persons at 50 years of age instead of 65 years, if such changes require increased OASI assessments?	6,065	4,058	2,007	66.91	33.09
31. Do you favor the use of a food-stamp plan or some equivalent plan to enable needy people to eat more meat when meat is in excess supply?	6,133	5,202	931	84.82	15.18
32. Do you favor the Federal Government's reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical insurance plans?	5,717	1,835	3,882	32.10	67.90
33. Do you favor Federal expenditures for research activities of the National Institutes of Health, and for research and teaching facilities of non-Federal institutions?	5,690	3,816	1,874	67.07	32.93
34. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public-housing program?	5,791	4,005	1,786	69.16	30.84
35. Do you favor free Government treatment of a veteran for non-service-connected disability when there is doubt of his ability to pay for needed treatment?	6,080	3,608	2,472	59.34	40.66
36. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today:					
(a) Government spending		(3) 3,518			
(b) Balancing the budget		(5) 3,275			
(c) Reduction of debt of Federal Government		2,562			
(d) Taxation		3,030			
(e) Farm prices and policies		(1) 4,808			
(f) United States foreign trade policies		2,179			
(g) Control of communism in America		(4) 3,391			
(h) Labor policies		2,088			
(i) Defense and war preparedness		(6) 3,171			
(j) Maintaining peace		(2) 3,927			
(k) American foreign policy		2,197			
(l) Corruption in government		2,822			

The total tabulation of the white ballots appears on this page and the tabulation by occupations follows on the next page.

MY DUTY AS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, each year I have received several inquiries regarding the purpose and use

made of my questionnaire. The source and substance of the questionnaire grew out of my analysis of the President's reports and messages to Congress, and I developed my method of distribution of it after consultation with Dr. George Gallup. The purpose of the questionnaire is best described in the words of Edmund Burke, 18th-century British statesman, as follows:

Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

But a representative's unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure—no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

Total vote of the questionnaire by occupations

	Farmer		Labor		Business		Professional		White collar		Miscellaneous	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you approve President Eisenhower's general foreign policy?	1,854	628	738	264	503	84	473	78	537	89	438	122
2. Do you favor continuing foreign military aid?	1,584	971	717	301	427	161	431	118	492	115	360	197
3. Do you favor continuing foreign economic aid for another year?	1,686	853	673	349	427	157	436	116	466	145	383	173
4. Do you favor putting foreign economic aid on a new long-term footing?	640	1,862	243	763	167	403	215	326	171	432	150	391
5. [Funds spent to date on atomic and hydrogen bombs have been primarily for their military use.] Do you approve additional expenditures by our Federal Government to develop and apply atomic and hydrogen energy to peaceful purposes?	2,340	354	955	99	541	53	516	56	580	53	530	54
6. Do you approve the transfer of unused immigration quotas to countries whose quotas are in short supply?	1,097	1,410	289	628	246	321	265	285	270	346	260	289
7. Do you favor basing immigration quotas on the percentage of the various national groups in the United States according to the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census, which is used now?	1,435	974	563	431	321	232	321	210	348	239	320	217
8. [The Organization for Trade Cooperation is proposed to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which the United States is a party.] Do you favor United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation provided it is strictly an administrative agency without power to control United States tariff policies?	1,950	363	807	162	488	52	468	45	522	67	395	84
9. Do you favor the following amendment to the United States Constitution: "No treaty or other international agreement shall of itself be law within the United States, nor shall it enlarge the power of the Congress to enact law"?	1,590	716	676	297	383	154	351	174	424	157	331	167
10. Do you approve the "soil bank" plan which will give farmers negotiable certificates for surplus commodities in exchange for taking already allotted acres out of crop production; and which will share costs of establishing and continuing conservation uses on lands most needing them?	1,758	889	637	377	400	178	390	155	396	211	361	184
11. Do you approve acreage allotments to qualify corn producers for the benefits available under the soil-bank acreage reserve program?	1,913	722	609	367	405	163	366	156	388	208	351	164
12. Do you approve price supports for corn to all producers on a basis comparable with other feed grains in lieu of acreage allotments?	1,387	1,114	509	444	270	291	219	278	260	317	282	219
13. Do you approve selling surplus farm commodities to "unfriendly" nations?	1,419	1,247	320	720	288	306	272	276	288	330	216	348
14. Do you approve sales of surplus farm commodities in domestic markets at prices lower than presently required, namely, 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charges?	1,718	885	488	490	339	218	326	187	349	233	321	191
15. Do you approve permitting farmers to raise and feed wheat outside their quotas?	770	1,871	424	567	200	380	224	297	217	389	237	316
16. Do you approve supports at the highest levels, that will not encourage the accumulation of new surpluses, for farm commodities on which price supports are discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture?	1,954	598	597	367	386	183	322	192	351	231	350	170
17. Do you approve limiting the amount of price support loans to any one individual or farming unit?	2,311	431	833	188	508	88	462	85	507	115	462	104
18. Do you approve a rural development program to help low-income farm communities by attracting new industries to these areas?	2,472	229	953	86	554	47	508	56	574	49	528	52
19. Do you favor exemption from Federal gasoline tax, the gasoline used on farms?	2,563	209	433	623	253	355	244	329	232	395	353	230
20. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	547	2,135	279	763	111	496	84	477	114	522	139	429
21. When the Federal budget is balanced do you favor reduction of the Federal debt before reducing taxes?	1,797	863	607	420	432	178	415	143	417	214	382	181
22. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet postal Department deficit and to provide better post-office buildings and equipment where needed?	1,341	1,336	729	321	404	198	389	168	440	187	315	270
23. Do you approve a 40,000-mile interstate highway system over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of $25 billion, if it requires an increase in Federal highway-user taxes?	1,150	1,536	610	441	392	208	415	146	424	201	269	298
24. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to help build schools?	1,688	963	788	251	354	239	362	193	434	188	386	174
25. Do you favor requiring registration of union pension and welfare funds and disclosure of financial transactions involving them?	2,204	301	849	183	561	40	513	40	580	48	461	79
26. Do you favor extending minimum-wage-law coverage to retail, chain-store, hotel, and service employees?	1,470	1,036	930	121	824	271	421	135	507	120	409	131
27. Do you favor private insurance for losses due to natural disasters such as floods, tidal waves, hurricanes, earthquakes, etc., with the Federal Government subsidizing private companies for excessive losses on insurance issued by them?	1,147	1,440	538	471	814	266	315	228	367	250	309	230
28. Do you favor direct Federal insurance covering losses caused by natural disasters, provided such insurance is sold on a commission basis by private individuals or firms?	1,145	1,327	509	474	235	329	179	345	240	355	237	270
29. Do you approve extending social security old-age insurance to all groups of workers not presently covered by social security insurance or some equivalent plan?	2,129	521	933	123	508	91	468	95	543	92	500	74
30. Do you approve making women eligible for old age insurance benefits at 62 years of age instead of 65 years, and disabled persons at 50 years of age instead of 65 years, if such changes require increased OASI assessments?	1,629	1,045	875	176	361	233	328	231	449	181	416	141
31. Do you favor the use of a food-stamp plan or some equivalent plan to enable needy people to eat more meat when meat is in excess supply?	2,443	296	864	177	454	147	437	115	510	118	494	78
32. Do you favor the Federal Government's reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical insurance plans?	746	1,739	429	567	155	426	145	397	159	449	201	304
33. Do you favor Federal expenditures for research activities of the National Institutes of Health, and for research and teaching facilities of non-Federal institutions?	1,610	840	636	309	361	203	377	170	413	189	359	163
34. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public-housing programs?	1,769	771	729	268	342	235	368	180	422	191	375	141
35. Do you favor free Government treatment of a veteran for non-service-connected disability when there is doubt of his ability to pay for needed treatment?	1,553	1,115	725	319	336	268	280	276	381	253	333	241
36. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today.												
(a) Government spending	(4)	1,484	(2)	648	(3)	374	(5)	318	(4)	359	(4)	335
(b) Balancing the budget	(6)	1,309		565	(2)	418	(6)	312	(6)	336	(4)	335
(c) Reduction of debt of Federal Government		1,010		462		264		260		262		304
(d) Taxation		1,246	(6)	569	(6)	320		255	(5)	338		302
(e) Farm prices and policies	(1)	2,500	(1)	658	(1)	440	(1)	404	(1)	436	(2)	370
(f) United States foreign trade policies		1,133		258		188		223		216		161
(g) Control of communism in America	(3)	1,512	(3)	638		308		258		329	(3)	346
(h) Labor policies		786		404		263		203		256		176
(i) Defense and war preparedness		1,180	(5)	619	(5)	328	(4)	328	(3)	391	(6)	325
(j) Maintaining peace	(2)	1,823	(4)	634	(4)	358	(2)	338	(2)	399	(1)	375
(k) American foreign policy		800		319		239	(2)	338		284		217
(l) Corruption in government	(5)	1,388		511		250		167		238		208

Veto the Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since the debate on the Harris-Fulbright bill began, and since its passage by the Senate, there has been an increasing tide of editorial opinion from responsible papers in many parts of the country, first urging the defeat and now the veto of this bill.

For the information of Members of Congress and of leaders of other branches of our Government, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post for February 8, 1956, entitled "Veto the Gas Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETO THE GAS BILL

When the Senate heard the alarm it closed its eyes and ran recklessly into the danger zone. This seems to be the best explanation that can be made of the 53–38 vote for the natural-gas bill while the use of campaign contributions to influence senatorial opinion in regard to the bill was awaiting investigation. We can understand the reluctance of Majority Leader JOHNSON and other sponsors of the bill to allow Senator CASE's disclosures to upset a vote that had previously been scheduled. But their adherence to routine in the face of a grave challenge to the Senate's integrity does them no credit. If either the investigation launched yesterday by Senator HENNINGS' Privileges and Elections Subcommittee or that to be undertaken by the select committee approved by the Senate shows that gas companies have undertaken to finance the campaigns of Senators favoring the bill, the Senate will be in a sorry predicament, indeed.

Already the evidence is very unfavorable. John M. Neff, Nebraska lawyer, who last year registered as a lobbyist for the Superior Oil Co., has admitted contributing 25 $100 bills to Senator CASE's campaign fund. Mr. Neff also admits his interest in the gas bill, and he has lobbied with the Senators from Nebraska in behalf of the bill. The generous Mr. Neff makes much of the fact that no strings were attached to his contribution to Senator CASE's campaign, but every lobbyist worth his salt knows that special favors connected with a campaign, even if they are not very subtle, are more likely to be effective than outright bribes.

Certainly the facts as now known justified Senator CASE in refusing the contribution and in reporting the incident to the Senate. If it is true that enactment of the bill will increase the natural gas companies' take from consumers by $600 million a year and enhance the estimated value of gas reserves by $12 billion, even the most extravagant campaign contributions would be mere chicken feed. The public will not be satisfied until the flow of gas money into senatorial campaign funds, if any, has been fully exposed. Because of the limitations laid upon the select committee, the Hennings subcommittee is in much the best position to conduct this inquiry, and we hope that it will have full cooperation from everyone who has information bearing on the subject. In order to do justice to the inquiry, the subcommittee should be authorized to hire eminent counsel who would have a free hand in digging out the facts. The situation calls for an investigator of the integrity and skill of the late Justice Owen J. Roberts who made his reputation by probing into the Teapot Dome scandal.

Meanwhile, the President ought to veto the bill. It is not the President's business to save the Senate from the embarrassment that may result from its vote on this bill. But there is ample ground for a veto in the provisions of the bill itself. Though it is a very complicated measure, the overriding fact is that it would mean less regulation over the price of natural gas and therefore less protection for the public.

Supporters of the bill may be expected to urge White House approval on the ground that it would ease governmental restraints on private industry. But in the case of natural monopolies, such as the gas industry, the need for regulation is undisputably clear. The question here is whether that regulation should be complete and effective or incomplete and ineffective. It is no time to be retreating from tight controls over monopolies supplying essential public service. In any circumstances, a Presidential veto would protect the interests of consumers, and if it is shown that passage of the bill was tainted by the use of gas-lobby money, a veto would become imperative.

American Aid in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Burma Hanging on Communist Abyss—Will United States Help?" written by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, who has just returned from a month in Asia. It is a thought-provoking article, and should be read by all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURMA HANGING ON COMMUNIST ABYSS—WILL UNITED STATES HELP?

(By John Cowles)

In Rangoon, Burma, a few weeks ago, I had the feeling that tragedy impended, that unless the United States rapidly finds means of getting American dollars and American technicians into Burma, then rubles and Russian technicians might soon take over one more important Southeast Asian country.

Burma is a weak, neutral, politically adolescent, geographically exposed, but strategically important nation of nearly 20 million people to which the United States is currently giving no financial support.

An expenditure of perhaps $15 million a year for 4 or 5 years by the United States for economic aid might prevent the Bamboo Curtain of Asian communism from enclosing it and sealing it off from a continued exchange with the free world of people, products, and ideas.

Burma has hundreds of miles of common frontier with Red China, and Burma wants both from philosophical conviction and from expediency, to keep neutral as between the United States and Red China.

BURMA WANTS TO KEEP INDEPENDENCE

Burma does not want to go Communist. She wants to retain her independence. She fears, however, that if she should sign any kind of military pact with the United States, which she has no intention of doing, China might use that as a pretext for invasion and occupation.

Burma does not want even to accept dollar gifts from the United States for fear that that might jeopardize her position of neutrality. Burma wants to sell rice, her prinpal article of export, to get the foreign exchange she needs to develop her economy.

But the United States, which has huge surpluses of wheat and rice of its own, not only is uninterested in buying Burmese rice but has actually been depriving Burma of its normal markets by selling, or dumping, American rice and wheat in Japan, India, South Korea, Indochina, etc.

Burma wants American technicians. She wants to improve the docks at Rangoon; she wants new locomotives and freight cars for the railroad that runs to Mandalay; she wants more diesel engines, a cement plant, a small tire factory to use the rubber she grows, and a small paper mill in which she can convert her bamboo pulp.

But Burma does not want to accept charity from America, or aline herself with Western capitalism. She wants to keep independent and scrupulously neutral in the cold war.

SOVIET OFFERS TO BUY BURMESE RICE

Russia has now offered to buy all of Burma's rice surplus at world market prices and supply the industrial machinery that Burma wants. Of course, the Russians add, that would involve their sending Russian technicians to Burma to maintain the equipment and train Burmese workers.

Currently the only important American assistance to Burma stems from the Ford Foundation. It finances, among other things, a technological school near Rangoon where young Burmese are trained in carpentry and mechanics and engineering and electronics. It is operated by a handful of Americans, selected by the Dunwoody Institute of Minneapolis, who inconspicuously guide Burmese teachers in the training of the students.

The Russians are now offering to build a much larger technological school in Rangoon.

One member of the Burmese Cabinet told me he deeply feared that this would really be a training school for Communists and a center for revolutionary subversion.

"If we could only sell the United States some rice," he said passionately, "we wouldn't need to sell Russia our rice and take Russian industrial equipment and Russian technicians in payment."

Burma's situation illustrates the bankruptcy of the political philosophy of those Americans who take the position that "those who are not with us are against us; therefore we should help only those nations that are our military allies."

WE MUST KEEP NEUTRALS OUT OF RED CAMP

The important thing for us to do in Asia is not to press solely for more military pacts, or to make threats against the Russian and the Chinese, but to try to prevent presently neutralist nations from being surreptitiously taken over by the Communists.

Burma has many problems. The central government is not yet in firm control of the whole nation. Rebels and bandits hide in the jungles and hills and periodically emerge to pillage villagers and disrupt economic life.

Half a dozen separate bands of armed groups, numbering in the thousands, still defy the central government. They are so-called White Flag or Stalinist Communists; Red Flag or Trotskyite Communists; Karen Christians, who dislike Buddhist rule and want their part of Burma made a separate nation; two different hill tribes, the Shans and the Kachins, who want their independence, or use it as an excuse for robbery and lawlessness; and lastly some remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Chinese forces which fled to Burma when Chiang left the

mainland, who have refused offers to be transported to Formosa, and who live largely by pillage.

The situation is, however, much better than a year ago. The rebels, including Communists, are surrendering in increasing numbers.

I saw many inmates of a "rebahilitation camp" doing construction work. After they have been taught a trade they are released.

As an illustration of Burma's neutrality between the Communist and free worlds, consider this:

At the ceremonial parade, which I was fortunate enough to witness, marking the eighth anniversary of Burma's independence from Great Britain, one of the honored guests, who received a high Government decoration, was Sir Hubert Rance, the last British governor who ruled Burma as a colony.

(Incidentally, can any American imagine the United States giving the representative of King George III an American decoration of honor just 8 years after we won our independence from England?)

WIDOW OF REVOLUTION LEADER WAS HONORED

Also in the reviewing stand as an honored guest was Mme. Sun Yat-sen, widow of the Chinese revolutionary leader and herself now a member of an important government committee in Red China.

The President of Burma in his speech made it crystal clear that Burma was neutral between the two great power blocs whose representatives were seated near him.

That evening, I attended a dinner of the faculty of Rangoon university, where U Nu, the able, idealistic, and democratic Prime Minister of Burma spoke.

A small, hard core of disciplined Communists in the student body at the university is urging other students not to study, telling them that a general strike will be called at the time the spring examinations are given, and every student will be promoted without examination.

Although U Nu did not mention the word "Communist," he exhorted the faculty not to promote students who refused to take their examinations and not to submit to what he called mobocracy.

Afterward, two faculty members who had received part of their education in America and who are pro-Western, told me they feared this impending student strike would be tied to a general strike-planned for the time of the Burmese election, which will presumably be held in late March or April. They expressed apprehension that despite U Nu, Rangoon university might be taken over by the Communists just as has happened in Singapore, where the Communists now control both the faculty and the student body.

CAN'T AMERICA TRY TO SAVE BURMA?

When one sees at first hand a country like Burma, a country of gay, friendly people, politically naive and pitifully unprepared for self-government but equally determined to have it, teetering on the abyss of communism, one wonders can't America try to save it?

It is true that we already have more wheat and rice than Agricultural Secretary Benson knows what to do with.

But would it not be wise for us to buy $10 million dollars worth of Burmese rice, or even teakwood, so that Burma could get American technicians and American machinery instead of Russian?

It is true that Burma sold supplies to Red China while the fighting was going on in Southeast Asia. That technically makes Burma ineligible for American aid. (The Burmese viewed the Indochina war simply as anticolonial uprising against the French. Their opinion on the Korean war is less clear.)

Perhaps Burma will slide under Communist rule whatever we do.

But, at least, if we gave Burma aid we would have the satisfaction of knowing that we were giving to a relatively honest government. Informed people, Americans, British and Asians alike, say there is much less governmental corruption in Burma than in almost any country in the Far East, and our dollars would not go for the enrichment of a few dishonest officials. So, regardless of legal technicalities, regardless of mathematical odds, can America afford not to see that Burma gets some economic aid?

Our doing it might save 20 million more people from becoming Communist serfs.

Producer's Gas Bill Means Consumer Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senate and Your Gas Bill," which was published in the Kansas City Star of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AND YOUR GAS BILL

The United States Senate has voted to lift price regulation of natural gas at the point of production. This is bad news for the consuming public and good news for the producers — especially the big producers. Here was a conflict of interests in which elements of principle could be argued on both sides. And the Senate has lined up on the side of the producers.

But now—barring a Presidential veto—we shall see who was right and who was wrong. Basically, the Fulbright-Harris bill removes Federal control from the price of natural gas at the wellhead. But from this issue that appears deceptively simple have come diametrically opposed claims and predictions of doom. Proponents declared that without the bill development would be discouraged and prices would skyrocket; that gas would be limited to use in the producing States. Opponents argued that the bill would remove effective controls in interstate commerce and bring enormous cost increases to the domestic customer and industrial user alike.

The Kansas City area may learn who was right sooner than we would wish. The Cities Service rate case before the Federal Power Commission in Washington has been delayed pending the outcome of the Senate action. If the bill becomes law, much of the city's argument against current increases will be wiped out.

Despite protestations that they had the long-range interests of the consumers at heart, there can be little doubt that this was a producers' bill. Aside from the principle of Federal control, it embodies several lucrative gimmicks that could cost the consumer dearly. Not least among these is the reasonable-market-price clause which would become mandatory. That formula allows a company which produces cheap gas as a by-product of oil operations to base rates on the market price instead of costs. The same applies to reserves bought years ago when gas was cheap.

The matter now stands as a continuing problem for the future. The possible increase in the price of gas over the next few years is tremendous. If the consumer must measure the cost in billions of dollars, then the consumer may rebel. In that event producers may find themselves under far more stringent controls than were removed by the Fulbright measure.

Freedom: A Two-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the February 8, 1956, edition of the International Woodworker entitled "Freedom: A Two-Way Street."

The International Woodworker is the official publication of the International Woodworkers of America, a large and extensive trade union of the hard-working men who log and saw the timber which furnishes the material for much of our industrial progress in America. The editorial deals with the basic importance, particularly to members of the labor movement, of protecting such basic freedoms as freedom of the press. The author of the editorial, I understand, is Mr. Bruce A. Bishop, editor of the International Woodworker. Although Mr. Bishop probably does not agree with the editorial policies of many of the daily newspapers of America, he correctly believes it vital to America that their freedom of expression be vigilantly preserved.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM: A TWO-WAY STREET

The recent investigation of the New York Times by the Senate Committee headed by Senator JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, is a profoundly disturbing thing.

We have not always agreed with the Times—nor do we expect to. We are of the opinion that the Times often presents the big-business, antilabor view on certain questions of the day, and expect that they will continue to render this point of view in the future.

However, the basic question is not whether we agree or disagree with this newspaper.

The inside kernel of this issue is: Was the investigation of the Times by a Senate committee a proper thing for a branch of our Government to do?

We definitely think not.

Freedom of the press—and that includes the freedom to criticize, to disagree, and as Senators LEHMAN and NEUBERGER said on the Senate floor on January 12, "to criticize even when it is wrongful," should never be tampered with. As Thomas Jefferson said—"no government ought to be without censors; and where the press is free, no one ever will."

The Eastland committee went after the New York Times during an alleged hunt for Communists. The fact that Senator EASTLAND'S investigators chose the Times was indicative of their intent to embarrass that newspaper. If this is not so, then why, in

the words of Senator NEUBERGER, did that committee "look for Communists or ex-Communists specifically among newspaper employees at all, any more than specifically among lawyers or farmers or nurses or musicians?"

Actually, Senator EASTLAND was interested in an attack on the New York Times because of the solid position it has taken on the Supreme Court decision and the antics of race baiters like himself—and certainly not because he—or anyone else—thought that the Times was Communist dominated or influenced.

DICK NEUBERGER pretty well summed it up when he said in a letter to your editor—"When one paper can be singled out for investigation, a dangerous precedent has been created. Perhaps some future Senate committee will promote its own bias by investigating certain papers for private-utility influence, or trade-union influence or banking domination—or any other alleged influences."

Both Senator NEUBERGER and Senator LEHMAN pointed out that they have suffered plenty from partisan attack and partial reporting on the part of the Nation's newspapers, but both strongly supported the right of the newspapers to do this.

As Senator NEUBERGER pointed out, "If support for the rights and liberties of our free press were to be granted only on a basis of reciprocity, no Senator would have less reason than I to make the speech I am making today."

Thus, by citing the record that saw only 3 out of 21 daily newspapers backing him in Oregon during the 1954 election, NEUBERGER demonstrated that he did not have any ax to grind and clearly established himself as a worthy supporter of a free and untrammeled press.

We, of the labor movement, can do no less. We must exert ourselves just as much to protect the freedom of our enemies as we do our friends.

Our big problem is to carry on a continuing, high-level campaign to provide the people with our point of view, and the fact that we have been behind the 8-ball financially, in our fight to do this, must not be allowed to take victory from our grasp.

Public Should Complain of Brazen Tactics To Influence Gas Bill Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Case of Gas," which was published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF GAS

Politicians and gas and oil producers in the great Southwest must feel quite pleased with themselves. This week, with the Senate's approval of the Harris-Fulbright gas bill, they won another victory strengthening their area's position as the most favored part of the Nation.

The Harris-Fulbright bill, which had passed the House last year and now awaits only the President's signature to become law, frees natural gas of Federal price regulation at the wellhead. This law permits the Southwest's gas producers to determine the prices to be paid by millions of captive customers in Pittsburgh and other northern consuming areas—except for the dubious indirect control which the Federal Power Commission may exercise by regulating pipeline prices.

Thus for the second time since the Eisenhower administration assumed office, the Southwest has grabbed off a nice prize. Back in 1953, it will be recalled, that area obtained legislation giving States control over offshore oil.

When the gas and oil legislation of the last 3 years is added to the depletion allowance law which lets oil and gas producers deduct 27.5 percent of their gross income for tax purposes, then it becomes clear that the Southwest is indeed the Nation's happy hunting ground.

It is difficult to explain this in political terms, except to note that Texans and their close neighbors are not as devout in their adherence to the Democratic Party as, say, the Deep South, and thus their bargaining position, along with their votes, is something powerful to reckon with.

What's more, wealth has a way of breeding wealth and those tycoons in the most favored part of the Nation have plenty of money for this purpose and that, including high-pressure lobbying of blinding intensity and an ability to sweeten political campaign funds.

President Eisenhower has as much justification now as Harry Truman had in 1950 to veto the gas bill. But he probably won't. So the public can only hope that Congress will watch closely to see what happens to gas prices, with a view to reversing its decision if prices run wild, as opponents of the gas bill have predicted.

The Senate, meanwhile, should proceed determinedly to get at the bottom of a $2,500 campaign contribution which Senator CASE refused because it was offered by a Nebraska attorney interested in passage of the gas bill. The public has no choice but to swallow the legislation, but it should complain bitterly about some of the brazen tactics used to influence it. There should be a full exposure of what went on behind the gas bill.

The Rights of States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the February 9, 1956, issue of the Orangeburg (S. C.) Times and Democrat, entitled "The Rights of States." The Times and Democrat is one of our finest newspapers, and it is ably edited by Mr. Edward Sims, who also operates a Washington news bureau for many of our South Carolina newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHTS OF STATES

Every State in the Union, regardless of its history, has a large stake in the question of preserving States rights. States rights is not to be, and should not be, confused with any one issue or with hidebound clichés or emotions connected with the past.

States rights is something our Constitution's framers had very much in mind. There is no question but that States rights have been usurped since the Founding Fathers drew up the Constitution. States rights is not, and should not be, a sectional issue.

We should keep in mind that this country was not established as a pure democracy. It was actually set up as a republic, with the States retaining many sovereign rights and privileges. Electors were originally selected by State legislators, so that qualified men would choose the President.

In time, our system of Government has changed, and we now have something close to a popular election for President, although under our system a President can still be elected and receive fewer votes than his opponent.

Proposals are now before Congress to change this, and eventually, one of them will be adopted. It will require a constitutional amendment, with two-thirds of both Houses of Congress approving, and then three-fourths of all the States.

Other changes in our way of life and in our system of Government should be effected the same way. There have been too many cases, in recent years, of the Supreme Court assuming jurisdiction it was not given under the Constitution. Several times in very recent years, Congress has had to correct Supreme Court interpretations which actually changed our system of Government.

One of the weaknesses of our system, as Thomas Jefferson himself recognized, was that there is actually no check on the Supreme Court. Justices are appointed for life, and neither the Executive nor Congress has been able to exercise the function of a check on the highest court of the land.

It is, therefore, up to justices of that high body to remain above politics and to restrain themselves. It is, likewise, the duty of every American to protect the system of Government which has made this the greatest country in the world, and one of the ways he can accomplish this goal is to do his part to safeguard the rights of each of the 48 States.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-five Program for Timber Conservation Committee of the Railroad Tie Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of vital importance to the future strength and well-being of our country are the conservation and protection of our natural resources through the utilization of wise conservation practices and programs.

One of the most important of our needs is the conservation and protection of the Nation's forest resources. I have been pleased and gratified to have presented to me a copy of the forest conservation program adopted by the timber conservation committee of the Railway Tie Association.

The program recognizes the essential role which vocational agriculture is today playing in forest conservation through the teaching of sound forest conservation practices, and recommends

that our vocational agriculture program be greatly expanded.

The program recognizes that the future well-being and prosperity of so many of our American business enterprises is dependent upon the vital service being rendered by those engaged in vocational agriculture and other forest conservation and management activities.

The timber conservation committee program embraces three essential steps: First, intensification of conservation at the grassroots level through education and active work with teachers of agricultural education throughout the Nation; second, achievement of better product utilization through cooperation with other wood-using industries and government agencies interested in forestry; and third, promotion of safety in the woods.

I congratulate the timber conservation committee, and hope that its worthwhile program will be read by every Member of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the program, together with a letter from Mr. Robert N. Hoskins, chairman of the timber conservation committee. Mr. Hoskins is industrial forester for the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.

There being no objection, the letter and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO.,
INDUSTRIAL DEPARTMENT,
Norfolk, Va., February 7, 1956.

The Honorable LISTER HILL,
Member of Congress, United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: Every American has a tremendous stake in the conservation of our natural resources. To remain strong definite programs must be carried on by all organizations so that proper utilization will come as an end result.

We, of the Railway Tie Association, recognize the outstanding leadership and support you have given forestry and particularly, your efforts in behalf of vocational education as coauthor of the Vocational Education Act of 1946. This has meant much toward developing a real program at the grassroots level. We, too, recognize that one of the real problems we are faced with today is assistance to the small farm woodland owner and the real solution to getting at the grassroots level would best be accomplished by working through teachers of agricultural education throughout the Nation.

As former national chairman of the conservation committee of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and having served on other national and regional committees plus the work of our own organization, the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., we are continually placing greater emphasis on work with farm boys by working through the State supervisors and teachers of vocational agriculture.

I am attaching herewith a copy of the program approved at the recent national meeting of the Railway Tie Association which further emphasizes steps that must be taken which will not only develop leadership but will help protect the welfare of the entire Nation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. HOSKINS,
Industrial Forester.

NINETEEN HUNDRED FIFTY-FIVE PROGRAM FOR TIMBER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE OF THE RAILWAY TIE ASSOCIATION

The Railway Tie Association and its members must take an active part in forest conservation if it is to be assured of those products so necessary for its operations and for the welfare of the Nation. Recognizing that objectives in sound forest management can only be accomplished through active leadership, the chairman of this committee recommends for approval and adoption the following three-point program:

I. INTENSIFY CONSERVATION AT GRASSROOTS LEVEL THROUGH EDUCATION AND ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

1. What is agricultural education? Agricultural education is a part of the public-school program. In 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. This program was the first development of the Federal-State cooperative program of vocational education for less than college graduate in the United States. The purpose of this act is to provide for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in the promotion of vocational education in agriculture. Vocational agriculture reaches the all-day student in high school and is usually taught for 4 consecutive years. Enrollment in this program is open only to farm boys. Each farm boy receives instruction from technically trained teachers of vocational agriculture and initiate project work. These projects are supervised throughout the year by his teacher of vocational agriculture and consist of enterprises and supplementary farm jobs. He must keep accurate records and accounts of all project work similarly as is done in any business operation.

The program of agricultural education is well organized and ably administered. As such, it offers a challenge and an opportunity to business and industry that they might work directly with farm boys in getting a job done on the respective farm woodlands. It is an accepted fact that our greatest problem today in forest conservation lies in the ownerships of small farm woodland areas. Representatives of business and industry may work through individual chapters (Future Farmers of America) found in these areas where they are doing business or have operations. These companies may provide incentives to increase production by working through all levels of vocational agriculture—State, district, and local. Some companies may have prepared materials such as bulletins, leaflets, posters, etc., which could be distributed to the local teacher of vocational agriculture that might enable him to do a better job of teaching the all-day students.

Each State program of vocational agriculture is administered by a State supervisor. He has on his staff men well qualified to direct operations in the broad field of agriculture, that is, soil conservation, water conservation, forest conservation, etc.

The program of agricultural education is the largest and strongest strictly farm-boy program in the Nation.

2. What is needed to do the complete job in agriculture education? In 1953, 429,381 farm boys were enrolled in all-day classes. Administering this all-day program were approximately 10,000 teachers of agricultural education employed in the public schools of this Nation.

To meet the farm replacement needs in this country, our best estimates point out the fact that we will need enrolled at least 1 million or more in vocational education in agriculture. This means that with the present appropriation only about one-half of the job is being done. There are also between 1,000 and 1,500 schools that have programs where additional teachers are needed. At least 5,000 high schools serving rural youth need a program of vocational education in agriculture.

Supplementary legislation enacted since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 had the same general purpose as the original act. Under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, Congress is authorized to appropriate a total of $13,296,273.13 (for vocational agriculture). As of this date a total of only $11,724,730.44 has been appropriated for vocational education in agriculture. Under present laws, Congress could apropriate the remaining—$1,571,542.69. Summaries of recent studies indicate the need nationally for more than the full appropriation. It is believed that a total of approximately $20 million would be required to do the complete job in vocational agriculture. This would necessitate new legislation, increasing the present authorization.

From previous records it has been found that for every Federal dollar spent in the promotion of vocational education in agriculture, approximately $4.76 is spent from funds both State and local.

America must always remain strong. To do this she must have men trained in skills to do productive work. The surest way to develop a sound conservation program to meet today's and tomorrow's needs may best be solved by working through and strengthening the program of vocational education in agriculture.

The timber conservation committee recommends:

A. That every member of the Railway Tie Association take steps to activate a program of conservation at the grassroots through local teachers of vocational agriculture by gaining approval through State Supervisors.

B. That every member of the Railway Tie Association should use every effort to strengthen the present program of vocational agriculture in the public schools as the strongest means of grassroots conservation. This could mean additional teachers and new departments in all States of the Nation.

C. A recent outgrowth of this program has been the establishment of a young farmer organization. This group, seeking to establish themselves in farming, continues to receive instruction and attend evening classes under the supervision of the teacher of vocational agriculture. Business and industry, having assisted the all-day student, may also wish to pursue this program of practical education through the same channels by working with young farmers. Such cooperation with this group will enable conservation to be practiced at the grassroots, too.

II. BETTER UTILIZATION THROUGH COOPERATION

The timber conservation committee recommends closer cooperation with farm foresters and consulting foresters. These two groups are consistently in touch with owners of small and large tracts of timber, all of which can provide the necessary materials needed by the Railway Tie Association's members.

The average holding of the small woodland owner in America is 62 acres. All together there are 261 million acres in 4¼ million such tracts. This represents approximately three-quarters of all the privately owned, commercial forest land and more than one-half of all forest land, public and private, in the Nation. Three and one-quarter million of these small owners are farmers.

The Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 established another pattern of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States, whereby technically trained foresters would assist owners of these small woodland areas. While some of this service is free, there are those States that charge for this service.

Both the farm forester and the consulting forester are in a better position to effect better utilization should members of the Railway Tie Association consult with them from time to time as to their needs for certain products. Such a program of closer working relationships would mean better forest management.

III. The timber conservation committee recognizes that there will always be problems in woods safety. There are many effective programs in operation today by such associations as the American Pulpwood As-

sociation and also safety programs by individual companies.

In cooperation with the United States Forest Service and particularly Milton M. Bryan, Chief Woodland Management Section, United States Forest Service; and Seth Jackson, who is in charge of the safety program for the United States Forest Service, we have prepared a safety poster which we feel will be most effective in helping curtail accidents in cross tie production.

This is our first step in our program accenting safety in the woods and other steps will be devised which we hope will continue to reduce accidents in all wood production.

Gas Investigation Scramble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Little Maneuvering on the Bribe Probe," which was published in the Hartford Courant of February 8, 1956. In fairness to the Senators involved, I wish to say that the editorial is in error in saying that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] voted for the gas bill. Apart from that, however, it represents what I believe are rather widely held views.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LITTLE MANEUVERING ON THE BRIBE PROBE

The Senate has acted with almost fanatic and unseemly haste in scrambling to investigate the natural-gas bribe case. It is well that the Senate should move to clear this blot from the main issue. But a jurisdictional dispute between two committees does not add dignity to the fracas. And it inspires some close political consideration of the points concerned.

A special committee was proposed by Democratic and Republican leaders to look into the complaint. The special committee would have been composed equally of Democratic and Republican Members. The resolution was blocked for 24 hours by Senator LANGER, one of the opponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill. Meanwhile Senator THOMAS HENNINGS announced his Elections Subcommittee would start its own probe "to look into the Case matter and every other damn matter in connection with it and get at the big boys if we can." Senator HENNINGS also turns up on the short end of the vote in the Harris-Fulbright measure. So does Senator GORE, who serves with him on the Elections Committee.

Before he could get started, however, the Senate reconsidered the resolution. It named a special committee by 90 to 0. That committee named as its chairman Senator GEORGE—who was with the majority in favoring the Harris-Fulbright bill. The other members are HAYDEN, of Arizona; BRIDGES, of New Hampshire; and THYE, of Minnesota—all of whom voted with the majority for the bill. The explanation that Senator HENNINGS would be unable to conduct the hearing because he is up for reelection this fall is rather limp—for so is Senator GEORGE.

Not only the Senate, but the entire Nation, has an interest in seeing that this charge is fully explored. Only President Eisenhower can now exercise a veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill, and prevent this on-balance unwise legislation from taking effect. But the Senate must act on a larger issue—the control and prevention of open and illegal pressures on legislators. It is already tacitly recognized that the regulation of lobbyists is inadequate by today's standards. The thoroughness with which the special Senate committee acts will be watched with interest.

Fault in School Bill Pointed Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1956, there appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., an editorial entitled "COLMER Nails Down Fault in School Bill." This editorial points out the weaknesses of the present school bill which is now before the Rules Committee, of which my colleague, Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, is the ranking member.

The editorial is filled largely with quotations from our colleague, Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi, and I have found through the past years that BILL COLMER is a man who normally has his feet on the ground and realizes full well the fundamental problems of the Deep South. His judgment has gone through the test of time and has been fully supported by his own people. I have had occasion to visit Mr. COLMER's district recently and to see a lot of his people. I know of no one more beloved by those who know him in southern Mississippi than is Congressman BILL COLMER. He certainly has the complete confidence of those he represents in the Congress.

At some later date I expect to present my views fully regarding the school construction bill. At present it is before the Rules Committee of the House, and I will wait to do this until action is taken by the committee and I have had full opportunity to appraise the final bill which comes to the House.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial mentioned above:

COLMER NAILS DOWN FAULT IN SCHOOL BILL

Representative COLMER, ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee, has taken a position on the Federal aid for school construction bill which could mean the bill's defeat if it comes up for a vote in either House.

It is Mr. COLMER's contention that because of the Supreme Court decision forbidding segregation in public schools, any Federal aid offered under the bill would be denied to the South. He holds that the aid would be denied even if a proposed amendment banning funds for school districts practicing segregation is defeated.

Advocates of the bill do not agree. They say that segregation would not be outlawed in a State until Federal judges order its end, and that pending such action in the Federal courts the United States Commissioner of Education could not deny funds to a State practicing school segregation.

This is a flimsy reply, obviously worth no attention. Who can know now the position the United States Commissioner of Education will take in the future, in regard to this particular fund, or any other?

Mr. COLMER says flatly that southerners have made up their minds they will not have integration in their schools and that "it is difficult to see how those who believe in segregation can vote for this bill."

"There are two recognized privileges under the American system that the American people are most zealous of," he continues. "They are freedom of worship from Federal domination and freedom in the public-school system from Federal domination.

"Many thinking people interested in the public-school system are justified in their apprehension that this (the school aid bill) would be the beginning of Federal domination of our public schools. Federal control inevitably follows the Federal dollar. The next step would be requests for Federal assistance in payment of underpaid schoolteachers. Once the gate is down there is no end in sight.

"Who can say that eventually a Federal bureau would not be dictating the type of textbooks with resultant regimentation of thought among our children?"

Representative COLMER speaks with a respected voice in the House and there is some hope that his views will be heeded there. If not, and if the bill goes through as a special dispensation for all States outside the South, the last recourse will be strenuous opposition in the Senate, where there are ways to slow down a willful majority.

No doubt some of the supporters of the school aid bill look upon it as an adroit means of bringing about acceptance of the Supreme Court's integration decision in some Southern States. The expectation is fallacious, and adds to the reasons for rejecting the entire measure.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address I delivered Sunday, February 12, at the Kosciuszko monument in Lafayette Park, Washington, in commemoration of the birth of the well-known and beloved patriot, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, an original American patriot:

GENERAL KOSCIUSZKO, AN ORIGINAL AMERICAN PATRIOT

I am very happy to join with all those who today are commemorating the anniversary of the birth of that great patriot, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Those of us who know the timeless contribution made by General Kosciuszko to the cause of human freedom and individual liberty, look forward to this day each year as an occasion to rekindle the flame of human freedom by whatever means available to us.

You and I know full well that the cause of freedom will be kept alive only by those who are willing to sacrifice for it and who have come to learn that simple fundamental—that freedom is life itself and that there can be no life worth living without individual liberty.

Ih seems to me most fitting this year that we give some thought to General Kosciuszko and his great patriotism for the United

States and for his beloved country of birth—Poland. It will be recalled that General Kosciuszko journeyed to the United States to take part in the American Revolution which he so often said involved a cause and principles dear to all mankind. He was both a dedicated and inspired leader in the victorious campaign of the Continental Army—being blessed with both the genius of military leadership and an abundant knowledge of mankind's endless struggle for equality, independence, and dignity. During his entire life, General Kosciuszko expressed a warm patriotism for the United States, and fervent hopes for its prosperity. At the same time he expressed an equal patriotism for Poland which was then, as now, occupied by the Russians, and a fervent determination that Poland would soon be free of alien occupation and be sovereign among all the powers of the world.

General Kosciuszko did not consider it unusual that he would have such a strong patriotism for the noble cause of the United States and Poland. The leaders of the American Revolutionary War, the war by which we threw off colonial status and won our national independence, did not consider the dual patriotism of Kosciuszko as a bit unusual. In fact, the leaders of the 13 original colonies were ever mindful that the freedom-loving sons of many countries came to our shores all for the same purpose of supporting the insptiring cause set forth in the American Declaration of Independence.

It will be recalled that after the victory of the American Revolution, General Kosciuszko was offered a land grant in the hope that he would remain on the soil of the free America he helped to create. It is important in this connection to remember that when General Kosciuszko expressed his thanks for this offer and explained that he would have to decline because his native Poland was enslaved by the Russians, the leaders of the American Government understood immediately that the fire of freedom burned so brightly in his heart that he had no other choice but to return to Europe and there to carry on his struggle for the liberation of Poland.

It seems to me strange that today we here in the United States, entrusted as we are with the task of keeping bright the flame of human freedom, should have any question about the dual patriotism of men like General Kosciuszko. For some strange reason it has become the vogue since the Russians occupied Poland and many other once free and independent nations of Central and Eastern Europe, to frown upon or look with suspicion on anyone who would dare to express a concern for the enslavement of Poland or any of the other non-Russian nations. It is even more strange that one's patriotism to our beloved United States is likely to fall into question for advocating the liberation of Poland and the other enslaved nations from the ruthless colonial empire of the Russians. I cannot but wonder what the American patriots of 1776 who fought shoulder to shoulder with General Kosciuszko would think if they were to return to America today and would hear people raising questions on the subject of patriotism for the United States and patriotism for one's native land.

The very things that gave General Kosciuszko an equal patriotism for the cause of the American Revolution and the cause of liberating the Russian occupied Poland of his day, were the same moral and political principles spelled out in the American Declaration of Independence.

Those great principles made it possible for General Kosciuszko to have complete loyalty for the cause of both nations. These same moral and political principles bind the people of Poland and the people of the United States today.

History has the habit of repeating itself and sometimes the repeats in history are very happy ones. It is my fervent hope that American patriotism of our day will find a means of liberating Poland and restoring that once free and independent nation to her rightful place in the family of nations. I have no doubt that if we could inspire the world of today with our fundamental political beliefs as the signers of the American Declaration of Independence did in 1776, the liberation of Poland and the securing of a just and lasting peace for all the nations of the world would be a certainty.

It is a challenge to our traditions as well as to our moral responsibility, to awaken all the people of the world to the fact that human freedom and individual liberty will be secure only when all people of the world equally enjoy it.

General Kosciuszko stood for those same timeless moral and political principles and it is the clear duty of the people of the United States to stand up for those same principles. That is the great challenge of our time.

The Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the information of Members of Congress and of leaders of other branches of our Government, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times for February 8, 1956, entitled "The Natural Gas Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Senate passage of the natural gas bill throws the issue squarely into the lap of President Eisenhower. Approval of this measure taking independent producers of natural gas out from under effective Federal price regulation is, in our view, a severe defeat for the consumer. It is also a major victory for powerful interests in both parties that will profit from this overturning of a 1954 decision of the Supreme Court.

Aside from its economic implications, the interesting thing about this measure is that it cannot be laid unequivocally at the doorstep of either party, though its inspiration clearly comes from the Democratic representatives of the oil- and gas-rich central Southwest.

The bill passed the House last year by 209 to 203, with 86 Democrats for it and 136 against, and 123 Republicans for, 67 against. It passed the Senate this week by 53 votes to 38, with 22 Democrats for it to 24 against, and 31 Republicans for, 14 against. Leadership was provided last year by the Democratic Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, and this year by the Democratic leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON—both from Texas. Now it goes before a Republican President, who we hope will be moved to veto it if he can be convinced as we are that it grossly favors the interests of specific local groups as against the interests of the Nation as a whole.

It is generally agreed that regulation at the hands of public bodies is a necessity in the case of the distribution of natural gas to the consumer, and also in the case of the interstate transportation of the same product through a pipeline to the distributor. We fail to see the logic in refusing to extend this regulation—as existing law, according to the Supreme Court, said it should be extended—to the producer at the wellhead, who is intimately tied to the transporter and ultimately to the distributor. Congress has now decreed otherwise, and in the absence of a Presidential veto only experience will prove whether the major oil and gas producing companies will have a field day at the consumers' expense. If they do, they can be sure that the demand will arise for congressional reversal of Monday's vote.

Judging from the furious lobbying campaign that has been waged on behalf of this bill, it is obvious that it involves enormous economic stakes. One Senator has already suggested that a proponent of the bill had attempted to bribe him to the tune of a $2,500 campaign contribution. We are all for the promised investigation.

No doubt most of the proponents of the bill sincerely believe it is in conformity with good government practice as well as with expanding production of natural gas. We disagree, but we are sure the Republic will still stand even if the bill becomes law. However, its passage under Democratic leadership should take much of the steam out of the Democratic war cry of giveaway, and its passage with Republican votes should make the Republicans rather uneasy when next they approach the urban consumer.

Addresses of Andrew Roscoe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses by Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association and president of the Equitable Savings Loan Association. Both addresses were made at the annual meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association on January 30, 1956, at the Towers Hotel in Brooklyn. The first address was on the occasion of the presentation of a gold medal to Hon. Edward A. Richards, president of the East New York Savings Bank, and the second was on the occasion of the presentation of a scroll of honor to Col. Sidney H. Bingham:

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO HON. EDWARD A. RICHARDS

(Address by Andrew S. Roscoe)

It is our privilege today to welcome to Brooklyn's Legion of Honor a new member, the 26th.

The qualifications for membership in this illustrious group are many and exacting, but its most rigid demand is service to community and to neighbors, and fortunate is the group that finds such members.

The gold medal committee and the board of directors of the Downtown Brooklyn Association take pride in naming as the recipient of its annual gold medal, Judge Edward A. Richards.

Judge Richards is a native Brooklynite and graduate of our public schools. He

studied law at New York University and soon after was admitted to the bar of the State of New York. After practicing law in downtown Brooklyn he was elected a justice of the municipal court when only 28 years of age. Upon completion of his 10-year term, he was reelected to the second term, resigning 2 years later to accept the presidency of the East New York Savings Bank, a post he continues to occupy. While practicing law, he was a member of a prominent legal firm. One of his former partners is now chief judge of the New York State Court of Appeals; another partner will soon address this meeting.

Judge Richards must be a good banker, and indeed he is, for under his direction East New York Savings Bank has grown in resources and in service. He was an impelling force in efforts to have private enterprise assume a proper function in fulfilling the needs of returning veterans to the city's growing population. He assumed leadership in forming a corporation, consisting of his own and three other banks, that built Arlington Village for the accommodation of 210 families. With other bankers he was instrumental in developing the Concord Freeholders, Inc. and as president of the corporation, three 15-story apartment buildings were erected. In this endeavor and many others, he has indicated that private enterprise can and should serve community needs.

Judge Richards, we know, brings to his career a sense of duty and a sense of good will that probably came to him from deep religious convictions, for he is an active and lifelong member of the Episcopal faith and for many years has been the senior warden of Trinity Church in East New York and a member of the executive committee and a trustee of the estate belonging to the diocese of Long Island. He has devoted himself wholeheartedly to interfaith work and the range of his activity is indicated by the scroll presented to him in 1951 by the Brownsville Boys' Club for the outstanding work he did for the interfaith party, attended by 10,000 Brooklyn children. The list of his good services is indeed a long one and of great range. I could dwell at great length on his service to the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Red Cross, not only as a member of its board of directors, but in every working phase of this great organization. And, would time allow, I would like to tell you more about a great many of his other activities, including the Young Men's Christian Association, the East New York Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association, Boy Scouts of America, the Greater New York Fund, Beth El Hospital, the Brooklyn War Memorial, and many other community organizations which have honored him for his service.

Judge Richards, we are proud to recognize the enormous amount of work that you have done and we extend to you today, with warm friendship and deep sincerity, this expression of our high regard and esteem, as well as our everlasting gratitude for your devotion to the well-being of your neighbors and your community. Proudly we present to you this gold medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association for "most distinguished service for Brooklyn."

PRESENTATION OF SCROLL OF HONOR TO COL. SIDNEY H. BINGHAM

(Address by Andrew S. Roscoe)

The chief exceutive responsible for the continuous and safe operation of an oversized municipal transit system rarely hears a kindly word. So it is with the chairman of the Transit Commission and recent executive director and manager of the New York City Transit Authority, Col. Sidney H. Bingham.

A deecendant of William Hedley, who in 1812 built the first locomotive, the "Puffing Billy," it was natural that he should become a railroad man. And, he has been a railroad man all of his life, except when enlistment in the United States Army and service with the AEF interrupted his career for the duration of World War I, and in World War II, when Colonel Bingham served with distinction in the European theater of operations for 4 years. In 1946, he was appointed general superintendent of the transit system in charge of maintenance and operations, and in May 1947 was appointed a commissioner. He was designated chairman of the board of transportation on January 1, 1950; thus he became the first person appointed from the ranks to head our present system.

When the New York City Transit Authority was created in 1953, he became general manager and later was appointed executive director and general manager and served in this dual capacity until his retirement a few months ago.

Colonel Eingham is the recipient of many military decorations, the transit consultant of many cities throughout this country, Europe, Asia, and South America, and the designer and developer of many pieces of transit equipment that are now in use. We believe that after 40 years of service to the citizens of New York and the Nation, his achievements should be recognized with our gratitude.

It is therefore our great pleasure and honor to present to you, Col. Sidney H. Bingham, this scroll of honor, for the intelligent, faithful, honest, and diligent public service and leadership that have benefited the many millions who have lived, worked, and visited in this city during your long and distinguished career.

This scroll of honor says:

"The board of directors of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, Inc., award this certificate of honor to Sidney H. Bingham for his distinguished and eminent leadership as chariman of the New York City Board of Transportation, general manager and executive director of the New York City Transit Authority, and for his 40 years of devoted service in the field of public transportation in Greater New York and throughout the world."

Gas Bill Veto, the Public's Last Resort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Once Again Only the Veto Holds Hope For the Public," which was published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONCE AGAIN ONLY THE VETO HOLDS HOPE FOR THE PUBLIC

Six years ago Congress passed the Kerr bill which would exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal rate regulation. President Truman vetoed it and so it died.

Mr. Truman took a position on grim principle in spite of the heaviest of personal pressures. The bill's author Senator KERR of Oklahoma, was as close and warm a friend as the President had. He was also the most eloquent and untiring defender of Truman administration policies on the Senate floor and in the 1948 campaign. But Mr. Truman pointed out in his veto message:

"Under the peculiar characteristics of the business * * * there is clear possibility that competition will not be effective, at least in some cases, in holding prices to reasonable levels. * * * To remove the authority to regulate, as this bill would do, does not seem to be wise public policy."

Once again Congress has passed a bill to the same purpose. It was sponsored by Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas and MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and in the House by Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas. Once again, although bearing the names of Democratic Members of Congress, the bill won more Republican votes than Democratic. Once again it squeaked through the House by the narrowest of margins (6 votes in 1956 to 2 votes in 1950), and slightly larger margins in the Senate. And once again it goes to a President who stands as the last resort of protection for gas consumers against uncontrolled prices at the very source of the gas supply.

The great question is, of course, whether Mr. Eisenhower will see as clearly as did Mr. Truman the public danger of nonregulation for a commodity used in some 25 million homes and many thousands of industries. The same arguments which Mr. Truman found convincing have lost none of their truth and power since April 1950.

We confess a kind of bewilderment at these actions of Congress in granting special privilege to interests which bear the seeds of monopoly and exploitation. It seems almost a routine operation, when the Supreme Court holds that there is danger in monopoly, for the interests concerned to move in upon Congress to seek exemption from the plain law. The Kerr bill and the Fulbright-Harris bill are cases in point. There have been in recent memory the Bulwinkle bill, to exempt railroads from antitrust prosecution for rate agreements among themselves; the Mason bill to circumvent the Supreme Court and grant exemption to news-gathering agencies; the drive of the southeastern underwriters to get around the court decision that agreements on insurance rates were illegal. There is notably the Tidelands Oil case. Even in cases where Congress does not accede to the demands and override the Court, the vote is as close as a hairline.

This happens although the larger volume of argument, as in the case of the natural gas exemption, is plainly in behalf of the public. The greater tone of conviction is against exemptions. President Truman heard it and was moved against his personal inclinations. This time, it is gratifying that both Kentucky Senators voted for the people.

In practically every case the argument which seems most to impress Congress is that free enterprise will be impaired unless the exemption is given. Frequently, as in the natural gas debate, there is no substantial evidence to support this. The champions of exemption cry out that the search for new supplies will be stopped and incentive withered if the exemption from price control is not granted. The majority in Congress seems unconcerned at the very special privilege and incentive that already exist in the 27½ percent depletion allowance on income taxes given to the natural gas prospector. The majority voting on most of these drives for exemption overlook the petitions that come from local representatives of millions of people, as opposed to precious few of the hopeful exemptees—some 8,000 in the gas case, and these boiling down, when the truth is told, to some 20 to 40 major operators, none of whom are hurting in the financial nerve.

Even though it was his party whose votes in Congress put the gas bill over, and even though a special isolation surrounds Mr. Eisenhower that his predecessor never knew, there is still the hope that another veto may interpose to stop untrammelled license. It is the only chance now.

Address of Andrew S. Roscoe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association and president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, on the occasion of the dedication of the new building of the Institute of Design and Construction in Brooklyn, N. Y., on February 6, 1956:

ADDRESS OF ANDREW S. ROSCOE ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW BUILDING OF THE INSTITUTE OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION, BROOKLYN, FEBRUARY 6, 1956

Mr. Justice Giaccone, reverend sirs, Dr. Maurrillo, Director Vito Battista, Mr. Scervini, Chairman Cavallaro, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are assembled here today cherishing a common purpose. We dedicate more than a building on this occasion. This will be a building of builders, builders working with material and builders building men.

As we dedicate the edifice of an Institute for Design and Construction, we may invoke thoughts based on three premises. First, the material values generated by this building in our greater community and in our own downtown area. Then we may place even greater emphasis on the impact of the Institute of Design and Construction upon the livelihood and progress of its students and their careers, and last but foremost, let us devote our third premise to the great ethical values generated by this institution—ethical values which must be the first and the final instruments of survival in this world of atomic tension.

Brooklyn, the city of homes and churches and one of the greatest industrial towns of America, is at a crossroad. The percentage of industrial employment even in a period of full employment is smaller than formerly, and we are attributing this condition to the outgoing movement of industry. A closer and comparative analysis of this condition calls our attention to another cause. Many years ago the movement from the farm to the industrial city provided employment to a larger percentage of our people in the industrial group. Today, however, we no longer treat with two production groups only. We no longer consider the primary production group as consisting of men producing raw materials, men engaged in agriculture, mining, forestry and related fields, and the second group of production as consisting of people working in industry as the only two production groups. A tertiary production group provides services in disrtibuting the goods produced, furnishing transportation, financing, insurance, in medical health services, in government services and in teaching. This tertiary production group enjoys the highest income level; therefore, it attracts people from the farm as well as from industry. This tertiary group provided a solution to what years ago we thought a problem in employment arising out of the advancement of our technology. This tertiary group, today, employs the greatest percentage of the working population in America, and education, particularly specialized education, is qualifying men and women for services in this group. Even though we are losing some of our industries and although our industrial payrolls are but $650 million out of a family income of almost 5 billion in Brooklyn, the earning of our families engaged in this tertiary production group are providing not only the livelihood for most of our people but also through their purchasing power a ready market for the goods produced by our industries.

The edifice which houses the Institute of Design and Construction, in Brooklyn, represents additional evidence that Brooklyn is one of the greatest educational centers in the world. I maintain that Brooklyn is the greatest college town in the world. We have the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. We have Pratt Institute, St. John's University, Long Island University, Brooklyn Law School, State Medical College, the Community College, Brooklyn College of Pharmacy, St. Francis College, St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn College, Packer Collegiate Institute, and now a State-chartered Institute of Design and Construction.

Our American pattern is a class by itself from an economic, political, and social point of view. There is no parallel pattern in the world.

Our great American heritage is integrity, and integrity means wholeness and completeness of honesty. In the educational field a very practicable example of American integrity can be best exemplified by the recognition of pragmatic equivalence. This doctrine has enabled many of our institutions to start in a modest way to fill a great need. Another example of the practical application of American integrity in the educational field is the broadness of our institutions in making available adult education to all people without regard to race, color, or creed. There are no limits to the plane or horizon of American education.

I mention only 2 of these examples because the Institute of Design and Construction was built on these 2 premises, which, in turn, emanate from integrity. The students of this fine institution come here with high-school diplomas, college degrees, or the equivalent in experience and recognizable, special aptitudes. Most of them are adults eager to acquire education to enable them to build a better future.

My third premise concerns ethical values. The history of all great educational institutions is the history of the dedication and inspiration by a few, sacrificing heroes who work long and sincerely for a great goal. They establish the ethical standards of the institution at the very outset. The maintain these ethical standards as long as they survive. For standards of absolute honor are the most important ingredient in education. Day in and day out you must teach honesty of purpose and a sense of service to your community as well as a deep and abiding sense of duty to those who come to you for training. You will become a part of the great body of educational institutions in our great community. They are justly proud and internationally famous. This institution today faces an immense future. Your spirit of service, your imagination and your integrity will make this institute, I am sure, a solid asset not only to Brooklyn but to the Nation itself.

Professor Battista, members of the board of trustees and members of the faculty of the Institute of Design and Construction, let me tell you that I consider this occasion one of the important days in our modern Brooklyn history. For you have created an institute built on high ideals and hard work. This community is greatly in your debt. We will be happy to join with you in watching its progress and its growth.

Congratulations and best wishes to the founder and director of this splendid institute, Vito P. Battista.

A Message to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Message to the President," which was published in the Denver Post of February 9, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

To the PRESIDENT:

In your press conference on Wednesday you gave hope to millions of consumers of natural gas that you might veto the Harris-Fulbright bill which intends to remove producers of natural gas from effective Federal regulation.

You said you do not go along with the propagandists who claim the gas business is no different than the coal business and that if it is right to regulate gas it is equally right to regulate coal.

You pointed out, Mr. President, that the consumer who is attached to a gas line and has invested in gas appliances is in no position to switch to some other fuel if the price of gas, without effective regulation, becomes unreasonable.

We know, Mr. President, that you intend to study the Harris-Fulbright bill carefully. You will find the principal difference between the present gas act and the Harris-Fulbright bill is that the existing law requires that rates must be set to give the producer a "just and reasonable" profit whereas the new proposal provides for rates based on the so-called "reasonable market price" for gas.

There is a vast difference.

Why do gas producers object to being limited to just and reasonable profits? They say, Mr. President, that just and reasonable as interpreted by the Federal Power Commission means a return of only 6 percent or so on their investment and that, because of the risks they take, they must have greater returns than that if they are to explore for new fields.

As you know, Mr. President, gas producers are already granted special tax concessions in recognition of their risks. If they need still more incentives, either the Federal Power Commission or Congress could provide that, whereas 6 percent is a just and reasonable return for an electric utility, a return somewhat greater than that—perhaps 10 or 12 percent—is necessary for gas producers.

Of course, they claim that the limitation in the Harris-Fulbright bill which requires the reasonable market price for gas is ample protection for the consumer. Actually it is no protection at all.

What is the reasonable market price? Obviously, Mr. President, it is not the price which has been set by the Federal Power Commission to yield a just and reasonable profit. Instead, it is the price at which gas has been selling when it was not regulated—the price agreed upon when one man wants to sell gas and another wants to buy.

Normally, Mr. President, we rely on supply and demand of that kind to set fair prices automatically, but the natural-gas business is not normal by a long way. Since the war pipelines have spread miraculously to all parts of the country, creating tremendous new demands for gas. The supply has not

kept pace, and there is no indication that it can keep pace, no matter how high the profits of gas producers might go.

Under these conditions, natural-gas prices, where they have not been regulated, have gone up, up, up. In fields where gas formerly sold for 3 cents a thousand cubic feet prices have gone (without regulation) to 10, 12, 15, and even 20 cents.

These, Mr. President, are the unregulated "reasonable market prices" which gas producers want to use as a criterion for regulation. Some gas companies say, as you well know, that natural gas even at 20 cents at the wellhead is too cheap, and that the price should go on up until it is comparable to the cost of coal.

So the Harris-Fulbright bill has built-in features which will assure that prices can go no place but up, if you sign this legislation.

For example, the bill would require the Federal Power Commission to grant a gas rate which might be higher than the existing market price, provided that in return for the higher rate the purchaser got a promise of a supply of gas which he did not have before.

Of course, every time a buyer makes a new contract with a seller he gets a promise of gas he did not have before. The bill plainly contemplates that if gas in a certain field has been selling at 15 cents the Power Commission should approve a price of 16, 17, or perhaps 18 cents to a new buyer.

There is another neat gimmick in the Harris-Fulbright bill, Mr. President. It provides that a gas producer may get a price higher than the "reasonable market price," provided he made a contract for a specific and higher price before the bill was enacted into law.

No one knows how many contracts of that kind have been made during the many months that the bill has been under discussion and consideration.

We are sure, Mr. President, that a careful study of the bill will convince you that regulation on the basis of the amount needed to give the gas business a "just and reasonable" return should not be abandoned for a system which would recognize as "reasonable" any price producers have been able to get without regulation under conditions of woefully short supply.

Ninety-second Anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an address of Col. John J. Griffin, vice president of the First National Bank in St. Louis, at the annual meeting of the Union Veterans of the Civil War in commemoration of the Lincoln Gettysburg Address on November 16, 1955.

The address follows:

NINETY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

(Address of Col. John J. Griffin, vice president, First National Bank in St. Louis, at annual meeting Union Veterans of the Civil War, in commemoration of the Lincoln Gettysburg Address, November 16, 1955)

We are within the octave of the 92d anniversary of a very notable historic address delivered by he who exemplified everything that America stands for, President, Abraham Lincoln, and in keeping with the character of the man, the address is simple, short and humble. For 92 years it has been an example to the American people of the love and devotion that should be theirs for this great and glorious country of ours, a country devoted to the ideals and the principles of the dignity of man and his right to freedom.

As Lincoln stood there 92 years ago, we can close our eyes and almost hear him: "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Have any of you ever stopped long enough to take that little short paragraph, read it, study it, and become aware of what it means? A new Nation, a hope for the oppressed, a haven wherein those living under the pitiless iron fist of tyranny could find freedom and equality, and in this very first opening paragraph again we find evidence of the fact that the American people not only believed in God, but were willing to express that belief openly and publicly without fear, and then, even as today, there were those in the world seeking to destroy the right of man to worship his Creator. The right of man to live in equality. The right of man to enjoy the liberty that was his by inheritance, but in those days, they who would destroy it were not behind any Iron Curtain, they were in our own backyard, our own neighbors, our own people, divided and bent upon destroying each other. Today, there are those among us who would, if they could, divide and conquer, they who would use every method known not alone to man, but in many instances, methods, schemes and programs that seem to have had their very authorship in the depths of hell.

Ninety-two years ago we were engaged in a great Civil War testing whether a Nation conceived in liberty, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, could live. Mr. Lincoln went on to the second paragraph of his speech:

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this."

How well we can see the same principles attacked today. While it is true they have not openly and violently declared war upon us in our own land, nevertheless they are slowly, but surely laying the plans, so that when the opportune time comes, in their opinion, they can make of this a great battlefield, and let us not be stupid enough to be deceived by the hypocritical smiles or the pseudo handshake of friendship. Let us not forget what is behind that smile. Let us not forget the hand extended to us in friendship has been recently dyed crimson with the blood of innocent people; people whose only offense was to insist upon the right to liberty, the right to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience; the right to live as human beings, the right to the respect of the dignity of man, and today, millions and millions of them are lying in unmarked and unknown places, the victims of the ruthless, pitiless ruler with the iron fist of tyranny. They have felt the weight of it. And let us not forget that our indifference and neglect can bring to us the same destruction that the consecration to our principles brought to the innocent victims of the Communist rulers. They are not any different than they have been from the first day they took over. They live in violence, they rule by fear, they destroy that which opposes them. It is indeed unfortunate that too many of our people in this country cannot see this, cannot realize the end, cannot know the destiny that is theirs as they attempt to do the work of the Kremlin in the spreading of hates, unrest, and attempted destruction to this action to those who are active participants in bringing about the destruction of America, are the hundreds of thousands of our citizens who, through their indifference and neglect, bring great consolation to the leaders of the Kremlin because this indifference and neglect is an evidence to them of the fact that our system of government is decaying, so you can readily see and understand how you can do the work that would destroy us by being indifferent to or neglectful of the duties and obligations that you owe your government. Do not forget that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Again, let me repeat: Now is the accepted time for all free people to read the second paragraph of the simple, but ever-enduring speech of Lincoln, so that we may know, understand, and realize what it means, and as we do so, let us realize how the cemeteries have grown in 92 years, the hundreds of thousands of freemen who have dyed crimson every battlefield in the world with the blood of freemen as they baptized that land and consecrated it to the principles of liberty and freedom as we know and understand and enjoy them.

The third paragraph of the Lincoln talk, I think, is one that should bring home forcibly to us today the obligation that we owe to those who have died in order that we might live. Let us again quote one of the greatest of the great Americans, and let us picture him as he stands there—gaunt, serious, humble, and prayerful, bowed in trouble and grief, but a tower of strength in his faith and devotion to God and country.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work, which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Would it not be well for our American people to take this home and read it and study it; and analyze it, because it unquestionably places upon us the great debt that we owe to the hundreds of thousands of American boys, who tonight rest under the sod and under the dew with the blue canopy of heaven extending its fathomless depths over their patriotic and last resting place. As the great President tells us, they who lie there have consecrated that ground far more than any words of ours could do. Yes, they have dedicated it, they have hallowed it, and they have consecrated it, bringing home to each and every one of us a message that it is a sacred and a holy thing for one to die for one's country. I am sure, if they could cross that great divide where time blends with eternity and bring to you and I, a message, that message to you and I tonight would be that it is a sacred and holy thing for one to die for one's country, but it is just as sacred and just as holy for one to live for one's country. Further, I am sure they would say to us: We have died in order that you might live. Now let not our deaths be in vain. Let not our sacrifices be a mockery. Live so that you will prove worthy of the sacrifices that we have made, even to the supreme one, for you. Yes, we died in order that you might live, and our message to you tonight: Live so that our deaths will not have been in vain. Live for God and country.

Remember that just so long as you keep that flag flying in the protective shadow of the cross, just so long will America live.

I can find no more fitting way to close this address tonight in these days of strife and trouble, in these days of a cold war with millions of human beings behind iron curtains, millions of human beings are still held in prison camps, still shackled and bound in the chains of slavery, still looked upon as mere chattels of the government. Men, who are indexed, as you would the cattle in the fields, are inventoried, not as human beings, but as to how much they are worth to the government in dollars and cents. That condition, on a much larger scale, is the same principle that brought the Civil War, the principle that Lincoln so clearly enunciated as he said: "No nation can live half free and half slave," and I think if he were living today, he would say this world cannot long endure half free and half slave, and therefore, again, we must eventually come to grasp with a situation that if we do not correct it, it will destroy us.

I think the President's last, shortest, and best speech was the one wherein two ladies from Tennessee came before him seeking the release of their husbands, who were prisoners of war on Johnson's Island. They were put off on several occasions, and in each instance one of them was very insistent in impressing upon the President her husband was a religious man. The President ordered the release of these men, and then to one of the ladies he gave this advice, which I think was most appropriate, and I quote:

"You say your husband is a religious man; tell him when you meet him, that I say I am not much of a judge of religion, but that, in my opinion, the religion that sets men to rebel and fight against their Government, because, as they think, that Government does not sufficiently help some men to eat their bread in the sweat of other men's faces, is not the sort of religion upon which people can get to Heaven."

In closing, let me say to you what I have said on so many other occasions, and I again repeat them tonight. That never in the history of this world was there more need for a united American people. Let us not forget, in this crisis through which our Government is passing, our political and religious differences. Let us not quarrel with each other, but let each and every one exercise the right that is his as a free citizen to go down his side of the road with his own conscience, vote as he will, worship as he will, but when he comes upon the great national highway, that highway upon which all streets converge, that highway that leads to the safety and security of this Nation, then let him lay aside all of his differences with his fellow citizens in order that we might join in a united front as Americans. Then there should be no quarrel among any of us as we follow the cross emblematic of man's spiritual redemption and the Stars and Stripes, emblematic of man's political and material redemption, as we go forward to victory with the battle cry not alone on our lips, but better still in our hearts for God and country.

Every Free Election Makes Democracy Stronger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carmine De Sapio:

EVERY FREE ELECTION MAKES DEMOCRACY STRONGER

(By Carmine De Sapio)

It is not very easy these days to determine just why people become involved in the efforts and activities of one of the major political parties as against the other. I would guess that for the most part, the selection of a party, or dedication to its work, is the result of little more than pure chance. I have never researched the matter, but it is my feeling that most of us originally became Democrats because our parents were Democrats; or Republicans because our friends or neighbors were Republicans.

Certainly, there is no question that millions of people vote other than a straight party ticket, and other millions change their political allegiance from election to election. For as issues change—as platforms adjust themselves to the new problems of new eras, so do the votes of large groups of American citizens change. The farmer, more often than not, votes as a farmer, and supports the party which he feels represents his best interests as a farmer. The same is true of city workers, professionals, union leaders, businessmen, and most other segments of our population. And, I suppose, when you get down to basics, that is why both parties try to sell their programs to as large a cross-section of the American electorate as possible. And if it so happens that one of the parties, philosophically or even traditionally should happen to lean more sympathetically to one group in our population than to another, you may be sure that that party will make every effort to conceal the fact, at the same time that the opposing party makes every effort to proclaim it.

This, my friends, is where you—you who mold public opinion—have a unique and a rare opportunity. Your interests need not be partisan. Your efforts need not be aimed at the achievement of particular election results. Yours is the happy and constructive lot of being able to call the turns as you see them, without regard for political consequences.

Nor does this mean to suggest that politicians necessarily are completely selfish and biased. For although it is quite true that to the politician winning the election is paramount, it is equally true that, with very rare exception, the American politician is as patriotically devoted to his country as any good American would want to be.

But I would be the first to admit that politicians are perfectly fallible and that our political parties are nothing more or less than the men and women who constitute them, just as government is nothing more nor less than a reflection of the program and the attitude of the political parties in office.

And I suppose that so long as there is politics and so long as there are political parties there will be axes to grind and there will be biased views. There will be arguments and debate. There will be praise and vilification. There will be applause and derision. There will be accolade and insult. There will be confusion and contradiction.

But it also is true that so long as there are opposing political parties America will be great and strong.

We have witnessed a strange phenomenon in American politics in recent years—one which was brought into dramatic focus the other day by the President's state of the Union message. For in that message was defined what is at least an expressed acknowledgement on the part of the Republican Party of the need for social legislation and for recognition of the responsibility of Government to help those who are unable to help themselves.

I have heard many people in both parties characterize the President's state of the Union message as New Deal both in tone and in aim and as being in keeping with what has long been the Democratic philosophy of government. And in the absence of any evident rebellion from such Republican stalwarts as Senators WILLIAM E. JENNER, BARRY GOLDWATER, HOMER E. CAPEHART, and JOHN W. BRICKER, it is fair to conclude that the President set forth the new policy of the Grand Old Party. When you review this message in the light of statements of principles which have been made by the Republican legislative leaders in New York and by other Republican spokesmen throughout the country, you must come to the conclusion that if the Republicans haven't actually accepted a program of liberal government they at least believe that this is what the people want.

Now you and I know that our country can never be the long-term beneficiary of the kind of campaign strategy in which both parties seek to outpromise each other. And we know, too, that the two-party system loses much of its strength and meaning if both parties claim to seek the same thing, differing only on the question as to who could accomplish them quicker and better.

Our security as a Nation—indeed, the very safeguarding of our liberty—depends upon the acknowledgement and forthright declaration that there are fundamental differences between the two parties * * * differences in psychology, in philosophy, in tradition, in approach, in ideas and in objective.

Now I don't mean to suggest that the Democrats should claim a monopoly on social reform, any more than the Republicans have a right to claim a monopoly on sound economics. I don't believe that either party has an exclusive franchise on sincerity, on integrity, or on dedication.

But I do believe that the character of our governments—whether local, State, or Federal—should be appraised in terms of their achievements as well as in terms of the history, the backgrounds, and the philosophies of the men who administer these governments * * * to say nothing of the tradition of the particular party in office.

And just as honest debate and vocal difference of opinion is necessary to the preservation of our system of government, so is it extremely dangerous to take the myopic view, if you are a Democrat, that everything the Republicans do should be attacked * * * or if you are a Republican, that everything the Democrats do should be ridiculed.

Changing times bring changing challenges * * * and different needs. No party, no system, no government can survive the determination to stand still either in reflection on the glories of the past, or in fear of new experiments. We have no choice but to move forward, for it is impossible to stand still in today's moving world. Static thinking has no place in a dynamic era * * * and certainly in the age of the atom.

You are the last people in the world I need remind that we stand on the precipice of disaster. But, by the same token, we stand, too, on the threshold of new wonder, of new glory, of new advancement.

It is perfectly true—and has been true through the ages—that the people are possessed in infinite wisdom. They need only to be armed with the facts, to give expression to their inherent sense of humanity and to their natural instinct for being correct. This truism poses for you, my good friends—you who are gathered in this room today together with your counterparts throughout the country—a responsibility of incalculable magnitude.

The people read your writings and are influenced by what you say. They listen to your analyses and they accept your authority. They study our pictures and drawings and their judgments are formed. They look to you—as leaders in the arts—for objective guidance, for accurate portrayal and for honest leadership.

Whether or not the people obtain these is for your own consciences to decide. From politicians they get—as they expect—partisan propaganda. From the newspapers, from magazines, from radio, from television they expect—and should get—the unvarnished, the uncolored truth.

When the politician guesses incorrectly—when he fails to anticipate and understand the people's wishes—his mistake becomes graphically evident on election day. He is then faced with one or two alternatives. He can invite disaster for himself by seeking to impose his thinking on the people and hope to have better luck next time, or he can adjust his policies and his program to conform to the voter's wishes.

But he cannot lure public interest with a dramatic presentation which subtly conveys a particular viewpoint. He cannot attract an audience to his thinking through comic strips or entertaining columns or because he is a needed and necessary source of information on what is going on in the world. The politician cannot reach the voter every day with a cartoon that carries both interest and impact.

He is limited to the distribution of partisan literature or the delivery of partisan speeches. And he is almost always dependent upon you people to help get his message to the public. He can never hope to get into the homes and the minds and the hearts of the people every day as you do and even if he could, the chances are his message would be one-sided and slanted.

Now the question presents itself—are the editors and writers and commentators and artists to deny themselves the same right to human thought and emotion with which the politician should like everyone to believe he is possessed? Don't they have ideas and tastes and individuality of thought and opinion? The answer obviously is yes. But they have one other thing—they have an overbearingly profound responsibility as teachers of the people.

My friends, would you tolerate the partisan teaching of our children in the schools? And I ask aren't the people of letters, in fact the teachers of history in the classroom of the world?

Needless to say, it would be sheer folly to deny the right of editorial expression to any American, least of all to a person in the arts. But in your case, there is an added—an awesome—responsibility. It is for you to dispel confusion. It is for you to fulfill the right of the American people to know all of the facts, to know where they have been, where they are, and where they are going.

There is a distinction between exposition and explanation, as against interpretation and opinion. There is a world of difference between stating the facts and then expressing a judgment, and misstating or misemphasizing the facts in order to prove a judgment.

President Eisenhower, Governor Harriman, Mayor Wagner and other public officials everywhere will tell you how difficult it is to attract outstanding men and women to public service. The salaries are low; the hours are long; the work is hard. And instead of honor and respect and appreciation for their sacrifices, they live in constant fear of attack and vilification. Leonard Hall and Paul Butler and party leaders throughout the country know how difficult it is to attract men and women to political activity because the politician is depicted as a sinister, evil disciple of corruption and greed.

And yet, where would America be, where would the world be, without politics, without men and women who recognize that it is not enough for a citizen merely to cast his ballot, but rather that it is the duty of every citizen to be a part of and an influence upon his party and its decisions.

And just as our bad public officials, and bad politicians, and bad businessmen, and bad labor leaders and bad newspapermen should be exposed and turned out of positions of trust, so, too, should no group be maligned; no segment of our society be forced to carry the cross of the minority of mad-doers in its particular field.

I would strip the halo from the hypocrites and I would strip the mask from the phonies. But to condemn a politician or a party, either because of the wrongdoings of a few, or by the application of ancient history, is to condemn our American system of government.

I hope you will pardon the probable presumptuousness of what I say, and understand that when I suggest that some of those who have the responsibility for disseminating public knowledge may not be doing so with complete fairness, I allude to a small minority, the kind of minority which exists in my profession as well as in yours, and in all others.

But I feel as you must, that there is no place for politics-as-usual in these perilous times. Our children, their children and their descendants for generations to come will never forgive the mistake we make today, assuming that those mistakes do not foreclose the existence of future generations.

It is as unsound as it is precarious for our teachers—for you—to take the view in January of 1956 that whoever the Republicans nominate should be defeated, or that whoever the Democrats nominate will be no good. It is rather for all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—to agree on one simple principle, and that is that the most vital responsibility which both parties owe to America and to the world, is to nominate the best possible candidates for the overwhelmingly important office of President.

My friends, if both parties put forward the best possible candidates, the people will win the election.

The election campaign which we approach will be unprecedented in many ways, not the least of which will be in enthusiasm on the one hand, and in bitterness on the other. I am sure that none of us need fear the consequences of the campaign in terms of the future of our world position, because history has proved that every free election makes every democracy so much the stronger, at the same time that it brings to the world a new lesson in the meaning of freedom.

But we can dramatize this lesson at the same time that we render great public service by assuring that people will hear all sides of all questions in free and frank discussion.

In modern times, the complexion and character of election campaigns have changed to the point where both parties are very largely dependent upon radio and television for reaching the voters with their messages.

You people know better than I, how expensive this is. I read recently where the Republican Party has budgeted more than $8 million for radio and television alone, and this naturally places a similar onus on the Democratic Party, for it, too, must seek to reach the same number of people the same number of times.

Where do these vast sums of money come from? Obviously from the contributions of party supporters. And, needless to say, many of those who make substantial contributions to the party of their choice, expect to benefit in some manner. This benefit may be in the nature of an appointment to the cabinet or in some other form of favor and recognition.

The extent to which a political party is beholden to large contributors is the very extent of the weakness of our governmental structure. And that is why it may be well for us to consider the advisability of consolidating a large part of the public service time, which our radio and television networks so generously apportion throughout the year, to the period of an important campaign.

The less money the party feels compelled to spend, the less it will depend on large contributions and the more it can appeal to the general public for support. No person has the right to buy, and no group has the right to own a political party. No political leader should be beholden to a contributor, because our political parties belong only to the people and not to any individual or group of individuals.

And assuring this, too, my friends, becomes your responsibility, as well as the responsibility of our political leaders.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 7, the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual congressional banquet. One of the highlights of this occasion is the presentation of the Omar N. Bradley medal given each year to some deserving individual. This year, the presentation was made to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include his acceptance speech:

NATO—OUR GREATEST INSTRUMENT FOR PEACE

(Address by Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, at the annual congressional dinner, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington, D. C.)

Commander Murphy, honored Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, gratefully, I accept the Omar N. Bradley medal. I should like to be able to say that it is because of some distinguished service or conspicuous merit that this award has been made, but, unfortunately, that is not true. I have been the beneficiary of the inspirational leadership furnished first by General Eisenhower and then by General Ridgway, which left Allied Command Europe in a very viable state when I assumed its command. Next, I have had the assistance of millions of men and women of the armed services of the NATO nations. Also, the member governments have supported this alliance in magnificent fashion. The Members of the Congress of the United States, of whom a great number are present here, have given time and interest and support of a high order. I extend my deep appreciation to them. And, finally, Commander Murphy, the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have given us tremendous help.

You may not realize it but the pilgrimage of your organization to Europe in October-November of last year was a great contribution to our cause. I remember very well the ceremony at the Arc de Triumphe in Paris on November 11 where you made a splendid impact on the French people.

Incidentally, I had dinner last evening in Los Angeles with Gen. Omar Bradley, who asked me to extend his best wishes to the Veterans of Foreign Wars assembled here this evening. I am glad to report that he is in excellent health. He had a slight mishap the day before yesterday—he scored only an 83 in his golf game—an unusually high score for him.

I think on this almost-the-fifth anniversary of the date when General Eisenhower arrived in Europe to set up a headquarters for defense of the free world there, it is appropriate to review some elements of our progress, some of the problems which still face us, and some of the solutions.

When General Eisenhower came to Europe, the defenses of the free world were in a distressingly low condition. Prior to his ar-

rival, there had been a series of incidents: The Czechoslovakian coup, the Berlin blockade, and, finally, on the very day of his arrival, January 8, 1951, there was a depressing report from Korea. It seemed that it would only be a matter of weeks until the United Nations forces would be ejected from that peninsula. The atmosphere of Europe, and of the entire free world, was one of danger—almost despair.

When General Eisenhower surveyed his resources, he found that they were very, very low. But what was even worse, the resources he did have could not be used to implement a common strategy, because there was no such strategy.

I am pleased to be able to report now, 5 years later, that there is such a strategy, that there is an organization in being, and that if an attack should suddenly develop at this very moment, all of our commands know exactly what to do.

The resources themselves are approximately four times what they were at that time, but that, of course, does not give an answer to the question, "Is that good enough? Would we be able to repel successfully an all-out act of aggression tonight?" The answer, unfortunately, is "Probably not."

The Soviet might is increasing steadily, and when you consider the status of our defenses when we started, it would have required almost a miracle to be able to give an entirely favorable answer tonight. Our progress has been great, but it is not yet great enough.

We are facing today the largest aggregation of military power in the peacetime history of the world: Some 175 Soviet land divisions, nearly all of them good; some 20,000 operational aircraft. That is about the number of aircraft in 1951, but at that time 80 percent of them were piston-driven planes. Now, 80 percent of them are jets. Moreover, the Soviets are engaged in an all-out production program of the latest type of jets.

In the naval field, they have given high priority to submarines. There are now approximately 400 submarines in the Soviet Navy. That figure does not mean much until we recall that when the Germans started World War II on the 1st of September 1939, they had less than 75 submarines.

This, then, represents a very powerful force in being. In addition, the Soviets have made substantial progress in the nuclear field. It is also clear that they are giving great emphasis to their guided missile program.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Soviets published their sixth 5-year plan in which there is a heavy concentration once again in the war industries.

In 1946, Stalin announced a program for 1960 which he said would be enough to protect the country against what he called "all possible accidents." There are three items in that program which deserve a moment's attention. At that time, he said, "We will need 500 million tons of coal a year." In 1955, they reached the figure of 390 million tons, but they have increased the objective for 1960 to 593 million tons.

"In steel," Stalin said, "we need 60 million tons." Last year they produced 45 million tons, and they have upped their objective to 68 million tons for 1960. In case that does not impress us, we should bear in mind that in 1929 the Soviets had a steel production of only 5 million tons.

In oil, which was the third major element of his program, he said, "We need for 1960 a production of 60 million tons." Last year they already exceeded that with 70 million tons and they have upped their program now to 135 million tons.

Those are very formidable figures.

I do not want to leave the impression that everything the Soviets have tried to do has turned to success. That is not so. In the agricultural field, they have had great difficulty, and the indications are that these problems will continue. For example, last year, they had 8 million fewer head of cattle than they had in 1928, which was the year before the collective-farm system started. That is a very definite failure, which the Soviet leadership is trying to correct. They have also had major failures in connection with their grain programs.

All of these increases in Soviet industrial potential, all of this emphasis upon Soviet military might, is at the expense of the Soviet citizen. Today, in the Soviet Union a suit of clothes costs between 1,300 and 1,600 rubles. When one realizes that a painter or carpenter gets a salary of 700 rubles a month, you recognize the austerity of his living standards.

In case this might cause us to think that a revolution is likely in the Soviet Union—that we could look forward to a time when the populace would revolt—I feel that would be misguided, wishful thinking. The people are well disciplined, and they know no better way of life. The chances of a revolution are very slight. I feel that the Soviet Union is going to continue to make progress in its production goals.

Of course, they are having difficulties with the satellites. There again, though, they are making considerable progress in the armed forces. The satellite countries have 75 divisions, not all good ones by any means, and some 2,500 planes. They have a public relations problem with the satellite people, but they know that, and they are working on it. They are concentrating on the children through indoctrination and education on a long-term basis.

The Soviets feel that time is on their side and if they wait it out, they will have the strength for their system to prevail. Within the past year, there have been new indications that they have absolute confidence that their system will win in the end. With their ability to marshal scientific, technical, and economic resources under centralized direction—without regard to the wishes of the people—they constitute a very strong opponent. They have a leadership group of 6½ million Communists who are dedicated to their materialistic philosophy. They believe in it with all of their hearts and souls, and they are able to control easily the remaining 210 million people of the Soviet Union.

That tremendous strength is the reason why I say, as of now, we are probably not strong enough in Europe. I want to emphasize here, however, that I am talking about only one part of the problem; namely, Europe. That does not mean that we would lose a global war if it took place, because, as of today, we still have a very substantial advantage in long-range airpower. At the present stage of technological development, the offense in airpower has a very big advantage over the defense. To summarize, as of today, we have this situation: In Europe, we are not strong enough yet, but on a global basis we still have an advantage. How long we are going to retain that advantage is, of course, a speculative matter.

As for our defense in Europe, we expect to be able to give a positive answer to the question that I have posed after the German contribution is effective. We will have by the middle of 1959 some 12 German divisions, some 1,300 aircraft, and naval craft largely for use in the Baltic. When we reach that level, and if we can use atomic weapons, which we feel are an essential part of our armament, we then will be able to give reasonable assurance that we can defend Europe successfully against an all-out attack.

I do not want to give the impression that I am depressed over this situation, because I am not. We are actually further ahead than we thought we would be when we made our forecasts in those dark, dreary days in the early part of 1951.

I also want to make clear that I think that the next 5 years are probably going to be more difficult than the first 5 years. I say this because we are moving into an era where the battle for men's minds has become increasingly important, where the necessity for having unity among our own people, where the importance of their understanding of the issues, is absolutely vital. Basically, this gets down to a question of convincing the 450 million people in NATO to have confidence that this alliance can—and is the best way to—meet this threat.

We think—and that is the principle on which NATO was organized—that collective security is the only answer. Generally speaking, most people agree to that thesis. However, the great progress we have made has generated a confidence, which in turn has caused a certain relaxation of tension. These elements, coupled with certain changes in the immediate tactics of the Soviets, are creating difficulties for the free world. We are faced with the task of seeing to it that our people do not relax, but continue their support for this alliance so that it can continue effectively to prevent a war from taking place.

In that endeavor, the partnership of the United States is of supreme importance. Whether we like it or not, the mantle of world leadership has fallen upon our shoulders. This alliance will succeed, in large measure, in the degree to which we are able to exercise that leadership. Please know that the competition is tougher than ever before.

Take the most recent Soviet maneuver, which happened just a few days ago: Bulganin's response to President Eisenhower's letter is being circulated and broadcast all over the world now. The Soviets are working on the uncommitted billion among the 2½ billion people of the world. They are not concentrating on trying to win the 165 million people in the United States, or even the rest of the 450 million people of NATO. In this psychological struggle, we face very severe difficulties. As propaganda experts, they are masters. We are far behind them in getting our story told. Our effort is very small; theirs is a massive one, cleverly put over and it does produce results.

I am certain we can meet this challenge, but it will require a determination and a dedication on the part of the free world, and particularly on the part of the United States.

The Soviets get their unity by the gun-in-the-back method. We have to get ours through the more laborious processes of democracy. There are 15 nations in this alliance, all of them sovereign—and we want them that way—but it is time consuming and sometimes difficult to reach common programs.

Some Americans have the impression that the United States support of NATO—and I have actually heard this occasionally—is a type of charity. That is simply not true. We must be unmistakably clear that we need Europe just as much as it needs us. Our participation in this enterprise is a matter of our own survival. It is most important that we act in such a way that our allies know that their interests and ours are mutual.

I feel that if we are able to furnish encouragement to some of these countries which are having trouble, I am certain they are going to remain firm in spite of the tremendous pressures that the Soviets are applying to them.

Take one illustration, East Germany. This is Tuesday, the 7th. A week ago Saturday in Prague the Warsaw Pact powers met, and once again, Mr. Molotov, as he has done many times in the last year, issued a strong denunciation of NATO, charging that it is an aggressive organization. However, the Soviets introduced a new factor into this particular meeting—they admitted East Germany to the Warsaw Pact military command.

The East German forces, consisting of some 7 divisions and more than 100,000 men, have now been raised to the status of armed forces and operate under Marshal Koniev, whom I knew in Vienna in 1945. At this meeting, which ended last Saturday, they made a very shrewd maneuver. They said, "We feel that no German forces, be they East German or West German, should ever have atomic bombs." That is a clever play directed toward the West Germans to get them, who feel very exposed if a nuclear war should take place, gradually to assume a neutral attitude. If they should be successful in that endeavor, it would be very disadvantageous for our cause and for the West Germans. I do not think this maneuver will be successful. However, it demonstrates clearly the cleverness of their tactics, and the need of alertness on our part in the battle for men's minds. This is only one of a series of thrusts that the Soviets are making, all of great ingenuity.

If our people understand the issues; if they remain stout of heart I am certain we can succeed.

You may say that I am an optimist. I plead guilty to that charge, but I feel that I am more than an optimist. I feel that I have faith in our civilization, in our concept of religion, with their dedication to the dignity of the human individual.

I feel that we have the ability to approach these problems with an understanding and with a point of view which will definitely match the Soviet materialistic ideology.

I am confident that if we can preserve the unity which we have already developed, no power, however menacing, will be able to prevail against us.

It has been a great pleasure for me to be here this evening. In addition to the great honor of having received the Omar N. Bradley Medal, it gives me the opportunity to tell the members of Congress here and the Veterans of Foreign Wars how grateful we at SHAPE are for the visits they have made to Europe during the last year. These visits are tremendously helpful in assessing the problem that exists there, and in reassuring the people of Europe of our constancy in this alliance.

I want you to know that basically we feel this is your problem. We agree with Clemenceau, who said, "War is much too important to be entrusted to the generals." We are entrusting it to the Congressmen and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We turn the problem over to you and we shall be your willing servants, I assure you.

I extend an invitation to all of you, when you are in the European area, to visit our headquarters. We do not think we know all the answers to these problems. We are willing to take advice, criticism, be it constructive or destructive. The one thing we cannot stand is indifference. With your participation, I am absolutely certain that we are going to be successful in achieving a lasting and durable peace.

I thank you very much.

Stiffer Dope Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Picayune of February 7, 1956:

STIFFER DOPE PENALTIES

While there is no indication the President's Cabinet committee on illegal narcotics traffic is willing to go as far as a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in recommending the death penalty for smugglers and peddlers of dope in extreme cases, the five-department group did urge stiffer prison terms, more enforcement agents, and closer Federal-State coordination to combat dope addiction and supplying.

The group's recommendations particularly called for more severe maximum sentences for the commercial dope vendor. At the same time, the group proposed that addicts, whose crime is to obtain drugs for their own use, be considered as primarily a problem for treatment and rehabilitation.

Since the Federal Omnibus Narcotics Control Act of 1951 (the Boggs Act) was passed by Congress with emphasis on mandatory sentences against violators for repeated offenses, there is some evidence that peddlers are using young people with no conviction records. This development, with increased use of narcotics by teen-agers since the war, has raised requests for revision of the 1951 act. Congressman BOGGS has urged that first offenders be given mandatory sentences of at least 5 years. Present Federal law permits offenders to be put on probation or given suspended sentences. Some State laws permit judges to assess fines rather than prison sentences for first offenses. In the case of one State this penalty is fixed at not more than $100 or jail not exceeding 6 months, or both.

Present Federal laws call for the following maximum penalties: First offense, $2,000 and not less than 2 or more than 5 years; second offense, $2,000 and not less than 5 or more than 10 years; third or subsequent offense, $2,000 and not less than 10 or more than 20 years. In a bill introduced but not passed at the last session of Congress the penalties were greatly stiffened. The President's intergovernmental committee has made no specific proposals along this line. But it has agreed punishment needs to be stiffened to meet the illegal narcotics threat.

Good Man for a Rugged Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the President has reached into the city of Rochester for another big man to do another big job. He initially tapped Marion B. Folsom to serve, first as Under Secretary of the Treasury, and currently as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This week he has named Mr. Edward Peck Curtis, vice president of the Eastman Kodak Co., as a special assistant for aviation facilities planning. Mr. Curtis' vitally important task is to develop a plan to meet the Nation's requirement for aviation facilities in the light of the rapidly increasing use of our airways. The necessity for such a study is evident, and the choice of Mr. Curtis to direct it insures a cogent and comprehensive report.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of Sunday, February 12, with respect to this important appointment:

PRESIDENT TAPS GOOD MAN FOR TOUGH JOB

Appointment by President Eisenhower of a second Eastman Kodak executive to high position in the Government reflects high honor, of course, on the caliber of these Rochesterians. However, the task to which Edward Pack Curtis has been appointed is no mere position of honor. It is a tough job.

Just as he did when he tapped Marion Folsom for Government office, the President is reaching out for the best men he can find to accomplish the work. In this case the job entails getting American airports of all kinds ready for the jet age.

That is a simple way to state one of the most complex and important operations a man could take on. It includes everything from longer runways and new and better landing systems to the myriad human problems that are cropping up in aviation. Coincidentally, it was the subject of an editorial on this page not long ago.

There are now so many different kinds of planes, operating at speeds varying by hundreds of miles per hour, that this alone presents dozens of problems. Planes are being operated in great numbers by the military, by airlines, scheduled and unscheduled, by businessmen and by sport pilots. And all the different categories are disputing over their rights, real and alleged.

Military planes have long since gone to sonic speeds and faster, and within 2 or 3 years, airlines plan to do the same. Our airports, largely brought up to snuff for the old propeller planes by the beginning of the decade, are beginning to look outdated as they did 15 years ago.

This is a mere glimpse into what will confront Curtis when he gets to Washington. He has a brand new job, that of coordinating and speeding along the efforts to smooth out American aviation. From his days as one of the first American aces in World War I, through his service as executive assistant to the head of the Strategic Air Force, Gen. Tooey Spaatz, Curtis has been familiar with aviation. With the same courage he took into the air in his younger days, he has agreed to plunge up to his neck in today's aviation problems.

The importance to the Nation of this job is obvious. For the sake of us all, as well as his own, we wish Edward Curtis all possible luck in his latest assignment. The qualities aside from luck that he will need, he has. President Eisenhower has chosen a good man for a rugged project.

Dr. Harold R. Kurth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent eulogy that appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, of Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 12, 1956, concerning the late Dr. Harold R. Kurth. He was president of the Massachusetts Medical Association, and a leader of many other medical societies throughout the country and one who was a personal and intimate friend of mine for a great number of years. In fact, on my last two confinements at the Lawrence General Hospital, Dr. Kurth, was my personal physician and was most instrumental in restoring my good health

for which I will always be thankful for his careful, conscientious, and highly professional service.

In Greater Lawrence, Mass., Dr. Kurth will be a great loss, since he has rendered valuable medical service to people in all walks of life as a highly successful physician and surgeon. He has restored to many, many thousands their health and was of immense help to those who were invalids and others confined with incurable diseases.

Rich and poor alike had great respect for him as a lovable physician of the old school, active in the community life of Greater Lawrence, a willing worker with all the various charitable groups, contributing financially and otherwise to all worthwhile civic and religious endeavors.

He will be a great loss to his immediate family, and his friends, associates, and the people of our community for his excellent qualifications and untiring efforts in behalf of all of us.

The article follows:

A GREAT HEART STILLED

The funeral of a great surgeon was held yesterday. Local men and women representing diverse walks of life, and many from miles afar, came to bid farewell to Dr. Harold R. Kurth, who, at the age of 60 and in the prime of his life and career, succumbed on Tuesday to a coronary thrombosis.

Others of our neighbors passed away in the same week from the same cause. We cite the expiration of the life of Dr. Kurth with specific intent, not only because his departure was a great loss to our community, but, additionally, because it serves to illustrate the fact that no one among us is immune to heart disease—even persons who as medical men have been so closely associated with it for years.

Heart disease in its various forms is the greatest killer of them all. It is brought on in many instances by physical drive and mental pressures. All of us know this. Yet we continue to extend ourselves to the limit until that day comes when an overworked heart falters or stops completely.

Some survive such attacks. Provided they can adjust themselves to a slower tempo, they can be reasonably sure of a long and useful life. But there is no guarantee that we can come through it.

The only means by which medical science can one day proclaim that it has beaten heart disease is through an unrelenting crusade of study and research in our great university medical schools, in clinics, and in the laboratories where dedicated men and women strive to find the answers.

Few of us realize what study and research means. There are few persons in medicine who can afford to drop everything and just plain devote their lives and fortunes to attacking the causes of ailments of the heart. There are few who, from their own fortunes, can afford the vastly expensive laboratories and equipment and personnel necessary to a pursuance of this noble work.

Thus, the financial part of the crusade must come in good measure from the people. It is within their province to provide the funds essential—vital—to the perpetuation of this study and research. The medical scientists give of their stock-in-trade, time, and skill. The financial wherewithal must come from each of us.

We are now in the midst of February, the 12th part of a year set aside for the concentration of effort on the accumulation of these funds.

You have many avenues for giving. Find one and contribute to the continuation of this great work, the perhaps uncolorful but urgent campaign which is moving slowly but surely to its objective.

Progress is slow, but we are encouraged by the fact that, over the years, one after another of maladies which, in another time, were considered real threats to life, have been conquered or minimized. And there is every reason for the hope that in a generation ahead of us, the lifespan of mankind will be extended by years of expectancy by the minimizing of, or the eventual defeat of, diseases of the heart.

Genesee County's Outstanding Young Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Batavia, N. Y., has recently bestowed on Carl Yunker, a 32-year-old farm operator, the title of Genesee County's outstanding young farmer of 1955.

Mr. Yunker's record for industry, diligence and acumen as a farm operator is matched only by his notable contributions as a leader in his church and his community. His selection reflects credit on the junior chamber as well as on Mr. Yunker.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, an editorial from the Batavia Daily News about this outstanding resident of the 39th Congressional District.

YOUNG FARMER SHOWS THE WAY

Carl Yunker, 32-year-old farm operator, holds the title of Genesee County's outstanding young farmer of 1955.

It is an honor bestowed by the junior chamber of commerce through a selection by a special committee of agricultural leaders. As Genesee County's representative, the Elban is a prospect for State and national recognition.

A résumé of Mr. Yunker's activities is edifying. His skill and success at farming are portrayed in the fact that he has seen his investment increase from a net worth of $911 in 1948 to $22,560 today.

That, in itself, would seem to be an operation that would consume all of his time. Over and above this he is credited with being a spearhead in the new farm bureau organization. He is president of the Western New York Holstein Club, a director of the Conesus Milk Producers Cooperative, director of the Dairy Council of the Niagara Frontier, a county committeeman for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Mr. Yunker has likewise served as elder of the Elba Presbyterian Church, vice president of a Sunday school class and adviser, with his wife, of the Youth Fellowship.

This is a distinguished record, a tribute to his interest not only in agriculture but also to his community and his friends.

It is not often enough that there is pause to reflect on how dependent the rest of us are on people engaged in agriculture.

The junior chamber of commerce has wisely taken this shortcoming in hand. Such undertakings as this serve to make better neighbors of the so-called city folks and those who till the soil, a most desired goal.

What the Gas Bill Will Cost New Yorkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the information of Members of Congress and of leaders of other branches of our Government, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Post for February 8, 1956, entitled "What the Natural Gas Bill Will Cost New Yorkers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE NATURAL GAS BILL WILL COST NEW YORKERS

(By William H. Rudy)

Only President Eisenhower's signature on the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill is needed to open the door to a $1-million-a-month increase in the metropolitan area's gas bill.

The utilities concede a price increase is on the way.

"It's our belief that the cost of gas is bound to inch up," a spokesman for the Consolidated Edison Co. told the Post.

It will be a Big Inch, according to all indications, for when the bill becomes law there will be no regulatory body to keep the price of natural gas from going as high as the traffic will bear.

The magniture of the forthcoming price increase can be predicted from these figures:

In 1952, the price of natural gas at the wellhead ran from 7 to 10 cents per thousand cubic feet. As late as 1954 it was 10 to 12 cents. The current figure runs from 17 to 21 cents.

Even under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission the producing industry was talking about 25 cents per thousand cubic feet, and one leading producer has gone on record as thinking of 40 cents within a few years.

Every cent of these prospective increases will be passed on to the consumer. There is nothing to stop passing them on and indeed, there is little alternative to passing them on.

The three big units of the booming natural-gas industry are the producing, the transporting, and the distributing.

The FPC still regulates the interstate transporters—the pipelines.

The Public Service Commission here still regulates the distributors—Con Edison, Brooklyn Union, Long Island Lighting, Brooklyn Borough, and Kings County Lighting.

But without price control at the wellhead, the FPC and PSC powers are all but useless.

Here's the way a price increase at the source reaches the New York consumer, flowing along as swiftly as the gas itself.

Most of the metropolitan area's natural gas arrives in pipelines of the Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co. Transcon buys it in Texas or Louisiana, with the price in Louisiana somewhat higher on the average than in Texas.

Once the protection of the FPC is removed by the signing of the Harris-Fulbright bill, there is nothing to prevent the producer in Texas or Louisiana or Mississippi from raising his price to the figure he thinks he can get.

If the pipelines have to pay 2 or 5 or 10 cents more per 1,000 cubic feet they need

only apply to the FPC to charge 2 or 5 or 10 cents more to Con Edison or the other distributing companies. The FPC has little choice but to approve it.

Once Con Edison, for example, gets its gas at 2 or 5 or 10 cents more per 1,000 cubic feet it can, under a purchased gas adjustment agreement reached with the PSC 2 years ago, pass along the increase to the consumer.

The PSC, in turn, has little choice but to approve.

These is, in the Harris-Fulbright bill, one sop thrown to the consumer. The FPC is allowed to limit the pipeline corporations from paying more than a reasonable market price for the gas at the wellhead.

In the opinion of State regulatory bodies, this provision is worthless.

If most producers in an oilfield are charging 12 cents, for example, an independent attempting to charge 17 cents might be considered unreasonable. But if all the producers raise to 17, then that is the going rate and therefore reasonable.

Another factor operating toward higher and higher costs is the escalation or favored-party clause in virtually all producer-pipeline contracts. Says the PSC:

"Under these clauses the price paid at every wellhead skyrockets automatically whenever an additional source of supply is tapped at a higher price. Thus, one purchase of an infinitesimal amount of gas can and often does establish a uniform so-called market price for an entire area and under these bootstrap clauses the fluctuation can only be upward, never downward."

Inclusion of the reasonable market price in the Harris-Fulbright bill only gives administrative sanction to charging all the market will bear, says the PSC.

The PSC, which has been a party to all recent rate increase applications before the FPC which would affect this area, says flatly of rate increases:

"The end does not appear to be in sight."

There is a gloomy prospect for the nearly 175,000 homeowners who use gas for heating in the city, Long Island and Westchester, and the 2,250,000 other consumers who use gas for other purposes.

Because of the many variables such as the intensity of the winter cold, the size of the house, the efficiency of the insulation, no exact figure can be reached on the amount of gas needed to heat a house. But an average figure for a one-family house is about 15,000 cubic feet.

A 5-cent price boost—a conservative figure under present expectation—would increase each residential bill 75 cents a month.

Home heating alone, a small part of overall gas consumption, will cost New Yorkers $125,000 a month more once prices increase.

In still another way, higher gas prices at the well can make snowballing prices here.

Con Edison, for example, is able to buy its natural gas from Transcon for a relatively low price, paying presently about 34 cents per 1,000 cubic feet while some upstate utilities pay as much as 51 cents. Con Edison is able to do this because it takes a steady flow of gas 365 days a year, and what it does not use in warm periods for heating, it uses for manufacturing electricity.

"A rise of only a matter of pennies will make it uneconomical to use this extra gas," an industry spokesman says, "and a utility may not be able to take a steady flow day in and day out. This, of course, would mean a higher price, for the transporter can't regulate the size of his pipeline. It's cheaper for him to operate at full capacity."

The producers made much during argument for the Harris-Fulbright bill for the need of freedom to drill exploratory wells.

"That's a phony," say the experts. "Wells are drilled for oil, not gas. Up until the last war they flared the gas at the wells, just burned it off."

So the natural gas customer will pay for the drilling of more oil wells.

World Statesmen Join in Woodrow Wilson Centennial Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an extract from a recent issue of the Newsletter of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission containing the statements of several European statesmen who were associated with Mr. Wilson in his great work for world peace.

The extract follows:

BONCOUR SAYS WILSON POINTED ONLY SURE WAY

The Honorable J. Paul-Boncour, who represented France at the League, said:

"For myself, and I think for all the veterans of the 1914 war, the name of Woodrow Wilson is associated with the unforgettable date of November 11, 1918, when the bugles of all the armies sounded the 'cease fire' along the length of a battlefront which had stood almost intact for 4 long years of suffering and death.

"We had fought so that this should be the war to end all wars and, thanks to the voice of Wilson coming to us from across the Atlantic, that great hope spread around the world. The League of Nations, composed of free and equal sovereign countries, committing themselves to combat the aggressor, whoever it might be, was the surest guaranty of a collective security, the only valid way, the only way capable of preventing war.

"Alas, his noble candor was scorned at the diplomatic tables. His dream was mutilated. He returned to his own country only to see his proposals rejected by his own countrymen. He died like a King Lear, persecuted by his own daughters.

"Vincent Auriol, who was himself a great president of the Republic, went during his visit to America in 1925, to meditate at Mr. Wilson's tomb in the Cathedral at St. Albans, Washington. Knowing my fondness for this great man, he sent me a postcard of the tomb, saying that he had placed a wreath in my behalf.

"I look upon this card and recall this memory while in my turn I pay homage to the 100th anniversary of Wilson's birth."

SWISS VIEW CENTENNIAL AS WORLDWIDE EVENT

William E. Rappard, Swiss educator and Statesman who was director of the Mandates Section, had frequent interviews with Wilson regarding the actual setting up of the League in Geneva. He stated:

"The centennial of the late Woodrow Wilson, which is to be celebrated in 1956, is primarily, but not only, an American event. The statesmanlike qualities which President Wilson displayed, particularly during and after the First World War, make of him a figure to whom grateful reverence is due by lovers of peace the world over.

"We in Switzerland have many reasons for looking upon him as a benefactor of our country. In the first place, it was doubtless due in no small measure to his personal intervention that we were spared the famine which threatened us in 1917. Secondly, it was clearly due to his insistence that Geneva was chosen and, against the opposition of several of his allies, maintained as the seat of the League of Nations. Thirdly, and I should say principally, we in the small Alpine republic in the heart of Europe look upon him as the main champion of the democratic and liberal ideals of peace which the world owes to the political philosophy he consistently and courageously expounded and defended.

EX-CENTRAL EUROPEANS CALL WILSON LIBERATOR

Dr. Bogumil Vosnjak, chairman of the Central-Eastern European Woodrow Wilson Committee, released the following statement concerning the centennial:

"The historical role of Woodrow Wilson in the liberation of nations which lived until 1918 under the rule of the Hapsburgs is often neglected.

"The committee was founded October 15, 1955, in Washington, D. C. Its members are representatives of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia now in exile.

"The committee will not only participate in the centenary of Woodrow Wilson but has also the task to destroy the Communist legend that the liberation of these countries in 1918 was a consequence of the Russian October revolution in 1917 and not of the efforts of these nations themselves as also of the political and diplomatical assistance of the United States of America."

Chauncey W. Reed: Soldier, Patriot, Statesman

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep regret over the passing of our former colleague, CHAUNCEY W. REED. To his widow and children I extend my profound sympathy.

It was my privilege to know CHAUNCEY REED quite intimately and I have always been proud to claim him as a summer constituent. He and his famly spent the summer vacation months at Powers Lake in Kenosha County, which is within my congressional district. I know from information that has come to me that CHAUNCEY did considerable electioneering in my behalf with the residents in that area, all of whom were greatly attached to him because of his kindly manner and sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, CHAUNCEY W. REED was indeed a soldier, patriot and statesman. He, like many of us, lost no time in enlisting for service in World War I with the high objective of making the world safe for democracy. He served with distinction in that war as a member of that famous 86th Division. Upon his return to civilian life he helped to organize and was the first commander of the

Naperville Post, No. 43, of the American Legion. On the national level he continued to serve with the Forty and Eight. Thus he helped to firmly establish the American Legion in his own community. While so engaged he was elected State's attorney in DuPage County as a Republican. He served the Illinois State Republican Committee for 8 years and was elected to the 74th Congress and each succeeding Congress since that time.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who served with CHAUNCEY W. REED know how consecrated he was to the responsibilities of that great committee, House Judiciary. We shall miss him from our ranks but we know that he has left his imprint upon this body.

Mr. Speaker, I have lost a personal friend who on many occasions has upon my request given me sound counsel and advice.

Distribution of Surplus Government Property for Educational and Public Health Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a press release and report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the education and health benefits derived during 1955 under Public Law 61 which I had the honor to introduce and subject to detailed hearings.

The report shows that real property in the amount of $17,924,167 and personal property amounting to $165,464,872 was transferred to needy educational and health institutions during the year. It is gratifying to note that good, usable surplus property which would have brought but a few cents on the dollar, if sold, is going to our institutions in such volume at the time of real need:

Surplus Federal property for which the Government had paid $183,389,039 was made available to the States for educational and public-health purposes during 1955 by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Real property accounted for $17,924,167, and personal property $165,464,872.

Secretary Marion B. Folsom announced the year-end totals simultaneously with his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus-property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Total acquisition costs of surplus property made available during the fourth quarter of 1955 (October 1 through December 30) amounted to $49,176,777. Real property had cost the Federal Government $3,519,994 and personal property $45,656,783.

During the 5-year period 1951–55, personal property that had cost the Federal Government $469,939,218 has been distributed to the States. Included were such items as motor vehicles, furniture, tools, motion picture projectors, laboratory equipment, and school and office supplies.

Real property (buildings and land) distributed to the States during the same period originally cost the Government $49,087,479. Property transferred to the States includes school and hospital building sites, buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing, motor vehicles, hospital, school and office furniture, hand and machine tools, motion picture projectors, laboratory equipment, and school and office supplies.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Personal property made available for distribution to and real property disposed of to educational and public health institutions Oct. 1 through Dec. 30, 1955 (acquisition cost)

(In accordance with sec. 5, Public Law 61, 84th Cong. (H. R. 3322), McCormack bill)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$45,656,783	$3,519,994	$49,176,777
Alabama	1,117,222	123,052	1,240,274
Arizona	474,401		474,401
Arkansas	484,782	10,900	495,682
California	4,425,161	224,384	4,649,545
Colorado	481,432		481,432
Connecticut	336,637		336,637
Delaware	292,219		292,219
Florida	1,050,397		1,050,397
Georgia	895,878	6,190	902,068
Idaho			
Illinois	1,852,795		1,852,795
Indiana	1,457,576	11,424	1,469,000
Iowa	673,781	34,344	708,125
Kansas	495,183		495,183
Kentucky	752,769	25,480	778,249
Louisiana	1,534,639		1,534,639
Maine	302,712		302,712
Maryland	1,088,074	799,233	1,887,307
Massachusetts	1,437,449		1,437,449
Michigan	1,164,253	109,622	1,273,875
Minnesota	992,985		992,985
Mississippi	804,427	647,375	1,451,802
Missouri	1,497,289	48,438	1,545,727
Montana	156,238	120	156,358
Nebraska	585,745	100,256	686,001
Nevada	638		638
New Hampshire	354,570		354,570
New Jersey	483,645	2,057	485,702
New Mexico	234,888	140,761	375,649
New York	2,642,181		2,642,181
North Carolina	1,819,678		1,819,678
North Dakota	109,389	142,903	252,292
Ohio	1,677,769	37,185	1,714,954
Oklahoma	640,938	151,218	792,156
Oregon	995,805		995,805
Pennsylvania	1,215,628		1,215,628
Rhode Island	189,927		189,927
South Carolina	579,249		579,249
South Dakota	402,985	598,231	1,001,216
Tennessee	1,255,283	180	1,255,463
Texas	1,940,332	129,626	2,069,958
Utah	605,715		605,715
Vermont	176,255		176,255
Virginia	1,650,380		1,650,380
Washington	1,017,851	176,515	1,194,366
West Virginia	930,189		930,189
Wisconsin	966,701		966,701
Wyoming	132,795		132,795
Alaska	203,571	500	204,071
District of Columbia	252,840		252,840
Hawaii	366,232		366,232
Puerto Rico	454,506		454,506
Virgin Islands	2,799		2,799

Laudable Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Eastman Kodak Co., of Rochester, N. Y., has recently designated Good Friday as a paid holiday for its employees, and St. Augustine Memorial Post, Catholic War Veterans, has presented a scroll to the company in recognition of this enlightened and laudable step. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, the wording of the scroll:

St. Augustine's Memorial Post 1122 Catholic War Veterans of America commends the Eastman Kodak Co., of Rochester, N. Y., for designating Good Friday as an annual paid holiday for its employees. A deserved world renown for distinguished service to the community, to the Nation, and to the world, in time of peace and in time of strife, in the fields of industry, education, recreation, and social welfare, is, thus enhanced by this positive and powerful encouragement to increased reverence and respect for spiritual truths, upon which human welfare and a stable society must ultimately rest. "Not by bread alone can man live" was uttered by the Saviour of men, as one of many truths to which He bore witness and lent deathless vigor by his deed of imperishable memory on that day which Christian men have come to love and reverence as Good Friday.

Problems of Our Family Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I will not now consume the time of the House but, with leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter I recently received from one of the good farm women in my district. I earnestly request my colleagues, particularly those of you from large city districts who may have no personal familiarity with the problems of our family farmers, to read it in the quiet of your offices. I assure you that this eloquent story is not the isolated portrayal of the troubles of a single family, but that it graphically describes a constantly increasing and spreading condition.

I do not know whether the Secretary of Agriculture will read this or not, but I want to most emphatically remind him and you that March 1 is a critical date in the farm communities of my State, and while we debate here and in the Senate as to the best method to help our farmers, large numbers of them are being ruined while we talk. Time is short and I appeal to the Secretary to immediately use his present authority to prevent further unnecessary suffering. Here is the letter to which I refer:

SAVANNAH, MO., *February 6, 1956.*
Congressman WILLIAM HULL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I saw a program on television one night last week that I'd like to tell you about. Maybe you saw it. I hope so. It was about the closing out farm sale of Dale Peterson, Corning, Iowa. I didn't know what it was about and started to shut it off when I discovered it was a farm sale. We have attended several sales so I was curious more than anything else.

Also I was waiting for my husband to come home. He drives a Fillmore school bus. Had taken the basketball team to a neighboring town to play. I thought if he

could only see this. Then I started taking notes to tell him about it.

They sold a scoop shovel for $3.50 that had cost $6.25, milk cows cost about $235 and sold for $100. Hogs sold for about one-half of what it had cost him to raise them. I cried while it was going on, because he was taking such a loss. He came home from Korea and started farming in 1946.

They talked over the fence to three men who live near Corning in Iowa. They disagreed about whose fault it was and on what should be done to help farmers, etc. Visited a wheat farmer in Washington State. Talked to bankers in Iowa who said they couldn't loan farmers any more money because some couldn't even pay interest this last fall. Saw Wisconsin dairy men. Several different ones. All had the same story, were operating and continuing to lose money. Just skipped around over the country.

After a station break Mr. E. T. Benson came on to tell what he thought of what he had just seen. I was so glad to have a chance to see him and hear him speak. Have heard a lot about him and thought I'd have a chance to make up my own mind as to whether I thought he was the kind of man to have as Secretary of Agriculture.

The very first thing he did was laugh about the closing out sale he had just seen. Said, "I hope you folks won't take that little scene serious. Actually there's very few closing out sales or foreclosures as they're called. When they do quit its mostly the little inefficient farmer who doesn't know how to farm or only has 160 acres of land.

Now I know the difference between a closing out sale and a foreclosing sale. But I wonder if he does. Sometimes a farmer has a closing out sale to quit of his own accord, such as ill health. Sometimes it may be because he has to sell out and try to pay what he owes instead of having someone sell him out. There's a lot of difference to my way of thinking.

I couldn't tell you the rest of his speech because I was so mad to think he had the nerve to get up and talk like that. I knew then and there he couldn't possibly understand our problems. My husband came home then and I told him about the program. I wanted to write Benson right then, but Forest talked me out of it. It was late and I was too upset to write anyhow. Didn't think it would do any good if he didn't already know what was going on here on the farm.

We met you several years ago at the tobacco warehouse in Weston, Mo. Was with Mr. and Mrs. Parker Horseman who I know to be friends of yours. We met you again later when you made your campaign speech at Fillmore. We were with Mr. and Mrs. Harold Ramsey that time. Also know J. C. and Ruth McClain are friends of yours. So that is why I feel like I know you. Would like to tell you our own personal problem. I saw two other names in the Savannah Reporter, our local paper. They are Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS. Will also write Secretary Benson when I write them.

Now here is what I would like to tell you. We rent 160 acres. Have lived here 8 years. Since 1948. In the spring of 1950 our house burned with all our personal belongings. We were away from home at the time and didn't save a thing. We had a little insurance. Friends and relatives helped us all they could. We are very thankful for all they did and always will be. We bought what we had to have to start housekeeping again. We had borrowed money to get our farm seeds, alfalfa, red clover, and seed corn. They were in a storeroom and burned in the fire. We went in debt again for more seed. After we paid part of our bills that fall we couldn't pay our rent. Our landladies were very good. We promised to pay the rent and some on a note in 1951. That year we lost most all our spring pigs and still needed things for the house. Paid only part of what we had promised to. In 1953 we had dry weather and a few grasshoppers. Same in 1954 only more grasshoppers. Even worse last fall, 1955. We have hauled water since last May for household use and every summer for 6 years. Used a neighbors water wagon and tank. Four others used it, too. We own 1 now and 3 others are using it. We are now hauling water for stock and everything.

We thought of quitting last fall a year ago. Decided it was too much of a loss to quit. Besides we've never done any other work. Have farmed all our lives and like living on the farm. We decided to go on 1 more year. Last fall, 1955, we were worse off than ever. Owe for gasoline, oil, repairs on machinery, our doctor and last year's seed. Just about everything you can think of as well as back rent. Up until the time the house burned we were able to manage as well as anyone else.

On the surface it looks as if we are doing all right. But we we keep getting bills. Some threatening us if we don't pay immediately. Others are very patient. Keep reminding us how much we owe though. We would like to pay everyone every cent we do owe. My husband has worried himself sick. Has stomach ulcers and is never well. You know after so long a time it is easy to think what is the use of working all day and late hours and not get ahead.

We talked to a lawyer and he advised us to try one more year and pray for a better crop season. We can't sell out and pay everyone. We can't and don't want our landladies to foreclose and not get all we owe them. So what are we going to do? We've signed a contract for 1956 and made a lot more promises that we truly hope to keep. We can't go on and we can't quit. I know there're lots more like us and some who owe more than we do. Just little inefficient farmers on 160 acres. Last week our Savannah Reporter had a notice in the wants ads saying write to Secretary Benson if you were thinking of having a foreclosure sale. Well, what is he going to do about it? If we quit and work elsewhere we'll be taking someone else's job.

That's why Dale Peterson's closing out sale hit me so hard. And why it hurt so to have Benson laugh it off and try to say it wasn't happening.

Now I'm not complaining about the low prices altogether. It's prices, grasshoppers, and the drought combined that have me down.

I'm not in favor of high prices like we have had in the past accompanied by war. My brother served in Korea. We spent many anxious hours while he was away. God answered our prayers and sent him home. We have friends though near and far who lost someone close. They paid a far greater price for the high prices we received for our farm goods than we did. I don't ever want to see that repeated.

I'm not blaming Benson and the Republican administration for the low prices, although I believe anyone can do as good a job as Benson is doing. I don't think anyone should blame the Democrats who were in before either. Oh, yes, I can hear you Democrats saying, "She doesn't remember when Hoover was in and the other depression. Well, I most certainly do! I very well remember that! I can also hear Republicans saying the Democrats caused the last war. Well, I think Roosevelt was one of the greatest Presidents we'll ever have. Not because of his politics but because he was a great man and could see ahead. The low prices following war are a normal trend but why can't there be a middle price that we can expect the year round?

My parents are very good Republicans as were all my grandparents. I heard the Democrats cussed and discussed very much when I was a kid. In fact, I used to wonder what they were until I was old enough to know they were one side of a political argument. My husband and his family are most all Democrats. So I've heard their side 20 years. I made up my mind to vote for the man best fitted for his job not because of his political status, but because of his ability.

I don't know what you can do or are doing to help us all, but I do know its a very serious matter and not something to be joked about as Mr. Benson seemed to be doing.

Thank you for reading this. I'd like very much to hear from you.

Sincerely,

MRS. FOREST ELIFRITS.

The Moral Strength of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader on February 3, 1956.

The editorial follows:

THE MORAL STRENGTH OF WOODROW WILSON

This is the centennial year of Woodrow Wilson's birth. The State of Virginia, in whose city of Staunton he was born, and the people of the United States are now turning again to this 28th President and 8th and last Virginia-born occupant of the White House, to see what kind of a man he was.

The passing years have blurred the world that Woodrow Wilson knew until it is almost beyond recognition. Historians, looking back at the Wilson era, have pointed to serious errors he made. What seemed right in 1917 and 1919 has sometimes been found not to have been so right after all.

Yet this much is true: This Virginian was a man who profoundly influenced the course of American and world history. And this is true, too: He was a good and great man.

Much has been done already to honor him. The Presbyterian manse in which he was born in Staunton has become a national shrine. A commemorative stamp bearing his portrait has been issued. Churches throughout the Commonwealth have observed his memory. A Town Meeting of the Air broadcast has been staged at Mary Baldwin College, in Staunton.

Much more is planned by the various memorial commissions—the Memorial Foundation and the National Centennial Commission headed by Maj. Gen. E. Walton Opie, of Staunton, and the very active Virginia Centennial Commission headed by Delegate George Cochran. On February 21 former United States Senator Tom Connally will address a joint session of the General Assembly. The week of April 21–29 will feature a host of events. In July a Woodrow Wilson pageant will be staged. On Armistice Day next November his life and personality will be the theme, and on December 28, his birthday, other memorial observances will be held.

Elsewhere in the Nation, Wilson's memory will likewise be honored. The Library of Congress has published an impressive number of its Journal of Acquisitions devoted to Wilson's papers. Most of the States of the Union plan memorial observances, too.

In these times of much public and private confusion and international wrangling, the memory of Woodrow Wilson is particular-

ly green. For here was a man of irreproachable character, a thoughtful statesman and a magnetic political figure who gave the Nation lofty leadership in peace and in war. The achievement of Woodrow Wilson during his first term of office, the bold correction of abuses and farseeing implementation of needed political and social reform, represents a presidential record of high accomplishment.

His wartime leadership, his willingness to guide his country into full acceptance of its responsibilities, placed him in the foremost ranks of America's great Chief Executives. If he guessed unwisely and figured wrongly in his plans for the peace that followed, still he acted with high intentions and gave the free world a picture it still honors, of an America possessed of humanitarian zeal and deep democratic faith. Our foreign policy is still drawing upon the moral capital given it by Woodrow Wilson.

Those Silent Workers for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who work, hope, and pray for peace, it comes as a heartening lift and we are filled with admiration for that splendid group of unheralded women who, in their silent, steadfast way, are earning for you and for me that peace for which we yearn.

I commend to the attention of all, an article appearing in the Kernel, a newspaper in my district, entitled "America's Strength." Truly this is America's strength, and her hope, this powerhouse of prayer generated by these women who are working for the one membership that really counts, God. Unless that long-standing application for membership in the U. N. is approved, we cannot expect peace. We are finding out that we cannot go it alone.

The article follows:

AMERICA'S STRENGTH

Last Saturday taught us that the strength of America is not in her factories, her jets, her armaments, her Yankee ingenuity, her way with machinery.

Her strength lies in the soft determination of women like Dorothea Terwilliger, Mrs. William White, and Margaret O'Regan, three Freeport housewives.

A cruel wind whistled down Pine Street last Saturday, an early morning wind that drove through wool to ache its way into the bone; to set in that bone and defy normal heat and scalding cups of coffee to oust it. It was that kind of a winter's morning.

The children, like all children, didn't know it was cold. The three ladies looked frozen too, but they bustled around, making sure that all preparations for transportation to the U. N. were attended to, every last child loaded, 110 of them, plus chaperons. After the heated buses left, they joined the blue Kernel photographer and reporter for a quick, thawing cup of coffee before getting into their own cars and following the procession.

We wondered at the energy of these typical Long Island housewives, and asked just what there was about the united prayer for the United Nations movement that caused them to give so much of their time to the cause. Dorothy Terwilliger, an attractive mother, spoke for the group.

"We are going to the meditation room of the United Nations and, with the children, we will pray that God will guide the minds and actions of the delegates. We believe that unless God is brought into the U. N.—and we don't feel that he has been invited so far—the workings of that body will come to naught."

Sincerity shone in the faces of the three as they told about their work, sending thousands of letters to delegations, receiving assurances from other American and European countries that they, too, were glad to join the United States in the request for invocation at the beginning of each session; a prayer aloud for divine guidance instead of the minute of silence that precedes each session.

Said Mrs. White: "The present 'minute of silence' is a minute of mockery. As quasi-hosts (and this means that we pick up the biggest part of the tab) we certainly ought to be accorded the courtesy of an opening prayer at the beginning of each session."

The reason the Kernel is solidly behind the "United Prayer for the United Nations" movement is that it has no paid staff, no headquarters, and it does not accept cash donations. The thousands of letters sent out so far have been typed and mimeographed by the ladies and friends all over the country. Right now the crying need is for stationery, either printed or plain, stamps, typewriter ribbons and mimeograph supplies and machines. These supplies, plus the energy of these Freeport housewives, will be used to help the work of God, used to insure the world against the flaming holocaust of the hydrogen bomb.

The insurance won't be in the form of man-made pacts or the rumblings of statesmen who have grown away from the needs of the people. It won't be in faster jets, more powerful explosives, larger armies, bigger factories.

It will be insurance written by the Great Underwriter in the head office, upstairs. The actual forms are being filled in down here by his agents, the Mesdames Terwilliger, White, and O'Regan. Good policies, always paid promptly and in full, written with love for their fellow man in every line.

If you want to help this work, call this paper and we'll tell you what you can do to help this good cause along.

To make the delegations to the U. N. aware of the "grassroots" movement to admit God to the U. N., the U. P. for U. N. movement in Freeport has mailed 50 copies of last week's issue of the Kernel to 50 foreign delegations. The Freeporters fear that the delegations, living and staying in Manhattan, are not aware that the backbone of America is in her villages, towns, and suburbs—and that the thinking in the city of New York is not always the thinking of the rest—the real—America.

Invitation to a Heart Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a facetious mood, I am inserting at this point an invitation to all Members to join the Coronary Club. The membership requirements follow:

THE CORONARY CLUB—MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS

1. Your job comes first; personal considerations are secondary.
2. Go to the office evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.
3. Take the briefcase home on the evenings when you do not go to the office. This provides an opportunity to review completely all the troubles and worries of the day.
4. Never say "No" to a request—always say "Yes."
5. Accept all invitations to meetings, banquets, committees, etc.
6. Do not eat a restful, relaxing meal—always plan a conference for the meal hour.
7. It's a poor policy to take all the vacation time which is provided for you.
8. Fishing, hunting, golf, bowling, pool, billiards, cards, gardening, etc. are a waste of time.
9. Never delegate responsibility to others—carry the entire load at all times.
10. If your work calls for traveling—work all day and drive all night to make your appointment for the next morning.

Another Smear Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, February 13, 1956:

MCKAY ANSWERS PEARSON

Mr. Drew Pearson asserted in a column published February 9 in the Washington Post and Times Herald that Lloyd Bohlke of Prosser, Wash., was fired from the Kennewick Irrigation District by Bureau of Reclamation officials and replaced by Van E. Nutley at $10,000 annually.

Please be informed that Mr. Bohlke is not, and never has been, an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Nutley has been a career employee of the Bureau of Reclamation for 20 years. He is chief of the Field of Engineering Office of the Bureau for the Kennewick Division.

The Kennewick Irrigation District is an independent organization of water users who contract with the Federal Government for repayment of the cost of a share of the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project. The Bureau of Reclamation has no jurisdiction over the Kennewick Irrigation District nor are District employees on the payroll of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Recently the director of the Kennewick Irrigation District approached the Bureau of Reclamation, requesting the services of Mr. Nutley. Because of his career status, Mr. Nutley was reluctant to leave the Federal service. However, because of his experience on construction of the Kennewick Division, it was recognized that he would be of particular value to the Kennewick Irrigation District in its operation.

Accordingly, he has been granted a 6 months' leave of absence without pay from the Federal payroll to enter the services of the Kennewick Irrigation District.

The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are not informed as to whom he replaced or why.

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of Interior.

Genuine Cause for United States Alarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thought-provoking article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, under date of January 30, 1956.

The future welfare of our Nation may well depend upon an adequate supply of trained engineers, mathematicians, and scientists, and surely we can ill afford to fall behind other nations in the training of our young men and young women in science and engineering.

The article follows:

GENUINE CAUSE FOR UNITED STATES ALARM—SOVIET FORGING WEAPONS OF BRAINS AS AMERICANS LAG IN SCIENCE STUDY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

What we call "cold war" and the Russians call "coexistence" is going to last for a long time. It is a struggle, waged from positions of military strength on both sides with the paradoxical understanding that military weapons will not be used. The weapons are, instead, a factor contributing to the political strength and influence of each of the rivals. The real conflict is the political, economic and ideological struggle of each to expand its global influence at the cost of the other.

One factor in this struggle is industrial and technological capacity. Here the West is in the lead, but the Soviets are catching up, with the firm intention to equal and surpass the United States within a decade or so.

In this competition conceivably the primary factor is education. And here there is genuine cause for American alarm.

Previously I have described Russian secondary education with its enormous disciplines.

Not long ago Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and others concerned with American technological progress again revealed the deficits of American education. We are seriously short of students trained in science and engineering. The reason lies in our high schools, where students do not even have the opportunity to discover whether scientific studies appeal to them "because courses are either not available, or are taught by instructors doubling in other subjects," and (the comment is mine) such courses are not compulsory.

In 1950 only 4 percent of American high school students were studying physics, 7 percent chemistry, 27 percent algebra, and 13 percent geometry.

In contrast, in 1900, the percentage of such students was from 2 to 6 percent higher.

In more startling contrast, these subjects, elementary to all further scientific-technological training, are compulory in the Soviet Union for 100 percent of students, and begin in the seventh grade.

Russian education is continuous through 10 grades. Anything but progressive, it is, apparently, modeled on the system that prevailed under the Tsars, and which within the limited population it reached—by no means confined to the aristocracy—produced superb intelligences. Now, available to everyone—with the exception of rural communities to which the 10 years course has not yet been wholly extended—it is an education for an elite of brains, developed by effort and ambition, which the student either encompasses or flunks out of, into schools for the retarded, or into the ranks of manual labor.

I am not recommending this system for America. But we must face up to the fact that the attempt to educate everybody is progressing to the point of educating nobody in the knowledges fundamental to work requiring strict, intellectual disciplines.

Sixty years ago a high-school diploma testified that its possessor had an elementary knowledge of algebra, geometry, physics, chemistry, one antique and one modern foreign language; could speak and write his own language grammatically; give a somewhat coherent account of at least American history; had read and competently reviewed at least a few of the outstanding English-language classics; and had passed extensive examinations—not of the quiz-kid variety—with a minimum mark of 75.

Today possession of a high-school diploma may not assure knowledge beyond that once transmitted before the sixth grade. The intellectually ambitious student is pulled down to the level of the stupid and lazy.

In any rivalry and in all fields of victory goes to the nations that produce the better brains. Brains are developed only by effort and intellectual disciplines. If education progressively abandons the studies that demand these, everybody may be able to read and write (after a fashion) and nobody be able to think. Then we shall be finished.

Revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following statement regarding revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act:

STATEMENT FROM CONGRESSMAN ALVIN M. BENTLEY, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN

I have received a letter dated January 17, 1956, from Mr. Saul Grossman, executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born and enclosing a resolution concerning the McCarran-Walter act. The resolution apparently supports Gov. G. Mennen Williams in his demand for the repeal of the act and calls on Michigan's congressional delegation to sign a discharge petition to force H. R. 501 (a bill for repeal) out of committee.

I have said before and wish to repeat that I do favor certain revisions (not repeal) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I have also attempted to caution those who sincerely desire to change this law to be careful of the company they keep. This warning is specifically designated against individuals such as Mr. Grossman.

According to the public records of the un-American Activities Committee, Grossman has been named by witnesses testifying under oath as having attended conferences of the Michigan Communist Party, Communist Party schools, and as having been an active member of the party itself. When called before the committee, he took the fifth amendment and was voted by the House of Representatives in contempt of Congress in 1952. In 1953 he was indicted for contempt by a Federal grand jury on 3 counts and, in December, was found guilty on 1 count by the United States district court for the District of Columbia. The United States Court of Appeals reversed this conviction only last month.

The Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has not been cited. It is understood, however, to have cooperated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born which was cited by the Attorney General in 1948 as subversive and Communist. Following his indictment, Grossman was publicly supported by the Civil Rights Congress which was also cited as subversive in 1948.

In view of the foregoing, I am certain that those persons or organizations who wish to repeal or modify the McCarran-Walter act will give Mr. Grossman and the Michigan Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born the consideration which they deserve. The support of such persons and organizations can, in my opinion, only endanger the chance of amending or improving the legislation in question.

Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting editorial that appeared in the Boston Pilot, February 11, 1956:

A HERO'S LEGACY

The test of real greatness is often measured in the use that we make of our misfortunes. Personal human tragedy and an experience of death are for some people crushing events which seem to bring men to the end of a road from which there is no escaping, to smother them in a sorrow beyond all human enduring. And yet for others even the most trying incidents serve as a renewal of faith and a rededication to cherished ideals. For these the darker the night the more they see the glory of the distant stars. Sorrow is a sure separator, setting the weak apart from the strong.

During World War II a young United States Navy flier, like American boys everywhere, went gallantly to war in the service of his country; he carried that combination of duty and daring ever characteristic of American fighting men so much admired by our allies and so much feared by our enemies. His name was Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., a son of one of Boston's best-known families, and a name already conspicuous in patriotic service. From one flight he was destined not to return; in valor and courage he made the total sacrifice for his country.

In the years that have passed, the memory of this young hero has not in any measure been forgotten and in the days ahead it will shine brighter with each passing hour. His family has established in his name a foundation which, faithful to his own willing spirit, distributes in expanding largesse, financial aid to worthy causes. In the proper sense of true charity, it concerns itself notably with the handicapped and the infirm, with those who are, in fact, unable to do very much for themselves. It assists the young and the old, the troubled and the reclaimed, the school and the church. Some funds push back the research frontiers of science, others set the

hand of human compassion on the brow of the suffering. Every area of human life, it seems, feels in some manner the tender ministrations of a hero's memory.

Surely all of this is a tremendous tribute to a young man who in the full promise of his youth offered his life for his country. It is also, however, an immensely gracious gesture which reveals the character of a great Christian family. For members of this family, even in tragedy, the hand of Providence is the hand of God, and no power on earth can bring them to forget his loving sovereignty. From the blessings which he has bestowed upon them they are eager to pass on a benediction to others.

No one will fail to see some significance too, in the fact that the Kennedy Foundation has consistently channeled its benefactions through the organized charities and projects of the church. This in no manner limits its dispersal in the community, since any observer will see at once that the institutions assisted care for people of every religious and racial background. What it does, however, is to make plain that these are no mere philanthropies, scattered about as one might scatter an excess of abundance, but acts of kindness rooted in religious and spiritual motivations. There can surely be a world of difference even in the same act when the reasons that move to action are themselves widely separated. The Lord himself reminded us that our motives are of first importance, offering his divine reward to those "who give a cup of cold water in my name." When each charity, from faithful hearts, carries with it the sign and the seal of Christ's church, who can begin to estimate its heavenly reward?

In all of this we must see, too, an obvious enconomium for the zealous archbishop of Boston. No citizen of our city, indeed no citizen of our Nation, but knows that there is a heart on fire with the willingness to work for others, to wear himself out so literally in assisting the less fortunate. To give so generous an aid to the archbishop's many charities is to share in the blessings and prayers which each day are offered for his intentions. In joining the charity of a great Christian family with the zeal of a farseeing churchman, the entire community is enriched while the memory of a youthful hero is eternally enshrined.

Bryan Laymen's Prayer Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each Friday morning, businessmen, bankers, merchants, and men from all walks of life gather for the purpose of conducting a spiritual gathering.

Mr. C. D. Yancy, principal of the Carver Elementary School, of Bryan, addressed such a group on Friday, December 2, and I had the pleasure of being in attendance. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include his address:

SPEECH MADE AT THE BRYAN AND BRAZOS COUNTY LAYMEN PRAYER MEETING

(By C. D. Yancy)

"Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart,
Be acceptable in Thy sight, Oh Lord my strength and redeemer."

To Judge Barron and members of this Brazos County laymen early morning prayer group, may I assure you that I accepted this invitation with a deep sense of humility and gratitude, humble because I feel unworthy of so great a task, grateful not because of the benefits you will receive from me but for the great source of inspiration and encouragement you give me.

I am going to ask you to think with me for a few minutes on this topic, Where do we live? I would like to use as my scripture a portion of the 10th verse of the 14th chapter of the Gospel recorded by St. Luke: "Friend, go up higher."

The house of life has three stories. There is also a basement, Freud tells us. A few still live on the first floor, most of us live on the second, and some have climbed to the third. But all of us run up and down the stairs. On the first floor we live by instinct, impulse, and force. On the second we live by obligation, moral law, and the beginning of reason. On the third floor we live by insight. Either we think as we live or live as we think.

Naturalists tell us that there is a certain kind of fish in central Africa which varies in size according to the size of the lake in which it lives. The same species being larger or smaller in proportion to the dimensions of their habitat. Men are larger or smaller in proportion to their scale of thought and this too determines the floor of life in which he lives.

On the first floor life is a struggle and the fittest survive. If a man is strong enough to take a business away from another man he does it, "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Brother if anyone is caught in the very act of doing wrong, you who are spiritual in the spirit of gentleness, must set him right; each of you continuing to think of yourself for you may be tempted too. For if a man think himself to be something when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. (Gal. 6: 1-3.) Therefore we must attempt to manage our thoughts for someone has so wittily stated that: we are not what we think we are. But what we think, we are that.

On the first floor it is the law of the jungle, where the weakest go down and the swiftest win the race. Desire, not duty is the rule. Life is ruthless; no quarter is asked or given. Believe it or not, much of our life, more than we are willing to admit even in what we call civilization is lived on this level.

It is on this floor we forget that it was no accident that "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God" is the first commandment. That when a person has a deep love for God he is constantly strengthened by it. It removes unnecessary fear. A missionary in Africa says that most of the people with whom he works are filled with fears. They are afraid of all kinds of spirits, of a world of magic and superstition. But, says the missionary, we teach them that behind all these seemingly dangerous objects is a great loving father who controls all and is always good. It is possible through belief to move upward. How do people learn to love? Not merely by having a lesson on it. Not by self-discipline; we do not tighten our belts stick out our chins and say, "Now I am going to love God if it kills me." We learn to love by first being loved and responding to it. Then we must let God love others through us. Only the love of God can make us go straight. If we refuse to allow that love to become the controlling force in our lives there is no hope to keep us from acting out wild impulses or living on the first floor or even in the basement. It is in the basement where selfishness is shown. For a man wrapped up in himself makes a very, very small package.

But on the second floor man begins to live by reason and moral law. There is a stop in the mind. As John Woolman would say; something which arrests him and compels him to pass moral judgment on his thought and acts. He sees dimly that selfishness is short thinking and defeats itself. At this level we live and let live if only to protect ourselves. At this level we admit our character defects—we learn to face ourselves and say—Thou ailest there, and there, and there. Too often we think of sin as an event, while actually it is always a personal act or decision. We need to ask ourselves why did I tell that lie—or fail in that habit or refuse that job I was asked to do? What is wrong with my character that I have failed in that respect? It takes courage to face our real defects and to ask God to change us. We know that in the very act of prayer we must accept responsibility for making decisions. There is no escaping conflict—in other words we cannot save our faces and save our souls (or grow spiritually) at the same time.

But there is a third floor in the house of life, to which the other two lead if we do not stop. We must climb up to it; there is no elevator nor escalators—there the outlook is wider and the light whiter—we can see more clearly. Here it is not enough to live and let live; we learn to live and help live. On this level of gracious living a man sees that human values are far more precious than money values. He will not use men to make money. He will use money to make men. At this level we learn to act in the present. My present obligation is to live today well. Sir William Osler, the great physician, used to talk about living in day-tight compartments. He said we need to undress our souls at night like we do our bodies. This is what Christians have always done. But he does so as to acknowledge at any given time that we are under God and must depend on His help. It is on this floor that we must be in the proper management of our lives one day at a time.

Just before Jesus went back to the Father, Peter pointed to John and said, "Master, what about this man? What do you want him to do?" Jesus was almost severe when He answered, in effect, "If it is My will that he stay on the earth until I come again, what is that to you? You follow Me for yourself" (John 21: 20-23). It is the old story of thinking of finding God's will in a long-range life program. What He says to us is that if we would find His will it must be in the proper management of our lives one day at a time.

The tragedy is that so many of us live part of our lives on one floor and part on another floor. Sir John Browning wrote the stately and beloved hymn, In the Cross of Christ I Glory—yet the same man forced opium on the Chinese people at the point of British guns. He wrote his hymn on one floor of the house but went downstairs to do his dirty work.

The man on the first floor of life is a wild man, untamed—like a shadow he cries out with the wind. Just when we think we have him downed, covered with a layer of reason, he breaks out in hatred and egoistic cruelty. We can never be sure when we will make some disruption and calamity. The question is, "Where do we live?" Downstairs or upstairs? In the basement where instinct gropes in the dark, or on the third floor, where at night we can see the great stars obey the will of God?

Can't you hear a sweet, still voice constantly saying to us, "Friend, go up higher." Leave the low-vaulted past, the dim twilight, and climb to the upper room, where are celebrated mysteries of the life that is life indeed.

"If I have wounded any heart today,
If I have walked in my own willful way,
If I have caused anyone to go astray,
Dear Lord forgive."

Al Sarena Mine Claims Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Based on Law, the Democrats Have Poor Issue in Al Sarena Mine Claims Case," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, of February 8, 1956, together with a letter dated February 8, from Wendell Wyatt, chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Oregon to the editor of the Oregonian, at Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1955.

EDITOR, THE OREGONIAN,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: In his letter to the editor, Senator MURRAY accuses me of being unfair to Senator KEFAUVER and a certain Democrat leader because I wrote:

"To settle the issue, the committee should hear testimony from the owners of Al Sarena (most of whom are Democrats), former Interior Secretary Chapman, Senator KEFAUVER (who interceded for the applicants), and the Democrat leader who offered to handle the Al Sarena application for a $10,000 fee."

This is a strange accusation to come from a Senator whose subcommittee attempted to blacken the reputation of President Eisenhower, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, Congressman Harris Ellsworth, of Oregon, and the owners of the Al Sarena mining claims.

Instead of calling any of the suggested witnesses, the committee Tuesday voted to end the Al Sarena inquiry after months of severe but unfounded accusations uttered by Democrat members of the committee.

One must conclude that the committee agreed with the testimony it received from Interior Under Secretary Clarence Davis. He pointed out that the patents were granted in accordance with law and the Department had no recourse but to obey the law.

Another conclusion would be that the hearings were ended to avoid embarrassing Democrats, such as Senator KEFAUVER, Congressman BOYKIN, of Alabama (who also interceded for the Al Sarena applicants), and the certain leader who offered to represent the claimant for a $10,000 fee.

Is it too much to ask that a first order of business for a Republican Congress in 1957 should be to complete the Al Sarena inquiry by calling witnesses to explain actions taken during the Truman regime.

It would be amusing, if not so tragic, that a Democrat Senator protests my suggestion that the Al Sarena inquiry include testimony from two Democrats involved in a transaction questioned by Democrats.

Apparently there is a double standard of political morality: "If we investigate you and intimate that your party is in the wrong, that is good politics, but it's unfair if you drag my fellow party members into the inquiry. Further, it is misrepretentation if you attempt to set the record straight."

Sincerely,

WENDALL WYATT,
Chairman, Republican State Central Committee of Oregon.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of February 8, 1956]

BASED ON LAW, THE DEMOCRATS HAVE POOR ISSUE IN AL SARENA MINE CLAIMS CASE

In a closed session of the joint Senate-House committee investigating the grant of mining patents on 15 claims to Al Sarena Mines, Inc., it was voted to discontinue the inquiry.

Senator SCOTT, Democrat, North Carolina, who was heading the investigation said the decision was made after the McDonald brothers, Herbert and Charles, who are principal officers in the firm which developed the claims in Jackson County, informed him they did not wish to testify.

It is unfortunate the McDonald brothers made this decision even though it is doubtful they could have added to the voluminous record in the case. However, they could have made clear their views and intentions in regard to the 23 claims which have been under attack of Democrats since the patents were granted by Undersecretary of Interior Clarence Davis on January 6, 1954. And, it could be added: If the Democrats were seriously interested in getting to the bottom of the Al Sarena case, why didn't they subpena the McDonald brothers?

It seems evident that the issue will still be a topic in the coming political campaigns, principally because the investigation arrived at no conclusion, a fate of many other congressional investigations.

Mr. Davis, then solicitor for interior, granted the patents on the basis of the 1872 mining laws, and in our opinion had no alternative if the laws were to be upheld.

A series of articles on the Al Sarena mines by reporter Dan Wyant of this newspaper prior to the 1954 elections proved to us that Al Sarena is a legitimate effort to develop a mining operation. That there is a great conflict of interest because of timber on the claims cannot be questioned. But the fact that there is timber valued in the neighborhood of $100,000 on the claims (the Forest Service estimated it at $77,000 on the 15 contested claims in 1950), unfortunately is not material to the issue.

And even under the revision of the mining laws adopted in July 1955, the miner who proves a patent gets title to any surface rights. Although the laws have been improved, they are not tight enough to preserve the timber on national forest lands, which in many cases may be more valuable than the minerals underground.

An important point in the Al Sarena case is evidence that the firm spent at least as much, and probably more in developing the mining claims than there is dollar value of timber on the claims. It is not reasonable to believe that the firm would have done this if its only objective was to get the timber, as some Democrats have charged.

If the Democrats wished to prove that the Interior Department was wrong in granting the patents on the 15 disputed claims, their case would have to rest on two main points:

1. That the A. W. Williams Co. of Mobile, Ala., which performed the crucial assays (with approval of the United States Bureau of Mines and the mining firm) was incompetent or was in collusion with the interested parties. This was not done.

2. Testimony by competent mining engineers, who have investigated the Al Sarena claims, that the claims are not worth trying to develop. This was not done.

The testimony of Mr. Davis before the investigating committee was the most lucid and the most damaging to Democrat contentions. Mr. Davis, in regard to the law governing approval of mining claims, said:

"It is to the effect that if the miner has filed on these claims, made improvements and discovered minerals in such quantities to justify him in further exploration and development, the claims should be patented.

"It is not required that the mine should be fully developed or should have established a history of profitable operation. Neither is the timber on mining claims material to the allowance of the claim."

Considered in evidence by Mr. Davis, before allowing patents, were letters from four competent mining engineers from different parts of the country who had viewed the Al Sarena claims. The letters were from Alan Kissock & Co. of New York, G. Cleveland Taylor of Sacramento, Calif., D. Ford McCormick of Eagle Point, Oreg., and Col. J. E. Morrison of the United States Army, a registered engineer in Oregon. All of them noted the widespread mineralization in that area. The comment of Mr. Taylor, a registered mineral surveyor, are representative.

"I surveyed the claims for patent spending some 2 to 3 months on the ground, covering the area quite thoroughly, both on the surface and underground. My conclusion was that a patent should be granted to the applicants. This has been for many years what might well be termed a legitimate mining operation. * * * The present owners, who acquired the rights of the original locators, have always regarded the mine as a broad-zone and have predicated their activities on that theory. * * * Of course, a great deal of sympathetic drilling or other additional development work is necessary to actually prove a large low-grade ore deposit, but there appears to be sufficient widespread mineralization to prompt a prudent man to carry out such development."

Although it is almost certain that the Democrats will continue to make this a campaign issue, it is our opinion they have a poor example to make their point. We don't like the idea that forest lands go with mining patents, but until Congress changes our laws it will be difficult to overcome.

Hon. John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following well deserved editorial that appeared in the editorial column of the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News concerning our majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

This paper is one of the outstanding newspapers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and is the largest democratic paper in Essex County, published by Frederick W. Enwright, a newspaperman of many years of active and constructive experience in this field.

The editorial follows:

MCCORMACK SAVES HOSPITAL

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK added another milestone to his glittering public career this past week as he foiled a sneak attempt to close the Murphy Army hospital in Waltham.

Ever alert, the popular Congressman who is House majority leader succeeded in having the Senate knife an amendment to the deficiency appropriations bill which virtually would have turned the hospital over to the Air Force and Army engineers.

Congressman McCORMACK made one of his infrequent appearances before the Senate to state against the closing of the hospital and the elimination of the service available to thousands of Massachusetts veterans each year. That he commands the complete respect of the upper legislative body was apparent by the action taken in killing the amendment.

The newest chapter of McCORMACK's brilliant career is but a small item in a life of public service studded with such outstanding contributions to the people of his district and to his State. The House leader lived up to his reputation as one of the best informed men in the Nation's Capital by being ready to thwart the effort to close the hospital.

As a result of the McCormack victory, the Pentagon is barred from turning the hospital over to the Army engineers without the express consent of Congress.

Because Suffolk County is so close to Lynn, the people of this area have long admired the brilliant Hub representative in the National House. They admire him not only as a public official but as an outstanding family man and Catholic layman. Mrs. McCormack, wife of the Congressman, is also highly regarded by the people of this city. In his recent visit to Boston, former President Harry S. Truman paid a special tribute to the gracious wife of the Congressional leader.

The Blockaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg.

Some names of Members of the other body have been deleted, but otherwise the editorial is an exact reproduction.

A new and highly descriptive phrase is appearing in the nomenclature of the power industry in the Pacific Northwest. It's "the blockaders." And it is being applied, quite properly, not to the public power movement as a whole but to the small segment of the public power movement which either wants an all-Federal power program or nothing, or which advocates a regional power corporation in the image of TVA—or nothing.

This group is spearheaded by such men as Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, principal advocate of the regional Federal power corporation scheme. And it includes a few diehards in the Grange, PUD, and labor movements who haven't caught up with the fact that crusading for public power for public power's sake went out of fashion years ago.

These men, in general terms, oppose partnership power development, whether it is initiated by public or private power agencies.

They simply won't accept the fact that the lush days of all-Federal development are gone, probably forever. They still cling to the unrealistic concept that Uncle Sam can and should supply us with all the money we need to keep abreast of our burgeoning power needs—probably to the tune of $300 million a year.

To them an all-Federal John Day Dam is terrific, but a partnership John Day Dam is no good. To them an all-Federal Priest Rapids project is preferable to a PUD partnership project. To them, a federally financed high Hells Canyon Dam is a battle cry, regardless of cost, and a privately financed series of Snake River Dams is a red flag.

They don't want Tacoma City Light to build two dams on the Cowlitz River; they want Federal power there. They don't like the seven-State interstate compact; it might interfere with their grandiose regional corporation or all-Federal plans. They are cool toward Eugene City Light's partnership program on the McKenzie; again they want Uncle to do the job. They don't want the private companies to build Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep on the middle Snake; it might interfere with their Federal Nez Perce dreams.

This noisy segment of the public-power movement is against anyone who dares suggest that there is another or more promising way to do the power development job in the Columbia Basin. Its members fight the private companies. They'll fight the municipal operators. They'll fight the PUD's, if they attempt to supply their own power needs. Hence the name "blockaders."

We are convinced that "the blockaders" do not truly represent the public power movement in the Pacific Northwest.

They certainly do not speak for the long-established and successful municipal systems in Seattle, Tocoma, Eugene, Forest Grove, and McMinnville. They do not speak for the well-established PUD systems of Washington.

The men who operate these publicly owned systems aren't interested in an all-Federal-or-nothing crusade. They're interested in obtaining an adequate power supply, good service, and reasonable rates. They've learned that a kilowatt of power is a kilowatt of power, whether it is produced from a Federal, a municipal, a PUD, or a private company plant.

They've learned the lesson of cooperation—by working with others in the Northwest power pool, the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee, the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, and other groups representing all interests. They're not interested in an obstructive ideological battle. They know that the region's power needs are critical, that they must be met by cooperative action. They know Uncle can't do it all. They know that labels don't count anymore. Kilowatts do.

Apparently everyone but "the blockaders" has learned this lesson, albeit the hard way.

Speaking for ourselves, we've lost patience with "the blockaders." We believe the region, sorely pressed for power, has lost patience, too.

Views of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., on the Present Farm Program as Expressed by D. R. Stanfield, Its Executive Secretary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, while the great State of Ohio is recognized as one of the leading States of the Union in many ways, it must not be forgotten that it is one of the leading States in the Union in the production of all kinds of agricultural products. We in Ohio produce great crops of corn, wheat, oats, and barley, and also produce great flocks of sheep and great herds of cattle. We also produce a great number of hogs and a great number of cattle. Ohio has very strong farm organizations—the Grange has thousands of members in Ohio and the Farm Bureau Federation also is a very strong organization and has thousands of members in Ohio.

Mr. D. R. Stanfield has for many years been the executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, and is one of the best posted men in the whole country on farm problems. A short time ago he made a very comprehensive statement to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry regarding revision of the present farm program. I am glad to present Mr. Stanfield's statement for printing in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY REGARDING REVISION OF THE PRESENT FARM PROGRAM

(By Douglas R. Stanfield, executive secretary)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation appreciates this opportunity to present to this committee the thinking of its members regarding revisions of the present farm program.

Our organization is composed of 50,000 farm families and our objective is to increase farm income and improve rural standards of living. We are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation and cooperate with our national organization in the development of agricultural policy.

We must be concerned with bringing about improvements in the present program because agriculture is not sharing equitably in the general prosperity of the country.

In 1955, we held more than 3,500 policy development meetings throughout the State with our members to ascertain their thinking on what might be done by themselves and the Government to improve the farm income situation. We believe that our 1,500 Farm Bureau advisory councils give us a rather accurate picture of what Ohio farmers are thinking. Farm Bureau advisory councils are groups of 10 to 12 farm families who meet monthly in farm homes throughout the year studying farm problems and seeking sound solutions. One of their chief concerns the past year has been the drop in net farm income.

Farmers continue to be in a severe cost-price squeeze. Net farm income has declined seriously—28 percent since 1951. Products which farmers must purchase for production purposes continue to increase in price. National legislation could improve this inequitable situation.

We believe in the principle of variable price supports. Flexibility in meeting new conditions is just as important in agriculture as it is in any other business. Our present surpluses make it impossible for variable price supports to operate effectively. Too much land, labor and capital have been devoted to agriculture in recent years to permit adequate returns to be obtained per unit of resources. The 90 percent price support system worked to give us the results needed under wartime conditions but under present conditions has contributed materially to our surplus problem and has prevented agriculture from adjusting to a peace-time economy. We are living in a decade when our productive capacity has been increasing 3 percent a year and our consumptive capacity has been increasing only 2 percent a year. This requires that greater attention be given to reducing re-

sources devoted to agricultural production to bring supply in line with demand for agricultural products. Therefore, we recommend that the present farm program be continued and make the following suggestions which we believe would improve the present farm income situation.

1. SOIL BANK

We should add to the present farm program some means of adjusting production to bring supply of agricultural products in line with demand. In order to get this adjustment we recommend the development of a soil bank along the lines recommended by the President in his farm-program message of January 9, providing for an acreage reserve and a conservation reserve. We believe that such a program would definitely move to bring supplies in line with effective demand, improve the income situation of the farmer, and build up one of our greatest natural resources—the soil.

The extent of participation under the acreage reserve plan and under the conservation plan would depend upon the size of the payment made to the farmer. We believe that these payments should be large enough to get participation which in turn would make possible the other objectives previously mentioned. A voluntary plan would be more acceptable to Ohio farmers than a mandatory plan.

In addition to the payments that would be made for underplanting the acreage allotments which should compensate a man for normal returns, a fair rental on the productive value of the land plus out-of-pocket expenses for conservation practices necessary would encourage land being taken out of production including whole farms now being farmed by part-time farmers, absentee landlords, and others.

The level of payment for this land will determine the number of acres that will voluntarily be taken out of production. A large enough percentage of land must be taken out of production to bring current supply in line with demand plus an additional amount to reduce the surpluses. Certainly there should be no new land brought into production while surpluses exist, and the rental returns on Government lands now producing agricultural products should be high enough to make them self-liquidating.

2. LOW-INCOME FARMERS

There is a definite need for a program to assist and help adjust low-income farmers so that they might obtain higher income in or out of agriculture. Industrial decentralization in southern and southeastern Ohio is already playing an important role in this area.

3. RESEARCH

There is continued need for research with special emphasis on marketing problems and with increased attention given to reducing the margin between the producer and consumer and returning a fair share of the consumer's dollar to the farmer.

4. FAMILY FARM

The efficient family-type farm, which of necessity must be an economic unit, is the backbone of our Ohio agriculture, and we believe the proposed program of the President—especially the soil-bank features—plus the provision for some limitation on the size of loans would aid materially the family-type farm as it comes into competition with corporation farming. We have some of the latter in Ohio, and we certainly should do nothing in a Federal farm program to encourage corporation farming.

5. TRADE

There are two basic approaches to reducing the surpluses. One is that of increasing consumption, both at home and abroad, and an adjustment program. We believe the soil bank provides an effective adjustment program with definite conservation advantages. But, in the long pull, we must expand our markets and increase world trade in farm products—imports as well as exports.

We should attempt to increase the exporting of farm products through normal exchange channels by accepting local currency or needed supplies from foreign countries that need our supplies, by placing more emphasis on quality in export items, and by gradually lowering trade restrictions on all commodities.

Our first attention should always be directed toward increasing our normal trade with other nations but we should continue aid to friendly nations by technical assistance and by supplying them with our agricultural surpluses through voluntary agencies of the churches and other groups registered with our Government for this purpose when consistent with our foreign policy.

6. QUALITY PRODUCTS

It is important to all farmers in the area producing soft red winter wheat and to farmers in certain areas producing soft white wheat that the wheat portion of the Federal farm program be revised to reduce production of hard red winter wheat which has created the present surplus. This calls for recognition in the program that different types of wheat are used for different purposes and that within types of wheat there is a very great difference in the value of different varieties. Grain standards should be revised to recognize the different kinds and varieties of wheat as well as to improve the quality of wheat on the domestic market and to make our wheats competitive on the foreign market.

7. FARMER COOPERATIVES

Besides a Government program the farmer must be active in helping himself. Farmer cooperatives provide an important means whereby farmers can help themselves. Here in Ohio for example the Ohio Farm Bureau Cooperative Association saves its patrons 8 to 9 cents a bushel per year on grain stored in its terminals. Similar savings are made on production supplies. In this way farmer cooperatives help materially in the cost-price squeeze in which the farmer finds himself.

8. RAILROAD RATES

The railroads are proposing a 7 percent general increase in freight rates to become effective February 25, 1956. If permited to become effective, the cost-price squeeze confronting the Ohio farmer will be further aggravated.

The statement of the railroads before the Interstate Commerce Commission, in justification of the proposed increase, states that this country is enjoying the greatest wave of prosperity in its history. We submit that this does not correctly portray the condition of agriculture.

Here is a sobering example of the effect of the freight increase on an Ohio grain farmer. The grain farmer stands the transportation cost to the consuming market. Therefore, the day the freight increase becomes effective the price paid to the farmer will be dropped to reflect the 7 percent increase. At the same time materials purchased by the farmer will go up to compensate for the increased transportation cost. At the present time a farmer in Ohio must produce 50 bushels of corn to pay for one ton of fertilizer. If the increase becomes effective, he will then have to raise 52.1 bushels of corn to buy the same ton of fertilizer or the cost will be increased 4.2 percent.

In conclusion, I want to say again that Ohio farmers are not sharing fully in the general prosperity. For this reason we are in substantial agreement with the soil bank plan advanced by the administration and believe that it will work on a voluntary basis provided the payments, in cash or in kind, to the farmer are adequate to secure his participation. We also believe that it is of the utmost importance that early action be taken in order that as many as possible of the benefits of such a program will accrue to farmers in 1956.

Nailing a Falsehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the sorry spectacle of a former President of the United States making a false and reckless charge against Vice President NIXON has now ended, "not with a bang but with a whimper." It was not true that the Vice President leveled the charge of traitor at Mr. Truman. The record proves it. And, as Editor and Publisher points out in its issue of February 11:

Aside from indicating that Mr. Truman's memory might be a little faulty—he thought he "read it in the papers"—and then decided he didn't—it would seem that if the press is Republican controlled, as Mr. Truman charges, the newspapers never would have passed up such a statement by the Vice President, if it ever was made.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an excerpt from the column Shop Talk at Thirty, by Robert U. Brown, in the issue of Editor and Publisher of February 11:

Newspaper libraries were searched unsuccessfully last weekend for any reference indicating Vice President NIXON may have called Ex-President Truman and General Marshall "traitors," as Mr. Truman charged. The former President first made the charge in a New York speech Thursday night, February 2.

The next morning he elaborated to reporters and said he had in mind Mr. NIXON's statements during the 1954 congressional campaign. He said assertions made by the Vice President during a series of speeches constituted accusations of treason.

Having been challenged by the national Republican chairman to give chapter and verse, Mr. Truman said in Boston on Sunday that Leonard Hall should make himself familiar with the 1952 and 1954 campaigns for instances. When pressed for time and place that such remarks were made by Mr. NIXON, Mr. Truman said: "All over the West."

Arriving back in New York Monday morning, sticking by his guns, he said: "All I did was read the papers. * * * They wouldn't keep that kind of reference at Republican national headquarters anyway."

Later that day, a close associate explained that Mr. Truman's version was: During the 1954 campaign NIXON repeatedly made assertions amounting to an accusation of treason but was careful not to put them squarely on the record. Instead, it was said between formal appearances to the extent that prominent people soon reported it back to Mr. Truman.

Aside from indicating that Mr. Truman's memory might be a little faulty—he thought he read it in the papers, and then decided he didn't—it would seem that if the press is "Republican-controlled," as Mr. Truman charges, the newspapers never would have passed up such a statement by the Vice President, if it was ever made.

Petitions for H. R. 4627

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and by request I include in the Appendix of the RECORD petitions sent to me from my congressional district in two separate instances:

PINEVILLE, LA., *February 9, 1956.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LONG: I hope you will realize your Christian and civic duty to urge the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to report favorably on the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) and bills to quit having liquor allowed on planes.

Let's be considerate of citizens by not making them have to be bothered by drunken people who might hurt them.

When we can mostly only see KALB–TV, it is very disappointing to our children, when I can't let them watch every program, because some of them are sponsored by beer and wine. I let them watch baseball games sponsored by beer, but it is wrong. Let's get rid of such disgusting advertising that makes out that beer belongs at ball games. Let's let ball be a clean game again that people aren't ashamed to let their children see on television or hear on the radio.

Let's prevent advertising of beer, wine, and whisky in otherwise fine magazines. We can't have children and former alcoholics being tempted by beautiful pictures which make whisky seem so inviting, when it really takes away people's thinking power.

I certainly hope that bills get out of committee and even passed by the House that would improve the thinking of citizens in this country. Please do all that you can to follow God's will.

Yours,

MARY GODFREY.

P. S.—If I counted correctly, enclosed are 378 signatures on petitions for the Siler bill.

M. G.

We, the undersigned, urge you to attend the hearing and testify in favor of the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) to ban alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the air. The hearing will be held February 16 and 17. Please place these signatures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. Mary C. Smith, Madge A. McMahon (Mrs. M. L.), Mrs. A. M. Jenkins, Mrs. Pearl J. Brookfield, Mrs. Hayes Huffman, Mrs. W. R. Price, Pineville, La.; Meshack McCall, Sophie Howard, L. J. Young, Bessie L. Johnson, Helen S. Lott, Tattie B. Lawson, William H. Byars, Fredric D. Lawson, A. M. Tison, Jr., Foster Iles, Annie J. Iles, Julius W. Iles, Alexandria, La.; Wm. Scott, Israel Thomas, John O. Williams, Willit R. Aberson, Evelyn O. William, Charlie Carson, Mary B. Williams, Fred Eldridge, Mrs. Sadie B. Dukes, Mrs. Amy J. Iles, Mrs. Julia Dorsey, Mary Brady, Inez Nash, Lionel Daves, Stephen Y. Brady, Leona Brady, Hattie Williams, Thelma McCall.

Rev. Allie T. Johnson, Mrs. W. S. Haley, Mr. Walter I. Heeley, Mrs. Gertrude G. Bosley, Mrs. Millie M. Ford, Mrs. Allie T. Johnson, J. Aubrey Blaylock, Alexandria, La.; Elbert Dodd, C. E. McCall, N. Elizabeth Daniel, Wilena Price, Pineville, La; Dorothy Grant, Alexandria, La.; Ben Price, Lee Linn, Pineville, La.; S. L. Atwood, Alexandria, La.; M. R. Doucet, Mrs. Melvin Doucet, Mrs. C. E. McCall, Pineville, La.; J. A. and Mrs. Farthing, Simms, La.; Murrel Faulk, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. Elbert Dodd, Pineville, La., Nell L. Atwood, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. Louis Fhee, Mrs. G. A. McVay, Mr. Louis Fhee, Pineville, La.; Mrs. L. C. Atwood, Sr., Alexandria, La.; Mrs. Albert Parker, Mrs. Alice Ryder, Carl F. McCain, Ruby Price, Mrs. Effie McWilliams, Mrs. P. L. Brown, Mrs. Georgia McCain, Mrs. Herman Baden, Mrs. Mable Martin, Bias Price, E. M. McKenzie, Ruth Peart, L. R. Taylor, J. M. Floate, E. G. Langston, J. E. Ratcliff, Harold J. Derr, Pineville, La.; B. L. Batchelor, Katie C. Batchelor, F. Aiken Taylor, Sam Covington, Mrs. S. E. Covington, Alexandria, La.

W. T. Handy, Jr., J. L. Kane, Leola H. Kane, Ruth R. Handy, Lucille Ross, Earl Smith, Jr., O. V. Cooper, M. D., Alberta Alexander, (Miss) Ola Mae Morck, Mrs. Ara E. Jackson, Carrin R. Kelso, Irene Silas, Will Kraft, Clarence Williams, Olivia Alexander, Gladys Williams, L. C. Eckley, Orrie Robinson, Mrs. Darcus B. Page, Mrs. Nellie P. Chusher, Mrs. Bessie Burr, Mrs. Maude Breda, Mrs. Sallie Parson, Mrs. P. Bell, Adolph Burr, C. W. Pickens, B. F. Walls, W. A. Gatlin, S. W. Gatlin, H. L. Paul, E. L. Johnston, Fred Elsey, Bennette Edwards, Obie McCann, Frank L. Adams, H. H. Stuckey, Lewis E. Mason, Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Texada, Mrs. Sylvia Mitchell, Mrs. Jewell Fisackerly, Mrs. B. W. Lomon, Jodie Roberts, Imogen Shepherd, Alexandria, La.; R. E. Young, Pine Prairie, La.; Mrs. Joseph Bielkiewicz, Mrs. Fay Walla, Pfc., Florian A. Koranda, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. M. D. Satcher, Pineville, La.; Mrs. Beutra Melton, Charles E. Melton, Sr., Richard C. Melton and wife, Mrs. Eunice E. Gremillion, Pfc. Forrest J. Imel, 1st Lt. Robert N. McGaugh, Mrs. R. N. McGaugh, Mrs. Donald E. Bowser, Donald E. Bowser, William Willcox, Alexandria, La.

J. T. Girlinghouse, John C. Shirley, Roy Hale, Dolores L. Shirley, Mrs. Dora McDermott Eldred, Mr. and Mrs. W. Strothers, Carol Brakefield, Mrs. J. E. Brakefield, J. E. Brakefield, Dr. and Mrs. R. H. Whittington, Mrs. J. G. Ray, Mrs. J. Frank Reeves, Mrs. C. J. Moll, Mrs. Zoea G. Baden, Mrs. Claude H. Bewada, Mrs. A. A. Berry, Mrs. Effie Scroggs, Mrs. P. D. Bessonett, Sr., Mrs. Denon Smith, Mrs. Elsie Collins, Mrs. D. M. Deville, Mrs. Nettie Walker, Mrs. Jeff Redd, Mrs. C. E. Gilmer, Mrs. Frank Howard, R. Harrison Smith, Bruce W. Lerue, Mrs. Edward C. Mounce, Hardie D. Ward, David McKenzie, Michael McKay, Mrs. S. B. Whatley, Mrs. Alvin Nugent, Gary McKay, G. Earl Guinn, J. C. Lindsey, Mrs. J. C. Lindsey, Pineville, La.; E. C. Mannse, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. O. B. Fuglaar, Ollie B. Fuglaar, Mrs. Wallace McKenzie, Clarisa Bridewell, Linda Sue Lee, Carol Pettees, Carl N. Strohschein, Doris Cutler, Hazel H. Howell, Mrs. Roy Hale, Mrs. G. T. Girlinghouse, Mrs. L. L. Couch, Louis L. Couch, Mrs. W. W. Moseley, W. S. Honeycutt, Mrs. W. S. Honeycutt, V. B. Temple, Mrs. V. B. Temple, Mrs. F. J. Pharis, Mrs. T. V. Herndon, Mrs. J. K. Porter, J. K. Porter, H. M. Weallinsky, Mrs. Ol. H. Gutrick, Mrs. I. A. Hargis, Mrs. J. J. Price, Mrs. R. K. Garrett, Mrs. J. W. McCay, Mrs. Janie Tullas, Mrs. B. W. Baker, Mrs. Herman Randney, Pineville, La.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, February 12, marked the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the outstanding Revolutionary War hero.

The Americans, and the people of Poland both revere the memory of this great man who fought for freedom on two continents. The story of his life is an illustrious example of man's age-old quest for liberty.

Kosciuszko was born in Poland and educated there, graduating from the Warsaw Cadet School with highest honors. The King of Poland, impressed with his engineering ability, sent him to France where for several years Kosciuszko attended military schools. Upon his return, he was commissioned a captain in charge of Krakow's fortifications. There was little opportunity for the use of his talents in Poland, so the news of the outbreak of hostilities in America kindled his imagination and in the summer of 1776 Kosciuszko arrived in America on his own initiative and his own expense.

He joined the Northern Army in 1777 and his construction of fortifications and choice of battlegrounds contributed much to the success of the Continental Army.

American youth has paid tribute to Kosciuszko by erecting a monument to his memory at West Point—for it was Kosciuszko who first suggested the spot where West Point now stands, for a military school.

The story of the contributions made by Kosciuszko to the cause of freedom in the United States and in Poland is known to millions and has been repeated many times on this floor. As we pay tribute to his memory, may we recall the words of the famous poet, John Keats, who wrote:

Good Kosciuszko, thy great name alone
Is a full harvest whence to reap high feeling;
It comes upon us like the glorious pealing,
Of the wide spheres—an everlasting tone.

The Word Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article entitled "The Parity Formula Defined," by Robert H. Moats, which appeared in the fall issue, December 1955, of Co-Op Grain Quarterly.

The article follows:

THE PARITY FORMULA DEFINED
(By Robert H. Moats)

Parity is a term that is widely used and discussed by farmers and nonfarmers alike yet it is a term that has only a vague meaning to many. Actually, parity is very simple in concept. Visualizing this concept, however, has been made difficult by the various modifications in the basic procedure that have been introduced from time to time to adjust for changes in farmers' buying and selling practices, and to modify relationships among commodities that were not considered fair or reasonable by the Congress.

The word parity means equality or equal value. Congress has defined parity prices for agricultural products as the price that will

give these products equal value of equal purchasing power in terms of goods and services bought by farmers that they had in the base period. In other words, the prices needed to put commodities sold by farmers on a par with commodities bought by farmers.

BASE PERIOD 1910–14

In reference to the base period, Congress has indicated that a fair or reasonable relationship existed between agricultural prices and nonfarm prices from 1910 to 1914 and has specified that this period should be used as the base for parity price computations.

Thus if, on the average, prices paid by farmers for machinery, fertilizer, feed, seed, fuel, building materials, food, and other commodities coupled with rates paid hired labor, prices paid for telephones and electricity, interest on real-estate mortgages, taxes, etc., are now 2.75 times the 1910-14 average, then prices of products sold by farmers would need to average 2.75 times the 1910-14 average, if they are to sell at parity.

Back in the 1920's following World War I, the idea of equality for agriculture was widely discussed and was given serious study by economists, by farmers, farm organizations, and by the Government. The various ideas gradually took shape in a definite pattern, and in the Agricultural Act of 1933 Congress defined the concept of parity.

Although the basic concept still holds, Congress has from time to time modified the formula and has stated more specifically just what parity means and has specified the part this idea should play in agricultural programs. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948, 1949, and 1954 spells out in detail the formula for computing parity prices.

OLD AND MODERNIZED PARITY

Prior to January 1950, which was the effective date of the amendments introduced by the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949, parity prices were computed by what is now called the old formula. Basically, this formula provided that the August 1909–July 1914 average price for the commodity would be multiplied by the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, to obtain the parity price. To illustrate, prices received by farmers for corn averaged 64.2 cents per bushel for the period August 1909–July 1914. In May 1955, the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes (as computed prior to January 1950) was 284 percent of its 1910–1914 average. The old formula parity price for corn was thus 0.642 times 284 percent or $1.82 per bushel.

For a number of commodities either no data were available for the 1910–1914 period or production was so small that prices during this period were not considered suitable. For such commodities a more recent base, such as 1919–1929, or some portion thereof, was specified in the legislation and the Index of Prices Paid by Farmers (excluding interests and taxes) adjusted to the appropriate base, was used to compute the parity price.

Beginning in January 1950, the "new" or "modernized" formula came into use. This formula maintained the overall relationship between parity prices and prices paid by farmers. It also established a method for reflecting recent price relationships among commodities; and it provided an improved procedure for computing parity prices for commodities that were virtually unknown or unimportant during the original base period.

This modernization was achieved by the use of average prices for the preceding 10-year period. Adjusted base prices are computed by dividing the most recent 10-year average price received by farmers for individual commodities by the average of the Index of Prices Received by Farmers for the same 10-year period. These adjusted base prices are multiplied by the Parity Index to compute the "new" formula parity prices.

To illustrate, prices received by farmers for corn averaged $1.49 per bushel for the 10 years 1945–54. During this same period, the Price Received Index averaged 261 percent of its 1910–14 average. Thus during 1955 the adjusted base price for corn is $1.49 divided by 261 percent, or $0.571 per bushel. Since the Parity Index in May 1955 was 282 percent of 1910–14, the new formula parity price for corn in May 1955 was 0.571 times 282 percent or $1.61 per bushel.

Since the index of prices received by farmers measures the average change from 1910–14 to date in prices farmers receive for this product, this procedure converts the individual commodity price to a 1910–14 level, but at the same time maintains the relationship among commodities that existed during the most recent 10-year period.

WAGE RATES ADDED

The legislation that established the new parity procedure also specified that wage rates, as well as interest and taxes, should be included in the parity index. When the index was revised to include wage rates, the Department developed a more up-to-date and a more comprehensive index of prices paid by farmers. The new parity index (prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and wage rates) is based on approximately 350 price series instead of only about 175 series in the old index.

TRANSITIONAL PARITY

The new or modernized parity formula maintained the same general level of parity prices, but it raised the parity price for some commodities and lowered it for others. The Congress provided special procedures to avoid a sharp reduction in the level of parity prices for those commodities with a lower parity price under the new formula. One procedure was set up for nonbasic commodities and another for basic commodities.

For nonbasic commodities a gradual adjustment to the lower level was made by means of a transitional parity. The transitional parity price for a nonbasic commodity was the old formula parity reduced by 5 percent during 1950, by 10 percent during 1951, 15 percent in 1952, and 25 percent in 1954.

During 1955, the old-formula parity prices were reduced by 30 percent; and an additional 5 percent will be taken off each year until all nonbasic commodities have made the transition to the new-formula level. To illustrate, in May 1955 the old-formula parity price for buckwheat was $2.07 per bushel. Multiplying by 70 percent (100–30) gives $1.45 per bushel, the transitional parity price. Whenever the new-formula parity price exceeds the transitional, it becomes the effective parity price and the transitional is no longer computed for the commodity.

For the basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and most types of tobacco, the acts of 1948 and 1949 and later legislation provided that the parity price would be either the new- or the old-formula price, whichever was higher, until 1956. Beginning in January 1956, the old-formula parity for basic commodities will be reduced by 5 percent each year until the transition is made to the new-formula basis.

Petitions for H. R. 4627

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and by request, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD petitions sent to me from my congressional district in two separate instances:

We, the undersigned, do hereby sign this petition because we favor the Siler bill, House of Representatives bill 4627, which would not allow advertising of beer or wine on radio or television and of beer, wine, or whiskey in magazines mailed as interstate commerce:

Robert A. Corley, Jr., Pineville, La.; Douglas Hause, R. T. DeMoss, Mr. and Mrs. M. T. Pippin, Mr. and Mrs. Ollie L. White, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Baker, Alexandria, La.; Nat Bridewell, A. V. Farr, Pineville, La.; Mrs. Alton Parish, Jesse M. Kees, Mrs. W. E. Magee, Jr., Norma F. Owens, J. C. Short, Mrs. Blanche F. Mailer, Leo Mailer, Alexandria, La.; Halma B. Benedict, Pineville, La.; C. H. Short, Mrs. C. H. Short, Mrs. Ola S. Vaenado, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. H. B. Benedict, J. N. Miller, Pineville, La.; Mrs. S. H. Gravel, W. E. Magee, Jr., Mrs. Earl B. Wolff, Sr., Geo. W. Smithson, Mrs. A. C. Clover, Mrs. J. Q. Middleton, Mrs. Beatrice Jefferson, Mrs. Lola Odom, Mrs. Edith Stephens, Mrs. W. L. Cloud, (Mrs.) Alice E. Geyer, Mrs. E. S. Aiken, W. L. Cloud, Mrs. Ira Gonter, Mrs. Nettie B. Pye, Mrs. M. B. Pearce, Mrs. R. H. Dunbar, Mrs. W. T. Owen, Mrs. Ruby Mizell, Nelle L. Avery (Mrs. W. J.), Bessie Footenot, Mrs. Daisy R. Morton, Earl B. Wolff, Jr., Alexandria, La.

J. T. Walworth, Sr., W. F. Naiswarthy, Mrs. W. A. Rabb, Mrs. Bentie Duville, Miss Martha Faught, Mrs. E. F. Faught, Mrs. M. Patton, E. F. Fauger, J. L. Pollard, W. J. Oneal, Mrs. Harvey McGraw, Donald S. Tuncage, Mrs. Loddie Rollins, Mrs. Nell C. Nichols, J. O. Barron, Mrs. Lou Gibson, Mrs. J. O. Barron, Harvey D. McGraw, Paul R. Godfrey, Mrs. Paul R. Godfrey, Mrs. M. Walworth, Mrs. Eva Jones, Miss Katie Benson, Charlie Owens, JoAnn Trahan, Nancy Jacob, Nora Bordelon, George J. Bordelon, Mrs. W. D. Darnall, Pineville, La.; Mrs. M. M. Rembert, Alexandria, La.; Marvin McDaniel, Rita Harris, Patsy Speir, Carol Moncla, Roynell De Villiess, Mr. and Mrs. Troy, Pineville, La.; Mrs. J. W. Darnell, Alexandria, La.; Julia Gray, James Hudson, Jr., Mrs. L. Kent, Mrs. Etta Hawthorne, Pineville, La.; J. O. Williams, Mrs. J. O. Williams, Shreveport, La.; Mrs. J. D. Bailey, J. D. Bailey, John Bailey, Jr., Pineville, La.; Mrs. F. E. Goff, F. E. Goff, Alexandria, La.; Jesse D. Bryan, Joe Cruse, Mrs. H. J. Barton, Mrs. J. N. Loflin, Mrs. Elmer Carter, R. A. Corley, Mrs. J. M. Hutton, Mrs. Rex Nichols, Rev. Rex Nichols, Elmer Carter, Jasper L. Malone, A. T. Rylind, Mrs. J. L. Malone, Mrs. Ella Vinson, Pineville, La.

Mrs. D. C. Boss, Pineville, La.; Mrs. R. C. Powell, Mrs. J. R. Tackett, Mrs. T. Chelette, T. C. Davis, Mrs. Nobia E. Davis, J. D. Boyett, Mrs. Louise Y. Dugger, Mrs. Joe Laughlin, J. W. Laughlin, R. S. Miller, A. T. Whittington, J. O. Allen, T. Garrett, J. B. Funduburk, W. Ray Frye, J. J. Clyde, Harvey Paige, M. C. Duke, J. C. Pharis, Mrs. Alice B. Rudisill, Mrs. Harry Ketone, Mrs. W. A. Guinn, Mrs. J. J. Yarborough, Mrs. Mary Horton, Mrs. D. C. Gaar, John Groves, Pineville, La.; L. O. Deville, Alexander, La.; C. R. Barron, Frank Aycock, Lorraine B. Hoffman, George Hoffman, Paul L. Peguer, W. R. Barron, Ruby W. Groves, Pineville, La.; Frances E. Wilson, Alexandria, La.; Frankie B. Skeek, H. Milton Wolf, Mrs. N. C. Alsup, Jr., Robert D. Ryder, Mrs. O. W. Griffiths, Pineville, La.; Mrs. Frank Aycock, Deville, La.; Clarice Lee Ellis, Mrs. F. A. Burnum, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. J. C. Barron, J. I. Barron, Doris Pegues, Pineville, La.; Mrs. L. O. De Ville, Alexandria, La.; Byron L. Hansford, Mrs. B. L. Hansford, W. T. Friday, Mrs. W. T. Fryday, Mrs. Gladys M. Walker, Pineville, La.; J. D. Gouney, Fred L. Palone, Robert M. VanZandt, D. W. King, W. Weiland, Amelia M. Byram, J. R. Gardner, Milton W. Simpers, Dorothy A. Simpson, Rev. John C. Nurile, Herman C. Cuicutz, M. D., Ralph Brewer, Alexandria, La.; R. B. Hellams, Clinton, S. C.; Louis B. Cape, Bill W. Cutter, Alexandria, La.

Rev. Harold Davis, Carl Burris, Alexandria, La.; Harold M. Price, F. B. Jones, Ellis Froust, Virgie Froust, Pineville, La.; Mrs. Harold Davis, Mrs. G. P. Skeeles, Alexandria, La.; Martha Brown, Edgar B. Brown, Libuse, La.; Mrs. W. O. Forrest, Ardie Estes, Mrs. Ardie Estes, Alexandria, La.; I. M. Campbell, Homer Miller, Mrs. Mary Simmons, Mrs. I. B. Deviett, Mrs. J. J. Rush, J. J. Rush, John E. Cotton, Rosa Cotton, Pineville, La.; Nolie Mae Mooney, Rev. W. H. Westermeyer, Mrs. W. H. Westermyer, Alexandria, La.; Mr. Archie Taylor, Mrs. Archie Taylor, Pineville, La.; Mrs. D. J. Hargrove, Mrs. J. R. Ellis, Alexandria, La.; T/Sgt. Lester A. Hoptzinger, Mrs. Lester A. Hoptzinger, England AFB, La.; Mrs. Ralph Scott, Mr. Ralph Scott, Ball, La.; Mrs. W. Stevens, Tioga, La.; Vivian Cloninger, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dale L. Perry, Pollich, La.; Mrs. Frank P. Wharton, Mrs. Dalton Nash, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. Addis L. Smith, Pineville, La.; Nelwyn Stevens, Tioga, La.; Mrs. Frank Beeson, Jr., Mrs. Berta Beeson, Mr. H. H. Rayston, Mrs. H. H. Rayston, Pineville, La.; Mrs. S. L. Calhoun, Alexandria, La.; Mrs. & Mr. DeCamp Roit Roit, Pineville, La.

G. W. Leggett, Ray Stubblefield, Pineville, La.; Geo. P. Wyatt, F. E. Rice, Horace Daniels, W. E. Ates, Mrs. B. E. Doughty, B. E. Doughty, J. W. Jaynor, Mrs. Pauline C. Jaynor, Mrs. Georgia Ates, Mr. L. G. Prewett, Mrs. L. G. Prewett, Mrs. Ray Fugloar, Mrs. M. L. Lemmons, Mrs. H. L. Maxwell, Mrs. Ella Nichols, Mrs. Norvil Singuefield, Mrs. A. E. Randolph, Lelo A. Bracknell, Mrs. C. C. Quinn, Nellie Menchaut, Tioga, La.; A. E. Randolph, Gladys Higden, Notrie Whitehead, Myrtle Griffin, Edwin E. Whitehead, Ray Fugloar, Mrs. C. L. Handley, Mrs. Sarah J. Thompson, Mrs. Willie Vay Williams, Mrs. Mary D. Miller, Marvin L. Lemmons, Sr., Pearl Lanier, Mrs. Jackie P. Adams, A. D. Adams, W. Raymond Nichols, W. S. Poteet, Mabel H. Smith, J. L. McGrew, Mrs. J. L. McGrew, R. M. Falkner, Willis A. Brown, Mrs. D. F. Sellers, D. F. Sellers, Luth C. Tenell, Vera J. Delk, Mrs. Thelma T. Poe, M. J. Stewart, Mrs. M. J. Stewart, Mrs. Evelyn C. Merritt, Mrs. Gwendela M. Brasknell, Tioga, La.; Mrs. Charlotte Juneau, Mrs. J. V. Leggett, Mrs. J. E. Barton, Pineville, La.; Mrs. Vivion Phillips, Tioga, La.; Mrs. C. C. Wilson, Mrs. A. E. Davis, Anthony E. Davis, Pineville, La.; Edward Jordan, Mrs. Edward Jordan, Tioga, La.; J. H. McCann, Helen McCann, Pineville, La.; Mrs. Berniece Rice, J. T. Merritt, Tioga, La.; Mrs. W. E. Price, Jr., Pineville, La.; Mrs. W. A. Brown, Tioga, La.; Mrs. Ida Atkins, Ball, La.

The Jefferson Memorial, Gateway to West Still Sags After 20-Year-Old Promise—St. Louis Globe-Democrat Says Time for Governmental Action Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, my unanimous consent request to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial was intended to make sure that all Members of Congress interested in this great project can have the advantage of reading this excellent background series giving the history and all developments in connection with the Memorial.

All citizens of St. Louis, and our newspapers particularly, have been anxious to see this project become a reality. We have worked for it, dreamed of it, and—I might point out—we have paid for it, too, over a period of many years. We have voted local funds to pay our share of the project, we have removed property from the local tax rolls, and we have otherwise carried out our obligations in connection with this Memorial commemorating the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the West.

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT SERIES IS EXCELLENT

The Globe-Democrat series on the Memorial is an excellent one. The articles have been written by Ted Schafers, Ray Noonan, and, from the Washington Bureau of the Globe-Democrat, Marsh Clark.

First, I submit an editorial from the Globe-Democrat, of Sunday, February 5, entitled "The Jefferson Memorial," outlining the series of articles which began in the paper that day and expressing the newspaper's support for the $5 million appropriation which I have asked be appropriated and which other St. Louis Members of Congress have similarly requested, in line with the authorization bill which was enacted in 1954. The editorial concludes:

St. Louis, with its wealth of history, should have this modest memorial, so long delayed and so past due. Now is the time to recognize our great past and our even greater future.

The full text of the editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sunday, February 5, is as follows:

THE JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

The Globe-Democrat begings a short series of articles in this issue by Ted Schafers and Ray Noonan explaining the need for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

After almost a quarter of a century of delay, there appears a fair chance, now that the budget has been balanced, that the Missouri and St. Louis congressional leaders will be able to get the relatively small appropriation of $5 million for building this important historic project.

The Memorial has stirred controversy in the past and unquestionably will not meet with universal favor now. Some people may question the wisdom of spending any money on historic sites, while others who would be forced to park their cars elsewhere when the project is started will have a narrow interest in its defeat.

The Memorial commends itself to this newspaper essentially for this one great reason—St. Louis began its growth on the banks of the Mississippi River, the alarming blight of the downtown business district began gnawing its way to the vitals of the business district from the river bank and, therefore, any rehabilitation of the downtown business district and any flourishing of this vital area must, of necessity, start from the river's edge.

This project will do just that. It will be a first step forward in clearing what formerly was a dismal morass of decaying buildings and more recently simply a parking lot.

With the erection of a national memorial, St. Louis and the Nation will beautify our river-edge area where the city began, and provide incentive for the demolition of the remaining decaying buildings in this area and their replacement by new and modern structures.

It will also shift focus back to the downtown business district, and away from the disastrous decentralization of the city with its resultant loss of tax values.

Finally, and not the least important by any means, it will provide a historic memorial which will attract hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of visitors to St. Louis as the gateway to the West.

St. Louis has overlooked its own possibilities as a historic shrine. All the great explorations of the West and the reopening of more than half of America had their origins here. This wealth of historical material should have an appropriate home.

Though not included in the present plan, St. Louis should eventually have the spectacular "Saarinen arch" which will be at once a gateway and a rainbow of hope.

Those who say that the erection of such an arch is comparable to the old boondoggles of WPA days overlook the huge asset which similar giant attractions have been to their respective areas, such as the Statue of Liberty in New York, the Eiffel Tower in Paris, and the Rushmore Memorial in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

Neither a nation nor a city can be entirely functional in its planning. Each requires its great historic monuments, its shrines, as well as its parks, its museums, and its places of historic interest. It is a necessary part of America and of the world we live in.

St. Louis, with its wealth of history, should have this modest memorial, so long delayed and so past due. Now is the time to recognize our great past and our even greater future.

FIRST ARTICLE IN GLOBE-DEMOCRAT SERIES

Mr. Speaker, the first article in the series referred to in the above editorial was written jointly by Ted Schafers and Ray Noonan and gives in detail the current status of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and relates the legal technicalities and other factors which have previously stood in the way of this project. Not the least of the handicaps at the present time—I would say the greatest current handicap—is the failure of the Interior Department to request the $5 million needed to make the project a reality. Instead, in a multi-million-dollar supplemental budget request for the National Park Service, only a tiny amount of $150,000 was requested for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, and that merely for maintenance work on the existing old courthouse—nothing for relocation of the railroad tracks or the other work necessary to make the project a reality.

Following is the Ted Schafers-Ray Noonan article which was the first article in the series in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Jefferson Memorial:

GATEWAY TO WEST STILL SAGS AFTER 20-YEAR-OLD PROMISE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Globe-Democrat today begins a series of articles on the Government's unfulfilled pledge to build the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the downtown riverfront. The memorial would give a shing new "front door" to a St. Louis that is rebuilding for the future. This series will tell why a project, approved before the youngest generation of St. Louisans was born, may still be inexcusably stymied when they are aging—unless the Government can be persuaded to keep its promise.)

(By Ted Schafers and Ray Noonan)

(First of a series)

The shining "Gateway to the West" memorial on the downtown riverfront which St. Louisans voted for 20 years ago is still nothing but a sagging door to the city.

St. Louis taxpayers put up the money for their share in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, which the Federal Government had solemnly pledged to build.

After two decades, St. Louis still does not have a Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. All it has is the site. And, as one punster remarked: "The site must be a sight to first-time visitors coming across the Mississippi into St. Louis?

Acres of automobiles park in the area that was planned as a national shrine—marking the starting place of the pioneers who went out to open up the uncharted West and Southwest.

Congressmen from the St. Louis area again have renewed the fight to get this memorial off dead center, where it has lodged these many frustrating years.

The memorial was to have cost $30 million, with the Government to ante three-fourths of the sum. Prices have gone up during the years Uncle Sam fiddled around, so the final cost figure is not definite.

Legal delays have barred a start on the project at various times. But, one thing is certain: There is no excuse today for the Government to delay any longer in putting up at least $5 million to start building this important historic project.

Since there is no further legal excuse for the delay, how is the Government performing on its promise?

Instead of putting the $5 million in as a starter, the National Park Service wants to fluff off St. Louis with an outlay of $150,000. That sum would just fence in and landscape the Old Courthouse.

Probably no other project in the city's history has had so much publicity and so much effort expended with so little accomplished.

When President Eisenhower on January 16 submitted his budget, indicating a surplus of $435 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, there was a ray of hope for the riverfront memorial.

A 1954 Federal law provided that $5 million could be authorized for the $30 million project as soon as the Federal budget was balanced. The law also specified this money was to be used to clear away the railroad tracks, fill in and beautify the grounds, but that none was to go toward the cost of the spectacular Saarinen Arch. This steel monument, which will be 590 feet high, and taller than the Washington Monument, has had its share of controversy.

The new budget last month removed the legal bar to the $5 million and Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, aided by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Webster Groves, and FRANK M. KARSTEN, Democrat, of St. Louis, promptly called for the Government to start moving again in the direction of positive action.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial got its start in 1934 when Congress by joint resolution and the signature of President Franklin D. Roosevelt approved it. St. Louis taxpayers 2 years later voted $7,500,000 in bonds for their one-fourth share of the estimated cost. Except for an original $6,500,000 in Federal money to buy the 82.5 acres of riverfront property, to which St. Louis added $2,250,000, nothing has been done by the Federal Government in the last 20 years toward starting construction.

When the President announced his budget balance last month it seemed like the last of the obstacles had been overcome.

However, the National Park Service made no mention of the memorial in its original budget for next year. KARSTEN was told this agency had not planned to ask for any memorial funds because it had not been notified, at the time the budget was prepared, that the budgetary restrictions imposed by the 1954 law had been eliminated.

The three House Members pleaded their cause to the House Appropriations Subcommittee last week, and got a sympathetic ear.

However, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, who is chairman of the parent House Appropriations Committee, hinted what has to be done to get the project moving. He said the memorial had every chance of being approved "provided the Interior Department asks for the funds."

The National Park Service is part of the Department of the Interior. Proponents had hoped funds to start the project would be included in a supplemental budget of this Department. However, there was no such request last week, only $150,000 for the old court house fence and grounds.

The Park Service's original request for all its work everywhere was for $5,200,000. The new budget called for $8,300,000 more. All of this money was ticketed to remodel existing national parks. Nothing was asked for construction of the St. Louis project, which the Park Service considers a new undertaking.

Representative CANNON described the riverfront memorial worthwhile, adding, "St. Louis is certainly entitled to every consideration on this request."

Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky, and former Vice President, is chairman of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission which selected the St. Louis project. He, too, announced his full support to get the memorial underway.

However, with very few exceptions, Congress only appropriates for projects requested by governmental agencies responsible for them. So support from the National Park Service is considered vital. The agency is more interested in improving and expanding present national park facilities, than it is in giving St. Louis its memorial.

Therefore, it remains for St. Louis representatives in the House and Senate to persuade this agency to help the Government keep its word—given so long ago and still unfulfilled.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, an organization of civic leaders who had worked for the project these years also is expected to put up a strong fight.

Civic Progress, Inc., another city agency has made the memorial one of its major projects, and is expected to throw powerful support behind it.

Backers point out the project has withstood the test of the courts. The battle over relocation of the railroad tracks was settled in 1949. And, in reference to the 4,000 cars which now use the area as a parking lot, the National Park Service has notified the city it has no objection to underground parking facilities on the site. The only restriction is that the underground area does not interfere with the above-the-ground planning of the memorial.

The time for governmental action is now. St. Louis has waited patiently through two decades, which included World War II and the Korean conflict. Those who appreciate the historical and educational value of this memorial say it has been kicked around long enough.

They ask: "How much longer must we wait for the Government to keep its pledge made over 20 years ago?"

Why Reprisals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the January 13, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks, is deserving of the attention of our colleagues. The article discusses Arab attacks against Israel:

WHY REPRISALS?

(By our diplomatic correspondent)

JERUSALEM.—There has been a good deal of criticism of Israel, especially by commentators abroad, for the retaliatory action she has taken from time to time against Arab attacks. These critics maintain, no doubt rightly, that this is not a normal way for a state to behave—but the whole point is that Israel does not find herself in a normal situation. So it is perhaps worthwhile to consider this whole problem of reprisals, and see on what it is based and whether there is any workable alternative.

Israel's fundamental position is to say to the Arabs: "You leave us alone, and we shall leave you alone. But if you keep attacking us, you must not be surprised if after a while we hit back." Every act of reprisal by Israel has followed on an attack, and usually on a whole series of attacks, by one or another of the Arab States. Almost always an effort has been made to hit back against the actual attackers, especially when it has been possible to establish who they were and where they came from.

It is not always realized abroad that the Arab States, without exception, have maintained their war against Israel by all possible means throughout the past 7 years despite the armistice agreements which they all signed. Not only have the Arab States done their utmost—and are still doing their utmost—to damage Israel politically, diplomatically and economically, but they have carried on almost uninterrupted guerrilla warfare against Israel's defense forces and against her civilian population, especially in the districts closest to the borders. For years now there has been scarcely a day or a night without an attack of some kind from one or another of the Arab States. When things quiet down a little in one part of the country, they flare up somewhere else, in keeping with the Arab policy of harrying Israel at all possible points and by all possible means.

POLICY OF MODERATION

Sometimes an Israeli patrol is exposed to a barrage of fire, sometimes mines are placed on the road. At one time an armed Arab gang will enter a village at night and blow up houses; at another, the Arabs will shoot at an aircraft or at fishing vessels. It all depends on the circumstances of time and place. Not always do people get killed, but very often they do; and then feelings in Israel are naturally inflamed, and there is an intense desire to avenge the dead and teach the killers a lesson once and for all. It is, in fact, a tribute to the Israeli Government's moderation that acts of reprisal are as few and far between as they are—though it is perhaps precisely because they are so relatively rare that they come as such a shock to people abroad.

Acts of reprisal occur quite often in quite a number of places in the world, and they are always a sign that the situation in those places is abnormal, and that the people there do not know of any better way of dealing with it. The British, for example, carry out punitive raids from the air against Arab villages near Aden in reprisal for acts of violence or marauding by the villagers, and they give as their reason that this is the only effective way of dealing with this particular situation. An abnormal situation is bound to lead to abnormal measures, and the real question one has to ask oneself is who is responsible for this situation.

ARAB PROVOCATION

In the case of the trouble along the borders between Israel and the Arab states, the answer is not in doubt. Even the

United Nations has acknowledged that there is constant Arab provocation and has, in fact, done something to try to put an end to it. It seems now evident that the Arab states, or at any rate most of them, signed the armistice agreements without any serious intention of carrying them out. They are constantly violating these agreements, and their violations have indeed become graver and more frequent as time has gone on.

The armistice agreements were drafted explicitly—the text of all of them says so—to provide for a transition to permanent peace. It is in conformity with this, both in the spirit and in the letter, that Israel has continuously throughout these 7 years offered to enter into negotiations for peace. But the Arabs have constantly refused to enter into negotiations of any kind, and if peace seems impossible, Israel makes one demand and one demand only—that the Arab states at least observe the armistice faithfully and put an end to their constant acts of violence along the frontiers.

Nobody in Israel likes the idea of reprisals. They have been regarded by the government only as a grim and painful necessity, and nobody would be happier than the Israeli Government if there were never any further need for them. The government's viewpoint deserves perhaps to be restated. If the Arabs do not attack Israel, Israel will not attack them; but if they insist on keeping up their attacks, they can have only themselves to blame if sooner or later Israel hits back. This would happen everywhere else in the world under similar circumstances, for it is the first duty of a government to defend its territory and the lives of its people.

Address by Hon. Leslie C. Arends at Lincoln Day Dinner, Hotel Utica, Utica, N. Y., on Saturday Evening, February 11, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech by the distinguished minority whip of the House of Representatives, Congressman LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, which he made February 11, 1956, at a Lincoln Day observance dinner, held at Hotel Utica, Utica, N. Y., under the auspices of the Oneida County Republican Committee.

Congressman AREND'S speech follows:

It is a great privilege and a real pleasure for me to be able to participate with you this evening in paying homage to Abraham Lincoln—our first Republican President and a great American whose name and whose deeds will live forever.

I would be less than honest not to confess to you that I was a bit hesitant about coming here for this occasion. It was not that I did not desire to come. I had heard from many what a fine annual affair this is. I now can see for myself why those who have participated on your annual program have been so enthusiastic.

You have had so many outstanding speakers on previous Lincoln Day dinners that I frankly wondered whether I could measure up to what you might expect of me. But I am here. And I am sure the others who have been here from Congress before me will agree with me when I say that your Congressman, WILLIAM WILLIAMS, is one of the most persuasive men in the Congress.

The Republican National Committee had suggested during this Lincoln Day recess period that I make a speaking tour in California. I had planned to make the trip. Then along came my friend and colleague, BILL WILLIAMS, with his usual quiet, persuasive way. And so, as George Gobel would say, "there you are, and here I am."

You certainly demonstrated that you know your politics as the science of good government when you sent to Congress to be your spokesman in national affairs a man of BILL WILLIAMS' fine character and outstanding ability.

As the Republican whip of the House it is part of my job to keep close check on the attendance and performance record of each and every Republican Member of Congress. By virtue of the very nature of my duties as the Republican whip, I have an intimate knowledge of the record of BILL WILLIAMS. You surely know—without my telling you—the truly high quality of representation he has given this district.

I never have had to seek him out to be present on the floor of the House for some particular vote. He was always there. I never have had to concern myself as to how he would vote on a matter involving a proven principle of government. BILL WILLIAMS has always stood firm for principle, when others might allow themselves to be swayed by the political expediencies of the moment.

I will say, speaking not only as a friend but in my official capacity as the Republican whip, that no Member of Congress has a finer record of performance, both in the work of the Committee on Agriculture and on the floor of the House, than your own BILL WILLIAMS. I know you are proud of him. You have a right to be. He is a real Republican and a fine American.

And tonight we are paying homage to another real Republican and fine American—one of the greatest of the great.

I look upon Abraham Lincoln—a plain, God-fearing man—as the very symbol of democracy and the very embodiment of the American way of life. He came from a humble log cabin in Kentucky to occupy the White House. His life expresses, as nothing else can, the individual freedom and opportunity that is America.

As Abe Lincoln himself expressed it in a speech at New Haven, Conn., in 1860: "I am not ashamed to confess that 25 years ago I was a hired laborer, hauling rails, at work on a flatboat—just what might happen to and poor man's son. I want every man to have a chance."

To insure these United States of America as a land of freedom and opportunity, that every man may have his chance, Abraham Lincoln devoted his life, founded our Republican Party and ultimately gave his life. Let us be no less devoted.

In 1864, when our country was torn with internal strife and Abe Lincoln was struggling with a heavy heart to restore peace and unity, he had occasion to make a few remarks to an infantry regiment. This is what he said, with his customary humility: "I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here, as my fathers' child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance—that the struggle should be maintained that we may not lose our birthright."

We in our day are likewise called upon in the circumstances of our day to maintain this struggle for freedom and opportunity that we may not lose this precious birthright.

As we reflect on the life and character of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, our hearts fill with renewed devotion to our cherished heritage of freedom and opportunity for which he so nobly gave "that last full measure of devotion." In his words and by his deeds he has left footprints on the sands of time to show us the way, to inspire us and give us courage in our darkest hours.

Of course, we in Illinois take special pride in this great American. He practiced law in the immediate vicinity of my congressional district and served four terms in the Illinois State Legislature, as well as one term as a Member of Congress from Illinois.

The important fact is that he lived in the days of the pioneers. In this environment he acquired those sterling qualities of honesty and humility, patience and charity, self-reliance and industry; and, above all else, faith in God and his fellowmen.

Abraham Lincoln does not really belong to any one State. He does not belong solely to Kentucky, where he was born; nor to Indiana, where he was raised as a boy; nor solely to my own State of Illinois, where he rose to national greatness.

Lincoln belongs to the ages—to all Americans—to all peoples.

But he uniquely belongs to the Republican Party. He was our first national leader. He shaped our formative years as a political party.

The basic principles of freedom under a constitutional Government that Abraham Lincoln advocated are the traditional principles of the Republican Party. With time, conditions and circumstances change. But proven principles for individual conduct and proven principles for good government will live forever.

Lincoln believed that the Government belonged to the people, should be conducted for the people, by the people. That continues to be the doctrine of the Republican Party.

Lincoln believed that a government that governs the least governs the best. That continues to be the doctrine of the Republican Party.

Lincoln believed in equal rights for all and special privileges for none. That continues to be the doctrine of the Republican Party.

Lincoln believed in frugality. He believed that debts and taxes can be chains of bondage as much as other forms of enslavement. That continues to be the doctrine of the Republican Party.

Lincoln believed in honesty and integrity. He looked upon public office as a public trust. That continues to be the doctrine of the Republican Party.

It has been such traditional principles as these that have made America strong and great. It is to such traditional principles that our country is being returned under the crusading dynamic leadership of President Eisenhower.

As the people looked to Lincoln for forthright leadership in a period of grave national crisis, the American people look today to President Eisenhower, and the Republican Party, for the same forthright leadership in this critical period, when our very existence as a free people is threatened.

Lincoln kept faith. With determination and with courage, he applied himself to the problems of his day. He saved this Nation from self-destruction.

We are keeping faith. With determination and with courage, we, too, are applying ourselves to the complex problems of our day. With the full cooperation of the Republican Members of Congress, President Eisenhower is again furnishing the country the forthright leadership so earnestly desired by all Americans and so sorely needed to preserve the American way of life.

We Republicans are engaged in the tremendous job of reconstruction: spiritually, economically, militarily and governmentally. We have the appointed task to repair the great damage wrought by 20 long years of New Deal-Fair Deal misrule. It will take time; it will take courage; and, it will take patience to repair completely the damage wrought by many years during which the socialistic planners of the Democrat Party distorted and circumvented our Constitution and shackled our economy.

In this work of reconstruction we are, as immortal Abraham Lincoln expressed it in memorable words at Gettysburg, "Dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

As Lincoln kept faith, we are keeping faith. Truly remarkable progress has been made in just three short years. Much has been accomplished. But much remains to be done.

A great deal of which has been accomplished can be credited to the fact that we have in the White House another Republican who, like Lincoln, is a man of great spiritual and intellectual stature. He has but one ambition: that is to do that which is best for all of us that all of us, and our children to come after us, may as a free people ever enjoy peace, progress, and prosperity.

I venture the prediction that this period of our history will come to be known as the Republican era of stability and solid progress. It will stand in sharp contrast to the previous 20 years of debts, taxes, subversion, immorality, confusion, uncertainty, inflation and war.

As the very first step for meeting the great task before us, President Eisenhower determined it shall be the firm policy of his administration to adhere to the fundamental principles of our constitutional form of government. We now have in the White House a President who believes in the Constitution of the United States. To him it is not the straitjacket against which the New Dealers-Fair Dealers complain. To him the Constitution is a living document within the framework of which we can work together as a team to solve our problems and insure the people their rights and liberties.

During these past 20 years of misrule we have seen our Constitution distorted, circumvented, and even ignored. We experienced White House dictation, ridicule of the Congress and even an abortive attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

This shameful era has ended. With the Eisenhower administration we have returned to our constitutional form of government. Immediately upon taking office President Eisenhower inaugurated policies and procedures to restore Congress to its proper place in our system of government as the voice of the people, the doer of the people's will and the protector of their liberties.

This is precisely the same attitude taken by Abraham Lincoln. In a speech at Pittsburgh on February 15, 1861, Lincoln said: "By the Constitution, the Executive may recommend measures which he thinks proper, and he may veto those he thinks improper, and it is supposed that he may add to certain indirect influences to affect the action of Congress. My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country."

That was the intent of our Founding Fathers, that was the principle of government followed by Abraham Lincoln, and it is the principle of government being followed by Dwight D. Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower regularly consults with the leaders of the people's representatives in Congress. We meet with him regularly each week for a discussion of pressing problems and possible solutions by legislative or Executive action. These White House conferences provide opportunity for a free exchange of views and ideas between the President and the Congress as the voice of the people.

President Eisenhower's immediate predecessors did not consult with the Congress and recommend. They arbitrarily demanded certain measures be passed, without changing a comma; and insisted that every dollar requested be appropriated, without question. When the Congress refused their demands there followed White House attempts at political purges. There followed ridicule and abuse of your Congress as an arm of the Government.

Recall, for example, President Roosevelt's "Rubberstamp Congresses" and his efforts to purge the recalcitrants of his own political party. Recall President Truman's abuse of the Republican 80th Congress, notwithstanding the fact it complied with the people's wishes by cutting the cost of government, reducing taxes and improving labor-management relations. Recall President Truman's free use of the veto power and his repeated refusals to give the Congress the information it sought in order to legislate for the people the Congress represented. Recall the secret agreements entered into by the Executive and foreign commitments made without any consultation at any time with the Congress.

Our steel mills were seized without regard to the constitutional prohibition against taking private property of any man or group of men. Our country was even plunged—practically overnight—into a stalemate war in far off Korea, without any prior consultation of any kind with the Congress.

With our Republican administration this shameful era ended. From a government by executive dictation, order, and decree that we experienced for 20 long years under the Democrats, we have changed to a government of law as expressed by the people through their own Representatives in Congress. We Republicans have brought an end to the era of government by men and have ushered in an Abraham Lincoln era of government of, for, and by the people.

Our constitutional form of government is being revitalized in other respects. For 20 long years we have seen the Federal Government assume more and more authority at the expense of the States and local communities. So extensive had the centralization of power in Washington become that our States were becoming little more than geographic boundaries on a map.

We Republicans have not only stopped this dangerous, destructive trend. We have reversed it. Not only do we Republicans emphasize local self-government, local rights, and local responsibilities, we emphasize individual rights and liberties. We emphasize freedom and opportunity. We emphasize individual initiative and ingenuity. That is the American way of life.

Since we Republicans took over our national leadership there has been a moral and spiritual reawakening.

For 20 long years under the New Dealers-Fair Dealers, who control the Democratic Party, we have witnessed immorality, graft, greed, corruption, and in general a moral degeneration of our people. They offered something material to induce the people to follow them. Theirs was a dollar a vote philosophy.

But they never offered anything spiritual. They never sought to point out to our people that man is a spiritual as well as a material being. "Man cannot live by bread alone," and for 20 long years our people were actually starving for spiritual leadership.

All this has been changed under the forthright leadership of our Republican administration. President Eisenhower has brought about a moral and spiritual reawakening in the country.

No nation, however strong in a material sense, can long endure if it is not strong morally and spiritually. It is a lesson of history. Just as Abraham Lincoln showed the way, President Eisenhower has shown the way to moral and spiritual strength. That, to me, is one of our foremost accomplishments.

In these 3 short years our Nation has also become economically strong. This period of peace, progress, and prosperity stands in sharp contrast to the previous period of war, ever-mounting debts, ever-increasing taxes, ever-expanding Government, and widespread uncertainty.

Just consider for a moment what we have accomplished. When we Republicans took office—only 3 years ago—we were at war. It was an undeclared war in far-off Korea, in which we had no voice. It cost billions upon billions of dollars. More important, it cost the lives of 33,237 American boys and 119,196 wounded; some of whom will never see or walk again.

We ended that unnecessary, costly war. We brought peace in the world. And today, thanks to our Republican President's capacity for world leadership, we are in a stronger international position than we have ever been. We have seized the diplomatic offensive.

To be sure, it is not a certain peace. Yet we are on the march, for the first time in more than a decade, toward international justice and stable international peace. We are on the march for permanent peace and security with a leader who knows best how to achieve it.

In our untiring efforts for permanent peace and security we are following two basic principles. One is that the American people themselves shall at all times have a voice in the course pursued. The era of secret agreements has ended. Ours is the policy of keeping the people fully advised at all times and of giving the people, through their representatives in Congress, a definite voice in the decisions made.

A second basic principle in our Republican foreign policy is that we shall be firm and strong. While we are determined to insure peace, we are not so foolish to think that concessions and appeasement insure peace. That was the naive theory of the previous Democrat administrations, but it is not the policy of our Republican administration.

The Democrats have made much ado over the so-called "brink of war" statement of Secretary of State Dulles. In this, as in all things, they are desperately searching for an issue and desperately trying to becloud the facts.

The fact is that "the brink of war" is nothing more or less than the administration's policy, endorsed by Congress itself in the Formosa resolution, of making certain our allies and our potential enemies know that we say what we mean and we mean what we say. It is this firm, definite policy that has served to deter anyone with thoughts of aggression.

Of this I am sure: Our people would rather that we use "brink of war" policy than be in war itself, and that's exactly what the policy has accomplished.

We are following a principle enunciated by Abraham Lincoln when he said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right." That's the essence of our foreign policy, "firmness in the right." Our friends and enemies know it. Because they know it, war has been avoided, and we are closer to permanent peace than we have ever been. We hold no malice. We seek nothing. We seek only to be free to live and to let others live in peace and freedom. That is what is conceived to be right—a God given right—and for that right we shall, under a Republican administration, be always courageous and firm.

Yes, we have achieved peace. We have done more than that. We have given our

people both peace and prosperity. We are proving to our Democrat friends you can have both.

The unemployment problem of the 30's was never solved in 20 long years. World War II temporarily solved it. The Korean war temporarily solved it. But no real solution is temporary.

No real prosperity is based on war. Real prosperity has but one real basis—and that is the reality of peace.

We can be proud of the comparative ease with which the country made the transition from the Democrat wartime economy to the Republican peacetime economy. Such a transition is always difficult. Maladjustments are more or less certain to occur. Some still exist but steps are being taken to correct them.

You may recall that in making this transition the Democrat prophets of doom and disaster began to beat the war drums. But their loud cries of an impending depression, of doom and great disaster, never materialized. Our Republican administration not only brought peace, not only made possible a transition from war production to peacetime production with a minimum of hardship—we have ushered in a period of prosperity never before achieved. Home, industrial, public, and other construction are setting new high records. Civilian employment has reached an all-time peak of 65 million. For the first time in history personal income is exceeding the $300 billion level.

The average weekly wage of manufacturing workers has risen to almost $80. That is almost $9 more per week than it was a year and a half ago.

But that's not the whole story. The important fact is that not only have wages in dollars increased but what those dollars will buy has become stable. We Republicans have stabilized the dollar so that what the wage earner receives is a real wage.

The halting of inflation and the creation of an economic prosperity based on peace instead of war is no mere accident. It is the result of the policies put into effect by your Republican administration under President Eisenhower.

It is the result of our continuing to adhere to the principles advocated by Abraham Lincoln. In a speech on the floor of the House, when he was a Member of Congress from Illinois, he said: "We hold the true Republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong." And that is exactly the policy being followed by your Republican administration.

We released the energies of our people and private enterprise by removing Government controls on prices, wages, rents, and materials. We reversed the trend toward an all-powerful Federal Government in Washington and have been steadily taking the Government out of competition with private enterprise. We cut Government spending and passed the savings on to the people. We provided incentives to industry and business to create jobs by reducing their tax burdens and other aids. In short, your Republican administration has placed our whole economy on a solid foundation that all the people may enjoy progress and prosperity.

To be sure, there are still certain areas where complete adjustment from wartime to peacetime production has not yet been made. There are still problems to be solved. And the farm problem is the most notable. Farm prices continue to decline. But it must be borne in mind we have not yet put into effect our entire Republican farm program. It must be borne in mind that from the previous administrations we have inherited huge surpluses which continue to depress farm prices.

Nonetheless, the decline in farm prices which started in the Truman administration has been slowed down. We are vigorously pursuing a program for the disposal, at home and abroad, of the huge surpluses. We are finding new markets and new uses for the products of the farm.

I am confident that we are on the way to a solution of the farm problem. It will take time. It will take patience. But we Republicans are determined we shall find the solution and not simply play politics at the expense of our farmers.

It seems to me that the stoppage of inflation and the general stabilization of our economy is one of our great accomplishments of your Republican administration. It means considerably more than the Democrat proposal of a $20 tax reduction, which would only have meant the average family would have to spend that much and more in the price rise it would have caused. But Democrats are interested in lure for votes that they get power. We Republicans are instead working for national strength that our country may have power.

Why does the average man now have more take-home pay? Why is it more? There are two reasons: one is that under the rise, careful, painstaking direction of your Republican administration the inflation has been halted. And, secondly, we have in this brief period of less than 3 years cut the cost of Government to the extent that we have given the taxpayers $7,400,000,000 to spend for themselves, rather than have the Government spend it for them. And believe me, we have every reason to believe that more tax reduction is on the way if Republicans are left in control of our fiscal affairs.

The Democrats are trying to make it appear that the tax reduction favored the rich. The 10-percent cut was made in personal income taxes of all in the middle and lower brackets, consisting of 85 percent of the taxpayers. Does that favor the rich? All excise taxes, such as on electrical appliances, movie theater tickets, railroad fares, toilet articles, and various items in the average family budget, were reduced from 25 to 10 percent. Does that favor the rich? It is the average working man and woman who constitute 85 percent of the consumers in America.

The fact is that two-thirds of the huge tax reduction brought about in just 2 years goes directly to the average wage earner and his family. We Republicans are interested in making certain the average man, the average American, is able to find steady employment, and able to progress. We are achieving that objective and we are now entering upon a period of progress and prosperity never equaled in our history.

I wish I had the time to outline all that has been accomplished in this brief period of less than 3 years. On all fronts, foreign and domestic, governmental and economic, military and moral, we have made an outstanding record for a freer and stronger America. After 20 years of New Deal-Fair Deal misrule, with programs to make us a socialistic state, we have been engaged in repairing the damage they have done. We are engaged in rebuilding our whole national economic and governmental house in accordance with proven American principles of sound economics and good government.

Yes, we Republicans have something of which we can be proud. We have a truly American program for peace, progress, and prosperity. We have a record to show we know how to put that program into effect, and our record shows the effectiveness of the program. In just less than 3 years the whole country is beginning to enjoy its fruits. We are in a Republican era of stability. We are in a period of peace, progress, and prosperity.

That's exactly what the American people want. It is your job and mine to see that they really get what they want. If we do our job as we should, a complete Republican victory in November is a certainty.

In 1859 Abraham Lincoln made this pledge: "I have enlisted for the permanent success of the Republican cause." We here tonight pledge we shall do no less.

Lincoln Was Strict as Segregationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion in the northern press condemning the action of my State of Mississippi and other Southern States for interposing the rights of our State, rights reserved to them under the Constitution of the United States. I would point out such action is the only appeal from the unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court in the antisegregation decision. In view of such facts, I wish to insert the following editorial on the views of Abraham Lincoln on the race issue. I do this because in all the Lincoln Day Republican speeches, you will not find these truths about Lincoln:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger and Daily News of February 12, 1956]

LINCOLN WAS STRICT AS SEGREGATIONIST—GREAT EMANCIPATOR SAW "NATURAL DISGUST" IN AMALGAMATION OF RACES; ABE NEVER INTENDED FOR NEGRO TO BE A UNITED STATES CITIZEN

Today is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, emancipator of the Negro race, and it is timely that the Nation should know exactly what the great emancipator really thought on the race question.

It is a fact of history that Lincoln was a strict segregationist and did not believe in the "political and social equality of the black and white races."

Extracts from Lincoln's speeches, here quoted, may be found in almost any public library containing Lincolniana.

In a Springfield, Ill., speech on June 26, 1857, Lincoln said:

"There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people at the idea of an indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races * * *.

KEEP SEPARATION

"A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but as immediate separation is impossible the next best thing * * * is to keep them apart where they are not already together.

"If white and black people never get together in Kansas, they will never mix blood in Kansas. This is one self-evident truth.

"A few free colored persons may get into the free States in any event; but their number is too insignificant to amount to much in the way of mixing blood. * * *

"Such separation, if it is ever to be effected at all, must be effected by colonization. * * * The enterprise is a difficult one, but 'where there is a will there is a way,' and what colonization needs most is a hearty will. * * *

"Let us be brought to believe it is morally right, and at the same time favorable to, or at least not against, our interest to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be."

CHILDREN OF ISRAEL

"The children of Israel, to such numbers as to include 400,000 fighting men, went out of Egypt in a body."

At Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1859, in a famous debate with Lincoln, Judge Douglas, who defeated Lincoln for the senatorship, said:

"I hold that a Negro is not and never ought to be a citizen of the United States. I hold that this Government was made on the white basis, by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men and none others."

Lincoln replied: "I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position."

On September 16, 1859, at Columbus, Ohio, Lincoln spoke as follows:

ENTITLED TO RIGHTS

"There is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights, enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * *

"I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowments. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. * * *

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of the Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people.

"I am now in my 50th year; and I certainly never have had a black woman for either a slave or a wife. So it seems to me quite possible for us to get along without making either slaves or wives of the Negroes."

NO PERFECT EQUALITY

"I will add to this, that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman, or child, who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between Negroes and White men. * * *

"I give him (Judge Douglas) my most solemn pledge that I will to the very last stand by the law of the State, which forbids the marrying of White people with Negroes."

There were about 500,000 free Negroes in the United States at the time of the Civil War (1860 census), over half of whom lived in the South. On August 14, 1862, President Lincoln, in recommending colonization to a "Deputation of (free) Negroes" in Washington, said:

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference that exists between almost any other two races. Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think."

BOTH RACES SUFFER

"Your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason, at least, why we should be separated.

"Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with white people * * *. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you * * *. I cannot alter it if I would.

"I need not recount to you the effects upon white men, growing out of the institution of slavery * * * its evil effects upon the white race.

"See our present condition—the country engaged in war—our white men cutting one another's throats, and then consider what we know to be the truth.

"But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

He recommended Central America as an alternative to Africa, for colonization of American Negroes.

Our Inadequate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a single disaster if it took the lives of 105 people today would be reported by radio and television and would appear on the front page of every newspaper in the Nation. Yet about 100 separate tragedies which occurred every single day of last year and which resulted in an average of 105 people killed daily in the United States by automobiles have failed to shock legislators sufficiently to remedy this situation in the past. A highway system to take care of the 3 million additional automobiles being added each year is the remedy I have in mind to adequately handle our traffic problem. The death toll rose 8 percent in 1955 and yet Congress last year failed to act on President Eisenhower's highway construction program.

It is encouraging that Congress may soon consider a measure which provides for the Federal Government to assume a major role in accelerating highway construction, because I doubt if our constitutents next fall will register much sympathy if Members of Congress, as they did in the first session of the 84th Congress, set up partisan roadblocks—a rather appropriate expression—for authorizing such a program.

Last session, I could not support the committee bill that was reported out of committee—not, I assure you, on account of the measure's failure to conform to the administration's ideas; but rather because this Democratic bill taxed nonusers of interstate highways unfairly. Certainly, I have no objections to a pay-as-you-go program and I understand President Eisenhower has no objection to it as against his former suggestion of financing this highway program by issuing bonds.

There are details about this highway construction bill that are important. In my opinion, a provision such as the Davis-Bacon type of protection for local area wages and standards is fair and should be supported. I expect to have more to say on that score later. There will be difference of opinion, also, as to the apportioning formula as between States, and reimbursement factors to utilities.

Right now, I desire to address myself to the general need that exists as far as my own State of Washington is concerned. It happens that Washington State's needs recently have been carefully analyzed. Citing the highway study of this one State would indicate, I am sure, a good example of what exists in the other 47 States.

Our Washington State Highway Commission presented a long-range report at the 1955 session of our State legislature outlining the needs of the highway system over a 10-year period with anticipated State revenues. This comprehensive report was based on a 2-year study by our department of highways in evaluating every mile of the State highway system to determine needs of each section in respect to anticipated traffic growth.

The conclusion was that for a 10-year period $675 million should be spent while using the present tax base projected over the same period, allowing for expected revenue increases, only $331 million would be available to do the work.

These total needs, I am told by Washington State's Director of Highways, W. A. Bugge, are somewhat below the figures set forth in the section 13 study of the 1954 Federal Aid Act, this for the reason that in our State study, need was held to the bare essentials and it excluded improvements on 1,700 miles of State highways which while inadequate, yet could be tolerated. Also excluded was reconstruction of highway from Tacoma through Seattle to Everett which is proposed as a toll road to cost an estimated $194 million. Two other sections that cross the Cascade Mountains were omitted, part of the so-called Cascade Wagon Road from Marblemount to Twisp, and also part of the Naches Pass highway. These projects would cost $50 million additional.

In other words, without a revision of the tax base or additional assistance on the Federal level, the State of Washington will be faced with a very serious problem as it affects the improvement of the highway system. There is no doubt that if the highway transportation system of my State or the other 47 States, is not improved, consistent with the traffic demands, the effect will be of serious nature upon the economic and industrial growth of the State and likewise of the Nation, as well as upon the accident and mortality rate.

I agree with the conclusions reached by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should assume the major responsibility of reconstructing the interstate system, and if legislation is enacted to that effect, it would then make it possible for the State of Washington to re-evaluate its basic highway planning in such a manner as to more realistically meet the 10-year needs requirements with the funds that would be available. Other States, I am sure, will be in the same situation.

A Washington State factor of major importance is the relationship of the proposed Federal highway legislation to the Tacoma-Seattle-Everett toll road. It was the thinking of the 1955 Wash-

ington State Legislature that it was necessary to initiate such action so as to assure the early completion of this much needed highway section. The congestion that is developing in the metropolitan areas of Tacoma and Seattle make it imperative that highway improvements of freeway design be considered in the very near future. For that reason the 1955 State legislature directed the Washington Toll Bridge Authority to proceed with the construction of this highway as a toll road. This particular section of highway is part of the interstate system and if major Federal participation in the interstate system was effected by congressional action, it would then make it possible to reevaluate this particular project with respect to the possibility of building all or parts as a free road, which, of course, would represent a saving of millions of dollars to the highway users of the State, as would be reflected in interest charges on bonds issued and other costs incidental to toll projects.

I believe a thorough investigation of the Federal program will resolve itself into a situation wherein the Federal Government would assume the major cost of the reconstruction of the interstate system and if such legislation became a reality, the highway problems that are affecting the States not only today but in the future could be resolved consistent with the evident traffic demands and likewise the future growth of the State. I think other States would be affected in a similar way to Washington State.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by emphasizing that it takes years to construct highways. It will take years to carry out a Federal accelerated highway program. I strongly support action now to build a highway system adequate for present and future traffic requirements.

Heritage Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Massachusetts Law Quarterly of December 1955, issued by the Massachusetts Bar Association, by Attorney Albert West, chairman of the special Commission of the 175th Anniversary of the Constitution of the Commonwealth:

THE MASSACHUSETTS HERITAGE PROGRAM OF 1955

(By Albert West, chairman)

The 1955 Massachusetts heritage program of the association was held in conjunction with the observance by the special commission of the 175th anniversary of the constitution of the Commonwealth. The commission was given an appropriation of $5,000 by the legislature for its work and voted to finance the association's history pamphlet on the background of the adoption of the Massachusetts constitution to be distributed in supply to the history departments of all high schools in the Commonwealth.

No effort was spared to make this pamphlet attractive and of lasting value to the schools. Many schools had complained that no adequate teaching guide was obtainable in order to comply with chapter 468 of the acts of 1949, which requires that the history of Massachusetts and its constitution be taught in the secondary schools. This pamphlet was written to help in supplying that need and to stimulate further efforts in this direction. It has been acclaimed by some and well received by all.

We used the Herter mural, the Drafting of the Massachusetts Constitution, in full natural color on the cover. This was the first time this great painting has been published in color and it has excited widespread interest. It is one of five murals painted by Albert Herter, the father of the present Governor, who presented them to the Commonwealth in his last year as speaker of the house in 1943. There is reason to believe that other organizations may follow our lead and reproduce some or all of the others in color. We reproduced, in facsimile, for the first time, the first page of the constitution and published this on the back page of the pamphlet.

Following last year's pattern we made a lawyer available to those high schools wanting a speaker during Massachusetts Heritage Month. Most of the high schools and a great many service clubs and organizations requested a speaker. The speech of His Excellency John Wright, bishop of Worcester in 1954, an address of Basil Brewer, the distinguished New Bedford publisher, which Mr. Brewer supplied, at his own expense, and the matter contained in the pamphlet were made avilable to all speakers. The results were more than gratifying and letters of high praise continue to come to us. The demand for the pamphlet from every conceivable source is evidence of the very great interest on the part of the general public.

The program was climaxed by a dinner on the 175th anniversary of the day when the government of Massachusetts commenced and John Hancock was inaugurated as the first Governor under the Constitution, October 25.

This was an impressive occasion. The main ballroom of the Hotel Statler was filled. The entire board of superintendents of the Boston school system attended and Rt. Rev. Timothy J. O'Leary represented the parochial schools of Massachusetts, among other distinguished educators and leading citizens. Hon. Edward J. Cronin, Secretary of the Commonwealth, paid the association the honor of bringing the original Constitution to the dinner to be viewed by those participating.

The principal speaker was Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, the foremost authority on the formation of the Constitution, and his address is printed in full in this issue. Hon. Raymond Fellows, chief justice of Maine, represented His Excellency Edmund S. Muskie, Governor of Maine, which was part of Massachusetts under our Constitution until the separation in 1820 at the time of the Missouri compromise.[1]

Chief Justice Stanley E. Qua spoke entertainingly.

A telegram from President Eisenhower was read by President Schneider.

Hon. Paul C. Reardon, the recently appointed chief justice of the superior court was a special guest. Other guests presented were recently appointed probate court judges, Hon. Edmund V. Keville, of Suffolk County, and Hon. Beatrice Hancock Mullaney, of Bristol County, Gen. Otis H. Whitney, Chester C. Steadman, representing the Boston Bar Association, Deborah Greenberg, representing the Women's Lawyers Association, and Joseph Ford, chairman of the committee on public relations of the Massachusetts Bar Association.

Basil Brewer John Taylor, Erwin Canham, Rt. Rev. Francis J. Lally, represented the press and Paul F. Clark, president of the John Hancock Insurance Co. made available funds to distribute enlargements of the Herter mural in full color to the governors and chief justices of the several States. The members of the special commission were head table guests and were presented by the chairman to an appreciative audience.

As pictured below, the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Timothy J. Murphy, a member of the association, presented on behalf of his organization a citation which was awarded by them to the Massachusetts Bar Association and the special commission for their efforts in citizenship education.

Judge Daniel J. Gillen, of the Boston Municipal Court, was presented, as the sponsor of the legislation which created the special commission. In addition to breaking records for attendance, the dinner set a high mark for performance and was a fitting climax to a great event. The county chairmen whose efforts helped to make this program a success were awarded a special citation; they are: Hon. Paul M. Swift, Barnstable; Walter E. Reilly, Berkshire; Gerald P. Walsh, Bristol; Andrew Linscott, Essex; Joseph T. Bartlett, Franklin; William F. Stapleton, Hampden; Edwin P. Dunphy, Hampshire; Thomas M. A. Higgins, Middlesex; Dennis F. Ryan, Norfolk; George C. P. Olsson, Plymouth; John E. Connelly, Suffolk; Paul G. Gearan, Worcester.

Special citations were presented by the association to Joseph Lee, present chairman of the Boston School Committee, Thomas J. Curtin, director of the citizenship program of the State Department of Education and Thomas C. Heffernan of the Boston School Department who is also a member of the association, for their help as consultants in the preparation and distribution of the pamphlet.

The members of the special commission on the 175th anniversary of the constitution are: Albert West, chairman, by the Governor; Silvio O. Conte, by the president of the senate; John W. Costello, and Harold Putnam, by the speaker of the house.

As an inspiring example of the far-reaching effect of this work the Massachusetts Teachers Association has invited the association to participate in a conference on citizenship training through public relations, at the Hotel Sheraton Plaza on February 4, 1956. We have been asked to participate because of our "important work in citizenship training directly through the schools or with school cooperation and approval." Thus like dropping a pebble in a pool our circle of influence ever widens. Or as Frank Grinnell says, the continuous radiation of this program is limitless.

[1] Chief Justice Fellows read an original letter of John Adams in 1819 (from the Maine archives) in answer to an inquiry as to the proposal of separation by a member of a Maine committee.

An Arab Kibbutz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of our colleagues to the following article on Arab refugees

which appeared in the January 1956 issue of the American Zionist. The article was written by Mr. Stanley Newman, a British student of Middle Eastern affairs, who has visited the Near East on several occasions.

THE STORY OF AN ARAB "KIBBUTZ"

(By Stanley Newman)

Of the many Middle East problems awaiting a solution, the position of the Arab refugees is possibly the most poignant. Caught up in the wider struggle between Israel and the Arab States, the refugees are forced to remain homeless until the Arab leaders decide it is politic to agree to a peace settlement.

The overwhelming majority of the refugees left Palestine during the Arab-Israel war at the urgings of their leaders, and the remainder fled as the battle drew close to their villages. It is now 7 years since the armistice agreements were signed, but the Arab refugees are, for the most part, still encamped on the squalid sites where they went in the expectation of only temporary shelter. They remain where they are as it suits the aims of the Arab leaders. Indifferent to their welfare, and eager to use them to bring about the hoped-for final destruction of the State of Israel, the Arab leaders have consistently obstructed attempts to settle the refugees in permanent quarters and in productive jobs. Although the American plan for a Jordan Valley authority will benefit Arabs as well as Israel, the Arab leaders have repeatedly stalled the scheme. The project, if carried out, would irrigate land in Jordan and so make it possible to settle many of the refugees. But this would eliminate the Arab refugee issue in the continuing propaganda campaign against Israel, and would largely remove the excuse constantly being offered to explain Arab incursions into Israel.

The director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, Henry Labouisse, has repeatedly threatened to expose Arab opposition to resettlement plans, but so far he has failed to carry out his intention. Meanwhile the Arab refugees continue to live in their ramshackle quarters. Despite their protestations of sympathy for their refugee brethren, the Arab States benefit economically from the present situation. United Nations' dollar aid bolsters Jordan's precarious economy, and the shipment of refugee aid goods through Beirut harbor contributes significantly to the city's prosperity.

It is not only United Nation's aid or American development schemes that are treated in this fashion. Private attempts to ease the lot of the refugee have also met with considerable opposition. One such scheme is sponsored in Jordan by the Arab lawyer, Musa Bey Alami. At the outset Musa Alami encountered much hostility, but now that he has outwitted the opponents of his program his project is proudly displayed to visiting Americans as a model of progressive Arab farming methods. Alami himself is periodically brought to the United States on Arab propaganda tours to speak before civic groups on the tragedy of the Arab refugees.

The Musa Bey Alami project is a small experimental village huddled on the sandy plain near the ruins of ancient Jericho. If allowed to prosper, the project holds out fresh hope for the reconstruction of the Arab Middle East. The village, which I visited in 1953, bears many physical resemblances to an Israeli kibbutz, and is but part of a wider scheme for solving the Arab refugee problem, at least in part, and for helping to pioneer a modern Arab agriculture.

Musa Bey Alami, a tall, heavily-built man in his early fifties, with a determined-looking face, is the originator of the project and its driving force. A lawyer by training, Alami was in his younger days an agent for the Jewish National Fund, acting as intermediary with Arab landowners in Palestine. Later he became director of the Arab Offices, the Arab propaganda bureaus established in New York, Jerusalem and London to counteract Zionist political activity prior to the establishment of the State of Israel.

Although no friend of Israel, Musa Alami was inspired by the success of Jewish endeavor in converting the deserts and swamps of Palestine into fertile soil. Shortly after World War II he established the Arab Development Society as an Arab counterpart of the Jewish National Fund. The aim of the Society was to buy land in Palestine, and so keep it out of Jewish hands and at the same time develop it in the Arab interest. In furtherance of this aim, the society planned to grant interest-free loans to the Arab peasants of Palestine, thereby freeing them of the burdensome debts that hung like stones about their necks. The Society also hoped to encourage modern agricultural techniques in order to improve the productivity of the Arab farmer; to improve the health standards of the Arabs by providing clinics and hospitals, by disseminating a knowledge of modern hygiene and sanitation, and by building modern houses in place of the old, dilapidated ones; and finally, to raise the educational level of the Arab peasants by building and supporting schools. The Arab governments received this plan with lukewarm enthusiasm. Only the Iraqi Government thought these aims were sufficiently worthwhile to warrant financial support. With this money the Society bought some land in that part of Palestine that is now Israel territory.

The Arab defeat at the hands of the Israelis, and the Arab refugee problem that accompanied it, convinced the founder of the Arab Development Society that the need for his organization was even greater than before. Musa Alami wrote a short book. The Lesson of Palestine, in which he indicted the Arab leaders and people for their failures. The Arabs, he said in effect, wallowed in the memories of the past, allowing disease, disunity, and poverty to garnish indolence, while the Jews looked forward to a constructive future with hard work and imagination. If the Arabs really wished to regain Palestine—and Alami wants them to—then they must take a firm grip on themselves and organize their society on modern lines.

Not satisfied with a mere condemnation of Arab shortcomings, Alami and his associates drew up a plan of action. The Arab Development Society approached the Jordanian Government with a request for a land grant. They planned to establish a model village in which they would use the Arab refugees to found a new community. This would be a pilot project, one which would serve as an inspiration and an example that might be followed throughout the Arab world. Almost contemptuously, the Jordanian Government gave the society 5,000 acres of what was classified as "dead and waste" land. To the eye, the land was as arid as a block of salt. No water had ever, from biblical days until that time, been found on the site, and the British Mandatory had consequently written the land off as unsuitable for cultivation.

Disregarding all prophecies of failure, Musa Bey Alami and his associates went ahead with that determination possessed by dedicated men. True, no water had ever been found at that spot, but then nobody had ever drilled for any. With home-made tackle they drilled for water. To their own amazement, and to the consternation of their opponents, they discovered water at less than 100 feet below ground level. At the time I was there they had found 18 springs giving clear, sweet drinking water.

A short while after its establishment the village suffered a most severe blow, more cruel by far than the impersonal ravages of nature. Overnight, the 25 families of the village left their new homes and returned to the refugee camp whence they had come. The Jordanian Government had ordered them to leave.

From the outset of the scheme, there had been a deep cleavage between the approach of the Jordanian Government and the Arab Development Society over the problem of the Arab refugees. The Jordanian Government maintained, in common with the other members of the Arab League, that the Arab refugees must return to their former homes in Palestine. While Musa Alami and his associates yield to none in their support of Arab nationalist aims, they do believe that the Arab States must treat the Arab refugees as brothers and not as pariahs and the playthings of politics. Further, Alami sees in the refugee problem a unique opportunity for Arab revival. By training the refugees as modern farmers and to organize their society in keeping with the 20th century, he hopes by such an example to snowball reforms in the Arab world.

It was this wider objective which the Jordanian Government feared. If by proper medical care and welfare facilities Musa Alami could reduce infant mortality, then the peasants in the rest of Jordan would demand equal advantages. Clamor for such amenities would disrupt the present structure of Arab life. The Arab landlords would have to give in to demands for improved living conditions or go. Rather than face such a possibility, the Jordan Government decided to kill off the Musa Bey Alami scheme by forcing its inhabitants to leave.

Alami responded to this setback by adapting another Israeli institution to his needs. With the Youth Aliyah villages as his model, he established an Arab Boys' Town. When I was there he had 100 Palestinian orphans living in the village. They are fed, clothed and housed, and they also receive schooling. In addition to the basic and necesary book-learning, there is vocational training on the village farm, in the tailoring shops, and in the boot repair shops.

The boys' home is largely supported from the income the society gets from the sale of its agricultural produce. Eventually Alami hopes to be able to establish a complementary village for girls.

Unfortunately, there are few men of Musa Alami's caliber in the Arab world today. Let us hope that the boys he is training will be inspired to carry on his constructive work. For it is only when the Arab states devote their attentions to eliminating the basic ills of their society that we can expect peace in the Middle East.

Note on Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post under date of February 11, 1956. I commend its reading to the entire membership.

NOTE ON FEDERAL AID

If some Members of Congress still have doubts about the urgent need for the school construction bill, let them ponder these figures: In Montgomery County there are some 52,000 pupils now enrolled in the public elementary and secondary schools. It is con-

servatively estimated that within 4 years there will be 75,000. Some estimates put the figure even higher. Despite a large building program, some Montgomery County schools already are on a double shift, which is to say that students do not get the full training to which they are entitled. Nearly all the schools are crowded. This is not an isolated community but a fairly typical one. Similar figures could be cited for almost every growing urban or suburban area. The need for additional funds for the schools is so great that even the most ambitious programs fall far short of the ideal.

Law and Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, February 10, 1956:

LAW AND CHOICE

A chapter of an old and respected college fraternity has voted to accept into membership two Negroes. After some hesitation, the national body consented. This is taking place in Williamstown, Mass., in a region, to be sure, where Negroes are only slightly less scarce than are Eskimos in Alabama.

The pertinent elements in this situation are: The college exists under private auspices. The fraternity is a wholly voluntary association. No law or court ruling dictates whether the fraternity shall or shall not bar any race or races from its ranks. The chapter has chosen to do as it is doing.

At the State University of Alabama, a State where 1 out of every 3 persons is a Negro, a young Negro woman was admitted under a Supreme Court ruling. The Court had not said that one or many Negroes must attend the university; it said that any Negro has the legal right to attend if he wishes. Miss Autherine Lucy, for whatever motives, chose to enroll. The university obeyed the law. A number of the students made known that they did not choose to welcome a Negro in their midst. This much is their right.

Here were two examples of the interplay of voluntaryism and law in two quite different situations. And could it remain at that point at Tuscaloosa (as it probably will at Williamstown) it would be valuable to see how matters work out. We cannot believe that, having won the equal legal right to attend or not to attend, any great number of Negroes of their own choice will flock where they are not welcome. People, regardless of race, flow with, not against, the currents of acceptance.

But at Tuscaloosa there have been those, not many of them students, who have sought to force the university to disobey the law and to frighten the Negro student into withdrawing. They by no means represent the whole of community sentiment. (It would be only realistice to say that neither does a faculty minority nor any others who appear to accept willingly a biracial student body.)

The most hopeful local sentiment yet evident might be summed up as: A condemnation of violence and of flouting the law, and a concomitant condemnation of the law and antipathy to desegregation.

The Tuscaloosa News condemned the university as having "knuckled under to the pressures and desires of the mob." The campus Crimson-White denounced the rioters as "forcing their actions and their beliefs on us." The student council called upon the authorities to protect the personal safety of students. But none expressed any disapproval of segregation.

Positions such as these may be far removed from abstract ideals of justice and equality. But to hold such positions in the atmosphere created in the Deep South by the segregation issue takes breadth of view and courage that must be appreciated.

Meanwhile, the duties of the university and the State are clear: To reinstate Miss Lucy as a student and to protect her from violence until some accommodation is reached within the framework of what is now the law of the land. There is a principle at stake here which transcends whether or not townspeople or students choose to like the law's immediate consequences.

Problems of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, to keep as much as possible the great need of the people of Israel before our country, I today insert into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which I have taken from the Detroit Jewish News published on January 27, 1956, by my good friend, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, its editor and publisher. I think the editorial sets forth an aspect of the problem the Israelis face which has not been treated before. I would preface it with a quote from Prof. Preston Slosson, of the University of Michigan, who is one of the great students of history and world affairs in the world today and in whose views I wholeheartedly concur:

The first basis of any Near Eastern settlement at the present time is the recognition of the right of Israel to exist. So long as this is denied or challenged by any of the Arab States, there will be the possibility of war.

Once Israel is fully recognized by her neighbors, other matters can be more easily adjusted. The United Nations (or, failing that, NATO) might well fix permanently the frontiers, resettle refugees, and maintain a token policy force to prevent border "incidents," since any attack on the United Nations force would involve the aggressor, on either side, with the whole United Nations.

I renew my urging on this Congress and upon the administration that positive action be taken at an early date to provide defensive arms to Israel for the protection both of herself and of world peace.

THE "CAN'T YOU DIE DECENTLY?" ATTITUDE

While Arab propagandists are shouting "war," "death to the Jews," "we'll drive the Israelis into the sea," Israel continues to plead for peace. It is a tragic contrast, in the light of impending dangers to world peace.

The developments in the Security Council, the Russian infiltrations into the Middle East, the sponsorship of anti-Israel resolutions by Soviet spokesmen, whose predecessors in the United Nations were among the chief supporters of the original proposals for the establishment of the Jewish State, point to a prolonged controversy. Latest occurrences represent serious challenges to world peace efforts.

In the course of the bitter debates over the Arab-Israel conflicts, irresponsible propagandists often resort to low tactics in their efforts to gain assistance in their chief aim of destroying Israel. We often hear the charge that only the New York press backs Israel. It is a shocking way of saying to an unsuspecting world that the Jews of New York are pressuring American public opinion. It is, of course, a falsehood.

In spite of the uncertainty of the British position, there are newspapers in England whose fairness helps to assure a fair evaluation of the Middle East's problem. One of them, the Manchester Guardian, is rendering especially valuable service in the struggle for peace. In a recent editorial, the Manchester Guardian reviewed the Arabs' about-face demand for adherence to the 1947 U. N. partition resolution, which they had opposed when it first was adopted by the world organization. That editorial stated:

"Since the 1947 resolutions have been brought to the fore, it is necessary to recall their history. The resolutions provided for a partition of Palestine between a Jewish and Arab State, which were to be in some form of economic union. The Jews accepted the resolutions; the Arabs denounced them, to the point that the Arab States attacked Israel at the moment of its birth. The Arab States lost the war with Israel, which had enlarged itself during the fighting to its present size. The Arabs desired to cancel out what had happened by reverting from war to diplomacy and going back to the resolutions which they had rejected. (It is an interesting example of "Heads I win, tails you lose.") It is not clear whether the Arab States, in saying now that they stand by the resolutions, mean that they would accept the Palestinian Arab State envisaged in the resolutions. Large parts of the territory which would have belonged to that state are now incorporated in Jordan and Egypt. Are they willing to disgorge? Israel itself includes no territory which belonged to any of the Arab States. It is also not clear whether the Arabs, in return for the 1947 boundaries, would recognize Israel as a permanency."

These are truths that challenge those who are unrealistically attempting to turn the clock back in the Middle East. The Manchester Guardian supplemented this statement with another vitally important one when it asserted in its editorial:

"Everybody outside the Communist countries wants peace in the Middle East. There is naturally a disposition to be pleased with any side which says that it will negotiate, and to blame any side which objects to terms, even if it should be clear that it would be death to that side to accept them. The Egyptians will exploit this for all they are worth. They believe themselves well placed, since they have learned how to play off the great powers against one another. They know how anxiously their friendship is desired by Britain. Having accepted one delivery of arms from Russia, they have already succeeded in getting the 1947 resolutions disinterred by the British Government and in getting new competitive tenders of aid from the West. It would be natural if they now told themselves that, by accepting a second installment, they could get the West to tilt itself further in their direction in their combat with Israel. Probably the western countries will not be as gullible as the Egyptians think and there will be no cynical surrender of Israel. Israel may be overanxious when it compares itself with Czechoslovakia just before it was sacrificed by the powers. Yet its fears are understandable. It is forgotten that Israel has made all the peace offers, has proposed a corridor

for the Arabs through the Negev, has invited Jordan to use the port of Haifa, has agreed to rationalize its frontier with Jordan, has accepted plans for border security, has agreed in principle to the Dulles plan, subject to the lifting of the blockade. There is surely too much disposition to feel that all would be well if only Israel would shrink and be less conspicuous. It recalls the sentiment of Frederick the Great toward a writhing soldier on one of his battlefields. 'Can't you die decently?' "

The Frederick the Great story must be directed at all those who close eyes and ears when arms shipments are flown to Egypt in vast quantities. A people that has suffered the miseries of purgatory reaffirms that its only intention is to live decently and to aspire for peace and similar equal treatment for its neighbors. To assure world peace, general endorsement must be given to such a policy.

Widespread Opposition to Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am submitting four editorials from newspapers in several sections of the country which illustrate the widespread opposition to the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

One of them is from Springfield, Ohio. This newspaper is owned by the illustrious James M. Cox, once a candidate for the Presidency. Mr. Cox is recognized by farmers as an authority on our agricultural problems.

The editorials follow:

[From the Springfield (Ohio) Sun of January 16, 1956]

COLORADO PROJECT SHOULD BE DROPPED

There is a time coming when Americans will consume almost everything United States farmers grow. As Secretary of Agriculture Benson said last week in New Orleans: "We will some day need much greater output of farm products than we have today." However, he did not hazard a guess when demand for food and fiber in the United States will eliminate surpluses and empty storehouses of unused farm commodities. It certainly will not happen tomorrow.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, California, is preparing a report for congressional review in which he exposes the nonsensical reasoning behind a proposal of reclaiming half a million arid acres in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. He shows that, in the first place, the Nation has no possible use for more farmland at the moment. (In fact, it is the express purpose of the administration's latest farm program to reduce producing acreage this year as a means of slowing the heavy influx of excess food.) However, Representative HOSMER bases his opposition primarily on the exorbitant expense of the western reclamation proposal, known as the upper Colorado River project. He estimates that it would cost $4 billion to put the Colorado River area into farm production, or about $5,000 an acre.

He underlines the cost factor with additional information indicating that if, in the near future, the Nation should need more food, production could be easily—and inexpensively—boosted in established farming regions. A survey completed at his request shows that nearly 21 million acres of the "best farmland" in America is idle in 19 States from the Mississippi Valley east and south to Florida. "Moreover," Representative HOSMER observes, "there are millions of other unused acres in lower soil classes in other States in humid areas of the Nation. Much of this idle lower-class land could be improved with little cost and developed into pasture." He believes reclamation of eastern farmland could be accomplished for as little as $15 to $150 an acre.

The California Republican builds a good case. It should persuade fellow Congressmen to oppose strongly any effort to push through the upper Colorado River project. Men have often dreamed of making deserts bloom, of raising fields of golden grain where there is only unyielding ground. One can envision the day when the land in the shadow of the Rockies will be reclaimed, welcomed as a great and unexplored agricultural frontier. But at a time when the Nation stands in the shadow of huge piles of surplus farm commodities, it would be silly to create new reserves of fertile land.

[From the Haddonfield (N. J.) Gazette of January 26, 1956]

"ECONOMIC IDIOCY"

At a time when the administration is advocating a soil bank to take land out of production and the taxpayers are buying and storing surplus crops at a staggering cost, one would think that advocates of irrigation projects would ke keeping mum. But that is not the case.

The Nation has 21 million acres of rich, idle farmland in the Midwest, South, and Southeast available for crop production when more food and fiber are needed. But Congress is being asked to approve the upper Colorado River project to irrigate 523,000 acres of arid mountain land at a cost of $4 billion in added taxes. Conservative estimates show that it will cost $5,000 an acre to bring water to this land and grade it so that it can be properly irrigated and put into production.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, says "The whole thing is nothing short of economic idiocy." It so happens that the crazier the schemes are the more apt they are to be adopted by our economic planners. A letter to your New Jersey Senators and Congressmen may help to head this one off.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal Times of January 19, 1956]

RIGHT, LEFT HANDS AT CROSS PURPOSES

One of the devices of big government may be never to let the right hand know what the left hand is doing. But when the left hand and the right hand are both giving away the taxpayer's money for contradictory purposes, the taxpayer should be interested in seeing that at least one hand is stopped.

Before Congress are two contradictory proposals. One is to take 25 million acres of farmland out of production as a means of reducing surplus food production and raising the level of farm income. Another, in general terms, is to continue federally sponsored land-reclamation projects, most of them in the West, which would make millions of acres of land available for farming.

Oddly enough, many high-ranking officials of the Government, both in the executive departments and in Congress, seem to favor both of these contradictory proposals.

A case in point is the upper Colorado River Basin reclamation project. A year ago, this was a subject of controversy between those in favor of reclamation and conservationists who saw the project as a danger to the Dinosaur National Monument and the natural beauties of the Echo Park area.

But the fight over the Echo Park Dam and its 14 to 32 irrigation projects is now more than a parochial argument between Western States over water rights, or between the reclamationists and conservationists. Furthering this program today, whatever the arguments for and against it, would mean that the United States Government is spending from $1 billion to $1.6 billion to put huge areas of land under irrigation, while spending more than a billion dollars a year to take existing agricultural land out of cultivation.

Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, a proponent of the Echo Dam project, estimates that it would irrigate 300,000 acres of land which now have no water, plus another 470,000 acres which now have inadequate water. Thus, if the Senator's figures are correct, the project would put 770,000 acres under cultivation, raising crops we do not need while we are paying to take another 25 million acres of land out of cultivation.

Despite this obvious contradiction in national policy, both the President and the Senate are on record in favor of the Echo Park Dam program. President Eisenhower endorsed it specifically in his 1955 state of the Union message, and the Senate adopted the program last April. This year, since announcing his soil-bank program, President Eisenhower has not mentioned the giant irrigation program.

Neither the President nor the Senate can have it both ways. Advocates of this program in the Southwest, are, of course, exercising the privilege of promoting their own interests. But the national administration and Congress are elected to take a larger view. A surplus of food and a surplus of land under cultivation are national problems, to be viewed from Washington with the best interests of the whole country in mind, and they cannot logically continue to support simultaneously programs which take land out of cultivation and put other land under cultivation—both at a tremendous cost to the taxpayer.

We suggest that Echo Park Dam, and all similar projects which are solely designed to irrigate more land, be put back in the filing cabinets until we have licked our farm problem and found a way to use profitably all the land which is now available for food production.

[From the South Milwaukee (Wis.) Voice-Journal of January 26, 1956]

CERTAINLY NO BARGAIN

What has been branded as the most expensive and unsound scheme yet devised continues to plague economy-minded legislators in Washington. We refer to the gigantic upper Colorado River project which would bring into production more than half a million acres in high, barren, remote areas in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, is presenting to the House of Representatives evidence to show that while the Federal Bureau of Reclamation is asking Congress to approve enormous, costly new irrigation projects, at least 20,937,153 acres of the best American cropland are unused for any purpose. Included is land in Wisconsin and 18 other States.

HOSMER asserts that the 4 States benefiting from the proposed scheme would pay less than 2 percent of the cost which would run into billions. The upper Colorado Basin project, he says, would "saddle a new $4 billion tax loss on the Nation's taxpayers."

By contrast, he declares, the cost of bringing the millions of acres of good farmland now idle into full production would run from only $15 to $150 an acre, compared with $5,000 per acre in the Colorado River Basin project.

After paying the billions, taxpayers would still have to pay for roads, schools, and other facilities and then subsidize the crops which would be grown.

On the basis of what we know of the project, we agree with HOSMER that it is "nothing short of economic idiocy."

Mental Health Legislation for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Santa Ana Register, Santa Ana, Calif., regarding the mental health legislation for Alaska, has resulted in a number of protests from my constituency. The attached statement from the Secretary of the Interior on this subject is enlightening and, I believe, will do much toward erasing any misunderstanding. Since wide publicity has been given to this controversial matter, under unanimous consent, I include the statement in the Appendix of the RECORD so that people throughout the United States may have a knowledge of just what the legislation proposes:

STATEMENT CONCERNING ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL

The editorial which appeared in the Santa Ana Register on January 24, 1956, purports to show that the Alaska mental health bill will establish a 1-million-acre "Siberian concentration camp" in Alaska. The editorial also states that, if the bill is enacted, anyone with a grudge against another person can have him railroaded into this concentration camp. Lastly, the editorial says that provisions for reciprocity in the bill will enable the governors of all the States to exile their mentally ill to Alaska. These statements are based upon a misunderstanding of the terms of the legislation.

The provisions of the bill now before the Congress can best be understood against the background of existing Federal statutes relating to the care and treatment of the Alaskan mentally ill. Under these laws which date from 1900, a person suspected of being insane is apprehended by the United States marshal, lodged in the nearest jail—because there is usually no other safe place in which to lodge him—and in due course tried before the United States Commissioner and a jury of laymen which determines whether the person is insane. If found to be insane, the patient is then transported by the United States marshal, often in the company of convicted criminals, to Morningside Hospital, the private institution in Portland, Oreg., which provides care and treatment under a contract with the Department of the Interior. Approximately 368 patients are now hospitalized at Morningside under this contract.

There are also in Morningside Hospital a number of mentally defective children, some of whom are less than 5 years old. One was admitted when only 18 days old. These unfortunate children had to be tried before a jury before they could be sent to Morningside for care and treatment.

The existing statutes relating to the Alaskan mentally ill were possibly justified when enacted in the early part of this century. Today the commitment proceedings are archaic and barbaric. The Territory of Alaska has also developed economically and politically until it is now in a position to assume responsibility for the commitment and care of its mentally ill. This selfsame responsibility is now exercised by each of the 48 States and the Territory of Hawaii.

Against this background, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget drafted legislation intended to modernize the outdated commitment procedures for the Alaska mentally ill and to transfer to the Territory, where it belongs, the responsibility for their care and treatment. This is the legislation which was considered by the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in public hearings in Washington, D. C., and Portland, Oreg., and which was favorably reported on July 25, 1955. Subsequently, during a series of hearings in Alaska in October 1955, the committee heard virtually unanimous endorsement of the Alaska mental-health bill.

Basically, there are two parts to the pending legislation. The first relates to the hospitalization of the mentally ill and the second to grants to the Territory to assist it in undertaking this new responsibility. In keeping with modern emphasis on facilitating access to needed medical care, the Alaska mental-health bill authorizes admissions to qualified hospitals either on the patient's voluntary application or on the basis of application by others supported by medical certification. Such admissions, however, do not authorize compulsory detention of the patient and there is further preserved, even to the patient who is certified as dangerous and hospitalized under emergency procedures, the right to a discharge unless judicial proceedings are promptly instituted. In addition to the right of discharge and the availability of habeas corpus to protect the right, a right of petition for a judicial determination of his mental condition is also provided and may be invoked either by the patient or by others.

Nowhere in the Alaska mental-health bill is there authority for a person to be hospitalized without a prompt review of his mental condition nor is there authority for a patient to be held against his will without a judicial proceeding.

Because the Federal Government has exercised exclusive jurisdiction with respect to the Alaskan mentally ill during a period when the States were building up their present hospital facilities and personnel, it was our belief that the Territory should be assisted in assuming its new responsibility. Accordingly, we recommended a $6 million grant over 10 years to aid the Territory in establishing and operating a mental-health program and a $6,500,000 grant to assist it in constructing hospital facilities. Additionally, a grant of land to the Territory was recommended. In this connection it should be pointed out that Alaska's potential tax base is considerably narrowed because the Federal Government now holds more than 98 percent of Alaska's 375 million acres.

The legislation now before the Senate authorizes the Territory to select up to 1 million acres of vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated public lands of the United States in Alaska. All such lands so selected and the income from them are to be administered as a public trust for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill. The 1 million acres will not be set aside as a hospital site, but it is the purpose of the legislation that the revenues and income from the sale or lease of the lands will be used to help the Territory meet the costs of caring for its mentally ill.

The editorial mentions that a section of the original bill as submitted by the Department of the Interior had been deleted. This section provided penalties against any person who willfully causes, conspires with, or assists another person to cause unwarranted hospitalization or the denial to any individual of rights granted by the bill. The Department feels that this provision should be retained and has recommended to the Senate that it be restored.

The editorial specifically objects to section 119 (c) of the bill which authorizes the Governor to enter into a reciprocal agreement with any State for the care and treatment of Alaskans, or for care and treatment in Alaska of residents of such States. This provision was included so as to authorize treatment at Alaska's expense (or that of the State concerned) in instances where repatriation would not be in the best interest of the patient. This provision, as well as others in section 119, must be read in connection with subsection (d) which states that "due consideration shall be given to the relationship of the patient to his family, legal guardian, or friends, so as to maintain relationships and encourage visits beneficial to the patient."

The editorial also states that under the bill judicial proceedings for commitment will be held under the direction of a United States Commissioner who can omit notice to the patient, need not require the patient to be present, and who can exclude anyone from the hearing. Again, this is an instance of a complete misunderstanding of the provisions of the legislation. The bill provides specifically that notice of a hearing shall be given the proposed patient, his legal guardian, if any, and to one or more of the other interested parties, if any. On the other hand, the language provides that if the Commissioner has reason to believe that notice would likely be injurious to the proposed patient, such notice may be omitted. Obviously, there will be occasions in which a notice to appear before a court for a sanity hearing will have a severely injurious effect upon the mental condition of the patient. Similarly, it may not be in the best interest of the patient himself to be present at a hearing, or for the Commissioner to hold a hearing open to the public at large. However, the bill does not authorize star chamber proceedings. Notice is required to be given at least to the legal representatives, friends, and other interested parties and the patient, his guardian, and other interested parties are afforded an opportunity to appear, testify, and to present and cross-examine witnesses.

It is stated in the editorial that the Commissioner may make a commitment for an indeterminate period or for 6 months. Properly stated, the Commissioner may order the patient's hospitalization either for an indeterminate period or for a temporary observational period not exceeding 6 months if the patient is found to be mentally ill and, if because of his illness he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed at liberty, or if he is in need of custody, care or treatment in a hospital. While the bill also authorizes the head of the hospital to impose certain restrictions on correspondence and visitors, every patient specifically retains the right of habeas corpus upon petition by himself or a friend. Restrictions on correspondence and visitors may be imposed only if it is determined that they are necessary for the medical welfare of the patient.

Rather than provide the machinery for a police state, the bill is intended to correct outdated and barbaric practices and to provide enlightened treatment for the mentally ill of Alaska. As Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, chairman of the Territories Subcommittee, stated on the floor of the House of Representatives:

"This bill is designed to erase a blot from our national honor, to treat sick people as such and not as criminals."

A First Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shakopee

(Minn.) Argus-Tribune of February 2, 1956:

A FIRST STEP

A piece of legislation before the Senate which is receiving more than its share of attention is the Harris bill, which would exempt natural gas producers from regulation.

The bill edged through the House by a narrow 209 to 203 vote and it is certain there will be a long hard fight in the Senate before final action is taken on the measure.

Opponents of the bill feel that should gas producers be exempt from Federal regulation the price of gas at the wellhead would jump to an excessive rate, and since the people who have equipped their homes to use gas, could not very well switch to another form of heat, they would be hard hit.

Adding weight to those opposing the bill has been the support of mayors, governors, and other public officials who feel that the passage of the bill would mean higher gas prices for their constituents.

However it seems there are more logical arguments for passage of the bill. Up to 1954, gas production was not under Federal regulation and gas rates did not rise to excessive proportions.

Gas producers point out that they receive only 10 percent of the total amount the consumer actually pays for his gas. The bulk of the money goes to the firms transporting and delivering the gas to the consumer and these firms are under Federal regulation.

Gas producers say too, that there is a heavy financial risk involved in producing natural gas and that Federal price controls will reduce the incentive for exploration which eventually would lead to a shortage of natural gas, and normally, they point out, when supply gets low, prices rise.

Furthermore, supporters of the bill point to the fact there are 8,000 independent natural gas producers in the field, a factor which would tend to keep prices down without regulations.

Then as their crowning argument supporters of the bill feel that the Government, by regulating natural gas, a commodity which must compete with other fuels such as coal and oil which are not regulated, is changing a long-established Federal policy and they see a danger in the possibility that this practice might spread to other fields.

If gas prices are fixed, then why not iron, copper, livestock, and automobiles and other competitively priced commodities. The end result of such a first step might well be the death of private industry, many fell.

Russia Outproducing United States, Top Air Officer Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Friday, February 10:

RUSSIA OUTPRODUCING UNITED STATES, AIR OFFICER SAYS—"BEATING US AT OUR OWN GAME," GENERAL WHITE, VICE STAFF CHIEF, TELLS STARTLED GROUP

(By Mark S. Watson)

CINCINNATI, February 9.—Gen. Thomas D. White, vice chief of staff of the United States Air Force, tonight declared that the Russians not only are "making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we," but that they are presently "beating us at our own game" of mass production.

The former declaration is familiar, but the latter startled White's hearers, a considerable assembly of scientists, technologists, and industrialists as well as military people.

The occasion was the General Electric Co.'s open house for its impressive new research and production center for supersonic aircraft and missiles at nearby Evendale.

CENTER NOT YET COMPLETE

The center, which is not yet complete, is described as the most important of industrial installations in the realm of supersonic propulsion. It includes a leading research department from which the first great rocket for next year's earth satellite will emerge on schedule and another mysterious department where development is still under way on the power plan for, presumably, the world's first atom-driven airplane.

In yet other departments of the big plant, new fuels, new metals, and new plastics are being developed for tomorrow's planes and missiles by techniques no less astonishing than their products. The entire plant will cost $100 million and its supersonic research center alone about $20 million.

A large part of General White's speech was in praise of American private industries' research with their own funds—and their own freedom from restraint—as distinguished from governmental research. But he added that the Nation's total of privately sponsored research is far from sufficient yet.

He, therefore, called on industrial leaders to roll up their sleeves and pitch in and thereby make up for the Government's apparent inability to provide enough funds for the research and development which national defense requires, and requires quickly in view of Russia's advances.

White, who is the second-ranking officer of the Air Force was distinctly not critical of the Defense Department's inadequate request for research funds in any such degree as was Trevor Gardner who has just resigned as the Air Force's civilian chief of research upon the issue. On the contrary, White sees large virtues in private industry's taking over a big share of the research work.

"Government projects are accountable to too many people," he said. "Research, especially basic research, is best accomplished by unfettered initiative working in an environment of complete freedom."

Nevertheless, General White showed that he is greatly concerned, as are many others inside and outside the Air Force, over America's reported lag in the international technological race.

MENTIONS BASES

"We believe we have a better Air Force," he said, "but that superiority now rests almost entirely upon our better system of worldwide bases and upon our better and more experienced crews.

"During the last few decades we Americans have always depended upon our mass production, but the Soviets are presently beating us at our own game. They have halved our lead-time on the heavy jet bomber and in developing and producing all other aircraft their lead-time is considerably less than ours. The fact is that they are outproducing us in all categories but medium jet bombers.

"The Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we. That they can put, not one, but several projects on a rush basis indicates a tremendous capacity for research and development.

"There are other reasons for their success. They build trucks instead of automobiles, submarines instead of commercial vessels, bombers at the cost of refrigerators. And radar instead of television sets."

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

"We must realize that the defense of this Nation is everybody's business, not just the Government's. Our great corporations must accept, along with their comparative freedom of action, their share of the national responsibility to provide our own defense.

"No one can expect private industry to seize the initiative in production of weapons. They can best volunteer increased efforts in research and development.

"This is a business in which failure is routine and success extraordinary. The taxpayer and the legislator understandably prefer to see national income spent on success. This makes the research and development dollar hard to get. This is one reason that private industries must devote increasing efforts to research."

Stevenson's Contributions to a Forceful and Effective Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under extension of my own remarks I have obtained permission to have printed in the RECORD a number of important editorial comments to current thought. Each of them deals with the courageous contributions by Adlai Stevenson to a forceful and effective democracy.

[From the Tampa Tribune of February 9, 1956]

ADLAI SHAPES CAMPAIGN ISSUES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON. — Two significant facts emerge from the preconvention campaign which Adlai Stevenson is waging in California.

This primary campaigning shows that the Democrats are making hay while the Republicans are marking time. Mr. Eisenhower's uncertainty is understandable and justifiable but it is evident that it gives the initiative to the Democratic candidates. Stevenson and Senator KEFAUVER are, thus far at least, wisely refraining from any attacks on each other. They are pleading their case by each showing how he can make a better attack on the Republican record than the other.

Secondly, we are seeing unfolded the kind of campaign which the Democrats will make after the conventions if Stevenson is nominated or if the nominee follows his lead. It is an approach to the voter which, I suspect, can be effective, especially effective if the President does not run or the Republicans fail to choose a nominee whose progressive leadership would be easily demonstrable.

Stevenson develops his theme in this way:

He agrees that, despite certain weak spots in the economy, the United States is experiencing notable prosperity. Stevenson's thesis is that the real challenge which faces the American people is not "loss or lack" but "wealth and plenty"—how to maintain our wealth and plenty and how to use them to improve our society and to safeguard the free world.

Stevenson, sometimes directly, sometimes by clear implication, asks his audiences questions like these:

"How can a divided Republican Party, which most of the time voted against most of the New Deal social-welfare measures but which has come tardily and reluctantly to in-

dorse them, be expected to serve these measures as reliably as the Democratic Party?"

"How can the Republican Party which has been complacent about the past, as shown by its delayed semiconversion to social reform, be expected to be anything but complacent about the future?"

Stevenson, of course, brings in a verdict of guilty at both points.

On the issue of future problems—and opportunities—he says: "We live in a time of danger and a time of great hope. Whoever offers us complacency blinds us to the one and denies us the other."

In the issue of past problems, after citing the measures—such as social security, minimum wage, Federal aid to education, farm income supports, public housing and others which the Republicans mostly opposed throughout the Roosevelt and Truman administrations—Stevenson says:

"That our Republican friends are now accepting all of these things make us happy. After all, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. But the basic issue is: Who means what he says about these domestic issues and who doesn't? Who is going to do anything about putting these agreed principles into effect and who isn't?"

At times Stevenson seems to me to trip a little over his own logic. He criticizes the Republicans dealing "complacently" with the Nation's unresolved problems and then chides the Republicans for proposing so many "Democratic solutions for them."

But his central theme is fair and pertinent political debate. Unless world events take an unexpected turn, he is raising questions which will be on the minds of the independent voters this fall. Such questions as these:

Can the Republican Party, whose conservatism is not doubted by the country, be relied upon to maintain and prudently expand the welfare measures which the President calls "humanitarian?"

Can the Democratic Party, whose reformist record is not doubted by the country, be relied upon to maintain and prudently expand the climate and conditions which enable competitive enterprise to function best for everybody?

Which party under whose leadership is most likely to keep to the "middle road?" This is an essential question since Stevenson himself avows that the right answers "do not lie at the extremes."

Stevenson is asking valid questions. The response from the voters may come out differently than he expects, but it will, I think, take progressive Republican leadership to answer Stevenson effectively.

[From the Tampa Tribune of February 9, 1956]

STEVENSON'S SANE VIEWPOINT

Adlai Stevenson made sound and sane comment on the segregation issue in a talk to Negro leaders in California. Despite the insistence of some of these leaders that integration should be hastened, Mr. Stevenson boldly stated that the problem must be approached gradually. He recognized the fact that the tradition of generations cannot be upset overnight. His idea of how much time would be required to bring about the complete harmony of the races in the United States is that the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1963, could be the date of the full flowering of the spirit of equality.

This view, naturally, did not meet the approval of the more pronounced Negro leaders who heard him. One Negro clergyman asked if the might of the Federal Government should be employed to enforce desegregation in schools and in travel. He evidently meant the use of the Armed Forces.

"That would be a great mistake," said the party's 1952 nominee. "It would be a revival of the Civil War. It's the spirit of men that will change things for the better; it will not be troops or bayonets."

Mr. Stevenson denied trying to appease anyone for political reasons. "I'm not running for office for the honor of it," he said. "I'm running because I believe I can serve the Democratic Party, the party that serves all races and creeds and segments of our people."

Mr. Stevenson made a strong point when asked about the interposition proposal. He doubts that the interposition theory can ever work. "If schools are made private schools, as some Southern States are suggesting, and the Government gives them money, aren't they by their very nature then public?"

He believes education is the main instrument for improving race relations.

Mr. Stevenson's views will appeal not only to public sentiment in the South, but also to right-thinking people throughout the country. His statements, made to a rather hostile audience, will strengthen his candidacy for renomination. He has again shown that he has the courage of his convictions.

[From the Washington Post of February 10, 1956]

MR. STEVENSON'S COURAGE

When Adlai Stevenson rose to address his Negro audience in the Wilkens Hotel at Los Angeles last Tuesday, he was confronted with a clearcut choice between demagogy and statesmanlike candor. He chose the latter course, and it would be a sad reflection on the popular American intelligence to believe that because of this he imperiled his chances for the presidency.

What Mr. Stevenson's audience wanted to hear were Mr. Stevenson's views of the crisis that has arisen in the Southern States in consequence of the Supreme Court ruling which has outlawed the practice of race segregation in the public schools. Mr. Stevenson's rival in the California Democratic preferential primary election, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, has been making a strong play for the support of the organized Negro vote, which might conceivably be decisive in that State. Just what pledges Mr. Kefauver has given the Negro leaders are still a matter of mystery. According to one report, he has promised to support the Powell amendment to the Federal school-aid bill which would deny any Federal funds to States in which segregation is still practiced. Senator KEFAUVER has now denied that he has committed himself to any position on the Powell amendment; but, whatever the reasons, many Negro leaders now seen persuaded that he is the warmer champion of their cause and are accordingly shifting their allegiance and support to him.

Thus with respect to the question of the southern schools Mr. Stevenson was placed clearly on the defensive. He met the challenge by a great show of intellectual honesty, refusing to pretend that political complexities admit of simple and drastic solutions. He is opposed to segregation and has always been in favor of full race equality; but as far as the Southern States are concerned he believes that this must come about through gradual enlightenment and acceptance rather than immediate coercion. Thus he flatly rejected any proposal to enforce the Supreme Court ruling by means of Federal troops or police. He pointed out the absurdity of supposing that prejudices, social usages, and traditions that are older than the Republic could be abruptly eradicated by such methods and said the effect of such an effort would simply be to Balkanize the South. Earlier Mr. Stevenson had refused to endorse the Powell amendment, on the very reasonable ground that it would only lead to a determined filibuster by the southern Senators that would defeat the Federal-aid bill in toto.

It took a great deal of courage for Mr. Stevenson to make openly, and under such circumstances, so fair a statement of the actualities. He opposed the counsel of commonsense to the sort of fanaticism that has been well defined as "redoubling your efforts when you have forgotten your aims." He may have lost a few potential votes, but he has also strengthened the impression of his qualities of statesmanship.

Communists Fight for Mind of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of San Diego's most distinguished citizens, Mr. Hoyt E. Ray, who has served the city capably for a number of years as deputy city attorney, was recently commended by the city council for his authorship of an article outlining the development of the English-speaking civilization and the challenge presented to it today by communism. This article appeared in the December 1955 issue of National Republic, and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

COMMUNISTS FIGHT FOR MIND OF MAN

(By Hoyt E. Ray)

There is a river in the ocean. It is the Gulf Stream. There is, in all the world, no other such majestic flow of waters.

There is a counterpart in humanity. By strange association of the warm waters of the ocean river tempered the climate of that portion of the earth which became the birthplace of the stream flowing among peoples. That stream is the English speaking civilization.

It began in England when Rome was still the great military power in the world. This island people became a strange mixture. In assimilation they produced something the world had never seen before and envies today.

The idea that the citizen was an entity, independent of the state, took root. From this germ idea sprang a new civilization, which today contests for domination of the world. On the outcome depends whether the individual shall control his government or the state shall direct the life of the citizen.

This civilization has advanced through the centuries in all the fairest portions of the earth. Wherever the English-speaking civilization has gone, there it has ever asserted the right of man as the individual citizen to develop his capacities in endeavors of his own choosing and to worship God as his own conscience dictates.

This mongrel people was a seafaring, adventuresome lot. In their intercourse with different peoples they always took their language, customs and desire for peace, so trade could develop higher standards of living everywhere. They knew trade was the catalyst of social groups.

At home they fiercely resented government ment interference with their conduct. Magna Carta was written to define rights of state and citizen. They elected their own representatives to their legislative halls and they took charge of the purse strings of government, asserting that elected officials were responsible to the people from whom they took their office.

They adopted something else new in government by selecting a committee from among themselves to hear and decide the guilt or innocence of those charged with

crime. This jury system characterizes the English-speaking peoples today.

After centuries of struggle they established the right of the individual to speak out his opinions, orally and written. Meantime this people following their new way of life adopted beneficent principles of Christianity, and today amaze the world by practical demonstrations of a cardinal precept of that faith—charity. In adopting principles of Christianity this people insisted upon the dignity and right of the individual to seek his God his own way.

To safeguard these rights claimed to be inalienable by the individual, the social order developed the writ of habeas corpus, the greatest legal process man has devised for the protection of his individual freedom.

In its spread to America this civilization began and developed in the United States a public school system wherein the children of all citizens are educated at public expense. The idea of the common school system was and is that it is better for all the people to be educated so as to better participate in their government, than it is to raise to higher levels of education a portion or favored class of society. It is better to have millions learning by their own mistakes to govern themselves, than to have an educated oligarchy.

These peoples adventuring into all portions of the earth, have carried with them always, their English language, until today it is used throughout the world, and may be in time the official language in all international relations, governmental and business, reserving for cultural purposes other languages, to avoid any misunderstanding among peoples of definitions or meanings of words used to express an idea or ideology.

In the United States this civilization learned the art of production, which, coupled with the right of the individual to develop his own capacities by freely engaging in enterprise, has developed a standard of living and a way of life the rest of the world covets and envies. This freedom has, here only, been guaranteed to the individual by a Bill of Rights written into the Constitution.

It is arguable whether a man in a free society with private ownership of property can lose the right of ownership of property and still retain his freedom. Does the passing of ownership of property from the individual to the state, of necessity, require proportionately the passing of the freedom of the individual? This touches upon communism, which in practice is the rule of few over many.

Today the English speaking civilization is challenged. Because this civilization has uniformly emphasized the worth of the individual and his freedom, as opposed to the claim of godless communism that all rights derive from the state, it has always been tolerant of other peoples' rights, ideology, and social conduct. Hence the Moscow Communists have successfully imposed upon the good will and tolerance of the English speaking peoples. By making a mockery of the English words in common use in discussing social and governmental conduct, the Communist propaganda confuses many.

If peoples are to develop mentally from ignorance to light, and physically from slavery to individual responsibility, this surge of the Orient against the Occident must be met and overcome by force, if that is the only thing they respect, and today happily the English speaking civilization combines strength and freedom, but the hour is getting late. The Moscow Communists have reintroduced into modern statecraft the discredited and repudiated Machiavellian theory of misrepresentation and deceit between governments. They know that the 10 percent of the peoples of the world owning two-thirds of the wealth of the world, must respect the values upon which their civilization was built. They know pride of race has always existed and the English speaking society in this world cannot absorb all the rest into their blood stream. They should know this civilization has offered too much hope to mankind to be diluted and drained of its substance and character.

In its march to whatever destiny it may have, the English speaking people has demonstrated that it is the world's best hope for a continuous unfolding of the individual's capacities in an environment of mental and spiritual freedom so that man can improve always his creature comfort and spiritual well-being, while lending a helping hand to the less fortunate and pointing the way for an ultimate of mankind at harmony in health, in comfort, and in spiritual freedom to work out its fate under God.

Birthday Tribute to Earl Godwin, Dean of Washington Commentators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Morgan Beatty, noted NBC correspondent, paid a highly deserved tribute to his colleague, Earl Godwin, dean of Washington commentators on the occasion of Mr. Godwin's 75th birthday.

When Mr. Godwin appears out there in the Speaker's lobby to visit with Members someone invariably addresses him as "the Congressman at Large." This endearing greeting shows the high esteem in which he is held by scores of Members here on the Hill.

Mr. Speaker, Earl Godwin has long been one of my favorite newsmen. I have the most profound respect and admiration for him. Along with unmeasured thousands of other Americans I join in a salute to him on the occasion of his arrival at another milestone in his career of responsible and conscientious reporting. May he continue for many years to come as the dean of Washington reporters.

I am happy to insert Mr. Beatty's broadcast in the RECORD.

This is Morgan Beatty, and tonight I hope I am speaking for you rather than to you.

Perhaps you have heard the story of the pretty young thing who told the veteran reporter, "You have such a wonderful job, meeting all those interesting people." The news veteran replied, "Yes, I have met hundreds of interesting people, all of them reporters."

In all my days as a newsman, I have met few people as interesting, as lovable, as Earl Godwin. So as an Earl Godwin fan, let me be your representative and wish our friend Earl a very happy birthday on this his 75th birthday.

Our Earl Godwin fan club is a large organization. Some of the members are Alben Barkley, Speaker Sam Rayburn, former Speaker Joseph W. Martin, J. Edgar Hoover, Senator Harry Byrd, Congressman Joel Broyhill, Fishbait Miller, Doorkeeper of the House, and others too numerous to mention.

Any true Godwin fan knows that Earl is the No. 1 citizen of Bailey's Cross Roads, Va., and the No. 1 booster of the Bailey's Cross Roads Fire Department.

Not too many years ago it would have been possible to fire a cannon near Bailey's Cross Roads without attracting any attention. Indeed, legend has it that during the Civil War a battery of Union cannon was set up on Earl Godwin's farm.

Perhaps Earl will tell the legend about that Civil War battery on a broadcast some night soon. It's a fascinating story whether it's a fact or fiction. Bailey's Cross Roads has seen many changes. And Earl Godwin has accepted each change and continued to grow in stature himself.

Our esteemed Earl Godwin was born in 1881, when the Civil War or the War Between the States was still fresh in the minds of Washingtonians. Earl's birthplace was a house that stood across the street from the United States Capitol, the site is now occupied by the United States Supreme Court.

Earl attended Washington schools and the Emerson Institute here, but while still in his teens he took a job in Bridgeport, Conn. Marconi hadn't sent out his first radio signal yet, but Earl, even in his early days, must have been struck with a fascination for speech communication. His Bridgeport job was in a talking-machine factory. The talking machine of those days used round cylinders as records.

Earl saw no particular future for himself in the talking-machine business, so he became a cub reporter on the weekly newspaper at Passaic, N. J. Soon after he returned to Washington and his first bigtime newspaper job, with the Washington bureau of the Baltimore Sun. The year was 1908, and for the next 20 years reporter Earl Godwin was a familiar sight anywhere that news could be found in Washington. In 1928, the Republican National Committee needed someone in Chicago to help manage press relations for the Herbert Hoover presidential campaign. Earl Godwin was selected for the job. Earl's broadcasting career began in 1936, when he joined the news staff of NBC in Washington.

There are few prominent people in our city who are not known to Earl personally. I recall that the late President Roosevelt accorded to Earl the privilege of sitting at the edge of the President's desk during White House press conferences. Not that Earl needed to sit down, I rather think FDR enjoyed having Earl sitting close up where a Roosevelt statement or quip would bring a Godwin reaction.

All of us in the broadcasting industry honor Earl Godwin today as the dean of Washington commentators, and for his many other accomplishments as a founder and past president of the National Press Club, and former president of the Radio and Television Correspondents Association, of which he was a founder.

I want to make one distinction clear, however. We honor Earl Godwin not because he has been with us so long. True, he was here first, with the most. More importantly, Earl Godwin has always maintained a fresh outlook on world events. He has been a faithful and accurate reporter, with a gifted ability to draw on the lessons of the past. But he lives very much in the present. His concern for the future is a matter of public record, he has received scores of distinguished honors for his vigilant exposure of the Communist threat against American freedom.

Commentator Godwin has informed us, counseled us, and delighted us with his reports on—you've guessed it—"Busy" the cat.

To us who know him personally, and to you who have met him through your radio, Earl Godwin is a true and valued friend.

I would like to thank another Godwin friend, Mr. W. Franklin Morrison, executive vice president and general manager of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Washington, and my wife has had an account there for 7 years, for his courtesy in permitting me this birthday greeting to Earl Godwin. Earl, a happy birthday from all of us, and many happy returns. And that is all from Beatty at this time.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, we celebrated the anniversary of two great men, who both contributed so much to the freedom which we Americans enjoy today. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that day was not only the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, but also of Tadeusz Kosciuszko. It is well said that although born in different times, and on different continents, the two men shared the same philosophy and the same love of freedom for all. Their ideals are no less perfect today than they were in their times, and indeed, they are as vitally necessary to our American civilization as they were in the trying times in which these two great men lived.

Benefiting from a broad education at Warsaw, Brest-Litovsk, Mezieres and Paris, 30-year-old captain of artillery, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, sailed in 1776 to fight for America's freedom. Through his talents, he became a general officer in the United States Army and earned the confidence and respect of his Commander in Chief. He served with distinction at Saratoga and Yorktown. Thomas Jefferson was his especial friend and the executor of his will. No mercenary he, Kosciuszko willed all his American property to a fund for the education of Negroes. He recognized their problem and advocated education as a means of solution which commended itself to Washington, Jefferson and, later, to that great Virginian, Robert E. Lee. We should prudently follow this path today by improving and extending education to all.

In Poland's hour of need, Kosciuszko fought Prussian and Russian armies with great courage and skill. The combined forces of both these autocratic states were required to destroy Poland's independence in 1795, but the freedom which Kosciuszko loved continued to burn in his breast and in the hearts of all his fellow Poles.

When Napoleon and the Tzar sought to use Kosciuszko's influence with the Polish people, he rated the tyrants' overtures at their proper value and refused to become their pawn. Washington, in his farewell address, spoke for Kosciuszko and for all mankind who have learned by bitter experience how high to value the tyrant's pledge.

The morality of tyrants of his day did not confuse Kosciuszko. Rather, it led to broader understanding and a profound respect for the individual paths by which free and independent men find a common front in the struggle for a decent world order.

Kosciuszko literally died in the saddle; at the age of 71, his death was the result of a fall from his horse. A doer as well as a thinker, it might be said of Kosciuszko, as Pericles described the men of Athens, that he was a lover of wisdom and of beauty without affectation.

In saluting Kosciuszko, we of the 20th century salute the best of the 18th—the men who first made America free. Yet each of us knows within himself that so long as Soviet Russia continues to ruthlessly dominate the lives of free men, no one is truly free.

Americans carry the burden of billions of dollars spent each year for arms. Our young men are taken away from their homes and their peacetime pursuits to serve as citizen soldiers for the defense of their country, and our factories turn out materials of war instead of goods for peace and a better life for all.

And yet we bear our load in the happy knowledge that it is far less heavy than that of our brothers in the Poland which gave us Kosciuszko and Pulaski. Men who were once free citizens of other countries also know how Russia makes mockery of freedom and democracy.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the proposition that all men can and must be made free. To that end we must continue to press vigorously for the right of self-determination guaranteed in the Yalta Agreement which Soviet Russia scorns.

That right we will secure, not only for our American people but to others, by all means short of war.

It is in this dedication, and in the vigorous pursuance of it by all possible means, that we most honor the two great men whose birthdays we celebrated on February 12.

The Answer to Our Nation's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial from the Fort Lauderdale Daily News entitled "The Answer to Our Nation's Problems." Mr. Jack W. Gore, who is the son of Gov. R. H. Gore, is editor and co-publisher of the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, one of the outstanding newspapers in my district. Mr. Gore has won many honors in the editorial field for his editorials on Americanism.

It was my thought that it would be very appropriate at this time to bring this fine editorial to the attention of the Members of Congress, and I respectfully bring it to their attention.

The editorial follows:

THE ANSWER TO OUR NATION'S PROBLEMS

Today the people of America welcome in another New Year with a hope and a prayer that the peace and prosperity most of us enjoyed during 1955 will continue to be with us during 1956.

It cannot be said that the New Year dawns without any somber clouds on the horizon. International tensions are still with us. In fact, over the past few weeks they have increased rather alarmingly and no prospectus of the new year could be complete without taking into consideration the possibility that the uneasy peace we are now enjoying could suddenly and tragically be shattered.

Much the same is true of our present prosperity. Some economists feel that we are now riding the crest of the postwar boom with a downturn sure to come sometime during 1956. Others don't feel that way. They are just as certain that 1956 will continue to set new prosperity records and that the Nation is only on the verge of shoving our standard of living up to almost undreamed of heights.

But regardless of whether we continue to have peace and prosperity there is one thing in common which we think all Americans want the new year to bring. That one thing is better government all the way down from the Washington level to the individual community level.

What can give us this better government that all of us so deeply want and cherish? A poet by the name of Josiah Gilbert Holland wrote the prescription for better government some time ago. His poem, entitled "Wanted," was one of the late Dwight L. Rogers' favorite quotations and he thought so much of it that he submitted it the Congressional Anthology as the one piece that best represented his own views on government.

What does this poem say? Read it and see if it doesn't contain the answer for most of this Nation's troubles today:

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking.
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,—
Mingle in selfish strife, lo. Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps."

Who is there today who can read those words without feeling that the want expressed in them is not only symptomatic of what is wrong with our Nation but literally with the whole world? We have too many small men in high places today—men whose selfish ambitions, whose lust for more power and whose unending desire to perpetuate their position at the public trough make them a menace to the world rather than the saviours they make themselves out to be.

The problem facing this Nation and all other nations aren't insoluble. They could be easily overcome if the leaders of this and other nations could drop their pretenses and their shams and meet with each other in a true spirit of friendliness and cooperation.

Perhaps that is too much to hope for in this day and age as there is no indication anywhere in the world this first day of 1956 that such a spirit can or will prevail in the months ahead. But if even a small start is made toward such an objective, then 1956 could be the year in which the civilized nations turned off a course that can only lead to everybody's destruction and started off on a path of mutual trust and friendship.

And what of our situation right here at home? This will be a year of great decision in America and the politicians, big and little, will be roaming the land, breathing fire and brimstone, mouthing worn platitudes, and

engaging in all the traditional hocus-pocus that surrounds a political campaign.

Among the thousands who will take the political stump, how many will there be of strong mind, great heart, true faith, and ready hands? How many will there be whom the lust of office does not kill and whom the spoils of office cannot buy? How many will be tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking?

We don't know how many of this type there will be, but we do know this country of ours can use plenty of them and the more we put to work in Government at all levels the better off we will be, not only in 1956, but in the years to come as well.

Secretary Quarles Speaks at Goodfellow Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy that I could accompany the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Donald A. Quarles, to San Angelo, Tex., in my own 21st Congressional District, last Wednesday, and be present when he spoke before the San Angelo Chamber of Commerce. The occasion for the Secretary's visit was ground breaking for new, permanent buildings—the first in several years—at Goodfellow Air Force Base. The visit was also a recognition of the importance of Goodfellow—and Texas—to the United States Air Force and to the defense of the United States.

One-sixth of all our air bases in the United States are in Texas. So many pilots are trained in Texas, that the basic training plane, the T–6, has been officially named the Texan.

The visit had additional significance, however. In 1940 Goodfellow was thought of as a temporary base, and temporary buildings were erected. Now Goodfellow has been declared a permanent base, and permanent buildings are being erected. We recognize that Goodfellow and other elements of our military strength, will be needed for defense as long as we can foresee. As Secretary Quarles said, this is a situation new in our history.

Goodfellow's special contribution to the strength of the Air Force—and the fense of the United States—is that it helps to train leaders, the fledgling pilots who from the start are prepared for the responsibilities of command they must, from the start, be prepared to assume.

San Angelo's special contribution to the Air Force is a recognition of its importance to the United States. Secretary Quarles was generous in his praise of what the good people of San Angelo and the 21st Congressional District do for the officers and airmen stationed at Goodfellow. He paid special tribute to our able mayor, my friend Mr. M. D. Bryant. But he was rightly generous. What the community does for its airbase neighbors are things which, as Secretary Quarles said, make Air Force personnel even better prepared to perform their military duties. These things are important, not merely to the Air Force but to all Americans.

An important measure of the effect of good community relations, is the improvement in the reenlistment rate, not only at Goodfellow but elsewhere. I am proud that this Congress also had a part in stabilizing and improving the reenlistment rate. The pay bill passed at the last session of the present Congress was important.

The problem confronting San Angelo, and all of us, is to keep up the good work. The threat is one of a duration that cannot be measured. The challenge is one that will continue. So we must be prepared to support the Air Force, in every way it needs support, for the indefinite future.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the people of the 21st District are prepared to do that. I am sure they will continue to be an example to good Americans everywhere. For that reason, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Secretary Quarles' speech of February 8, 1956. It is a tribute to San Angelo. It is a skilled presentation of the challenge to the people of the United States. It is an unvarnished statement of the seriousness of the struggle to prevent the kind of war which could endanger and perhaps destroy our civilization. Secretary Quarles' speech follows:

ADDRESS BY DONALD A. QUARLES, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE SAN ANGELO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASE, SAN ANGELO, TEX., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1956

Governor Shivers, Congressman Fisher, distinguished people of San Angelo, and my colleagues of the Air Force, it is a particular pleasure for me to be here in Texas with you today. While I grew up in Arkansas and lived for a time in New Mexico, thus sort of bracketing Texas, I'm probably not entitled to call myself a Texan. Nevertheless I always feel I am homeward bound when I strike out for this part of the country, and your warm welcome has certainly helped to make me feel that way. I am afraid some of my friends back in the Pentagon suspect me of having other motives for coming out here. You know Congress is working us over right at the moment on our military budgets, not to mention a lot of other Air Force matters that the representatives of the people seem to be particularly interested in or concerned about, and there may just be a suspicion back in Washington that I was glad to get away.

The coincidence that our Chief of Staff, General Twining, is finding it necessary to keep a speaking engagement in Waco right at this same time adds some weight to this point. This is mighty fine, clean, fresh air you have out here in Texas.

Still, your climate can get pretty rugged at times. I understand that the blizzards which hit to the north of here last weekend were as bad as any the area has encountered in this century. Our Air Force bases at Amarillo and Lubbock, and across the State line at Clovis, have been working with local authorities to assist stranded people and to drop feed to cattle.

Amarillo Air Force Base has dropped more than 50,000 pounds of hay near Wildorado and Bushland, operating in coordination with the county agricultural agent there. At Clovis, a woman was rescued on the highway and rushed to the base hospital where she gave birth to an 8-pound girl. At Lubbock, a newly organized Civil Air Patrol squadron is maintaining surveillance in the area and private pilots have dropped food and medicine to isolated families.

These incidents gave me a better appreciation of the assistance our Air Force units can provide for their neighbors in such emergencies.

Of course, you might say neither General Twining nor I need any excuse to visit Texas almost anytime. I wouldn't like to mention this in Washington because the Senators and Representatives of about 47 other States seem to resent the idea, but it is a fact that Texas has a very special place in our airpower picture.

One-sixth of all our air bases in the United States are in Texas. The first military airplane was based at Fort Sam Houston, virtually all of our pilots were trained at Brooks, Kelly, and Randolph Air Force Bases in this State between World Wars I and II, and at Fort Worth you produced the world's biggest combat airplane, the B–36, which has held the line—not quite singlehandedly, we must agree—as a global deterrent to war for the past decade. So many pilots were being trained in your State that we named our T–6 training plane in its honor. I don't know offhand whether there are more Texans in the Air Force than residents of any other State, but I am quite sure there are more Air Force wives from Texas—and let no one underestimate their importance to the Air Force.

Today we are signalizing a major step in our Air Force activities in Texas—the conversion of Goodfellow Air Force Base to a permanent Air Forse installation. We now expect to be a part of the San Angelo community for many years to come.

We hope we will always be as welcome as you have made us feel in the years since the base was first established here in 1940. The addition of Goodfellow to our growing list of permanent installations was certainly encouraged by your friendship and cooperation.

But this event we are celebrating has a wider significance. In 1940 we put up temporary buildings here at Goodfellow because we believed they would not be needed after the war. Now we are erecting permanent buildings because we recognize that Goodfellow, and other elements of our military strength, will be needed for as long as we can foresee. This is new in our history.

The armed services we have today are designed to meet the threat of global or limited war, and, by doing so, to keep such wars from starting. To perform our part of this vital deterrent mission, we have an Air Force that possesses immensely more fire power and global capability than we have ever known before. It is deployed at home and overseas where we join with our allies in more than 40 nations in mutual defense against Communist aggression.

We have a strategic striking force second to none, equipped, trained, and ready for retaliation against any aggression. With the Army and the Navy playing their parts we have an air-defense system in depth to guard against sudden attack upon this country. It ranges out over the oceans off both our coasts and, with the help of our Canadian friends, far up into the Arctic. We do not yet have a comparable radar-warning network along our southern border, primarily because a thrust from that direction would be a very long way around for any likely attack on the United States.

While we intend to improve our radar coverage of this area before long, we have it on good authority that there is no need to worry. Recently in Washington, while we were briefing a group of civilian leaders on our air defense, one of them asked what we

were doing about our Southern approaches. Before General Twining could reply, a voice in the back of the room spoke up with a pronounced Texas drawl: "General," he said, "any Russian bombers attacking from that direction—they'd pretty near have to fly over Texas, wouldn't they?" That settled the argument.

Here at a base of our Training Command is perhaps the appropriate place to discuss the totality of Air Force capabilities. One hears today many statements regarding the number of bombers in our Air Force as compared to the number of bombers in Communist air forces. The public is often advised to believe that if the Communists exceed us in a single element of the hardware associated with an Air Force, all is lost. Permit me a few moments to place the matter of Air Force capabilities in perspective.

First of all, let us realize that bombers do not fight bombers. This illustrates the occasional irrelevance of alarmed comparisons of one element of the Communist air force with the same element in our own. The rational way to approach the question of Air Force capabilities is on the basis of the capability of an air force to perform its own missions. Note that the air defense problem of the great, sprawling Communist land mass is quite a different one than the air defense problem of the United States. The Communists will require many more radars, many more interceptors, to provide an air defense of their vast land areas equivalent to that we provide for air defense of the United States.

The capability of an Air Force to perform its assigned missions is a product of a great complex of factors, including bombers, fighters, missiles, air bases, communications, the level of training of its personnel, the skill of its leadership, its deployment in the world at large, the effectiveness of its supply system, the number and quality of atomic weapons in its stockpile, and a host of other considerations. Because there is a tendency nowadays to greatly overemphasize the hardware element in this group of factors which constitute an Air Force capability, I would like for a moment to dwell upon a more abstract element—that of skilled leadership.

The corps of officers and airmen of the United States Air Force includes thousands of veterans of both World War II and Korea. It includes men who are the only military leaders alive today to have developed, organized and employed in war air forces comparable to the size and power of the United States Air Force today. These men have an experience level, in the employment of air power in war, which is not only without parallel in the world today, but is not even approached. There will never be, moreover, a group of Air Force leaders who possess the tested experience in the leadership of air power in war equivalent to that of the leaders of the United States Air Force, unless there is another great war. This skill in the employment of air power, this experience, this sure knowledge, is one of the great elements of our United States Air Force capability which no other Air Force can possibly achieve. It is one of the great factors of our air power strength that will remain with us for many years to come regardless of technological developments. This is one of many reasons why I have such confidence in the deterrent pressure of the United States Air Force against Communist aggression. In spite of all one hears about the danger of our losing the technological race—and we certainly must continue to take this race very seriously—I see no possibility that any technological development now conceived could upset our very broadly based deterrent position, assuming of course that we presss ahead with our own programs.

In some measure, the effectiveness of our weapons is diminished every time we lose a trained specialist. To get full benefit from the superior equipment produced by our industrial technology, we must do better in keeping qualified people in the Air Force.

The pay raise passed by Congress last year—and sparkplugged incidentally by Congressman Paul Kilday, of San Antonio—was a step in the right direction. It has contributed to an increase in reenlistment which has more than repaid the higher cost. But we are finding that, if we are to hold good men, we must be able to compete more effectively with the financial and other benefits of civilian life.

To to this we must sponsor and support such projects as housing, recreational facilities, medical care for dependents, and survivors' benefits. We must get away from the concept that it is reasonable and proper for a serviceman's pay and benefits to be well below civilian standards. This concept might be all right in time of war when the entire Nation is mobilized for victory. But we are engaged in the long pull, when we must maintain forces in being for an indefinite period. We cannot, and should not, expect patriotism and pride of service to outweigh a big difference in pay, particularly when it affects a man's ability to provide reasonable comforts and security for his family. I appreciate the support that the Texas delegation in Congress, and particularly your own Congressman FISHER, has given to legislation designed to improve these conditions.

These things are important to morale, that intangible factor which has an important bearing on the airman's combat effectiveness. Within the Air Force, too, we are doing many things to improve morale.

We have established an airman career program which makes it possible for every airman with ability and ambition to advance in his field of work. We keep the airman and officer informed on all developments that affect him and his unit, through regular meetings with his commander. His opinions and suggestions are welcomed, for we have found that the best management improvements come from the man actually doing the job.

Most important of all, perhaps, we are constantly striving to fit our personnel for their vital roles on our Air Force team, and to show each man his importance to that team, whether he pilots a plane, maintains its engines, or runs a supply warehouse.

This is a point of particular interest to the Air Training Command, which operates Goodfellow Air Force Base, for it is responsible for providing all Air Force commands with men who have been brought to the peak of their ability through proper selection, motivation, and training. As you may know, our commander here, Colonel Crawford, is one of the Air Force's top authorities in this field. Before he assumed command here he was in charge of Air Training Command research to improve its training program. Now, with an opportunity to apply his techniques at this base, we have good reason to expect it to be a model of training effectiveness.

By the time the aviation cadet now at Goodfellow completes his training and takes his place in our air crews, he knows his job in reaching the target, carrying out his mission, and returning to a friendly base. If he should go down in enemy territory, he knows how to take care of himself until he reaches safety or, if he is captured, he is steeled to face enemy interrogation and mistreatment without endangering his fellow countrymen.

These thing we can do for our people. But there are things you people of San Angelo can do which we cannot, things which will make him even better prepared to perform his military duties.

Not so long ago, an Air Force captain, a pilot decorated for service in combat, was assigned to Goodfellow to instruct aviation cadets. He arrived with his wife. They spent several days searching without success for a place to live. One afternoon they returned to the hotel. The discouraged captain sounded off in the lobby about his troubles.

An individual in dusty boots and levis jotted down an address where, he said, the Captain and his wife might be able to stay until they found a place of their own. Doubtful, but willing to track down any lead, they hailed a taxi and gave the driver the address. He drove them up a long winding drive to an impressive residence.

To the servant who opened the door, the captain apologetically explained that some cowhand had referred him there. While he was talking, the lady of the house appeared. Yes, she said, they had a guest house they didn't use too often. How long would they like to stay?

Only long enough to find a place to live, the captain said. They stayed there for 3 months, until they found just what they wanted. When they left, the owner, who turned out to be that dusty cowhand, wouldn't accept a cent in payment.

I don't know where the captain is today, but I'll guarantee that he did a better job of instructing cadets at Goodfellow because of that fine example of San Angelo hospitality. As for the cowhand, he's here tonight—your Mayor, Mr. M. D. Bryant.

Not all of you have spare homes to loan to our people, but I know that you are doing many other things to make our airmen welcome. I want you to know why these things are important to us and to all Americans. The average airman and cadet at Goodfellow has been away from home perhaps less than a year. You do a lot just by a friendly greeting, to show that he is welcome in your community. If he needs help, you have given him that help as you would to any other member of your community.

This is a two-way street, of course. The personnel of Goodfellow are expected to observe your laws and your customs just as your own citizens do. They know they are entitled to no special privileges as servicemen. But I am sure you have discovered that when you treat servicemen like members of the community you have no more trouble with them than with your own young men—perhaps less.

One important measure of the effect of all these things is in our reenlistment rate. We recognize, of course, that some of our Air Force people will prefer to return to civilian life when their terms of enlistment expire regardless of anything that can be done to encourage them to remain. But a man who likes his job and who feels he belongs in his community is an excellent prospect for reenlistment. I am proud to report that Goodfellow's reenlistment rate is well above the Air Force average, and that average has shown a sharp rise in the past year.

So you see, being a good neighbor is rewarding not only in a community sense but in a national sense. It gives us more effective air power, and at a time when it is sorely needed.

The men now being trained at Goodfellow are the stuff of which heroes are made. Texas has known many illustrious heroes, and San Angelo and the surrounding communities have contributed more than their share. They include men like Jack Mathis, who was posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, and his brother, Mark, who took his place and was also lost in combat. This base is named for one of your sons, Lt. J. J. Goodfellow, Jr., who was killed in action over France in World War I.

I might mention many others who have upheld in combat the fighting spirit of all Texans—like Maj. Horace Carswell, Jr., of Fort Worth, who entered the Air Force here in San Angelo and won the Medal of Honor for exploits in which he gave his life in the Far East, and Maj. George Davis, of Dublin, our top jet ace in Korea before he

was lost in combat. And I am sure we won't forget here that our illustrious Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower, was born in Texas.

These are but a few of the names that are inscribed in the honor rolls and the hearts of Texans and all Americans.

The men now being trained here are such men. They, too, have volunteered to serve their country at this critical time in its history. Despite the fact that President Eisenhower, in his earnest search for an enduring peace, has made it perfectly clear that we will not be the aggressors, someone else may start a war—perhaps the most frightful war ever.

But, if we are resolute in keeping our forces strong, if we will stand firm and united with our allies against Communist aggression, and devote our energies and resources to achieving a lasting, just peace, we will have reason to hope that world war III will not have to be fought. The struggle in which these young men are taking part is one with less glory for themselves but infinitely more for all mankind—the struggle which we must carry on for as long as it may be necessary, the struggle to prevent the kind of war which could endanger and perhaps destroy our civilization.

Our objective is clear. We must build and maintain at the ready the military strength which any potential enemy will respect, and we must have the moral determination to work and sacrifice for the kind of peace which heroic Americans have always been willing to fight and die for—looking forward to that brighter world in which man can live, with purpose, in freedom and harmony with his brothers and his God. This is a cause to which we can all dedicate ourselves and in which we must not fail.

Thank you.

Billy Graham Serves Well in Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present herewith an editorial taken from a recent issue of the Shreveport Times, a daily newspaper with general circulation over 100,000, in reference to the magnificient work which is being done by Rev. Billy Graham on his overseas tour. The editorial is entitled "Billy Graham Serves Well in Cold War" and is as follows:

BILLY GRAHAM SERVES WELL IN COLD WAR

Accompanying Billy Graham on his evangelistic tour of India is George Burnham, staff writer for the Chattanooga News-Free Press. In a recent dispatch from Delhi, Mr. Burnham wrote:

"The triumphant tour by Billy Graham has created more good will for America in India than all the millions of lend-lease dollars.

"He is a clean-cut American that people can see. They can listen to what he says. He isn't some vague figure in the national budget that never filters down to the people in a language they can understand. The people of India like what they see in Billy and they have been listening with rapt attention to what he says. In less than three weeks he has talked to over a half million in person.

"At every city and hamlet he has been met at the airport by civic and church leaders and ordinary people. He has had enough flower garlands to make him hump-shouldered. Five little girls got up at 4 a. m. to watch him catch an early morning plane. He has drawn crowds of 10,000 at 7 a. m. and 100,000 at 7 p. m. to hear him preach. A man walked 400 miles to shake his hand."

Unquestionably Billy Graham has brought to India and to many another foreign lands a better understanding of the United States and its people—certainly a clearer understanding than is conveyed in foreign aid statistics and a more accurate understanding than may be derived from free-spending, self-centered American tourists.

If, as has often been said, the cold war is a war for minds more than anything else, Billy Graham is serving as a good soldier in the American cause. His youthful vigor, his abounding faith and his tireless energy are an invaluable aid to his country.

To all of this I say, may Billy Graham have God's richest blessings.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartbreaking aspects of the manner in which we have too often tackled the problem of the mentally ill, is the way we have treated the emotionally disturbed child. This phase of the mental health problem is the subject of the sixth of a series of articles printed in the Amarillo Globe-Times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include A Break for Johnny Doe.

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—A BREAK FOR JOHNNY DOE

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

Case history: Johnny Doe, white male, recently turned 15, IQ 132 (superior). Mother deserted. Father served penitentiary sentence for rape, assault and petty larceny. Boy put in Kansas Boys Industrial Home after escaping several times from children's home. Stabbed another boy at industrial home. May be dangerous.

These were the heartbreaking facts in a case history read at a recent conference in the Children's Unit of the Kansas State Hospital.

At the table were 5 doctors, 2 nurses, 3 teachers, a therapist and a social worker. Before each was a sizable stack of records which had been accumulated as these staff members had worked with Johnny Doe. An occupational therapist and a child welfare case worker who ordinarily would attend the case conference were absent.

Presiding was Dr. Joseph Noshpitz, chief of staff for the Children's Unit, a young psychiatrist graduated from Columbia University of New York City. That is, Dr. Noshpitz appears young—in his middle thirties—but he is not young in experience. He served on an Army psychiatric team and for several years was with Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospitals before coming to Topeka.

What was Johnny doing in a State hospital for the insane?

First, he was getting a chance that no highly disturbed emotional Texas youth could have—expert diagnosis and treatment at a special center for children.

Secondly, after he had assaulted another boy inmate of the boys industrial home with a knife, a battery of psychological tests had shown he might have an underlying psychosis.

CONFINED 11 OF HIS 15 YEARS

Johnny is a very real person, not a make-believe case history. Big for his age, 5 feet, 10 inches tall, he weighs 180 (the staff is concerned that Johnny, for too long skinny, now is gaining weight too rapidly). He is too pale—but Johnny has spent 11 of his 15 years in State institutions, from the time he was sent to the children's home at the age of 4.

His black hair is too long, not a ducktail exactly, but somehow he thinks the straggly locks make him more noticeable, and the staff agrees to this effort to establish his identity. His fingernails are bitten to the quick but the children's unit staff expects Johnny to retreat into many childhood traits before he starts to grow up under guidance.

He wears glasses, after many years of refusing to do so in the industrial school even though he is nearsighted. One day recently when the frames were broken, he wouldn't allow the aide to take them for repair. He was afraid he wouldn't get his glasses back. Johnny doesn't believe that anyone could be kind.

Johnny's medical history isn't a happy one: Scabies, impetigo, rheumatic fever. But Johnny's life history is shudderingly unhappy.

His mother at the age of 16 had married a man 18 years older than she—over her parents' objections. There were four children. The mother, following long mistreatment by her husband, deserted the children.

Thereupon her husband moved in with his mother-in-law and shortly after raped her, possibly in the presence of the small children. He was sent to the penitentiary. Johnny was put into a children's home at the age of 4, because even then he was creating a behavior problem in the neighborhood.

Time and again he ran away from the children's home and usually was caught in some minor criminal act, such as petty thievery. At last there seemed nothing to do but send him to a correctional institution—the Kansas Boys Industrial School. There his personality continued to be thorny, until the stabbing which brought his transfer to the State hospital.

For more than three-fourths of his life Johnny had been in State institutions. His future looked as though it might include a lifetime in either a State insane asylum or, if released with rehabilitation, in the State penitentiary.

SECURITY FOR THE FIRST TIME

But the children's unit workers already have reached the conclusion that Johnny Doe probably is not psychotic but is an emotionally disturbed youngster, reflecting the environment from which he came, unable yet to live with his own kind.

At first Johnny resisted treatment and wanted to go back to industrial school. Then slowly he seemed to gain some sense of security. The staff feels that probably for the first time in his life Johnny feels secure. He seems to be reaching the point at which he can be treated, and there is hope for eventual rehabilitation.

The conference goes on. How does Johnny respond in school? (The children's unit has teachers for school subjects.) How does he react to therapy? Have his behavior patterns changed?

The way to useful life may be long. Johnny must be retrained, and that is a longer process than training. If the doctors

and staff are successful, they will overcome the results of the first 15 years of Johnny's life—and could anyone have a more terrible handicapped past than Johnny has had?

"It is from the children that we are going to learn about the human mind, and, therefore, about mental health."

These were the words of Dr. Ernest Southard, one of the great leaders in American psychiatric work, and a teacher of Dr. Karl Menninger. Menninger set to work to put that teaching into effect. The Southard School at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka was established in 1925, designed especially for the treatment of children.

With this excellent pattern at hand, the Kansas program was set up to incorporate a children's unit.

"These are the sickest children in the State," says Dr. Noshpitz, as he surveys the 40-bed unit at the Topeka hospital for children's care. The ward was set aside in 1952 to house and treat disturbed adolescents, to take them from the adult wards where they were a disruptive influence and to provide a self-contained unit where the special problems of childhood could be studied and treated.

Original plans called for the treatment of youths from 12 to 16 years of age but today there are 11-year-olds and 18-year-olds in the unit. Boys and girls are housed on separate floors. There are security rooms for highly disturbed patients, who might have suicidal tendencies or who, on admission, are causing serious trouble.

Most of the children are sent from other State institutions, such as the State industrial and reform schools, where their personality disorders and possibly latent psychoses are discovered. There also are direct admissions from communities.

There are 34 children in the ward. Here is the highest staff-patient ratio in the hospital: 36 staff to 34 patients. The unit is served by 2 doctors, 2 social workers, 3 teachers, 2 nurses, 2 psychologists, 4 resident psychiatrists-in-training, 2 therapists, 18 aids, and a secretary.

But many of these staff members are "in training" (later the overall training program in Topeka's 3 hospitals will be explained).

Even so, the program is costly—$120,000 for the staff alone, plus proportionate cost of the housing, food, clothing, and the kitchens and maintenance staffs provided by the State hospital. The people of Kansas admit it is a costly program, but Kansans feel the children's unit will pay its way in lessened future costs to the State.

EARLIER THE BETTER

The Kansas State Council for Children and Youth has sponsored a unit for even younger children. At present, two cottages, containing 15 beds, are being built to house children under 12. It is hoped this unit eventually will contain 90 beds.

"As we have developed skills and knowledges in this field of mental health, we learn that the fundamental principle of medical treatment holds true—the earlier the ailment is found, the better the chance that treatment will bring recovery," says Dr. Noshpitz.

There have been no long-range plans in policy made for this unit. Now, it is thought it will serve as a central diagnostic center, with treatment carried forward in scattered centers throughout the State.

If Dr. Southard's rule holds true, it is in this unit set aside for the youngest of children, that the greatest strides in treatment and in research will be made.

And it is in this Kansas plan of a central children's treatment center we may find the solution to our Texas problem. Recently in Armarillo, there were 5 children desperately in need of resident treatment in a mental hospital, according to the Potter County Child Welfare Unit. One needs only to trace the recurrent news stories in the Globe-Times of juvenile delinquency, of children who come from homes so badly broken that it can be assumed that no training—or worse, very bad training—has been given, to know that we must face—and solve—this problem.

A MUST FOR TEXAS

Doctor Noshpitz feels that all children cannot be "cured" in the sense of being brought to vital mental health. Certain neuroses and psychoses stubbornly resist the terminal note: Cured. But most of these children in Kansas are being helped to the extent they can make marginal adjustments to people and social adjustments sufficient to prevent crime.

Unless there is such a central diagnostic and treatment center in Texas, planned guidance centers in the individual cities will have no place to send the more emotionally disturbed found in the city centers. Those will need the resident hospitalization and skilled treatment that cannot be provided at the local level, no more than the highest specialization in physical disease can be found in each community.

Child guidance centers play a big role in the overall picture of the care of the mentally sick child. They can give treatment to many children, but they always will need to refer patients to the State treatment center.

Some Texas cities already have such guidance centers for children but, as the Texas Research League report points out, a State center devoted only to care of children—separated from the adult treatment wards—is a must.

ONE VITAL GOAL

The children's unit has an outpatient clinic, and many children are served so well here that hospitalization is avoided.

Boarding homes are maintained for children just as they are for adults. If the children can be taken from the institution and put into the boarding home, which more nearly approximates the world of reality, away he goes.

The children's unit, like the other wards of Kansas State hospitals, has one goal toward which each staff member, from aid to psychiatrist, works.

Cure them if possible. Rehabilitate them to the point they can lead relatively normal lives. Get them out of the institution as soon as possible. Move them along the road back to reality by easy stages. Lose, if you must, to incurable insanity, win, if you can.

The Goals of My Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently a most forceful and informative speech was delivered by Hon. James McDaniel, of Jonesboro, Ark., titled "The Goals of My Soil Conservation District." Mr. McDaniel, a successful practicing attorney for a number of years, won top State honors in his presentation. This address is incorporated below in its entirety:

THE GOALS OF MY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

(By James McDaniel, Jonesboro, Ark.)

I am always proud to call Craighead County, Ark. my home. My family has been here since 1839, so it is truly my home. Also, it is different from most of our other counties in this or any other State. The western part of the county is almost entirely level, or nearly level, and growing rice. The eastern part is mostly sandy delta land. Through the center, from north to south, is a narrow strip of lush soil called Crowley's Ridge. The ridge averages 4 miles in width and is about 100 miles long. I live on a 410-acre cattle farm on the ridge where I grow Aberdeen Angus cattle. Then off the ridge I own and farm some 840 acres in rice, cotton, feed crops and pasture.

The earliest settlements in this county were on the ridge. The ridges were very fertile. Yellow poplar, white oak, red oak, gum, and hickory covered the hills and supplied every timber need for these pioneers. To the east the Mississippi and its tributaries flooded the bottoms annually up to Crowley's Ridge; to the west the swamp lands which are now fertile farm lands seldom dried up. There were pestilences and diseases in the east and west bottoms. So these early families settled on Crowley's Ridge, which they called God's levee. As the land was cleared, cotton, corn, clover, fruits, and other crops produced a bountiful harvest. I have heard my father speak of the red clover on the ridge that was knee high.

As word of this delightful location spread, more people came. They came from Missouri, from Tennessee, and from South Carolina for the most part. More and steeper hills were cleared and some began to clear lands in the bottoms. There was so much good soil that no one was worried about muddy water running down the hills. Straight rows and clean cultivated crops were the mark of a good farmer. If their land washed away, they could clear more.

The progress of sheet erosion was so gradual that no one noticed it. Production on the ridge declined, and more bottom land was cleared. In the 1920's huge drainage projects were carried out on the bottom land. The ditches were new and again every prospect was pleasant. However, this condition didn't last long. Soon the ditches nearest the ridge were filling up with soil carried by the ridge water. About this time, huge gullies began to appear on the hillsides. Sheet erosion had destroyed most of the topsoil and the subsoil was leaving the hills by the millions of tons. As the ditches filled, floods came frequently and devastatingly.

In 1935 a Civilian Conservation Corps camp was established at Jonesboro, to do soil conservation work. Thousands of acres of eroded land were treated with trees, vines, sod, terraces, and many other ways. However, this was not the most important help the county received. In 1939, the farmers of the county voted to organize a soil conservation district and ask for technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. This was accomplished in September of that year. However, only the ridge section of the county was included in the district. Within a short time, many farmers realized that the problem of soil and moisture conservation was not limited to the ridge. Thousands of acres of the high-priced east bottoms, which now sell for $300 and $400 per acre, were blowing away, and other problems plagued farmers in every section of the county. So, in 1945 all of the county was included in the district, by vote of the farmers involved. It is about this district, its origin, its problems, and its goal that I want us to think.

With the help offered by the district, farmers have vigorously attacked the enormous job of saving soil and controlling water. The farmers set up their own program and do their own work. The district provides technical assistance and some equipment which the average farmer does not have. But most important of all, it provided them with means of working out their own particular problems. This is done by discussion

meetings, demonstrations, tours, field days, and just farm visits. We have asked and received the cooperation of the Extension Service, the FHA, the ASC, the PCA, and 4–H, and FFA clubs, the chamber of commerce, the Boy Scouts, and the vocational agriculture teachers. The Lions Club annually provides the banquet for the district for winners of the save-our-soil contest. The bankers, the lumber dealers, the local oil companies, and the farm-equipment dealers take turns in providing substantial prizes for these winners. The county quorum court has been most liberal in helping pay for equipment. This year it appropriated $1,000 to help us make our payments. The local newspaper and radio stations have been more than generous in giving us publicity in our vital work.

As of January 1, complete conservation plans had been made on more than 1,800 farms. On these farms, 28,000 acres had been planted to some form of permanent vegetation; 132 miles of terraces have been built, 400 miles of farm ditches have been dug, draining more than 50,000 acres. On jobs where several farmers were involved, we have had 40 different groups who pooled their resources to get the job done for the good of the community.

Just recently we had nine farmers who, working together, obtained help from the county judge, the State highway department, the Agricultural Stabilization Commission, and the soil conservation district to drain their farms. The complete job couldn't have been done without the help of all, and nowhere but in a soil conservation district would there be the machinery set up for such cooperation.

These are just a few of the 41 soil and moisture conserving practices being carried out in the county. The most important thing that has happened is that people in cities and on farms have become soil conservation conscious. We are proud of what we have done, but we also realize that we have barely scratched the surface. No one, who really loves the land, can travel over Crowley's Ridge and not be saddened by the sight of thousands of acres damaged or destroyed by erosion. It took a hundred years for it to get this way, and it can't be brought back in one. But by constant planned, coordinated effort, we expect to see it brought back. Many of the farmers are already growing clover again. And we look to our own soil-conservation district, made up of the farmers of the county, operated by supervisors elected by them, to provide the leadership and other assistance we need. Incidentally, we have 375 of these supervisors in Arkansas and 12,500 in the United States who are giving freely of their time and talent with no hopes of any reward except the satisfaction of a vital job well done. Our debt to them can never be paid. We know it will be a long and expensive job to bring our soil back. Some may doubt if we can afford to do it, but we all know that we can't afford not to do it. The soil is not ours to waste; we are merely stewards of it and we must daily give an accounting of our stewardship. No longer can we follow the practice of cut, burn, plow, destroy, and move on.

I said in the beginning that I was proud to call Craighead County my home. The rest of the people in this county feel the same way about it. We need to solve our own local problems and believe we are capable of doing it. We would hate for any State or Federal agency to come in and force us to save our soil and control our run-off. We would much rather do it as we are now, on a strictly volunteer basis, under local leadership, with the best technical assistance available. Our districts now stand as a democracy, as opposed to a dictatorship, which we will have if we don't do the job ourselves. If the farmers will not do the job themselves, the Government will compel us to do it and this would result in our losing part of our democracy.

Many of us have built stock ponds up to an acre in size to stop the fast flow of water which carries away our soil and fills up our ditches. I have six such ponds on my cattle farm. This means that we not only protect our hill soil and the drainage ditches on our bottom lands off the ridge, but the cattle have water close by wherever they might be in the pasture. And we farmers have a ready source of fish since our ponds are stocked by the Soil Conservation Service. There are nearly 400 of these ponds on Crowley's Ridge, covering 1,600 acre-feet and holding one-half billion gallons of water.

These men of the Soil Conservation Service who work so patiently with the farmers have not been properly recognized for their work.

For centuries man has failed God in his stewardship of the land. His sins against the soil have been visited upon his children down through countless generations. God forgives sin, but not the results of sin. One can read the results of sins upon the pages of history, or the sands of Asia-Minor—more than 500 cities and villages where once fertile lands supported millions, now lie buried under the sands. We can read it in the faces of millions of Chinese who never had a square meal, or the thousands in India every year who starve to death. Surely the wages of sin against the soil has been death to these. I will not insult your intelligence by suggesting that this is going to happen here. We are firmly resolved that it shall not. But we, as a Nation, have a very poor record for conserving our natural resources. And this seems incongruous, since our country was founded by a people who believed in giving an accounting of their stewardship to their God. No other nation in the world has wasted its resources as rapidly as we have. As a civilization we are very new, yet we have already destroyed 280 million acres and damaged 700 million more so badly that it requires intensive treatment to keep them in production. When the Mississippi River is at flood stage, enough good soil goes down it every hour to cover an 80-acre farm 8 inches deep. Our population is increasing at the rate of 7,500 each day. Eroded soils and over population brought misery and death to India and China. Whither are we going? I repeat, we have wasted our natural resources faster than any other nation in history, but we are now soil-conservation conscious, and are now leading the world in that work.

It won't happen here, because we are gaining in the fight against it. We will never rest until every farm in this county has a conservation plan and until each farmer is following the plan.

This is the goal of our soil-conservation district. Our district has helped us in overcoming our major water problems; the bottom lands are no longer flooded and the hills are no longer washing away. We have discussed the accomplishments. It has enabled our farmers to work out their own land and water problems. You have been told how our district office coordinates the work of Government agencies and private organizations. So we pride ourselves in the job we are doing to help ourselves.

It is hard for a man to be very religious or patriotic on an empty stomach. Down through history, people have given up their political and religious freedom to dictators because they were hungry. They were hungry because their farmlands couldn't support them. We will remain a strong nation just as long as our soil remains fertile. "When the soil is gone, the people perish," has been a true saying for centuries. We expect to remain strong. We do not expect to give up our civil or religious liberties for the promise of food. One of our great poets gave us Horatius' saying:

"How can one die better than facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers and the temples of his Gods."

I ask you, "How can one live better than facing fearful odds for a chance to make a living and the right to worship God."

Edison: The Man Behind the Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix, I would like to have included in the RECORD a speech given by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., during the pageant of light festival at Fort Myers, Fla., at the Edison memorial service. Mr. Stringfellow's speech throws light on the feelings of Edison, the man behind Edison the genius. The people of my district have revered Edison ever since those many years past when he became a part of the community of Fort Myers. It was here that he built a home and a workshop and contributed so much, not only to America, but to Florida and, in particular, to Fort Myers. He is greatly revered and loved by the people of Fort Myers and each year they commemorate his birthday with a festival known as the Edison pageant of light. The pageant is held at the climax of the Fort Myers' winter season and attracts visitors from everywhere. I believe the remarks of Mr. Stringfellow, who knew this great man so well, will be of interest, and I ask that they be reprinted below:

EDISON: THE MAN BEHIND THE GENIUS

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., and longtime business associate of Thomas A. Edison, at the memorial service for Thomas Alva Edison, the Edison pageant of light, February 6, 1956, Fort Myers, Fla.

You have invited me, a layman and a businessman, to take part in this memorial service for Thomas A. Edison, and I am honored. In trying to select an appropriate subject for this occasion, I discovered how difficult it is to say anything about Edison that hasn't already been said. Those of you who are present at this service are here because of your respect and admiration for that great man, and I am sure that you are familiar with all the known facts regarding his life, his struggles, and his achievements. However, because it had been my privilege to have worked closely with Thomas Edison during the latter years of his life, it occurred to me that I might be able to give you a few closeups of him that have not already been recorded by his biographers.

We all recognize, of course, that Edison was a genius. We know him as a great American, as a benefactor to mankind, as an inspiration, and as a wizard. Let's see what the combination was that made him all these things.

Except for his deafness, he was remarkably sound physically, no doubt due to the kind of life he lived. He didn't use alcoholic beverages. His principal dissipation was strong coffee, chewing tobacco, and cigars.

A number of years ago an intimate friend of mine visited me and expressed a desire to see Mr. Edison. Mr. Edison was a very easy person to see. Appointments were never necessary. All we had to do was to find out where the "old man" was. About 80 percent of the time he was in the chemical laboratories, so we looked there first, and if he wasn't there, we went to the library where we usually found him.

On the way to present my friend to the great inventor, he remarked, "I understand Mr. Edison chews tobacco. Wouldn't it be a joke if I asked him for a chew." Now to get the point of my story, my friend neither smoked nor chewed tobacco.

Soon after the introductions, I remarked to Mr. Edison, in all seriousness, "My friend would like a chew of your tobacco." The "old man," as we reverently called him, ran his hand down his right pants pocket, pulled out a plug of tobacco in a little case, laid it on his desk, ran his hand in his other pants pocket, pulled out a knife, opened it, took the plug of tobacco out of the case, and handed the knife and the tobacco to my friend and invited him to cut off a good hunk. My friend didn't want to decline and yet he didn't want the tobacco. Bravely he cut off a piece about the size you could put in your eye, but Mr. Edison insisted that he take a much larger piece. When my friend took a larger piece, it still didn't suit the "old man's" generosity, so he took the knife and tobacco and cut off a good hunk and passed it to my friend and said, "Try this. You will get the true flavor if you take a mouthful, as I do." My friend got the full flavor all right. He got out of Mr. Edison's library as quickly as he could and got rid of the tobacco on the steps of the building. Edison's generosity with chewing tobacco just wasn't appreciated.

Mr. Edison was opposed to smoking cigarettes for he felt that inhaling the smoke was bad for the lungs and that the chemicals in the paper were injurious to health. He felt so strongly about it, he issued instructions that no one in the library or laboratory should smoke cigarettes. Those instructions still appear on the time clock in the laboratory:

"Cigarette smoking in the laboratory must be stopped. Anyone disobeying this will be dismissed. (Thomas A. Edison.)"

His friend Henry Ford was equally opposed to cigarettes and together they wrote a book on why people should not smoke cigarettes. The book created so much publicity for cigarettes, it had an opposite effect to what the authors intended. As a result, so far as I know, both of them refrained thereafter from talking about the injurious effects of cigarettes.

Edison was 5 feet 9½ inches, and weighed around 175 pounds. He spent more hours at work and less at sleep than most people. In common with Napoleon, he slept more soundly and got more rest in a given time than the average person. He was serene and relaxed—seldom agitated. However, I remember one time, when he really lost his patience. The machine shop of the Edison laboratories is on the first floor and the drafting room on the second floor. Mr. Edison used to commute between those two departments many times each day. He would run up the stairway as often as he would use the slow freight elevator.

The elevator was an old contraption. On one occasion, Mr. Edison yanked the rope and the elevator started. Halfway up, the belt came off and Mr. Edison and the elevator were suspended midway between the two floors. It was about 20 minutes before we could lower the elevator and its occupant to the machine-shop floor. During that time Mr. Edison was anything but serene. He used some selected language and he made sure he could be heard throughout the two departments. So far as I know, he never used that elevator again, with or without an operator.

Mr. Edison's step at 80 was a spry as that of most men of 40. He liked to repeat the story Chauncey Depew told when Depew was in his 90's and still going strong. When asked, "How do you get your exercise?" The wit replied, "by acting as pall-bearer for my young athletic friends."

Edison got most of his exercise in his laboratory. He rarely sat at his desk. He moved around from one instrument to another, going from scale to tube, from report to drawing board, and from building to building covering as many yards as most businessmen cover on their round of golf.

Edison had great patience and determination. His most difficult invention was the nickel-iron-alkaline storage battery. After conducting more than 45,000 experiments without any measure of success, an associate asked, "Are you not discouraged?"

"Discouraged" responded the genius. "Certainly not. I have learned 45,000 ways the job cannot be done and I am, therefore, 45,000 ways nearer my goal."

Although recognized for his prodigious industry as well as for remarkable intellect, the old man loved a joke, not so much the sophisticated, sharp-witted kind, but more of the homespun variety of Abraham Lincoln. For example, he would with humility walk into his legal department and apply for a job as an inventor. Or, he could and would imitate the accent of a city low-brow, or the pompous manner of the holier-than-thou reformer, or a smooth promoter.

Edison contended that integrity is man's greatest asset, and he valued his integrity and his honor above material gains. On learning that a product bearing his name had developed defects in service, Edison closed one of his factories and requested his customers to return their purchases and get their money. The inventor felt that his integrity was involved, and this priceless ingredient was not for sale. He was always careful to see that his customers received a little more than he promised.

I am sometimes asked if Edison was a religious man. He was indeed, but he cannot be made to fit into the frame or pattern of any of our orthodox denominations. He felt that he was favored by some higher power. He was frequently asked, "Where do you find all those wonderful ideas of yours?" In response he generally remained silent, but a smile would pass over his face as he raised his finger and pointed upward.

Edison was not a materialistic thinker. While he was a master magician in dealing with material things, he was awed by what he called "the mystery of life," which he found it impossible to comprehend or fathom in terms of matter and physical concepts. While he admitted his uncertainty as to the meaning and scope of life after death, he did believe in the fundamental premise of eternal life.

Many of Edison's inventions and discoveries are based on nature's phenomena, particularly in the realm of light, sound, and chemistry. He saw vast possibilities in applying these wonders for the benefit of man, and nature was kind and revealed to him some of her secrets enabling him to develop the many things that made life easier and pleasanter for humanity.

Edison was many times a winner and an acknowledged champion in many fields, but he was a modest winner and a good loser. He suffered many failures with calm and stoicism. His concern was for the present and the future. He did not live in the past.

He knew and ever practiced the motto: "Sweet are the uses of adversity." For example, he turned his deafness into an asset in helping Alexander Graham Bell convert the telephone from a scientific curiosity into a practical instrument. He made his deafness a courtship asset. He taught his best girl the Morse code. In noisy, chattering social groups, they conversed by hand pressure. That was an excuse for them to sit closer together. Overcoming his natural shyness Edison built up the courage to propose when he could do so by hand pressure rather than by sales pressure.

Edison's pleasures were simple—his books and his music, and greatest of all was his pleasure in work. He gave the world light, warmth, joy and a higher living standard. He asked only for the opportunity to carry on his experiments for the benefit of mankind.

I like to think of Edison as exemplifying the faithful servant in the parable of the talents. You have read the story in St. Matthew's gospel: how the master, before going to a far country, called his servants to him. To one he gave 5 talents, to another 2, and to another, 1. The servant with 1 talent buried his in the ground. He who had 2 gained still another 2 and he who had 5 gained still another 5. Wherefore, when their master returned, he was pleased with the stewardship of the two servants who had made the most of their gifts, and because they had been faithful over a few things, he set them over many.

Edison was indeed a faithful servant. Vision, imagination, genius, industry, and character were the potentialities with which he was endowed. By the wise use of the talents committed to his care, the world has been enriched a thousandfold. Little wonder that his memory commands the devotion rooted deeply in human gratitude.

Chiang Kai-shek and Our Postwar Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, appearing in the New York Times of February 10, 1956, entitled "Chiang Kai-shek and Our Postwar Policy":

CHIANG KAI-SHEK AND OUR POSTWAR POLICY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—General MacArthur's statement, in his retort to former President Truman's explanation why he dismissed MacArthur as Far East Commander in Chief in the Korean war, that Averell Harriman "cautioned me of the extreme dislike with which the President regarded Chiang Kai-shek" vividly recalls the official line on China in Washington at that period.

In his letter of July 30, 1949, to President Truman, transmitting what became known as the China white paper, Secretary of State Dean Acheson laid the burden of blame for the loss of China to the Communists on the Generalissimo and his Nationalist Government. The following sentence in that letter is typical of this official defense against the widespread charge at the time that China was lost to the West because of the administration's failure to give Chiang Kai-shek the economic and military support which the critics insisted would have prevented the disaster:

"The reasons (for the disaster) do not stem from any inadequacy of American aid. * * * The fact was that the decay which our ob-

servers had detected in Chungking (the Nationalist capital) early in the war had fatally sapped the powers of resistance of the Kuomintang (the Chiang party). Its leaders had proved incapable of meeting the crisis * * * its troops had lost the will to fight, and its Government had lost popular support."

THE OFFICIAL VILLAIN

This was the period in which Acheson announced in a public speech that our policy in China was now to "let the dust settle," and in which the critics of the administration's policy record in China assailed the white paper for alleged omissions and distortions of pertinent facts that would have demonstrated the validity of their criticisms. The net result was that the generalissimo, for whom MacArthur as late as 1951 "openly expressed admiration and personal regard," became the official villain of the administration.

In August 1949, Dr. Philip C. Jessup, who was the editor of the much-denounced white paper, was appointed 1 of a committee of 3 to review the China policy and make recommendations. He sought the views of known experts in the field, among them Walter S. Robertson, of Richmond, Va., now Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East in the Eisenhower administration. Robertson, then in retirement, had served 18 months, part of it as chargé d'affaires, in our embassy in China.

THE ROBERTSON LETTER

His reply, dated October 8, 1949, began:

"In justice to ourselves as well as to whatever friends we may have left in Asia it would seem to be imperative that we clarify our objectives and pursue them with fidelity. Chiang Kai-shek has now been made the official scapegoat not only for China's sins but for ours as well. His back is hardly broad enough to bear such a burden. * * * In my opinion, at least, it can be fairly demonstrated that the confused and confusing inconsistencies of our own vacillating policy, however well-meaning it may have been, contributed directly and indirectly to the debacle which engulfed him and his government, our ally, and brought to power the Communists, our long-avowed enemies."

"THE CASE AGAINST US"

In those days and since, the administration and its defenders humped many of its China critics and supporters of the Generalissimo as the "China lobby," and sinister impressions of their activities were encouraged. But Robertson was not, and could not be, put in that line of fire: his record in the Far East, his high character and his established objectivity as an observer would have refuted such an implication. His letter, however, had no apparent influence on the administration's review of policy, which is not remarkable when these blunt passages are considered:

"Both the Nationalist Government and the Communist Party can make out a case against us of having run with the hare and ridden with the hounds. The confusion is explicable. Officially we were committed to a policy of expediency which was constantly being challenged by reports from certain foreign service officers in the field denouncing the Kuomintang, praising the Communists and recommending a course of action directly contrary to the one we were pursuing. And the fact that some of our official observers whose reports later influenced changes in policy completely failed to recognize the nature and character of the Communist movement only served to compound the complications already inherent in the situation."

Robertson then traced the origin to Yalta, and to the summer of 1945 when devasted China stood in dire need of economic assistance. "We withheld our help," he wrote, "and tried instead to bring about a coalition with the Communists. The collapse which followed was inevitable."

This kind of criticism, even though requested, and from such a source, moved the administration more firmly to the stand that Chiang Kai-shek was the culprit; otherwise it would have been obliged to concede inexcusable policy errors that the white paper in toto denied.

The Gasoline Price War in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, close study of the economic history of the United States reveals that the relation of government to business is predicated upon the principle of free and competitive private enterprise. The wise and beneficial nature of this public policy seems clearly demonstrated by its long and firmly established acceptance by the American people.

Last fall, I had occasion to listen to an admirable exposition of the social principles which underlie the public policy concerning the relation of government to business. At the time, my Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices of the Senate Small Business Committee was sitting in Newark, N. J., to receive testimony on the New Jersey gasoline price wars. One of the witnesses who testified during those public hearings was Father William J. Smith, S. J., a Catholic priest familiar not only with the peculiar competitive problems of the New Jersey gasoline retailers but also with the basic social principles which distinguish free competition from the law of the jungle.

In inserting Father Smith's statement into the Appendix, I wish to call especial attention to the passage beginning on page 99 in which he warns that when private business fails in its responsibilities, then the Government has a duty to remedy the situation. On this point I have noted the many bills recently introduced for the purpose of checking competitive evils in the automobile industry. In my judgment, there would have been no necessity for such measures if certain corporations had properly fulfilled their responsibilities toward those with whom they did business.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Father Smith be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REV. WILLIAM J. SMITH, S. J., DIRECTOR, ST. PETER'S INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

It would be well at the outset, I believe, to state the purpose of my appearance before your committee this morning. I have come at the request of the committee to point out some of the social principles which may underlie the solution of the problem currently concerning the committee, namely, that of the gasoline price wars which have been plaguing the State of New Jersey for a long time.

My appearance is in the capacity of an individual and entirely unofficial both in relation to the Catholic Church, of which I am an ordained priest, and more specific work in which I am engaged as director of St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations. I make no claim to the title of expert or authority on any of the matters under consideration.

The invitation from the committee, as I understand it, grew out of an article of mine in my syndicated column Spotlight on Social Reform which was published in the Advocate, the Catholic weekly of the Archdiocese of Newark, on August 14, 1955. Prior and subsequent to the publication of this article I have met in conference with a number of the gas dealers both individually and in groups. It was with the thought of giving encouragement to these men and women in their efforts to find a solution to a difficult problem, of manifesting a spirit of cooperation with this committee and of fulfilling a civic duty, that I have responded to your request to appear here this morning.

For almost 20 years I have been engaged in social action and as an apostolate of social reform, particularly in the field of industrial relations, and social education through the medium of labor schools and institutes, conferences for management, and forums of various kinds for the general public. The work of informal adult education has been implemented by extensive writing and the spoken word in the pulpit and on lecture platforms. Beyond that, I possess no special qualifications to comment on the current subject other than those of an informed citizen desirous to cooperate in the solution of a common social problem.

The subject of price wars in the gasoline industry has at least a threefold aspect: It is an economic problem, a legislative problem, and a social problem. These three phases of the subject are interrelated but are not necessarily identical.

From the economic angle, the aspect is more or less a technical one. It concerns itself with the production of gasoline, the administrative agencies of large corporations in the processing and distributing of the product, the retail sale and distribution of it by dealers who man the service stations, and the eventual use of the product by the motoring public.

In its legislative phase, the problem centers around the need of investigating prevailing conditions in the industry as they relate to Federal and State law for the purpose of determining whether present legislation is adequate both in existing statute and enforcement or whether further salutary legislation is deemed advisable.

The social aspects of the subject relate to people—to the groups involved, the public welfare, and the moral connotations which may be attached to the activities of the participants both as individuals and as social groups.

It should be made clear at the outset, I believe, that there is a difference between economics and moral law. One is not the other. They are not identical. If we are to live truly human lives, however, it cannot be denied that there is a strong relationship between the two.

There is no such thing as an economic man either in the area of economic activity or in any other sphere of human society. As a human being, every person is at one and the same time a member of human society, a citizen of the country of his birth, and a participant in the economic activities in which the people of a Nation engage to sustain life and material well being. His rights and duties extend to all three domains—namely, the social, the civic, and the economic. He is likewise a citizen of two distinct worlds—the world of time, the present, and the world

of eternity, the goal of his immortal destination.

Insofar as economics is a science or, at least, a quasi-science, it has postulates, if not laws of its own. It is possessed of scientific theories and the possible application of them in regard to production, distribution, and the consumption of goods and the rendering of services.

Economics in itself is neither moral nor immoral. It is a branch of the tree of knowledge. It is good or bad, as a science, in proportion as it is based upon true facts and valid conclusions. It is good or bad, morally, depending upon the use men make of it. Economic science steps into the jurisdiction of the moral law when it is translated into economic activity. When theory is reduced to practice, it is immediately clothed in the robe of a human action. It steps upon the playing field of rights and duties. It must be contained by the chalk marks of justice and injustice just as two football teams must confine their activities to the white lines marking off the goalpost at each end of the field.

Economic life and an economic system that develops through economic activity are not some sort of mechanical routine, isolated and divorced from the rest of human society. Laissez faire capitalism tried to pretend that it had a right to act on that false assumption. Some faint vestiges of the savage theory still remain. It is an insult to divine law and human dignity.

Economics did not create the universe and material elements of production. Economics did not create the power and genius of men to devise technological improvements. Economic activity, insofar as it is human action, must fit into the overall objectives of human life itself, just as political, military, educational, and domestic activities must be measured by definite standards and norms of human right and wrong, of justice and injustice, of charity and the lack of it.

The principles of social order are all inclusive of human activity. They must be applied to family and domestic life if the Nation is to survive. The family is the first social unit of society. They must apply to civic life if chaos and anarchy are to be avoided. Industrial society is a segment of the national life—the material basis of the whole cultural, educational, and spiritual life of the Nation. There is no divine dispensation or exemption from the rules of human living for economic activity. It must be guided by the same social principles as any other form of organization in human society, or it defeats the very purpose for which it exists.

Capitalistic economics are based on the profit motive. There is nothing wrong with the profit motive in itself. There is everything wrong with a profit obsession. There is a great deal wrong with an industrial society or a civilization that is based exclusively on the profit motive.

Free competition is a good and necessary element of industrial society. Both the wisdom of the scholars of the ages and the horrible effects that have followed from modern examples of totalitarian economics attest to the fact that you must have a free-enterprise system if you are to have a free nation. You cannot have a truly free nation, however, if the very term "freedom" is not correctly understood and interpreted.

There is no word in the American language that is so adored as "freedom." There is no word that has been so abused. "Obedience to just law is liberty. Freedom is the awesome responsibility of doing what we ought—not as we please.

The word "competition" itself can have either a rational or an irrational meaning. War is a form of competition. Organized gangsters engage in competition. The beasts of the jungle are in constant competition.

The only type of competition entitled to the proud adjective of "free" is fair, just, socially sound, and morally defensible competition. Unfair, unjust competition has no right to the claim of freedom. Unfair, unjust competition is an infringement upon the rights of men who were created by Almighty God to enjoy justice. Every human being, every last one of us, has a divine right to justice—as a matter of fact, that is the very definition of "justice": to give to each man what is his due.

Unjust competition has its source in greed and a lust for power; it feeds on injustice; it grows strong through conflict; it thrives on chaos and ends in monopoly for the strongest and the most unscrupulous.

In the current issue of the disorder in the gasoline industry it is not my obligation nor that of any individual citizen to ferret out the facts and determine whether unjust competition and its illegitimate offspring, monopoly, exist. That is the responsibility of the oil producers, the gas dealers, and public authority representing the public and the public welfare. This hearing this morning is evidence that public authority is accepting its responsibility. The recent formation of an organization of gas dealers intent upon showing by example their good will and sincere purpose of helping to solve the present problem is evidence of concern on the part of the gas dealers themselves. The organization is called the Petroleum Businessmen's Association.

A second organization, in the form of an incorporated service for gas dealers, called the Amalgamated Gas Dealers of America, is intended to give assurance to the motoring public that the service station displaying the approved AGDA dealer emblem is worthy of patronage.

The major oil industries may be equally concerned with the implications to the public welfare embedded in this problem. To date, however, no public action on their part has come to my attention.

What legislative action may eventually be taken by Government or whether legislation will be needed, must be determined by the facts unearthed in this investigation and others of similar type. The determination of the question is not the responsibility of the individual citizen, but rather the duty of the legislators, the organizations directly affected by present conditions and the voting public at large.

My present concern, and the stipulated purpose expressed by the committee for my appearance this morning, relates to the social aspects of the problem. It should be perfectly clear to anyone who understands the meaning of the word "social" that the economically unhealthy conditions now existing in the retail gasoline industry are not exclusively economic in nature. It is not merely a question of efficient and inefficient gas dealers. This is a social problem. It is a problem that affects the public welfare and the families of a great number of men engaged in this particular economic activity. The problems will not be solved by some naive individual waving a mystic wand.

Social problems can be solved only on social principles and by social action. It is of the very essence of social action that the common good of all be accepted as the common and mutual objective. A solution can be effected only by hard work, good will, and united cooperative action. The participants who must play a part in the solution of this particular problem are the representatives of the major oil industries, of the gas dealers, the motoring public, and public authority as represented by the Government. A few of the social principles that must be invoked—and they might be called commonsense, democratic guide rules which should prevail in a democratic society—are the following:

1. The principles of freedom. This means the right of citizens to conduct private enterprise without coercion or dictation by Government. Only when private groups are unable or unwilling to accept and act upon their own social responsibilities should Government exercise authority to correct abuses or restrict freedom. The true concept of freedom, however, is one that respects the rights of others. It is common to all parties, yet the private property of none. It is a common freedom that must be shared within the guide rails of justice, decency, and just law. Such freedom is a natural right of the citizens of a nation.

2. With equal emphasis it must be brought home that it is the positive duty of Government to promote and protect the public welfare and the common good. It is the solemn obligation of legislators and the judiciary to correct abuses in the social order. Far better, as a matter of fact, would it be for foresighted lawmakers to anticipate, through experience, the delinquencies that crop up in industrial society and incorporate natural rights and duties in the national policy before abuses can arise.

It is not a primary right of Government, however, to dictate economic activities. It is both its right and duty to establish a national social policy, based on principles of practical justice, within which the private groups may exercise a freedom proportionate to their own sense and execution of social responsibility. "Obedience to just law is liberty."

3. When proper standards of law and social order have either been neglected for long periods of time or have not been opportunely enforced, and social maladjustments have set in, it becomes the social obligation of all parties involved, both private and public, to cooperate one with another and correct those social disorders. The adage is very old that "God helps those who help themselves." It is equally true that those who are reluctant to help themselves have little reason to expect help from others.

We can likewise put it down as an enduring truth that, if human values are to be sacrificed for monetary gain, if power and domination are preferred to justice and good order, if men are determined to live by a law of the jungle rather than by a law of reason and the light yoke of moral responsibility, any plea for respect for sound social principles will fall on deaf ears and the expression of it will be wasted in thin air.

Those, in high places or low, who stand to profit by disordered social conditions may be disinclined to cooperate in the correction of them. They may prefer to tolerate economic chaos with an illicit profit rather than to work for order, justice, the common good, and the comfort of a clean conscience.

If that is the prevailing philosophy in the oil industry and those in a position of influence are determined to perpetuate it, any appeal to reason, conscience, the moral law, or the beneficial fruits of the common good and social order would be but a voice crying in the wilderness. A philosophy of this kind contains the seeds of its own destruction. Eventually it must boomerang.

4. A social problem such as the one that now plagues the oil industry in the State of New Jersey can be solved only in 1 or 2 ways. It will be solved either on the principle of self-discipline or a compulsory solution will be imposed upon the participants under the guise of establishing order and regularity. That compulsion will come either from within the industry itself or from without.

If a compulsory solution from within were to be attempted, it could be done only by the exercise of a monopolistic power of some kind or through physical coercion. From the legal implications alone such a solution would be self-defeating.

The gas dealers would not be able to compel compliance without running into violations of anti-price-fixing, and other laws.

The producers could not attempt to exercise a monopolistic power of any kind without running afoul of the antitrust laws.

The internationally famed expert on social ethics, J. Messner, writes:

"When a people loses its power of self-discipline, its doom is inevitable."

The prediction is applicable to specific industries as well as to a nation as a whole. The inevitable doom that might descend upon an industry or a segment of it would not necessarily mean its total destruction. It could not mean less, however, than its loss of freedom.

The practical alternative for a modern industry that has lost its power to govern itself is that of Government regulation. The road to Government regimentation is paved with the blocks of social disorder and social irresponsibility. An evident conclusion is: There are avenues to socialism other than that traveled by the avowed Socialists.

5. The first steps toward the solution of the problem of price wars should be the self-disciplinary reform of the respective parties themselves. The evidence, I think, will bear out the fact that there is substantial need of reform. The primary obligation of the gas dealers is not to attempt to reform the producers or the producers to correct the deficiencies of the gas dealers. Each in their own respective fields should first endeavor to institute reform in their own house. Codes of ethical conduct are in order.

6. If competition is to be the norm for establishing a just price, the norm should apply to the wholesale price as well as to the retail price. If fair and just competition is to prevail, the practices of economic jungle warfare must be eliminated. Some form of what might be called built-in social control must be established to prevent these practices which lead to cutthroat, jungle warfare competition.

The only ones who can organize and execute such a plan as a built-in social control are the representatives of the producers and the representatives of the gasoline dealers, with as much aid and assistance from the public and public authority as may be needed.

If either or both of the major participants in the distribution of gasoline are unwilling or unable to engage in mutual cooperative action to bring about a self-disciplinary solution of the present problem, the right and duty falls upon the legislators, both Federal and State, to step into the picture and impose upon both parties the obligation of fulfilling their social responsibilities through a compliance with necessary legislation.

Economic activity in industrial society is not some form of human life distinct, independent of, divorced and separated from the overall social and civic life of the Nation. The producers of gasoline are entitled to an honest and an honorable profit—nothing more. The gas dealers have a right to a decent profit. The employees of both have a right to a living, saving wage in keeping with the standard of life of the American way. The motoring public has a right to gasoline and motor services at a just price offered to them by honest dealers and repairmen in whom they can place their confidence.

The motoring public, on the other hand, must be educated to the fact that they cannot have their cake and eat it. We cannot have unreasonably cheap, price-war gas under present conditions, except at the expense of justice to many gasoline dealers, their families, and their employees. The public has both the right and the duty to demand that all the facts of the present chaotic conditions be made known to them. The hidden causes of the price wars, whatever they may be and wheresoever they are initiated and perpetuated, should be made known to the public.

A just and honest price can be established by just and honest competition. It is incumbent upon the representatives of all concerned to make every effort that is humanly possible to establish such a norm. If through private initiative and effort it is found impossible for practical social justice to withstand the onslaught of corruption, it becomes the solemn obligation of public authority to regulate the industry in the most practical and reasonable manner possible. An approximation to justice at least, can thus be achieved. Freedom is "the awesome responsibility of doing what we ought—not what we please."

Poison Penwomen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a campaign based on misunderstandings, misconceptions, and plain fiction has been launched against H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act. H. R. 6376 was passed by the House of Representatives on January 18, 1956, and is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for consideration. This act is humane. It is long overdue. It is in the public interest. I am completley at a loss in attempting to fathom the reasons why certain individuals and certain groups have now started a letter-writing campaign to many Members of Congress aimed most obviously at an attempt to defeat the act. I am sure that if the letter writers would consult facts, they would join with all others not only in hoping this act would become law but in working for its speedy passage and approval.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers have taken editorial note of this deplorable letter-writing campaign in an editorial which reads:

POISON PENWOMEN

Probably we should not be surprised at anything fanatics do, but it is hard to imagine any group of Americans attempting through scurrilous literature to hold back the progress of Alaska, our great and vital northern Territory.

Yet newspapers and public officials all over the land are being deluged with a crude circular denouncing the bill now pending in Congress to authorize the building of a mental hospital in Alaska.

Some of the circulars are stamped "California State Chapter, Minute Women of the U. S. A." with a Los Angeles post office box. Others bear no identification.

The authors seek to give the impression that the allocation of a million acres of land for support of the proposed Alaska hospital means the institution will be proportionately large. It also is contended ridiculously that the provision for reciprocal agreements between Alaska and the 48 States means that any State governor can order sent to this "Siberian" establishment anyone he considers insane.

Actually it always has been the practice in the Western States to set aside sections of public lands, the income from which can be used for the support of the schools and other State institutions. It is especially logical in the case of Alaska, with its vast land area.

Likewise, reciprocal agreements among States for the care of citizens who become insane while away from home are commonplace, and Alaska's large number of visitors and seasonal workers make such an arrangement logical.

This bill is supported by the Eisenhower administration and by leaders of both parties in Congress, as well as by virtually every organization which is concerned with Alaska's prograss. It has passed the House and now is pending in the Senate.

It would give Alaska, which has no mental hospital now, an institution similar to those in States with like populations and needs. It is difficult to understand how anyone who knows the facts could oppose it.

Eisenhower Facing Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the February 13 issue of Newsweek entitled "Facing Both Ways."

The article follows:

FACING BOTH WAYS
(By Henry Hazlitt)

Like his budget message, President Eisenhower's Economic Report seems to preach two mutually contradictory philosophies at the same time. It pays lipservice to Government economy and free enterprise, and ends with scores of recommendations for increased spending and more governmental controls.

It is perhaps forgivable, especially in an election year, that the administration should congratulate itself on the astonishing economic record of 1955, and imply that the result came about because, as Franklin Roosevelt once boasted, "we planned it that way." "Full employment, rising incomes, and a stable dollar have been cherished goals of our society. The practical attainment of these ideals during 1955 was the year's great economic achievement."

But what caused this result? The report begins, modestly enough, by admitting that "lasting prosperity of the Nation depends far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does or can do for them." It adds: "Today we believe as strongly in economic progress through free and competitive enterprise as our fathers did, and we resent, as they did, any unnecessary intrusion of Government into private affairs." Then a qualification is added which, as it turns out, practically nullifies this statement: "But we have also come to believe that progress need not proceed as irregularly as in the past and that the Federal Government has the capacity to moderate economic fluctuations without becoming a dominant factor in our economy."

Under the multitude of measures the report proposes, however, the Federal Government would obviously become the dominant factor in our economy. For the President and his economic advisers are now apparently convinced that "wise and timely actions by the Government" and "soundly conceived and well-timed governmental policies" can smooth everything out, give us exactly the

right rate of growth, and "prevent a minor contraction from turning into a spiraling depression." In order to do this, it seems that some 53 new laws or policies on the part of the Federal Government would be required. Most of these would greatly increase Federal powers. They imply interventions in the private economy at a thousand points and a constant stream of Government subsidies and handouts.

Moreover, even the specific governmental policies proposed contradict each other. This is most clearly brought out in the recommendations for credit controls. The Federal Government should be empowered to set "minimum down payments and maximum maturities on installment credit," because installment credit sometimes accentuates swings in the buying of automobiles, furniture, television sets, and other consumer durables, thereby exposing the rest of the economy to the hazards of widened fluctuations.

But the same Government that fears the too-rapid growth of installment credit, even when financed by private lenders at their own risk, has promoted an enormous housing boom by itself guaranteeing mortgages on shoestring margins that make the installment-credit terms on automobiles or television sets look like the acme of conservatism. It has forced Americans who want to invest in American corporations to pay down 70 percent of the purchase price, while it uses the taxpayers' resources to encourage other Americans to buy houses for 7, 5, 2, or 0 percent of the purchase price.

The Federal Reserve authorities, bluntly, have not had the courage to exercise a sufficiently firm control over the total volume of bank credit. They have kept down interest rates below the levels to which they would otherwise have gone. It is this that has encouraged and made possible the huge growth in consumer credit. It is futile economically, and dangerous politically, to give governmental authorities the right to increase the total supply of credit to make it cheaper and easier, and then to ration the oversupply by stepping in to say who shall and shall not have credit and on what terms. This substitutes bureaucratic judgment and favoritism for the judgment of the market place.

Tribute to a Great American

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to my former chairman, dear friend, and colleague, CHAUNCEY REED.

It was with deep sorrow and saddened heart that I learned the news of his passing. To have had the privilege of knowing and working with such a great chairman, able lawyer, true and devoted friend, and sagacious legislator is one of the pleasures I have received through being a Member of this great body.

Those of us who served with him on the Judiciary Committee respected his wisdom, sincerity, integrity, and conscientious devotion to the responsibilities and tasks that confronted us. CHAUNCEY REED'S untiring efforts and true and loyal dedication to principle rose far beyond the ordinary line of duty. His service to his district, State, and country was outstanding. I shall always cherish my friendship with such a distinguished American.

My heartfelt sympathy goes to Mrs. Reed and his family in their bereavement.

Arab-Israel War Peril: Russians Gain Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Arab-Israel War Peril: Russians Gain Influence," written by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

I have not always found myself in agreement with Mr. Cowles, and on many questions he and I have had a friendly agreement to disagree. For some time, however, Mr. Cowles has been making acute observations on the deficiencies in our foreign policy, and suggesting constructive alternatives. He has just returned from Asia and has written an eight-point summary of his observations and proposals. This is a succinct and significant statement, to which I wholeheartedly subscribe. I commend it to the attention of the Senate and the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARAB-ISRAEL WAR PERIL; RUSSIANS GAIN INFLUENCE

(By John Cowles)

After a month of concentrated question-asking and observation in South Asia and the Middle East, I am convinced most Americans are unaware of the gravity of current developments in that part of the world.

First. The Israeli-Arab situation is imminently critical. If war breaks out—and some responsible, informed authorities believe there is a 50–50 chance of that happening within 90 days—no one can foretell where it might spread.

If such a war is not averted, most of the Middle East might quickly be lost to the free world. Even if such a conflict did not rapidly develop into world war III, as it might, the loss to Great Britain of its Middle East oil reserves, if that happened, would be a catastrophe of incalculable dimensions.

Not only would the Communist world's war-making potential be enormously increased, but economically Great Britain would be reduced to the position of a second-rate power.

If an Israeli-Arab conflict is to be avoided, real concessions will have to be made by both sides. Since the Arabs will not negotiate directly with the Israelis, either the United States or Britain, or both, must act promptly as go-between.

No matter how sympathetic most Americans are with Israel, we must realize that all justice is not on one side. Moreover, not only Israel but conceivably the whole free world might face disaster if a settlement, which can only be atained through mutual compromise, is not speedily reached.

Second. The Bulganin-Khrushchev tour of India, Burma, and Afghanistan was a major success for the Russians. The Communists are clearly gaining throughout much of Asia. Communist propaganda is diobolically clever and effective. Unless the United States adopts a much more imaginative and understanding psychological aproach toward Asia, and enlarges the scope of its economic aid, the probability is that much, if not most of Asia, will gradually slip into the Communist orbit.

Third. Most Americans have no comprehension of the psychological importance throughout Asia of the phrase "western colonialism." It is of supreme importance that the American Government try in every possible way to dissociate itself from all aspects of colonialism.

For example, official statements that can be interpreted, no matter how erroneously, as implying American approval of continued Portuguese occupation of Goa and other enclaves on the Indian subcontinent do the free world incalculable harm.

Fourth. Our paramount concern in Asia should be to try to prevent the presently neutral or uncommitted nations from slipping into the Communist orbit. India, with its 370 million people, is overwhelmingly the most important country in this category and Nehru the most influential Asian leader.

Nehru believes deeply in the principles of democracy. He is sincerely convinced that the course he is following is the most likely way of averting world war III.

Americans who criticize Nehru for being a Socialist and for not giving at least lip service to the American principles of free enterprise overlook the stark fact that the average Indian has an income of only about $55 a year.

India must be developed industrially but there are no pools of private savings, as there are in the United States, for this purpose. The Indian Government must therefore either get foreign loans or go totalitarian, as Russia and China have done, and depress an already unbelievably low standard of living, to extract from its miserable people the funds necessary for national development.

In my opinion, the United States in the interests of its own national security, cannot afford not to give India substantial financial aid.

I favor our giving India a line of credit of a billion dollars, payable at the rate of about $200 million annually, to help India with its new 5-year plan. Withdrawals on this loan should be made with the approval of the American ambassador as the 5-year plan progressed.

The granting of such a loan would not of course guarantee that India might not slip into the Communist orbit, but it would greatly reduce that likelihood.

In proposing such a loan, we should neither ask for nor expect any shift in India's present political alinement of neutrality. We should make the loan for two reasons:

Because of a sincere desire to try to help India develop itself and raise the almost incredibly low standard of living of its people without India being forced to abandon democratic processes to accomplish it.

Because our own national security would be gravely jeopardized if India were forced into the totalitarian orbit in order to satisfy the material aspirations of its people.

Fifth. We should put less emphasis on our military pacts in Asia. Certainly we should continue to supply arms to those friendly nations desiring and needing them to prevent possible Communist infiltration and subversion.

Some of our Asian military pacts, however, wholly in addition to providing effective propaganda material for the Communists, are causing discord in two other ways. On the one hand, the recipient nation doesn't get the amount of military equipment it, per-

haps naively, assumed it would get; on the other hand, a neighboring nation frequently fears that the arms that we have provided may be used against it.

In addition, there is ground for the belief that some of our military pacts with Asian countries may have tended to induce the recipient nation to use a larger proportion of its own national income and manpower on its armed forces than it can afford.

If the recipient nation is thus economically weakened, its government may be more susceptible to being overthrown than would have been the case had we given it a smaller amount of military aid.

Sixth:. Some Congressmen have expressed the view that our foreign economic aid should be greatly reduced or eliminated.

Unless we are willing to reconcile ourselves to letting all Asia slide under Communist rule, which to me would be sheer insanity, we should recognize that our foreign economic aid is going to cost us large amounts for many years to come. I am not suggesting billions more than the present level, but perhaps a few hundred million more for economic aid. Possibly such an increase can be fully offset by reduced foreign military aid.

While we should plan our overall economic aid on a long-term basis, the bulk of it should not be earmarked for specific countries in specific amounts at specific times, so that those recipient nations get the feeling that they have a right to it regardless of their own government's actions.

Perhaps half of our total economic aid appropriations should be given to the President to spend where, when, and how he thinks wisest. Our ambassadors would then have authority to increase, reduce, delay, or withhold aid depending on how effectively the recipient government was making use of the aid, and whether the recipient government was genuinely endeavoring to do the things it might have committed itself to do, such as tighten tax collections, eliminate graft in connection with the distribution of our aid, reduce fiscal deficits, carry out agreed-upon land-reform programs, etc.

Our foreign-aid dollars could be far more effectively and productively spent on such a flexible basis, and in addition the President would have the greatly needed authority to divert dollars from one country to another as relative needs changed.

Seventh. The American people should realize that an overwhelming proportion of the Asian countries, including even those like Pakistan with which we have military pacts, want Red China admitted to the United Nations. Leaders throughout Asia say that since the Red government is securely in control of China's 600 million people (one-fourth of the world's population) and since Russia is accepted as a member of the U. N., they can see no valid reason why Red China should not also be seated.

Some argue that if Red China is seated in the U. N., Peiping might become more reasonable. Some argue that if Red China were made a member of the U. N., that would tend to increase the likelihood of China and Russia taking divergent lines on some matters of foreign policy.

Some definitely non-Communist Asian leaders even express the view that the admission of Red China to the U. N. would tend to accelerate the possibility of an eventual split between China and Russia.

Asians who argue for Red China's admission to the U. N. largely agree that it would be proper to continue Nationalist China's (Formosa's) membership in the U. N. as an independent nation. Several Asian leaders told me emphatically, however, that Red China would not publicly accept this as "a solution," but that if the Nationalist Chinese withdrew from Quemoy and Matsu, they doubted that Red China would go to war with the United States in order to try to regain Formosa.

Americans should realize that within a year the pressure for Red China's seating in the U. N. will probably become so overwhelming that only a United States veto, if a veto is legally appropriate in such a proceeding, could prevent it.

Eighth: The American people should realize that historians a century hence, if there are historians then, will probably record that a new chapter in the conflict between the Communist and free worlds began in the year 1956.

The hundreds of millions of uncommitted peoples of South Asia and Africa, plus many in Latin America, have become determined to develop their natural resources and industrialize their economies in an effort to raise their standards of living.

The Russians are encouraging them, and offering help. Perhaps the Russians will not deliver on their promises, but it would be folly for us to risk our own future security in certain of the strategically critical areas of the world on the assumption that the Russians will not deliver.

Unless the United States demonstrates its genuine interest in helping these underdeveloped nations, and is able to devise mechanisms for accomplishing it, probably the governments in most of those areas will ultimately tend to follow the Russian method.

Russia proved during the twenties and thirties that a backward, illiterate, underdeveloped country could successfully force industrialization. Ruthless repression was required, and savings were forced from a people with an already extremely low living standard, but the goal of industrialization was achieved. China is apparently moving along this same path.

Now for the first time in human history it is at least theoretically possible to abolish poverty throughout the globe, and in the space of only a couple of generations.

Whether the people of the United States will come to appreciate quickly enough what is now happening in the underdeveloped areas of the world, or whether we will wait passively until the backward countries begin to accept Moscow's political and economic philosophies as their model, is the overriding political question of the period immediately ahead. Compared with it, most of our other problems shrink into insignificance.

Many Americans have exaggerated ideas of what we are now spending for foreign economic aid. The bulk of our foreign aid is for military purposes. Most of what we are currently paying out under the name of economic aid is going to Formosa, South Korea, South Indochina, and other areas directly affected by military operations, or for the direct or indirect support of military forces. Only a tiny fraction of the funds of the international cooperation administered (formerly called the foreign operations administration; previously to that called point 4 or the ECA or the Marshall plan) are going to the economic development of militarily uncommitted nations, even though these areas may be of great strategic importance.

It is not necessary for us to spend additional billions for foreign economic aid; but a very few hundred additional millions, plus some changes in our methods and psychological approach, might make a decisive difference.

While nothing should deter us from accelerating the development of our military strength and intensifying the scientific research on which our national security may depend, military weapons alone in the period ahead may well prove insufficient to insure the permanent maintenance of our freedom.

Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following column written by Yeshayahu Dan in the January 13, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks.

It carefully reports excerpts from the remarks of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, made before the Israeli Knesset—Parliament.

KNESSET BACKS GOVERNMENT ON PEACE

(By Yeshayahu Dan)

"The maintenance of peace is preferable even to victory in war. We know that any war, even one in which we gain the upper hand, involves ruin and destruction for both parties and intensifies hatred between nations. We know that after our victory in one war a second round is possible, and after our victory in a second round, a third round may come, and there is no end to the business."

These sentences, spoken by Prime Minister and Minister of Defense David Ben Gurion at the opening of one of the longest foreign affairs and security debates, held in the Knesset last week, summed up the decisive answer given to the principal opposition demand for partial or full preventive war—in one form or another.

In fact, it decided the major issue by the speakers. Manachem Beigin for Herut and Peretz Bernstein for the General Zionists (Beigin had recently thrown out a suggestion for merger between these two groups) in fact claimed that the issue was not between war and peace to be decided on by the Knesset. According to them, the war unleashed by the Arabs on May 15, 1948 had never come to a stop.

NO BASIC DISAGREEMENT

About the basic facts there was no argument. All speakers stressed the Arab guerrilla warfare being waged against Israel (it claimed no less than 884 Israel casualties in killed and wounded in the last 5 years); dwelt on the Arab boycott and blockade; mentioned the many evasions of the armistice agreements by the Arab countries; described the manifestly warlike intentions of most of the Arab rulers and in particular those of the Egyptian dictator.

The speakers therefore urged the House not to wait until Egypt will have absorbed the vast quantities of new arms supplied to her in order to strike at Israel, but take the initiative into our hands now. They claimed that the validity of their approach had been confirmed by what had happened since the Czech-Egyptian arms deal, for the chances of obtaining the defensive arms desired by Israel had never been great and had recently even decreased.

This approach was also echoed, though not quite fully supported, by youthful Yigal Alon, of Achdut Avoda—a coalition partner—one of Israel's most famed commanders in the War of Liberation. "The problem is not how to prevent a war in the future but how to put an end to the one going on now," was the way he put it.

MAPAM VIEWPOINT

The most forceful answer given during the debate was that of another left-wing speaker, Yaakov Hazan, of Mapam. "You say the (Arab) war against us has already lasted for 7 years," he asserted. "Yet, another

7 years like these and we shall have more than 2 million Jews in this country; hundreds of additional villages will have been established; the Negev will be settled, the Jordan will flow southward, our security will have increased." This admittedly precarious peace had therefore to be saved at all costs and all efforts should be directed toward that goal.

The central points in the debate were made by the two Government speakers, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The major points from these two speeches (together they lasted well over 2 hours) were these:

Ben Gurion:

"There is one certain method which can prevent war in the Middle East * * * the speedy supply of defensive arms to Israel." For "we are faced with a serious explosion, the results and development of which are difficult to foresee either for the Middle East or for the whole world. The responsibility for this explosion will fall not only on the Egyptian military junta, but on all the countries that unceasingly supply offensive arms to Egypt and deny defensive arms to Israel." Yet "war against us is not unavoidable and predestined. * * * All the members of the Cabinet, without exception, are firmly opposed to a war to be initiated by us."

OBLIGATION ON BOTH SIDES

In the face of constant guerrilla warfare against Israel, "the Government showed great forbearance. It is ready now, as in the past, to observe faithfully all provisions of the armistice agreements * * * but this obligation is equally binding on the other side. An agreement which the other side violates will not be binding on us either. If the armistice lines are opened to saboteurs and murderers from the other side of the border, they cannot be closed again for defenders.

"The situation of the State of Israel is unique and I know of no country in the world which, in nominally normal times, is subjected to such constant security dangers as the State of Israel. This uniqueness also makes it difficult for Israel's friends in the world to understand our peculiar situation and the ways of self-defense imposed on us by the attacks of our neighbors. * * * I know that no British or Soviet or American ruler would tolerate planned and continuous murder of his citizens by gangs organized by a neighboring Government for purposes of sabotage, assassination, and frontier violations.

"War is not inevitable, and if we obtain arms—arms of the necessary quality—it is almost certain that our neighbors will not dare to attack us * * * but whether we get the arms or not we have to be prepared at home. We have to establish a regime of mass voluntary effort * * * a minimum of 50 million pounds should be realized for the defense fund * * * shelters have to be built all over the country. * * * We shall have to impose on our young generation an additional year of service over and above their present military service."

SHARETT ADDRESS

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Moshe Sharett, concentrated on problems of foreign policy. The highlights of his address were these:

"The Government has made a concentrated effort to make public opinion in the world aware and fearful of the danger which threatens the security of Israel. Our cause has aroused a powerful response from friendly public opinion all over the world.

"We regard the Soviet Union as the factor primarily responsible for the crisis which has arisen. We tried to bring home to Mr. Molotov the responsibility which must fall on the Soviet Union. We have heard (from the First Secretary of the Russian Communist Party) a definition of the policy of Israel which has never before been uttered by the official spokesman of a state maintaining normal relations with us." Mr. Khrushchev had claimed that from the first days of Israel's existence it threatened its neighbors. Mr. Sharett quoted statements by Soviet representatives at the United Nations in 1948 when they castigated and criticized the Arab invasion of Israel, in order to refute the Soviet claims.

"We are bound to * * * intensify our opposition to the arming of Arab countries as long as they maintain a state of war with us. * * * We have previously raised our voice against the Baghdad Pact and against the military aid agreement which the United States concluded with Iraq. We must warn today against a continuation of arms shipments to that country and against the attempt to include the Kingdom of Jordan in the Baghdad Pact.

"Israel will conduct her campaign against hostile alliances—by political and not by military means. If a short time ago we acted against Syria, we did it in order to put an end to constant assaults on our security, on the integrity of our territory and on our freedom of action in it, and not for any other purpose.

"MISLEADING FORMULA

"The formula in currency today is one of mutual concessions. We have explained that this formula is liable to mislead, and to lend a semblance of equality where in fact it discriminates. The concession demanded of the Arabs is renunciation of their demands. Of us the concession demanded is renunciation of what we possess.

"The Jewish world should know (in spite of all difficulties and problems) that life in Israel continues normally—that it is possible and indeed a duty to visit Israel precisely at this hour and see her people prepared but calm, confident in their strength and working without cease for its consolidation."

Not less than 10 hours had been allocated to the debate—one of the longest periods in the history of the Israel Parliament. Speaker after speaker who mounted the rostrum gave expression to the gravity of the hour. In the evaluation of the dangers facing Israel and the goal to be striven for—peace—almost complete unity was evident. Where views differed was on methods, but on pure show of hands and hearts the vast majority backed the government in its effort to maintain peace until the last possible moment.

United Nations and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following speech I made before the Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club at Chicago, Ill., on Saturday, February 11, 1956:

The very origin of the United Nations had a communistic coloring. Russia was very conspicuous in the organization of the pact, and a Russian and Alger Hiss were the main operators arranging the provisions of the Charter. Did Russia at that time have an idea of working for peace within the organization she was foremost in organizing? I think the answer is "No." As Russia is a follower of Karl Marx it might be advisable to examine his manifesto. One of the principles set forth is a directive to Communists "to make any agreement with a capitalistic nation; keep the agreement as long as it benefits you; scrap it when it stands in your way in the complete destruction of capitalism."

The aim and purpose of the Communists was then—when the United Nations was organized—is now, and always will be to destroy capitalism anywhere and everywhere. We knew then, or our leaders ought to have known, that the Russian philosophy was clearly defined.

In order to gain prestige themselves, in order to more easily follow their plan of destruction they talked peace, yet while talking it they were fomenting war. That peace talk finally got stale and the United States could see, if their leaders were not asleep, that while pretending peace they were actually spreading a cold war as fast as possible.

The Charter of the United Nations was approved by the Senate with only two dissenting votes and those were cast by members of the nonpartisan league which in World War I was branded as disloyal. If the vote to approve the charter came up today, Senator after Senator would reverse himself. The peace propaganda spread by the Russians was so strong in the United States at the time of the approval of the charter that Senators as well as educators, ministers, and other intellectuals were taken completely off guard and this dangerous document was ratified.

What is the situation today? Both the United States and Russia sit side by side in the sessions of the United Nations, both pledged to obtain and preserve the peace of the world; both pledged to oppose aggression anywhere and everywhere, yet in our efforts to stop wars, we find our friend in the United Nations, Russia, fomenting and aiding aggression. Count the money and lives we expended in Korea, and you can see the effect of this Russian support to aggression.

The song of peace having faded, the Russians now bring up another slogan, which may fool a lot of people right here in the United States. The slogan now is peaceful coexistence. In both of these propaganda efforts of Russia they have a tremendous advantage over us, because we are asleep—right here from the Nation's Capital, the stream of propaganda is continually going out, while we have no such privilege in Russia. How dumb we have been. We blurted right in and recognized the Russian Government and thereby condoned the brutal destruction of property and lives of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

There isn't an American who would not do his utmost to bring relief to the people behind the Iron Curtain, but that cannot be done. We can't arm them, we can't even feed them. We have attempted to arm distressed nations, but in the end the engines of war have gone into the possession of the Communists. In Vietnam it took the Communists a month to haul home the enormous stocks of munitions which fell into their hands. In China, after the State Department deserted Chiang Kai-shek, the enormous stores in munitions, once intended for Chiang, went into the possession of the Reds of China. I would like to help the Polish people, the Czech people, the people of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Hungary, China, and all the others, but there is no way of doing it. We could, if we stopped long enough to think, do a lot for these people to preserve in them the spirit of liberty and freedom, and that would be:

First, withdraw recognition of this autocratic and despotic government and let the people in those countries know that we do not condone this ruthless government and do not put our stamp of approval on the summary executions of millions of people who show any disposition to rebel against this regime. But when we sit here like scared children and approve of that kind of

government, the people who are oppressed must lose hope when this great freedom-loving Nation approves the daily torture method meted out to them by their conquerors.

The second thing is get the Russians out of the United Nations or get out ourselves. Every move we have ever made to establish world peace has been vetoed by the Communists, when at the very moment their vetoes were cast, they were talking peace. How long it will take this country through its legal representatives to see the absolute impossibility of accomplishing world peace or any other peace—anywhere, at any time—remains to be seen, but for several years I have seen the impossibility of this and have said so, when only a handful of the Members of Congress agreed with me.

I remember one day at lunch at the Republican table that I presented a resolution to the Members for their signature, opposing the United Nations as then constituted, and two signatures were all I could muster. Now there are 138 Members who are not afraid to oppose it.

The United Nations project No. 1 is to settle matters in the area around Jerusalem, but what do we find? We find there the timberbox that is more than apt to bring about a major conflict. Russia, our buddy for peace, has rushed in and fomented war. There will be war there just as long as both sides are armed, and they are armed by members of the United Nations. This presents a sorry spectacle of two of the great nations, sitting side by side in the councils of the United Nations—one trying to bring about peace and the other trying to foment war. What kind of membership is this that the United Nations seems so proud of?

Turning now to the activities in the United States carried on by this Russian-inspired United Nations, we see a darker picture.

This Nation does not need any lessons in the way of freedom should go and how far it must extend. For example, do we need to have to subscribe to a genocide law? Have we ever been guilty of race murder or destruction? We have always respected minorities; we have always stood squarely for free speech, free religion and a free press. Why does this communistic United Nations have to redefine any of these cardinal principles of the Constitution? Yet that is exactly what this organization is striving for. First, free speech is well defined in the Constitution. Yet this organization insists on redefining our own Constitution. They say every person shall have the right to full free expression of mind, except as limited by law and except when it conflicts with the design of the United Nations to further world peace. Just as soon as we make exceptions, then free speech is no more; the same applies to free religion—the Russians would dearly love to destroy our belief in Jesus Christ and substitute for the Saviour Karl Marx, Lenin or Stalin. Doesn't the first amendment to the Constitution allow us free and unlimited religion? Why do they seek to change it—who seeks to do it? The Communists, because they are infidels, and in the past many religious organizations have let themselves be hoodwinked by this non-Christian band of assassins.

Isn't a free press protected under our Constitution? If it is, and it is, why change it to say that the United Nations shall be the judge of what we may publish?

The worst part of the whole scheme to change our Constitution is the way citizens of this country are dealt with, should they be charged with violating the edicts of this organization. Their revision goes as far as to say that if any citizen makes any statement that hurts the feelings of any group or any member group, he has violated this Charter of the United Nations and can be made to stand trial. But where will he be tried? Will he be tried here in the United States where he made the statement and be protected by our laws and the Constitution? No, he will not. He will be tried wherever the United Nations says he must be tried. He can be hustled out of this country and tried in Russia if he has maligned the Russians. He will not have the protection of the laws or the Constitution of his own country, but will be tried under such rules as the court of the United Nations promulgates. How do you free American citizens like this diabolical program? Yet that is exactly what this Genocide Convention of law will do if approved by the Senate and the President.

There can be no question, whatever, that the avowed purpose of the United Nations is to build a world government and make each nation merely an integral and subordinate part of this government. The United States must, therefore, surrender its sovereignty as an independent and constitutional government in order to partake of the blessings of this communistic-designed world government. Isn't that what the Communists are working for? Can there be any mistake about it? They want world dominion, and if we ever project ourselves into such an organization the job will be done. In this government a world congress will be set up on the basis of population, and it is axiomatic that with Russia, and her allies, the majority of that world congress will be composed of representatives who are opposed to our form of government. This is incontrovertibly true if Red China is ever permitted a membership in the United Nations.

This, therefore, being the purpose of the United Nations, let us see what means its advocates propose to use in order to build this world government. Most of the proponents are educated people—some of them among the most highly educated people in the country. They are fully aware that the vast majority of the people here love their country and would give their lives, as many have in the past, to preserve it. They know that we have great admiration for our great statesmen of the past, as is demonstrated annually by the celebrations of the birthdays of some of our great men like Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. They know how the children of the United States revere the builders of this great Nation.

Knowing this, they are smart enough to know that the place to start to undermine this loyalty to our institutions is among the schoolchildren of the United States. The agency of the United Nations which is to be used to eradicate this loyalty and patriotism for our Government is called UNESCO—spelled out it means the United Nations Educational and Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Teachers of UNESCO—at least a lot of them—have been educated at Columbia University to teach our children that loyalty and patriotic feeling for one nation is wrong and will be an impediment to loyalty and devotion to a world government. They propose to the children that they should devote their loyalty not to the United States, but to this super world government. Washington's Birthday is not to be celebrated, but in place of any reference to Washington the time is to be used to advance the cause of a world government. These proponents feel if they can successfully indoctrinate the youth of the land, that the rest of the battle can be won easily.

The unfolding of the purposes and objectives of the United Nations is now so obvious—that the building of a world government is their goal—that the citizens of America ought to see that in the end the sovereignty of the United States and the Constitution of the United States is destroyed.

If world peace is the purpose of the United Nations, why is it that this organization wishes to busy itself with repealing our laws and our Constitution? Why do they single out the United States as the victim of their destruction? The people have made our laws and our Constitution, and nowhere else on the surface of the globe have any people made greater progress under their own laws or Constitution.

The Fujii case in California is directly in point. There an attempt was made to set aside and repeal the laws of the State of California in regard to Japanese aliens owning property. To the astonishment of Americans the lower court did set aside the California statutes, in this regard, under the authority which the court found in the Charter of the United Nations. Fortunately for this country that decision was reversed, but it was not the fault of the United Nations that this decision was not upheld.

A more striking case was the Steel Seizure case before the Supreme Court of the United States. In that case the question before the Court was: Did the President have the constitutional power to seize the steel industry? The case was argued precisely on that ground.

None of the judges could find any provision in the Constitution of the United States for such a seizure. If the steel industry could be seized, all other forms of business could be seized by a President, including the farming and livestock industry. It therefore appeared that the case must be decided in favor of the steel companies. But much was to happen, and what happened was the most far-reaching decision ever handed down by the Court in its history. The Chief Justice in his opinion admitted that there was no provision in the Constitution authorizing this seizure, but listen. He produced the Charter of the United Nations as his authority and decided in favor of the seizure.

Fortunately for the life of this Nation, 5 Judges of the Court upheld the Constitution, 3 put the Charter of the United Nations superior to the Constitution, and 1 Judge took no part.

Suppose, for example, that if the majority of the Court had sustained the views of the Chief Justice, where would our Constitution have been? It would have been a dead instrument, superseded by the Charter of the United Nations. Some people do not believe that God Almighty has anything to do with what happens to this Government, but I do believe it. In all our history there seems to be a power, which we cannot see, that guides the destiny of this great Government. In this case the majority of the Supreme Court rose to the importance of the occasion and sustained the Constitution of the United States. Doesn't this action and the attempt to abrogate the Constitution in the highest court of the land lead the people of this country to take a new look att his insidious attempt to destroy our Government? We never in our history came as close to the destruction of the Constitution as we did in this case.

I do not believe that the people of the United States are ready and willing to abandon a government that guaranties life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and the protection of all citizens for a communistic inspired world government.

The fight is still on, and I want to do my humble part to preserve the greatest Government on earth.

Speaking before a club that bears his name, and in a State that gave this Nation and the world Abraham Lincoln, one of the greatest leaders in liberty and freedom in the entire history of the world, I feel we can well pause to hear his words uttered during the throes of a civil war then ranging on this continent:

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us here to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take in-

creased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Land Bank and Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1949, I introduced a soil conservation bill, H. R. 2368, and on March 23, 1949, I received unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, a copy of my bill and an analysis explaining quite in full the provisions of the bill.

I have good reason to believe that my bill, H. R. 2368, was the first soil bank—soil conservation bill to be introduced in Congress. But up until a few months ago, no Secretary of Agriculture, nor Congress, nor any farm organization seemed interested in such a bill. However, I am pleased to say that, some of the top officials of the Department of Agriculture now in power have for some time taken a keen interest in the provisions of H. R. 2368.

Mr. Speaker, had H. R. 2368 been made the law of the land soon after I introduced it, I am very certain the farm problem as it now exists would not have developed. I am gratified to see that, the agriculture bill which was recently adopted by the Senate Agriculture Committee corresponds in many of its provisions with the provisions of H. R. 2368, but apparently in greatly expanded form, which I presume is necessary at this late date in order to hasten its effectiveness.

My purpose in having my bill and analysis of it again printed in the RECORD at this time is, in the hope that the reading of same by Members of the Senate and by the Members of Senate and the House conferees, it will be helpful to them in writing a good farm bill which is so desperately needed now. I had, of course, hoped that the House Committee for Agriculture had seen fit during the past 40 days to hold extensive hearings, so I and many, many others could have been heard on this all important legislation, but such was not the case, hence all a House Member can do is to do as I have here done and then vote on the bill as it comes out of conference to the House.

My bill and analysis follows:

H. R. 2368

A bill to provide for establishment of a soil- and water-conservation policy, the coordination of soil- and water-conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Soil Conservation Act of 1949.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) That it is hereby recognized that the lack of a sound national soil- and water-conservation policy as a foundation for other agricultural programs; the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and woodland of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion; failure to maintain and improve soil fertility; improper lay-out for farm- and ranch-irrigation systems and use and management of irrigation water thereon; inadequate farm drainage; improper use of land; and, development of land unsuited for sustained agricultural use, is a menace to the national welfare.

And that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for using the Nation's land in accordance with its capabilities and the treating of it in accordance with its needs; for the control and prevention of soil erosion; for the maintenance and improvement of soil fertility; for the conservation, proper use, and management of agricultural water resources; and for the sound development and use of agricultural land resources and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors, and protect public health, and public lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture, from now on, shall coordinate all activities of the Department of Agriculture with relation to soil erosion; soil fertility maintenance and improvement; conservation, use, management, and disposal of farm and ranch waters; development and changes in use of agricultural land; and shall recognize as basic the conservation of soil and water resources in the formulation of other agricultural programs, and in order to effectuate this policy is hereby authorized, from time to time—

(1) to conduct surveys, investigations, and research, in cooperation with the State experiment stations, relating to the character of soil erosion, loss of soil fertility and productive capacity, water wastage, land misuse, and the preventive measures needed, to publish the results of any such surveys, investigations, or research, and to disseminate information concerning such methods;

(2) to provide technical assistance to soil-conservation districts and other conservation districts deemed by the Secretary to be qualified in the preparation, carrying out, and maintenance of locally developed and adopted programs for soil and water conservation, preservation and improvement of soil fertility and sound land use on farms, ranches, and other land in such districts; for rehabilitation or construction of needed individual and group farm and ranch drainage and irrigation systems and in conserving, managing, and disposing of irrigation water in such districts; and for necessary guidance of a widespread application program of recurring conservation practices requiring little or no on site (on farm or ranch) technical assistance for those farmers and ranchmen not yet reached in the schedule for assistance in adopting a basic conservation farm or ranch plan or not desiring to participate in the comprehensive program in such districts;

(3) to provide technical guidance, supplementing the efforts of the State extension services, and the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to landowners and operators in those agricultural areas not included in soil conservation or other districts in the widespread application of recurring conservation practices requiring little or no on site technical assistance. In addition, technical assistance may be provided in these areas in the preparation of a limited number of basic conservation plans on farms or ranches for demonstration purposes; and

(4) to complete, as rapidly as possible, a conservation survey of the Nation's farm and ranch lands; to analyze, publish, and distribute the inventory thus secured; to provide copies of land-use capability maps to landowners and operators for their own units of land and to assist them in interpreting and utilizing such maps; to survey and classify by capabilities for agricultural use the lands in existing, proposed, or potential agricultural development projects or the agricultural parts of multiple-purpose projects; to determine the suitability of such lands for sustained agricultural use; and to provide technical and other aids necessary to, or to clear, level, and otherwise develop project, woodland, cut-over, and other lands needed and suitable for agricultural use.

ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) In furtherance of the policy expressed in section 2 of this act, the Secretary is also authorized to cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other assistance to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he may deem appropriate. Such assistance may include, but is not limited to, financial payments, conservation materials, planting stock and seed, use of equipment, or other similar materials and aids: *Provided*, That in furnishing financial or other assistance authorized under this act to any person with respect to land situated within a soil-conservation or other conservation district which meets the standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture, such assistance shall be made available only through, or in cooperation with, such districts.

(b) In determining the nature and extent of the assistance to be furnished, the Secretary of Agriculture shall take into consideration—

(1) the recommendations of the governing bodies of soil-conservation or other conservation districts concerning the need for, and the capabilities of such districts to use effectively, the funds, materials, or equipment;

(2) the urgency and extent of the need for such funds, materials, or equipment to prevent irreparable damage to agricultural land and water resources; and

(3) the availability of technical assistance to assure the most effective use of such funds, materials, or equipment.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) Any financial payment authorized to be made to any person under the provisions of this act shall be a class A, B, or C payment and shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe except—

(1) class A payments shall be made for conversion of land that has been for the previous two or more years in grain, row, and other soil-depleting crops to non-soil-depleting uses such as meadow, hay, pasture, and woodland, in order to encourage livestock and forest production and prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land. The first payment shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of converting the land to grass or trees, and payments may be made not more than five times thereafter at a rate of one-fifth of the original cost as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on a generally fair and reasonable basis for continuing the land in nondepleting use. After June 30, 1952, class A payments may be made only when such conversion of land is initiated and carried out as a part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan, and if such conversion of land is initiated and carried out on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil-conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator;

(2) class B payments shall be made for practices and improvements of a permanent or semipermanent nature, such as terrace systems, drainage and irrigation installations, farm ponds, range water-diversion systems, and for other practices and improvements as may be required to prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land. Such a payment shall not exceed 60 percent of the cost of such practice or improvement, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on a generally fair and rea-

sonable basis, and shall be made only once. After June 30, 1952, class B payments may be made only when such practice or improvement is carried out as a part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan, and if such practice or improvement is carried out on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil-conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator;

(3) class C payments shall be made for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility, such as liming, fertilizing, grass seeding, crop rotation, cover cropping, mulching, and prevention of stubble burning. Such payments may be made annually and shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of performing such practice, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, on a generally fair and reasonable basis.

(b) Classes A, B, and C payments shall be classified according to such areas and practices as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine and announce for each fiscal year.

(c) Classes A and B payments may be made to a landowner or operator only when the governing body of the conservation district has certified to the Secretary of Agriculture through the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, in accordance with certification standards prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture; that the work has been performed in accordance with the provisions of this section, except that prior to June 30, 1952, classes A and B payments may also be made to a landowner or operator with respect to land not within the boundaries of a soil-conservation or other conservation district under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe.

(d) Class C payments may be made to a landowner or operator with respect to land within or without the boundaries of a soil-conservation or other conservation district when the local committee, established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, has certified, as specified in subsection (c), that the work has been performed in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(e) In making classes A, B, and C payments the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as practicable, utilize as his agents the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

SEC. 5. The members of conservation district governing bodies shall not receive Federal compensation for services rendered or reimbursement for expenses incurred under the terms of this act. This provision regarding Federal compensation and expenses, however, does not preclude their being compensated for their services, travel, and other expenses by the State, county, or district.

SEC. 6. (a) In furtherance of the policy expressed in section 2 of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized—

(1) to provide for the employment of, and with State extension services jointly to select, necessary personnel to assist locally with conservation education activities primarily (a) in the areas critically in need of conservation treatment not now in districts and (b) in supplementing the county extension staffs in soil-conservation and other districts in preparing the way for conservation, farm planning, and application action on the land;

(2) to cooperate or enter into agreements with or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act; and

(3) to acquire submarginal agricultural lands, or rights or interests therein, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, and to sell federally owned lands suitable for agricultural use to neighboring landowners needing additional acreage to complete a sound farm unit, or in family-sized units to veterans and others desiring to engage in farming or ranching, using procedures consistent with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937, whenever necessary for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The acts authorized in sections 2, 3, and 4 may be performed—

(1) on lands owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, with the cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction thereof; and

(2) on any other lands, upon obtaining proper consent or the necessary rights or interests in such lands.

SEC. 8. As a condition to the extending of any benefits under this act to any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, the Secretary of Agriculture may, insofar as he may deem necessary for the purposes of this act, require—

(1) agreements or covenants as to the use of such lands; and

(2) contributions in money, services, materials, or otherwise, to any operations conferring such benefits.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture may—

(1) secure the cooperation of any governmental agency;

(2) subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as he may deem necessary; and any persons with technical or practical knowledge may be employed and compensated under this act on a basis to be determined by the Civil Service Commission; and

(3) make expenditures for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the purchase of lawbooks and books of reference, for printing and binding, for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, and perform such acts, and prescribe such regulations, as he may deem proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. In recognition of (1) the necessity for technical assistance in determining and applying needed conservation practices and measures, and in assuring the effective use of such grants-in-aid as may be necessary to supplement the contributions of landowners and operators in establishing such conservation practices and measures; (2) the impossibility of practically separating the responsibility for the conservation of water or the sound use of land from the responsibility for soil conservation and the prevention of soil erosion; (3) the desirability of having all technical action programs involving conservation, irrigation, drainage, water development, and flood control on farmlands, as well as the development of new agricultural lands, technically directed by one agency; and (4) the desirability of taking advantage of existing relationships and working arrangements already developed with conservation districts organized under the laws of the respective States, the Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize the agency known as the Soil Conservation Service in carrying out the powers conferred on him by sections 2, 3, and 6 of this act and the local, county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, in carrying out the powers conferred on him by section 4 of this act, and in order that there may be proper coordination of the activities including grants-in-aid involving soil and water conservation, sound land development and use, drainage, irrigation, and other physical adjustments of farm and ranch lands, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the Soil Conservation Service such functions, funds, personnel, and property of other agencies in the Department of Agriculture as he may from time to time determine necessary to avoid duplication, achieve economy, and carry out the spirit of this act.

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary. And the Secretary is directed in presenting his first budget to Congress after the passage of this act to recommend a preliminary conservation timetable, based on currently available information, as a guide to Congress in making appropriations. On completion and analysis of the conservation survey of the Nation's land, the Secretary shall revise and improve the conservation timetable and present it to Congress for use in determining annual appropriate needs.

REMARKS OF HON. BEN F. JENSEN, OF IOWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1949

Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1949, I introduced in the House of Representatives a soil conservation bill, H. R. 2368.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2368

This legislation provides a national land policy, and the legislative framework for the effective administration of a United States Department of Agriculture soil conservation program that will assist our farmers and ranchers to conserve and make proper use of their soil and water resources—and will get the job done in the shortest possible time.

In addition, there are provisions which will help to correct the problem of surplus in certain crops. Land-use-conversion payments will encourage farmers to use some of the land contributing to such surplus for the production of crops for which there is greater demand, such as grass for meat and dairy livestock and timber. When the proper and necessary changes in land use are made I am sure there will be no need for acreage allotments. In bringing about a balance in agriculture production the Government will be better enabled to support farm prices permanently at a full 90 percent of parity.

By using about $100 million annually of the funds now being used for soil conservation payments, for land-use-conversion payments, as provided in my bill, 24 million acres of land could be converted from soil-depleting crops to soil-conserving crops in the next 6 years. This would bring our food, feed, grain, fiber, and meat production into better balance, and greatly assist in flood prevention, and soil, woodland, and water conservation.

Conservation payments and grants-in-aid are provided in such manner that the taxpayer can be assured that the Nation will receive a dollar's worth of benefits in true, effective soil conservation for every dollar spent. Farmers receive more responsibility in administering their own national soil and water-conservation program. No new agencies are established. The Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and Production and Marketing Administration are each given more responsibility and without duplication.

If H. R. 2368 becomes the law of the land it will begin to bring "solicide" to an end, the crime too often committed against the priceless topsoil of Mother Earth. It will insure a more stable income for our farmers, which in turn will insure an adequate and stable income for workers, business, and industry. It will be an effective program to help reduce price-depressing surpluses; increase the speed and quality of soil-conservation work in the Nation, while strengthening the farmer-managed institutions engaged in such work; keep more rainfall on the land where it falls, and thus lower flood crests and reduce reservoir sedimentation; give better protection of our rich agricultural uplands and bottom lands, human lives, live-

stock, and buildings; save the taxpayers'—your—money through a more efficient and effective farmer-managed water, woodland, and soil-conservation program; provide the legislative and administrative framework to put our agricultural house in order—for any national or international emergency.

National land policy

A productive and prosperous agriculture is a must for the Nation's prosperity. The wealth of our Nation is wholly dependent upon the productivity of our soil. As the topsoil is destroyed or weakened through erosion or overuse, the productive capacity of that land is lowered. Food costs rise and a lowered standard of living results. This legislation provides that we use our agricultural land within its capability for safe production, and that we treat each acre in accordance with its needs.

National conservation survey

Early completion of a nationwide survey of our farm, ranch, and woodlands to determine the productive capacity and conservation needs of each acre is provided. A land capability map shall then be made available to each landowner, showing how each acre should be used according to its capabilities for safe production.

Conservation timetable

A conservation timetable shall be developed as a guide to the Nation in determining the speed with which our farm, ranch, and woodlands should be treated to prevent further extensive damage.

Sound farm units

H. R. 2368 will assist landowners in acquiring acreage to complete a profitable farm, and thus reduce much land overuse resulting from uneconomic-size units.

Technical assistance

Technical help for effecting proper land use and conservation treatment shall be made available to all farmers. Inside conservation districts, technical help shall include on-site assistance to plan and apply a properly coordinated conservation program. Until a district is organized, such help shall be limited to helping farmers carry out the more simple but effective conservation practices.

Conservation payments

To encourage proper use and conservation of our agricultural resources, land use conversion, soil conserving, and soil building payments and grants-in-aid shall be made available.

Class A: To avoid surpluses resulting from overuse of the land, payments shall be made to assist farmers in converting the use of land that has been for the previous 2 or more years in grain, row, and other soil-depleting crops. This will encourage a balanced production of food, feed, grains, and fiber.

Class B: Payments shall be made to help farmers defray the cost of applying certain permanent or semipermanent soil and water conservation measures. Generally, such payment shall be made only once.

Class C: As an added incentive to encourage farmers to hold their topsoil through proper land use, and other soil and water conservation practices, class C payments may also be made annually for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility.

Local conservation districts and farmer committees

This legislation recognizes that farmers themselves are best qualified to administer their own national conservation program on a local and community level. Farmer-voted conservation districts organized under the laws of respective States and directed by their respective boards of soil-conservation commissioners and supervisors, and county agricultural conservation association, and State production and marketing administration committees shall be the principal farmer-managed organizations through which the Government shall assist farmers with their soil and water conservation problems.

Agencies to be used

Primarily, three governmental agencies shall carry out the provisions of this act. Each is well schooled in the art of doing its part in soil and water conservation.

Soil conservation service

Because it is impractical to separate the technical, conservation payment, and grants-in-aid assistance in soil conservation, erosion control, drainage, irrigation, water-conservation development, and flood prevention on farm and ranch land, the Soil Conservation Service shall be responsible for all such provisions of this act, except for the specific responsibilities of County Agricultural Conservation Association and State Production Marketing Administration committees.

Extension service

This legislation provides for the needed personnel for county extension staffs for educational work in conservation districts and in areas critically in need of conservation treatment not now in conservation districts.

Production and marketing administration

The County Agricultural Conservation Association and State Production and Marketing Administration committees shall be the agents of the Secretary of Agriculture in making all class A, B, and C conservation payments.

Federal lands

With cooperation of the agency having jurisdiction, all of the conservation survey, timetable, and technical assistance provisions of this act may be made available for the conservation of federally controlled lands.

We must save the soil by which we live. Rich productive soil will insure the survival of America.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a copy of a letter addressed to the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, N. Y., by George L. Waldbott, M. D., 2930 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich., commenting on the New York Health Commissioner's report on fluoridation of drinking water.

The letter follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *January 23, 1956.*

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor of the City of New York,
City Hall, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: Dr. B. J. Nesin has asked me to comment on Dr. Leona Baumgartner's Report to the Mayor on Fluoridation for New York City.

As a physician I shall limit my remarks to the medical aspect of this project, namely, to the question of its safety.

1. Why does this report fail to answer the points presented by Dr. F. B. Exner (1), Dr. C. G. Dobbs (2), and myself (3) on the inadequacy of the four key studies which purport to prove the safety of fluoridation, namely, the Bartlett-Cameron Study (4), the Paired Mortality Statistics (5), the McClure Studies (6), and the Kingston-Newburgh Study (7)? Why does the health commissioner thus evade the real issue and merely accept and enlarge upon the conclusions of these highly controversial statistics?

2. Why does the report exclusively quote the highly biased public health literature which is favorable to fluoridation, whereas many important publications pertaining to harm from fluorides appear to be deliberately ignored?

3. Why does the author base some of her conclusions on opinions such as those expressed in the two exhibits and on endorsements by medical and lay organizations which have no scientific value?

The following are specific examples in elaboration of the above points:

There are at least twelve well-substantiated reports on fluorine poisoning from drinking water at concentrations from 1 to 12 ppm by competent clinicians in the literature. Such recent studies as those reported by Walters (8), Siddiqui (9), Frada and Mentesana (10) and Rao (11) present exhaustive details on chronic fluorine poisoning from drinking water. Since the daily dose of fluorine intake in food and water is considered safe by the Public Health Service is four glasses per day and many people drink many times that amount, it is inconceivable how such important data could have been omitted from this report.

Well-substantiated data on death from chronic fluorine poisoning in animals and in humans as a result of industrial exposure has shown that this disease is a chronic wasting-away process, cachexia. (The French literature calls this disease fluorose cachectique.) The cause of death, therefore, in cases who die from fluoridated drinking water is extremely difficult to diagnose. Dr. Baumgartner casually dismiss the case of the Texas soldier who died from drinking fluoridated water at near the so-called safe concentration [1] and completely ignores a similar fatal case from Argentina. In the latter, the report was made for the expressed purpose of alerting the Argentine government to this health hazard. Yet, Dr. Baumgartner and her consultants attempt to dismiss these cases as insignificant or as caused by something else.

Instead of quoting the two publications (12, 13) in which I reported my first cases of poisoning from drinking artificially fluoridated water at 1 ppm, Dr. Baumgartner refers to another article of mine not pertaining to the medical aspect of fluoridation and, therefore, not even offered to a medical journal for publication.

In a new article which I am now preparing on the basis of 55 cases, the proof of fluorine poisoning from what is called a safe concentration is thoroughly established by careful evaluation of a clear-cut syndrome not known in any other disease, which is identical with that observed by other authors from poisoning at higher concentrations as well as poisoning in animals. It involves the same organs that are affected in acute fluorine poisoning. This proof does not rest, as she states, on the fact that the individual "has a stomach upset," or that "the condition disappeared when the individual visited a nonfluoridated area."

When Dr. Baumgartner states that "the rules of scientific investigation require that it be established that the condition could have arisen only because of the consumption of fluoridated water and that the relief was obtained by changing the water source alone"; this is precisely one of the methods,

---

[1] Linsman, J. F., and McMurray, C. F.: Fluoride Osteosclerosis from Drinking Water. Radiology 40: 474–84, 1943. (The misprint of 12 ppm was corrected to 1.2 ppm in Radiology 41: 497, 1943.)

among others, which I have employed to prove that this is fluorine poisoning.

Increasing numbers of similar reports are now coming to light. During my visit to the naturally fluoridated town of Lubbock, Tex. (4.4 ppm), October 25, 1955, where I addressed the staff of a hospital, a case of advanced fluorine poisoning was presented by one of the staff physicians. The record and X-rays of an advanced incurable case were shown to me at a second hospital by another physician (names on request) which clearly fitted the description of my own cases.

Two highly significant publications have appeared recently. One deals with further elaboration of the Newburgh data ([2] 59–61) which is based on the premise that the early manifestations of fluorine poisoning are detectable in the urine by examining for albumin, red cells, and casts. That this premise is fallacious is clearly established by the enclosed letter to the editor of the journal where the article was published.

The other publication (14) pertains to the Bartlett-Cameron study in which damage to health was detected in a large percentage of the population (Bartlett with 8 parts per million, Cameron with 0.4 part per million of fluorides naturally). In this new report the claim is made that the 21 individuals who showed bone changes had no other symptoms of poisoning. This highly significant statement is not supported except by fragmentary data on only three cases. Even in these three cases, there is evidence to the contrary. For instance one of them had hearing defects which have recently been reemphasized as characteristic features of chronic fluorine poisoning from drinking fluoridated water by Siddiqui in the British Medical Journal, December 10, 1955. No other data whatsoever is presented on the other 20 cases.

The most striking example of how Dr. Baumgartner has been misled by those whom she consulted for information, is her reference to the "theoretical claims of interference with many enzymes," page 28. All scientists, as well as textbooks on the action of fluorides agree that such interference with enzymes is one of the principal characteristics of fluorine action. Voluminous data on this point is presented by the monumental work by the Danish scientists, Hans Borei (15) and by many other authors, none of whom are quoted in her report.

On the other hand, for substantiation of her own statements, Dr. Baumgartner quotes one author whose writings cannot be considered scientific ([2] 63) and another ([2] 62) who fails to document his views in his article. By thus quoting unsubstantiated data, she makes it appear to the uninformed that the ill effect of fluorides on enzymes is open to question and that those who report it are incompetent.

May I comment on two points outside of the realm of scientific evidence in the report? The letter by Dr. G. J. Cox, in the appendix, regarding the personal experience of his relatives and friends is of no more scientific value than a testimonial for a patent medicine.

The other point is Dr. Baumgartner's claim (p. 29) that citizens have complained of illness from fluorine before fluorine was actually added to the water supply. A similar story is propagated from many cities where fluoridation has been installed. On the other hand, health officials, when asked, nearly always state that there have never been complaints of harm registered with the health department. In view of this apparent contradiction, it would, therefore, be desirable to obtain documentation for this statement.

May I be permitted to make the following suggestions to your committee:

1. The establishment of a neutral committee, composed of competent physicians who have no connection with either the PHS or with institutions dependent on PHS grants to study:

(a) The photostatic copies of the 21 case records of the Bartlett-Cameron Report in order to discover whether other symptoms were present, and if so, how these symptoms and laboratory data correlate with those observed in my cases, the two cases encountered in Lubbock, Tex., and the many others reported on fluorine poisoning in the literature.

(b) The four key articles quoted by Dr. Baumgartner which purport to prove the safety of fluoridation with their critiques submitted by Dr. Exner, Dr. Dobbs, and myself.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE L. WALDBOTT, M. D.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Exner, F. B.: Fluoridation, Northwest Medicine, 54: 721–737, July 1955.
2. Dobbs, C. G.: Bangor, Wales. Letter published in British Medical Journal, February 12, 1955.
3. Waldbott, G. L.: Report to the Florida State Health Department, August 20, 1955.
4. Dr. Baumgartner's reference No. 48.
5. Dr. Baumgartner's reference No. 58.
6. Dr. Baumgartner's reference No. 39.
7. Dr. Baumgartner's reference No. 61.
8. Walters, J. H.: Transactions Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 48: 385–394, September 1954.
9. Siddiqui, A. H.: Fluorosis in Nalgonda District, Hyderabad-Deican, British Medical Journal. December 10, 1955, 1408–1413.
10. Frada, G., Mentesana, G.: Some Observations on Chronic Fluorosis, Boll. D. I. Soc. Ital. Biol. Sper. 29: 750–53, April 1953.
11. Rao, D., et al.: Studies of Endemic Fluorosis. Compression of Spinal Cord Due to Skeletal Fluorosis. El Dia Medica. 27: 857–860, May 1955.
12. Waldbott, G. L.: Chronic Fluorine Intoxication From Drinking Water at the 1 ppm Concentration. An Epidemic in Saginaw, Mich. Folia Clinica Internacional. 5: 144–150, 1955.
13. Waldbott, G. L.: Chronic Fluorine Intoxication From Drinking Water at the 1 ppm Concentration. A case report. International Archives of Allergy and Applied Immunology. 7: 70–74, 1955.
14. Leone, N. C., et al: A Roentgenologic Study of a Human Population Exposed to a High Fluoride Domestic Water. American Journal of Roentgenology, 74: 874–885, November 1955.
15. Borei, Hans: Inhibition of Cellular Oxidation by Fluoride. H. K. Lewis & Co., Ltd., London, 1937.

[2] Dr. Baumgartner's references.

The Nugget of Fact—Trevor Gardner's Resignation Sounds Warning Soviet Russia Leads in Life-and-Death ICBM Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am personally disappointed to learn that Mr. Trevor Gardner, the able Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, has resigned that important position. I am sure that he did so only after wrestling with his conscience. Mr. Gardner had made a great contribution to the American defense effort. His abilities will be sorely missed at a time when that effort must be intensified. Survival is at stake, and whatever the right or wrong of Mr. Gardner's action in resigning, everyone must admit that Mr. Gardner was fighting for survival of the United States.

As so often happens, Joseph and Stewart Alsop tell the story more clearly and more understandably than any news announcement. The reasons for his resignation are, they say, like the layers of an onion. When you peel down to the heart, you find a nugget of fact. In this case, the nugget of fact is that the Soviet Union is unquestionably ahead of the United States in the life-and-death missile race in the area where it really matters. That area is the intercontinental ballistic missile, the ICBM, to the development of which Mr. Gardner feels that every available man and dollar ought now to be devoted.

Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD The Gardner Story, as told in the New York Herald Tribune of February 10. Whether we accept the whole of the story as presented by the Messrs. Alsop or not, we cannot deny that the nugget of fact involves the very survival of the United States.

The article is as follows:

THE GARDNER STORY

The reasons for the resignation of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner are like the layers of an onion. The outside layer involves matters of personality and organization, as well as dusty old Pentagon rivalries. But when you peel down to the heart of the onion, you find a nugget of fact which involves the very survival of the United States.

The real turning point in the Gardner story came several months ago, when almost certain knowledge became available to the American Government that the Soviets had produced missiles with ranges up to 1,500 miles. Gardner was himself responsible for the successful American effort to find out where the Soviets really stand in the missile race and this grim knowledge, in turn, led rather directly to his resignation.

Before the Soviet success was known, the American long-range missile program had been very much of a one-man show. When Gardner came on the scene in the spring of 1953, as Air Force research and development chief, the intercontinental missile, or ICBM, program had been a limping, low-priority affair.

It was wholly in the research stage, and Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, who then tended to regard all research as wasteful nonsense, was getting ready to cut it out entirely. But Gardner, a man of strong views, protested loudly. Wilson at length agreed to submit the whole matter to a high-level committee of scientists, headed by Dr. John Von Neumann. The Von Neumann Committee in turn recommended not only against cancellation of the project, but in favor of giving it the highest priority.

Wilson thereupon put Gardner in charge of the program. In this capacity the strong-willed Gardner made numerous enemies in the Pentagon and the aircraft industry. He also alienated the implacable Lewis Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission when he publicly supported Dr. Robert Oppenheimer for his contributions to national security. Gardner's large array of enemies

undoubtedly explains in part the charge of conflict of interest which has been brought against him.

While making his collection of enemies Gardner spurred important breakthroughs in the long-range missile field. Then came the knowledge of the Soviet success in producing the intermediate 1,500-mile missile, known as the IRBM. This grim evidence that the Soviets were far ahead of this country in the missile field simply could not be disregarded.

The Pentagon reaction took two forms. First, a whole cat's cradle of missile committees was formed. There is a top-level coordinating committee headed by Under Secretary of Defense Reuben Robertson, another committee under Secretary of the Air Force Donald Quarles, an Army-Navy coordinating committee, and so on.

Having run his own show, Gardner now had to report to this array of committees, as did others working in the long-range missile field.

The result was the maximum of organizational confusion.

At the same time, Wilson approved a decision to undertake a crash program to produce an IRBM, and thus match the Soviet success.

Because the Army had produced the much-publicized Redstone missile—actually little more than an improved version of the German V-2—the Army was assigned the IRBM project. The Air Force automatically resisted the Army's claim. So did Gardner, but not on the usual strictly bureaucratic grounds.

Gardner argued that the IRBM, while strategically of enormous value to the Soviet Union, would have far less value to the United States. He conceded that it was probably a mistake not to have tried for the intermediate missile in the first place. But now, he argued, the only way to trump the Kremlin's ace was to be first in the field with the true ultimate weapon, the 5,000-mile intercontinental missile A crash program for the IRBM would only cut into the limited technical manpower and resources available for the ICBM, to which every available man and dollar ought now to be devoted.

But Gardner lost this fight, and partly as a result, his recommended budget for long-range missile and other Air Force research and development work was out on the order of $200 million. At the same time, when Wilson at length decided to appoint a czar to make some sense out of the organizational cat's cradle, Gardner was pased over as too controversial

Altogether, the man who almost single-handed saved the American long-range missile program from total extinction may be said to have been poorly rewarded. But such personal considerations aside, it is worth pondering the somber nugget of fact which is found at the heart of the Gardner story—the fact that the Soviet Union is unquestionably ahead of the United States in the life-and-death missile race, in the area where it really matters.

A Christmas Gift From Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago American of December 21, 1955:

A CHRISTMAS GIFT FROM IKE

One of the nicest things President Eisenhower could have given his fellow Americans for Christmas, in my opinion, came out of his confab on foreign policy.

The President boldly stood up to economy-minded leaders in both parties and demanded more money for United States propaganda abroad. As he put it:

"Nothing is more dangerous to our cause than to expect America's message to be heard if we don't bother to tell it."

That sounds elementary. Every shopkeeper recognizes the maxim when he prints placards. Every big business has been built by advertising. But there still are a surprising number of people who can't get it through their heads.

The President's program is reported to call for a budget of $135 million for the United States Information Agency for the year starting next July 1. That will be $50 million more than the budget for this year.

Will that ever sound good to the Americans on the firing line, charged with the responsibility of getting our story over to foreign people.

This is a subject upon which I can speak with the authority of first-hand acquaintance. I had the job, in one part of the world, for some years. It was enough to make you tear your hair out when you saw the Russians' bigger and better programs while your own budget was being cut.

Here's the way it would go:

Just about Christmas time you'd be asked to survey your field of operations and see what could be cut. That would mean radio, newspaper, magazines, posters, pamphlets, photograph and mat publicity service to the local press, information centers.

You'd look the field over, check the figures on audience response to each medium, see what ought to be added to and what cut back for best results. Then word would come through from the Department of State. The Bureau of the Budget predicted a 25 percent overall cut.

That might mean closing up two of eight information centers, or cutting by one-fourth the amount of photos, mats, and publicity releases which were being printed—virtually in toto—by the countrywide press. You hate to do that. When an editor is willing to throw his columns open to your thinly disguised propaganda, you hate to say "No."

Or it might mean issuing 20 pamphlets this year instead of 25, in editions of 10,000 each instead of 12,000, when free trade unions had already shown themselves willing to mail out all you could furnish.

Or cutting down on the number of posters prepared. Or on the press run of magazines for which you had developed a reading public.

What is this "propaganda"?

Two items which have top priority for the coming period are typical. One is the President's disarmament proposal of "open skies" and an exchange of military blueprints. The other is the atoms-for-peace project.

We say they are typical. That's the kind of thing the United States Information Agency abroad was set up to push. To tell people about, in the hope of countering the constantly reiterated Red talk that we want war.

So a handful of harried "information specialists" abroad, told they'll have to get along on less money, draw up their plans for the coming year. They'll close information center libraries, cut down on the amount of publicity sent out, cut down on pamphlets, on posters, on radio "spots."

What happens? The off-the-street library space on which you held the lease is not vacant 2 days after you move out. The Russians move in.

The space which local editors had been filling with your pictures of the great American auto industry is not left empty. It's filled with pictures of the hydroelectric project at Magnetogorsk or on the Volga.

And so on down the line. The Russians are no dummies. They figure it's cheaper to win a cold war than a hot one.

Now, virtually on Christmas Eve, President Eisenhower has stood up boldly and told the fellows—ex-newspapermen, most of them—in lonely outposts at Reykjavik and Seoul and Bangkok:

"Hold the line, fellows. We at home know what you're doing for us. And we'll see that you get the paper and ink to tell our story to the world."

Why I Am Glad To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following essay written by Miss Julia Ann O'Daniel, of Waldo, Ark. Miss O'Daniel's essay on Why I Am Glad To Be an American was chosen as the best of hundreds entered. She was presented a $1,000 Lion Oil college scholarship, after winning first place in a Lion Oil scholarship fund essay contest. Miss O'Daniel is now a senior in the Waldo, Ark., high school.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the essay:

WHY I'M GLAD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Julia Ann O'Daniel)

Why am I glad? When I see the corn, cattle, and other produce that American farmers proudly exhibit at the county fair; the pride in the eyes of parents at their child's first step; the earnest faces of America's youth as they learn at school; the excitement and loyalty of thousands of football fans as they support their team, win or lose; the ingenuity of all Americans, which has resulted in our having more automobiles, television sets, refrigerators, dishwashers, washing machines, telephones, and spare time than any other nation; the way Americans have used this spare time by organizing the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the YMCA, the YWCA, the Community Chest, the March of Dimes, and countless other organizations founded to aid humanity; the leadership the United States has assumed in the movement for world peace; the beautiful scenery in every part of this land; the gifts that America has given to the world in every field: science, religion, literature, music, politics; the Americans who have been world leaders in peace and war; the willingness of Americans to go out of their way to help others.

I am glad I'm an American.

When I hear the singing of Swing Low, Sweet Chariot and other stirring American Negro spirituals; the voices of the people at a public gathering as they enthusiastically sing The Star-Spangled Banner; the American symphony orchestra and the New Orleans dixieland band as they give their music to the world; the sound of people's happy voices as they go about their work;

the music made by machines as they turn out products in factories all over the land.

I am glad I'm an American.

When I feel the indefinable spirit which unites all men into one brotherhood; the electric excitement that comes only on election day; the religious zeal of Americans all over the country; the trust and faith Americans have in themselves and others; the moving spirit of a revival meeting; the thought of millions of Americans who are with me at church on Sunday morning.

I am glad I'm an American.

When I think of the thousands of men who shed their blood at Bunker Hill, Gettysburg, the Alamo, and on the battlefields of Europe, the South Pacific, and Korea, that we might be free; the brave pioneers who paved the way for America to reach from sea to sea; the thousands of people whose labor goes into making everything I use.

I am glad I'm an American.

Oil and Wildlife Don't Mix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on December 28, 1955, the New York Times carried the following editorial:

OIL AND WILDLIFE DON'T MIX

The Department of the Interior, which in addition to its other duties is supposed to protect the natural resources of the United States, is in hot water with conservationists once again. Obviously stung by the repeated charge of giveaway, Secretary McKay has in recent months been busily defending his record in this regard and citing an impressive array of statistics to prove his department's interest in conservation.

It will, however, take conservationists a long time to forget the Interior Department's backing of the proposal to erect the giant Echo Park power dam in the middle of Dinosaur National Monument, a proposal now happily defeated. It may take even longer to quiet the fears now arising from the Interior Department's new regulations governing issuance of oil and gas leases in Federal wildlife refuges. The Department and some private experts in the field of conservation take diametrically opposite views as to the meaning of the new rules. But on one point there can be little argument: After a period of 2 years during which no such leases were issued the way is now opened for private exploration and exploitation in the refuges.

One such lease has already been granted on terms that the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington has described as ridiculously low in respect to royalty rates, and on a noncompetitive basis at that. Without going into the merits of this particular lease, it is up to the Department to reconcile the decision to issue new leases with its statement early this month that the regulations are designed to strengthen protection of wildlife refuges for wildlife purposes. The men and machinery involved in exploration for oil and gas normally constitute a disturbing factor in any wild area.

What is particularly puzzling is the Interior Department's decision to open the refuges to such operations, perhaps more widely than in many years, in the absence of any shortage or national-defense consideration. Why should the Federal refuges as a whole be made available to oil and gas companies now? Why should the 2-year-old stop order, commendably issued by Secretary McKay himself, be torn up and the process of invasion of national wildlife refuges be begun with vigor once more?

It is true that the new orders give permanent protection to certain of the refuges; but the bulk of the acreage under Federal control now seems to be laid wide open for extraneous purposes, even though the regulations are rigidly enforced. The Fish and Wildlife Service, which under the new rules is in charge of the leases, will be under constant pressure to open up its refuges, with possibly disastrous results for wildlife conservation and with little if any visible compensating advantage from the standpoint of the national interest.

In the letters to the Times section of the January 29, 1956, issue, Mr. Wesley A. D'Ewart, former Representative from Montana's Second District and now Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management, replied as follows:

REGULATING WILDLIFE LAND—BENEFITS TO FEDERAL REFUGES UNDER REVISED ORDERS EXPLAINED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer of the following letter is Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management in the United States Department of the Interior.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of December 28, "Oil and Wildlife Don't Mix," pertained to the Department of Interior's recently revised regulations governing oil and gas leases on the national wildlife refuges. I do not believe the editorial reflects the true meaning of the new regulations promulgated by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

The new regulations have been widely misinterpreted. The most serious of these misinterpretations have been: that the new regulations permit oil and gas leasing on national wildlife refuges for the first time; that the regulations are without legal authority except in event of a national emergency; that the regulations do not provide adequate safeguards for the wildlife values of the refuges; that the regulations are against the intent of Congress; and that the leases issued under the new regulations do not return to the Federal Government the full amount due in the way of royalties and rental fees.

Allow me to clarify this misunderstanding point by point.

AUTHORITY FOR LEASING

Lands within national wildlife refuges have been subject to oil and gas leasing since the passage of the original Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920. The authority for such leasing was reaffirmed by the act of August 8, 1946, which amended the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. In 1947 Department of Interior regulations were issued which defined conditions under which the leasing would be permitted. A number of oil and gas leases were issued under the authority of these clearly defined laws and regulations.

However a few months after Douglas McKay became Secretary of the Interior he decided that existing regulations did not provide adequate safeguards for the refuges. On August 31, 1953, he issued a stop order suspending oil and gas leasing on the national wildlife refuges until such time as his Department could formulate new regulations.

During the more than 2 years between August 31, 1953, and December 2, 1955, the old regulations were given a thorough review by the Department of the Interior, specialists from its Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management, its solicitor and the Secretary's advisory committee on conservation.

SUPERVISION OF DRILLING

The new regulations embody the corrective measures that were recommended and agreed upon as a result of this study. Important among changes that plugged loopholes in the old regulations is one which gives the Fish and Wildlife Service and its career technicians absolute authority over where, when, how, and by whom drilling will be permitted on the refuges. Another significant revision makes refuges which provide habitat for rare and endangered species absolutely inviolate for the first time in history.

It is obvious, therefore, that contrary to permitting unprecedented oil and gas leasing on the refuges, the new regulations provide much more stringent limitations than the regulation in existence when this administration took office.

The legal authority for the issuance of oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuges is set forth in detail in the laws. The confusion surrounding this aspect of the new regulations has been generated by those persons who have mistakenly contended that the same laws which apply to prospecting permits for fissionable materials also apply to oil and gas.

As stated above, the purpose of Secretary McKay's 1953 stop order was to arrest a situation that obviously was inimical to the primary purpose of refuges—the protection and propagation of wildlife. The new regulations correct these deficiencies inherent in the old regulation by carefully spelling out the conditions and on what refuges oil and gas leasing is permitted.

INSURING PROTECTION

Though space does not permit me to enumerate all of the many safeguards included in the new regulations, I think it is significant that they have the whole-hearted endorsement of career specialists in the Fish and Wildlife Service and the approval of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation. Those who are dedicated to the protection of our wildlife feel that the new regulations are the means by which that protection can be insured.

The assertion that oil and gas leasing on the national wildlife refuges is a violation of the intent of Congress is an error in fact. The laws mentioned above, which were enacted by Congress, are irrefutable proof that it has been the sense of Congress that these refuge lands should be subject to multiple use, including oil and gas leasing.

The Department of the Interior is bound by the law. Any argument about the philosophy of permitting oil and gas drilling on the refuges is irrelevant. The Secretary of the Interior has no alternative but to abide by the stipulations of the laws that apply to the functions of Government under his jurisdiction. The most that can be done is to make the regulations implementing these laws as stringent as possible. This has been done by Secretary McKay.

Only those persons who are totally unfamiliar with the law will argue that the Government is not getting its just rental and royalty fees from the leases issued under the revised code. Because these leases were issued on lands defined by the Geological Survey as not being on a known structure of a gas and oil field, they had to be granted on a noncompetitive basis.

The act of August 7, 1947, is explicit on this matter. That act also prescribes the royalty to be charged in noncompetitive leases; to wit, 12½ percent, the amount stipulated in the so-called Frankfort leases. The rental fees of 50 cents per acre are a further provision of the law.

WESLEY A. D'EWART.

Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, had this to say of Mr. D'Ewart's letter in the

"Letters to the Times" of February 14, 1956:

INVADING WILDLIFE REFUGES—OIL AND GAS LEASING CHARGED WITH CONTRAVENING WILL OF CONGRESS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The letter from Assistant Secretary of Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart that appeared in the January 29 issue of the Times stated that your editorial of December 28 "Oil and Wildlife Don't Mix" does not reflect the true meaning of the Interior Department's new oil and gas leasing order, and that "the new regulations have been widely misinterpreted."

It is easy to understand why the millions of sportsmen and conservationists across the country did not realize that the national wildlife refuges have been subject to oil leasing since 1920. They were not aware of the fact because only 25 leases had been issued on 4 refuges during the 33 years from 1920 to 1953.

Whether Interior has a stronger set of regulations now, as compared to the old order, is beside the point. The fact is Secretary McKay has invited oil leasing, and leases are being issued. There are nearly 300 applications on file, and still other leases undoubtedly would have been issued during the past 6 weeks except for the public uproar that was caused by the new order.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE

The Congress, in 1954, in both the Atomic Energy and Mineral Leasing Acts, made it clear that the national parks and monuments and wildlife refuges should not be invaded even for exploration for fissionable materials. Fissionable materials are in short supply. Even so, Congress said that the refuges should not be invaded except for national defense and only by Presidential order. In view of the expressed will of Congress it would seem that there is little excuse for encouraging oil and gas leasing on the meager refuge lands. The Interior Department's own Office of Oil and Gas Production says that the oil industry is not pumping 1½ million barrels a day from producing wells due to economic reasons.

There are less than 10 million acres of Federal refuge lands in the United States—only about one-half of 1 percent of the total land area—and the conservationists contend that there is no justification for any such leasing. Naturally, the service cannot prevent oil and gas operations on refuge lands where former owners retained the mineral rights, but Interior, even with that so-called weaker order, had been able to block practically all leasing. A total of 89 leases have been issued since 1920, 64 of which were granted since December 1952. The earlier ones were issued to protect the Government's interest under the unit plan.

REFUGES RECLASSIFIED

Mr. D'Ewart stated that the Department is bound by law, and that the most that can be done is to make the regulations as stringent as possible. Well, the Secretary, in exercising his discretion, put less than a dozen of the 264 refuges in the no-leasing classification that he established. The remaining refuges are open to invitation in classes B and C.

If he has that authority under the basic law, which has not been changed, then it is self-evident that he could have exercised the same rigid control that was maintained heretofore. The trouble is, the present policy-making officials see no harm in having prospecting and drilling operations on wildlife refuges.

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President, Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that a number of other points should be made at this time.

I recall that when the Mineral Leasing and Atomic Energy Acts were being amended in 1954, it was then Congressman D'Ewart who put in the almost identical protective clauses in each.

In the case of the Mineral Leasing Act, the clause reads:

Provided, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national park, monument, and wildlife purposes only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interests of national defense.

As the sponsor of that amendment, Mr. D'Ewart knew full well the intent of his colleagues in Congress. Congress said it did not want the Federal refuges exploited.

Now Mr. D'Ewart stated that the new regulations give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and its career technicians absolute authority over leasing and drilling. I agree that the new order could be regarded as a slightly better set of regulations—if it were not for the fact that all the heads of the Service have been put into schedule C.

The new order does place more responsibility on the Service, but the incumbent political appointees now are subject to all of the pressure, and, of course, must yield to the will of the Secretariat. A telephone call from higher up can force them to issue a lease—the blame would be on the Fish and Wildlife Service, and it would appear that the Secretary had avoided the responsibility which is his under the law.

Mr. D'Ewart says the purpose of the Secretary's 1953 stop order was to arrest a situation that obviously was inimical to the primary purposes of the refuges—the protection and propagation of wildlife. The Secretary's stop order was put into effect on August 31, 1953, but witnesses told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee last month that more than 50 leases were issued between that date and December 2, 1955, when the new opening order was executed. One cannot help but wonder why the stop order was ignored. The Times editorial was in error on this point.

Mr. D'Ewart wrote that the new regulations had the approval of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation, but the record shows that in its meeting on January 27 and 28, 1955, and again on December 1 and 2, 1955, the committee recommended against any oil and gas leasing on refuge lands except to prevent loss to the Federal Government by drainage of oil by peripheral wells or in case of national emergency.

Mr. D'Ewart says the new regulations have been widely misinterpreted. Regardless of any misunderstanding that may exist, conservationists are sure of two things:

First, the Secretary's new order takes its authority from the basic law that has not been amended since 1947; and

Second, leases are being invited now on about 250 of the Federal refuges that have not been exploited heretofore.

Mr. D'Ewart is right when he says the basic law has not been changed. The change is in the discretion that is being exercised and in the current thinking in the Department that there is nothing wrong in opening up the wildlife refuges to leasing.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is to resume its hearing February 27 on my refuge-protection bill, H. R. 5306, which follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of wildlife conservation, it is the policy of the Congress to maintain and preserve the areas of the national wildlife refuges; and the Secretary of the Interior shall not dispose of or relinquish any of the national wildlife refuges, or parts thereof, without the prior approval of the Congress.

Chairman BONNER, of that committee, has offered the following amendment to this bill:

SEC. 2. That section 1 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and following), be amended to read as follows:

"That deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale or gas, and lands containing such deposits owned by the United States, including those in national forests, but excluding lands acquired under the act known as the Appalachian Forest Act, approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), those in incorporated cities, towns and villages, in national parks and monuments, those in wildlife refuges operated or under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, those in national parks and monuments, those acquired under other acts subsequent to February 25, 1920, and lands within the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves except as hereinafter provided shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States, or to associations of such citizens, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, or in the case of coal, oil, oil shale, or gas, to municipalities. Citizens of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of this country, shall not by stock ownership, stock holding, or stock control, own any interest in any lease acquired under the provisions of this act.

"The United States reserves the ownership of and the right to extract helium from all gas produced from lands leased or otherwise granted under the provisions of this act, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That in the extraction of helium from gas produced from such lands it shall be so extracted as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced from the well to the purchaser thereof.

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease lands under the provisions of this act located in wildlife refuges operated or under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service only when the President by Executive order declares that the requirements of the common defense and security make such action necessary."

The senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, and I have offered concurrent resolutions requesting the Secretary of the Interior to refrain from granting further geological and geophysical prospecting permits, and oil and gas leases on refuge lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service until the appropriate committees in both bodies have determined whether the issuance of such permits is in the public interest.

We believe that one of the best places to have the Nation's oil reserve is in the national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges. We may need these resources badly some day—but there is no oil shortage now.

Profits Hide Business Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article entitled "Profits Hide Business Realities" as it appeared in the Daily Oklahoman, Sunday, January 29, 1956.

PROFITS HIDE BUSINESS REALITIES

(By J. Willis Baker)

Brisk and profitable business conditions such as have been experienced here during the past several years have a seamier side.

A total of 19 business firms suspended operations in Oklahoma City during 1955, the local office of Dun & Bradstreet, national credit reporting firm, disclosed Saturday. That total figures out to a rate of nearly 30 failures per 10,000 concerns as compared with a national rate of 42 in 1954. National figures for 1955 are not yet available.

However, before you start talking about the boom collapsing, consider this estimate of the situation in the words of Dun & Bradstreet: "That failures should have increased across the country in 1954 (from a rate of 33 per 10,000 concerns) is not good news; however, viewed against the background of pre-World War II levels, today's failure situation still stands up as one of the barometers of the current general good health of American business."

What they are saying is this: When business is good, more people move into the commercial world in hopes of getting a share of the profits, and the fact that the failure rate has not increased more than it has indicates a measure of stability on a comparative basis.

Standing out like a beacon light to the person with a few thousand dollars to invest are those profits. And that makes two strikes on him before he comes to bat if the gleam of those profits blinds him to the cold realities of the business world.

First, when times are good the competition for those profits increases. In addition to the many new firms attracted to the light are the expansions of the older firms already in that particular market. So, the less competent of the newer firms and economically inefficient older companies fall by the wayside.

Let's examine some of the major causes of business failures, or maybe suspension of operations might be a better term considering the definition of "failures" used by Dun & Bradstreet: "* * * those businesses that ceased operations following assignment or bankruptcy; ceased with loss to creditors after such actions as execution, foreclosure, or attachment; voluntarily withdrew leaving unpaid obligations; were involved in court actions such as receivership, reorganization, or arrangement; or voluntarily compromised with creditors."

For the most part, business failures are human failures: failures in judgment, personality, decision, ability and know-how. They just don't happen without a pretty good reason.

A survey by Dun & Bradstreet of the 9,162 failures reported in 1950 shows that 96 percent were blamed wholly on the individual. They list these causes: Incompetence, 41 percent; lack of experience in the particular line of business, 16 percent; lack of managerial experience, 15.4 percent; unbalanced experience (not well rounded in sales, finance, purchasing and production), 13.5 percent.

Back of these deficiencies are inadequate sales, heavy operating expenses, accounts and inventory difficulties, excessive fixed assets, poor location and competitive weakness.

Next major grouping of reasons is that of neglect, 5.8 percent, brought about by bad habits, poor health, marital difficulties and others.

Fraud accounted for 3.8 percent of the failures in such matters as misleading names, false financial statements, premeditated overbuying, and irregular disposal of assets.

Disasters such as fire, flood, burglary, employees' fraud and strikes forced 1.5 percent of the 9,162 to the wall, although some of these could have been avoided through proper insurance coverage.

Of the total 2.3 percent were attributed to unknown reasons. The average loss was set at $27,099.

Normally, the most vulnerable business is that of food or grocery stores, followed by eating and drinking places, apparel and accessories, and home furnishings.

One intangible usually overlooked is the fact that the consumer himself is being better educated in supplying his own wants. In the wholesale and manufacturing field this also evidences itself in that buyers know more about qualities and tests because of the greater dependence on research.

Nationwide, Oklahoma merchants and those in other west south central States are exhibiting considerable business acumen, comparatively. Dun's report for the 1940–50 period shows that the rate of failures dropped to 13 from 31 per 10,000 concerns while number of businesses grew 26.2 percent. This compares with the top record rate of 14 failures on an increase of 41.3 percent shown for the east south central States and the poorest record of 50 failures per 10,000 on an increase of only 14.7 percent for the Middle Atlantic States.

One other note. Before you start planning to open your own profitable (?) business, look also at your cash reserves. Dun's report shows that the first 5 years are the hardest: 2 out of every 3 concerns that failed in 1950 had been in business 5 years or less. The first few years test the owner's ability, stamina, and management.

The Late Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of our respected and distinguished colleague, Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, who served here in the House of Representatives for over 21 years.

CHAUNCEY represented the 14th Congressional District of Illinois with great honor and distinction. He was the ranking minority member of the great House Committee on the Judiciary at the time of his death and had served as chairman of this committee during the 83d Congress. He rendered invaluable service as a member and chairman of this important committee and contributed greatly to the improvement of our judicial system, law enforcement, and the development of our laws.

CHAUNCEY's friends on both sides of the aisle held him in high esteem and greatly admired him for his courage, ability, and devotion to his legislative work. I had a very deep respect and affection for him and feel that I have lost a dear friend. I shall miss him very much. Mrs. Reed, his daughter and sons have my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Dale Carnegie: Use Him as a Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. ERTEL CARLYLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Fayetteville Observer, established in 1817 and known as North Carolina's oldest newspaper, can always be depended upon to produce splendid editorials, and for this reason I commend for your reading the fine editorial which follows, taken from the September 20, 1955, issue of the above-mentioned paper.

Even though Mr. Carnegie has passed away since the editorial appeared, its message is just as pertinent now as when it was published. His work, which is praised in the editorial, is being continued by Mrs. Carnegie and long-time associates.

Because of the international interest and timeliness of the editorial, I believe it deserves the attention of a wider audience by appearing in the RECORD:

DALE CARNEGIE: USE HIM AS A DIPLOMAT

One of the greatest problems and menaces facing the world today is the inability of the leaders of different nations to get along with each other.

This inability has been the cause of the plague of wars which have rocked civilization back on its heels for hundreds of years.

One of the remedies can be found in the Dale Carnegie book, "How to Win Friends and Influence People."

If Louis XVI of France had been a reader of Dale Carnegie it is possible that the French Revolution and the subsequent Napoleonic Wars could have been avoided.

If Kaiser Bill had studied a Carnegie course World War I might never have happened.

If old President Hindenburg and his advisers had known more about getting along 25 years ago they might have converted Adolf Hitler into something useful instead of the international mad-dog he became.

The history of Dale Carnegie is the opposite today of the history of the hard-headed diplomats who have butt-headed the world into a sequence of tragic armed conflicts.

While international diplomacy was being developed into the art of getting the best of the other fellow, Carnegie was creating what has come to be a vast industry or educational system in how to get along with the other fellow.

And he has had remarkable success.

His book, "How To Win Friends and Influence People" has sold more copies than any other nonfiction book except the Holy Bible.

His educational courses in this art since 1912 have boasted 450,000 graduates.

Carnegie has concentrated himself on the problem of man's dealings with his neighbors. His work has had a pronounced influence not only on human relations in the United States but on the art of selling.

Today we need more than ever to sell ourselves and our way of life to the people of the world who differ from us. History has taught that principles cannot be forced down other peoples' throats at the point of a cannon or a bombing plane.

It is much more painless to convince them in friendly fashion.

It is a wonder to us why some administration, Republican or Democrat, has not called this proven expert in friendliness into its Cabinet.

Certainly his precepts should be must reading for every diplomat assigned to improve the relationships of the United States with the other countries of the world.

Meantime, Carnegie and his wife Dorothy, are going ahead with their work of promoting friendship and understanding between individual human beings.

One of the subjects of their courses for women is, How To Get Along With Men.

If this course is as successful as other Carnegie enterprises have been we may experience a sharp drop in the divorce rate in the near future.

Jeanerette, La., and the Civic Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, pride in one's hometown is a very fine thing and I am always pleased when I find someone advertising his or her community at every opportunity. I have had occasion to note a good example of this fact during a visit to Washington by my constituents, Dr. and Mrs. K. P. Brown, of Jeanerette, La. Dr. and Mrs. Brown came to the capital for three main reasons—to attend the annual Mardi Gras ball of the Louisiana State Society, present Louisiana camellias to the Nation's First Lady, and last but certainly not least, to tell everyone about Jeanerette.

With these enthusiastic civic leaders on their trip to Washington were the many lovely Louisiana festival queens who were honored at the Mardi Gras ball, and 24 other Louisiana beauties—choice camellias from 3 of Jeanerette's outstanding floral gardens, including those of Dr. and Mrs. Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Beaullieu, and Peter Derise—for presentation to Mrs. Eisenhower. But that was not all. There was a large supply of well-prepared and attractively illustrated pamphlets from the chamber of commerce listing the many features offered by Jeanerette and surrounding area, in the heart of the famed Teche country, and which the visitors saw to it were well distributed.

With the fine community spirit demonstrated by Dr. and Mrs. Brown, Jeanerette is certain to continue its forward march as an agricultural, industrial, educational, and religious center, and, as the chamber of commerce pamphlet also stresses, the recreation capital of southwest Louisiana. In short, it points out in many ways how this enterprising cit yoffers every opportunity for a happy, comfortable, and profitable way of life.

How One California Woman Aided Democratic Cause by Selling Subscriptions to Democratic Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, here is the inspiring story of how one California woman has helped the Democratic cause by selling subscriptions to the Democratic Digest. It is entitled "How To Tone Up Your Circulation" and appears in the March 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOW TO TONE UP YOUR CIRCULATION

Last fall over 1,000 Democrats gathered at two $100-a-plate dinners in San Francisco and Los Angeles so they could cheer Pennsylvania's Gov. George M. Leader and the Democratic Party.

Scattered among the hundreds of dedicated Democrats were 29 guests who came to the dinner, thanks to their own initiative and the Democratic Digest.

There was Alden E. Auller, a steamfitter foreman from El Cajon; Jessie Sletton, a Los Angeles private secretary; Beverly Halcrow, nurse from San Mateo; C. T. Vincent, Whittier attorney, and Faith L. Hawkins, assistant manager of a motel at Bakersfield and a weather columnist.

These 5 persons and 24 other Democrats were present because they each had sold 50 subscriptions to the Democratic Digest, either on their own, or as part of a drive put on by local Democratic organizations or labor unions.

There was one delegate from the Hawthorne Democratic Club, another from the Long Beach Democratic Women's Study Club, another from the 21st Assembly District Democratic League of San Francisco. The Fontana steel local sent a representative; so did the San Francisco Democratic Women's Forum.

Behind this sales campaign and its 1,450 new subscriptions lies the story of how the the Democratic National Committee organized Digest contests for its big fund-raising dinners and how such contests can be turned into a smashing success by the lively cooperation of local Democratic groups.

The California story opened far across the continent in the Democratic Digest office in Washington. The Digest had tied in subscription drives with two earlier dinners. There was the Indianapolis regional dinner in September 1954, which brought in over 1,500 new subscribers to the Digest through the canvassing of 29 contest winners.

Last April when Democrats gathered in Washington to honor Speaker SAM RAYBURN, 16 members of the audience had won their way by each selling 50 subscriptions to the Digest. Mr. RAYBURN and the Digest pulled in admirers from as far away as Oregon, Florida, Michigan, and Texas. Miss Anna Belle Clement, sister of Tennessee's Gov. Frank G. Clement, was among the winners this time.

Both these contests were managed from Washington, but when the Digest decided to tie in a drive with the California dinners last September, local Democrats said they would like to manage the drive. The offer was welcomed in Washington where the staff recognized that they were too far away to give the kind of help which makes a sales campaign successful.

California Democrats talked about the contest at a meeting of the State central committee. One enthusiastic believer in the drive was Mrs. Zella Crown, of El Cajon, chairman of women's activities for California's 30th Congressional District.

National Committeeman Paul Ziffren took it as his cue when he learned that Mrs. Crown had come to the meeting with a proposal of her own for a Digest sales contest with cash prizes.

"Zella," he said, "how would you like to be the Democratic Digest chairman for southern California?"

So Mrs. Crown took on that assignment, and followed it up by agreeing to run the digest contest for the dinner. The national committee promptly expressed her a package of order books, summary sheets, sample magazines, and sales tip sheets. Over 10,000 flyers announcing the contest were printed for the drive.

Even before the literature arrived, Zella began talking about the Digest contest to Democratic meetings in her part of California: to a meeting of the Riverside County Central Committee in Norce, 100 miles away from her El Cajon home; to the Men's Democratic Club of San Diego next door; to a statewide meeting of the Democratic Council of District Directors in Santa Monica, 150 miles away; to a newly organized Women's Democratic Club in San Bernardino County, and to a tea in Beverly Hills, 150 miles away, given by the southern California women's division in honor of the visiting Michigan national committeewoman, Mrs. Margaret Price.

At each gathering, Zella sold 8 or 9 subscriptions, enlisted several members as salesmen in the drive, and arranged for a Digest chairman to be appointed.

This early groundwork produced 6 winners by August 22, more than 3 weeks before the dinner, but the drive moved into high gear with the mailing of the folders that arrived from Washington on August 15.

"Reserve your own place of honor," said the folder. "Take your choice between two major Democratic national committee dinners, one in San Francisco on September 14, and one in Los Angeles on September 15. Sell 50 subscriptions to the Democratic Digest between now and September 10. You keep a $1 commission on a one-year order."

"Commissions help pay your way."

Headquarters for the mailing was the home of Mr. and Mrs. Crown at 580 Millar Avenue in El Cajon, about 25 miles inland from San Diego.

Mr. Crown, an El Cajon building contractor, takes pleasure in the fact that he married a Democrat. Home life on Millar Avenue is flexible enough to encompass assorted precinct workers, files, work shop planning sessions, and campaign mailings.

This time the intermittently quiet routine in the 6-room frame house gave way to 3 typewriters (1 of them borrowed), wooden fruit lugs full of files, cartons of office supplies, and 10 regular volunteers.

Mr. and Mrs. Crown and their teen-age son, Glenn, began eating off trays to make work room on the kitchen and dining room tables. An older boy, Frank, missed out on this year's political activity. (He's in Korea.)

The national committee had advanced $300 to Mrs. Crown to cover the cost of mailing, but by getting the flyers out early enough to send them third-class mail, she cut the cost in half. Her area, of course, was California. Flyers went out from Washington, D. C., to Democratic leaders in six neigh-

boring States and Hawaii, including State Democratic officials, county chairmen, leading Democratic women, officers of the Young Democrats organization and to Democratic Digest sales representatives.

In California, the mailing was far more voluminous. Mrs. Crown wanted to give every active Democrat an opportunity to come to the dinners, so flyers went out to the entire mailing list used by Democratic News, the party's State newspaper. This list included State central committee members and staff: county chairmen and many county committee members; club chairmen, secretaries, and Digest chairmen; council directors, district council presidents and their Digest chairmen, and where possible, to club members themselves. Individual sales representatives were also brought into the drive.

In short, the State was blitzed with announcements of the drive.

On the day that the flyers arrived from Washington, a group of standby volunteers poured into the Crown home, from the El Cajon and Point Loma Democratic Clubs, and from the Richard Thompson County Committee. A few friends who dropped by that day were also enlisted, and within 24 hours the group mailed the first 2,000 letters and flyers. The rest went out later in the week.

The returns started coming back by what seemed like return mail, which can be taken as a sign that the California mailing list is solidly up to date.

The dinner-Digest commiftee knew from experience that scores of eager Democrats would want to earn their way to the dinners where they could rub shoulders and swap anecdotes with famous national Democratic leaders. The prompt returns proved that these people had been reached.

During the next weeks, Zella kept busy with her tallies, with pep talks to groups who called for help, and with letters of congratulation to the winners, telling them where to pick up their dinner tickets. A week before the drive closed, she sent letters of encouragement or made phone calls to all the people who were getting near the finish line.

"You have sold 33 subscriptions already," she wrote one club. "Only 17 more and you can send a representative to the dinner. Good luck to you."

"How are you coming along?" calls were put in to other lively salesmen and saleswomen.

While she was tallying, phoning, and writing letters with her right hand, Mrs. Crown sold another 35 subscriptions with her left, so that she could win a second dinner ticket.

Meanwhile in northern California hopeful Democrats were getting their encouragement from Miss Jane Morrison, Digest chairman for her part of the State. Both women redoubled their efforts as the September 10 deadline drew near.

In her part of the State, Zella Crown took to the road. She drove through 100-degree heat to Fontana, so she could give a last-minute spurt to four groups with prospects of winning tickets. Mrs. Crown and Mrs. Lillian Serra, Digest chairman in her area went out together, sold nine subscriptions and got promises of more. On her way back from Fontana, Mrs. Crown stopped off to sell three $100 tickets to good Democrats in San Bernardino County, and at 8 p. m. while the heat was still high she started toward San Diego.

On several occasions, Mrs. Crown had had heart spells, with shortness of breath, and as she drove through the still heat, she felt another attack coming. So she pulled into a filling station, in Riverside, telephoned Mrs. Serra, and asked her if she would come drive her home. Before Mrs. Serra could get there, Mrs. Crown went to nearby Riverside Hospital for emergency treatment, and was ordered to rest in bed there. That was September 10, 4 days before the dinner, and the closing day of the drive.

Zella is one of those remarkably conscientious people who was determined that no Democrat who had won his dinner ticket would miss out just because the Digest chairman got sick.

With the indulgent permission of her doctor, Zella had her husband bring the last minute mail from El Cajon so she could finish the tallies and notify additional winners by telephone from her hospital bed.

There were 29 victorious contestants throughout the State; new subscriptions totaled over 1,450. After a few days' rest, Mrs. Crown was well enough to go to the Los Angeles dinner, where her work won high public praise from National Chairman Paul M. Butler.

Four days later Mrs. Crown wrote a note to the Democratic Digest general manager, Arthur B. Thatcher, in Washington:

"The doctor says slow down, but how can there be any harm to working with all these wonderful people? I never had so much fun in my life. Bring on the next dinner."

Recognition Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the well-thought-out editorial entitled "Recognition Overdue," taken from the January issue of the Louisiana Legionnaire, the official publication of the Louisiana American Legion.

This editorial refers to the heroism of four chaplains in the Armed Services during World War II who set a priceless example in giving up their lives as the troopship *Dorchester* went down beneath the waves of the Atlantic Ocean 13 years ago.

I commend this editorial for the reading of all American patriots:

RECOGNITION OVERDUE

Some memories dim with the passage of time; others remain clear and bright regardless of the years. Vets may forget many of the discomforts of basic training. They may not remember the names of girls they danced with at USO. They may even have to think hard to recall the face of a particular drill sergeant. But the friendship of certain buddies, the inspiration of certain events will stay with them forever.

There is not a veteran of World War II, for example, who does not still thrill to the story of the four chaplains who gave up their lives together on the American troopship *Dorchester* 13 years ago this month. Six hundred lives were lost in the icy Atlantic when the German torpedo found its mark that dreadful night, but the calm heroism of four brave men of God turned the defeat into a shining victory.

George Fox, Alexander Goode, Clark Poling, and John P. Washington—2 Protestant ministers, 1 Catholic priest and 1 Jewish rabbi went down with the *Dorchester*—by choice. They could have saved themselves. Eager arms reached from the lifeboats to help them to safety. Instead, they gave their lifebelts—and their precious space aboard the lifeboats—to four young GI's and remained to bring last moments of comfort and ease to the wounded and the dying. In the moments before the final explosion the men rowing away from the burning ship saw the four chaplains standing together on the deck, arms linked, Bibles in hand, waiting serenely for the end.

Different in background; different in creed; their unity of spirit beamed an undying message of brotherhood to all the world. And on far-flung battlefields in Europe, Asia, and Africa, American boys of all faiths, races and religions swelled with pride for these four—and fought all the harder to be worthy of their sacrifice.

It seems almost incredible that the four chaplains, for whom chapels and churches and parks have been dedicated by grateful American civilians, have not yet been honored with the highest military decoration their country has to offer. The Congressional Medal of Honor is long overdue for these heroes whose bravery was so inspiring to soldier and civilian alike during those trying days when victory was far from certain. A bit of prodding from veterans seems very much in order to make sure this recognition is no longer delayed. But medal or not, their act and courage will eternally remain a pride on America's faith, unity and manhood.

Fitting Memorial to the Gateway to the West—Article From St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the second in a series of excellent articles in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is entitled "River Front Memorial Shrines Would Occupy Visitor All Day," and is by Ray Noonan and Ted Schafers, Globe-Democrat staff writers.

In it, the authors have put into vivid focus the glorious and impressive park and memorial planned for the St. Louis waterfront area to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the West. The article tells of the museums and other civic and cultural attractions which would be part of the completed project. And it points out that the main hurdle at the present time to appropriation of the necessary $5 million for the authorized Federal share of the work is the failure of the National Park Service and the President to ask Congress for these funds.

The Members of Congress from the St. Louis area will do their very best, Mr. Speaker, to obtain the necessary funds for the project, as authorized by the law which we passed in 1954. Legal restrictions to appropriation of the funds are now removed. We therefore sincerely hope that the Administration will assist us in our efforts by making a formal request in a supplemental budget recommendation for the $5 million as authorized by law.

Under unanimous consent to insert the Globe-Democrat series of articles in the

Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the second article in the series, as follows:

RIVER FRONT MEMORIAL SHRINES WOULD OCCUPY VISITOR ALL DAY

(By Ray Noonan and Ted Schafers)

(Second of a series)

Most persons here have forgotten how the proposed Jefferson National Expansion Memorial would transform the riverfront into a national shrine, in memory of those pioneers who opened the West.

A whole new generation has grown up since St. Louis voters endorsed the project in 1936 and voted to put up $7,500,000 as their share of the estimated $30 million cost of this national memorial.

Some, for instance, unquestionably think of it as only a park with that big steel arch in the center. The 590-foot stainless steel Saarinen arch symbolizes the gateway to the West theme of the St. Louis site.

Like the Washington Monument and the Eiffel Tower the arch would serve as a giant magnet attracting thousands of visitors from all over the world. But, equally important will be the vast treasure of historical and cultural wealth which will be stored in the museum to attract the tourists and scholars.

Others visualize the present riverfront parking space for 4,000 cars going up in smoke and raise the cry, "Where will we park all those autos?"

The city of St. Louis and the National Park Service have an agreement on this matter. Automobiles could go into a vast underground garage which could be built underneath the memorial area.

The city's plans for developing off-street parking facilities here are being stymied by the Federal Government's failure to act on the memorial, which was approved by Congress in 1934. An appropriation to start construction would help city and State agencies meet the parking situation.

Congress in 1954 authorized $5 million toward construction as soon as the budget was balanced. That condition has been met, and St. Louis representatives now have requested the money. Much depends on the National Park Service to ask for the funds. So far only $150,000 has been sought by this agency, and that is for a fence and landscaping of the Old Courthouse. There has been no indication it will seek the authorized $5 million.

Construction of the memorial would cause a tremendous transformation of the entire downtown area of St. Louis.

To tour the completed memorial as proposed a visitor would have to spend a full afternoon to completely tour the beautiful grounds spread over 82.5 acres of old St. Louis.

There will be museums with priceless painting and sculpture portraying important events and personalities in the westward expansion of the United States.

To spark the imagination and recall the color of pioneer days, frontier scenes will be reproduced. All the glamour of the West, which stirred dad when he was a boy and still keeps him and his sons glued to TV westerns today, would be found on the memorial grounds.

Many a St. Louisan, on his first visit, would be surprised to learn how little he knows of the city's historical role in the opening of the West and Southwest.

Julian C. Spotts, head of the National Park Service headquarters here, said yesterday:

"There are far too few St. Louisans who really know and appreciate the tremendous historical role of their city."

Spotts was sent to St. Louis 20 years ago on what was supposed to be a 3-year tour of duty in establishing the memorial.

Despite all these years of struggle and frustration Spotts is still cheerful: "These things take time. I still feel this fine memorial will someday be completed as designed," he said.

Meanwhile Spotts works with members of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, a local group, to rebuild the old courthouse. The structure is part of the projects.

During his 20 years Spotts here has picked up a wealth of knowledge about old St. Louis and its historical importance. He shares this information with people who visit the temporary museum established in the courthouse.

In his office in the building is a huge drawing of the proposed stainless steel arch, which would act as a shining beacon to all visitors. But the $5 million item authorized, but not voted by Congress in 1954, specifies none of this money is to be spent for the arch itself.

Like Paris' famous Eiffel Tower, "Saarinen's Arch" has had rough sledding. Backers believe however the arch, once built, will become one of the wonders of America.

Touring the completed memorial will be a rewarding experience.

Visitors will start the tour at a campfire theater where they will learn something about the history of old St. Louis: How Laclede and Chouteau founded the city. How early pioneers brought their covered wagons by steamboat or overland to begin the perilous journey to the West.

Youngsters will be able to walk in the park over the famous trails that had their start on the memorial site. Further on the tour would be the old cathedral, completed in 1834, and the old courthouse where the Dred Scott was argued when the issue of slavery divided the Nation.

Other attractions would include the Architectural Museum, and the Historic Museum. The latter, unlike an ordinary museum would have animated exhibitions, sound film and other modern devices to recreate the life of Jefferson and other historical episodes of history commemorated in the memorial.

There will be cafes on a roof terrace overlooking the river serving lunch and dinner. Finally, the visitor would go to the arch for an elevator trip up its wishbone side. Here the entire panorama of a city will unfold.

This national shrine probably would cause a tremendous "face-lifting" in the area surrounding the downtown riverfront. New offices and apartment buildings would be constructed. It would spur redevelopment of the sections from Third Street to Broadway, long marked for decay.

Through the years there have been many suggestions for other uses of the riverfront. One has been for a large sports stadium. Such a project could still be built either north or south of the memorial.

Those who suggest other uses must remember that title to all this land belongs to the United States Government. It can be used for no other purpose unless Congress revokes all previous actions authorizing the project.

Citizens of many States, regardless of their party affiliations have worked hard for the memorial. World War II and the Korean conflict helped to block development.

The last requirement raised for a balanced Federal budget, has been met.

All that is required now is for the Department of the Interior to give the nod so Congress can act. St. Louis and the Nation will then have what has been long in coming—a fitting memorial to "The Gateway to the West."

Lincoln and the American Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, over the weekend to attend the Lincoln's Birthday dinner at the Commodore Hotel of the Central Trades and Labor Council of greater New York and vicinity. The principal address was made by its president, Martin T. Lacey.

While too many Lincoln Day orators merely lip that great American's philosophy, it is pleasant to note that some exhort us to live it.

Mr. Lacey's speech follows:

Mr. Mayor, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, fellow trade unionists, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure once again to welcome you to our 32d annual Lincoln's birthday dinner and dance.

It is fitting, too, that the birthday of this great American should be the occasion of this annual celebration. We can have no finer inspiration in all that we set out to do than the model of that statesman who gave true meaning to our American doctrine—that all men are created equal.

He learned the dignity of labor with his own calloused hands. He had to work, and work hard, for everything he gained, but what he gained most of all was a sound sense of values that measured the good and the right, always in terms of the common right, of humanity.

Lincoln, who has been called a character so unique that he stands alone without a model in history or a parallel among men, was a labor man by background and a labor man in his philosophy.

In his address delivered at the Wisconsin State Agricultural Fair of 1859, he expressed his views on labor in these words, which must have sounded quite radical to the listeners of his day: "The world is agreed that labor is the source from which human wants are mainly supplied. There is no dispute upon this point. From this point, however, men immediately diverge—labor is prior to and independent of capital; in fact capital is the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor can exist without capital, but capital could never have existed without labor; hence labor is the superior, greatly superior of capital."

The dinner in honor of Lincoln's birthday has been a happy tradition of the Central Trades and Labor Council in this town. The party tonight marks the first since the merger of the AFL and CIO. Many of our CIO brothers are now here to celebrate with us. We bid them official and hearty welcome.

There are a few worry warts in the union movement, and some smart alecks out of it, who have been wagging their heads and moaning that the marriage of the CIO to the AFL is a fluke and can't last. They say the AFL groom is too old and too set in his ways. They whisper that the CIO really married the old man for his money.

Since it is no longer polite to flatten these critics out, let me straighten them out. The merger was no shotgun wedding. It was no marriage of convenience. True, the couple were not always passionately in love with each other.

Yet, over the years, there developed between them a feeling of mutual respect and an understanding of the common purpose. It made them realize that the time had come to join hands.

From now on they will be happily wedded for a long, long time to come. Of course, during the difficult and quarrelsome courtship, and before the ceremony took place, there were a few offspring born out of wedlock, but the constitution of the new federation provides machinery to take care of the illegitimates.

Section seven of article eight gives the executive council the power to throw out any Communists, Fascists, and racketeers. The machinery may come in handy.

So, too, is there machinery provided and already in motion, to take care by voluntary agreement of jurisdictional disputes between unions. The new constitution provides that the president and the executive council of this federation shall seek to eliminate such conflicts through the process of voluntary agreement or voluntary merger.

Two very important departments of the new federation have taken positive steps to implement this process. The building trades department and the new industrial union department have agreed to establish a permanent joint committee to regulate matters of jurisdiction that may arise between their affiliated unions.

Just before that, the building trades department had voted to make its own jurisdictional dispute settlement plan calling for impartial arbitration as a terminal step, binding on every union affiliated with the department. The importance of this is obvious. It is not that the jurisdictional machinery is perfect or that conflicts won't arise. They already have, as you know.

Rather it is that the ugly business of hostile unions raiding each other to represent workers already organized will be replaced by orderly procedures where the contest can be settled within the united house of labor.

The merger is thus significant, if only as a declaration, that the civil war in the house of labor is over. Naturally there will have to be a period of reconstruction.

We know too that during this adjustment period we will have to be on guard against carpetbaggers trying to gain or to peddle position and power.

And we can expect that the critics of labor will be waiting eagerly to play up and scarehead every misstep in the new unity.

But, at the least, the merger will mean that the new federation can move ahead to its first and most immediate goal—organizing the unorganized. To be sure, this goal will not be reached just by a declaration.

The boys in the movement will have to get off their well-cushioned rear ends and really do the job of organizing that for too long has been left undone. Yet the importance of this objective canot be overemphasized.

In all the hullabaloo about the merger and the curse of bigness hurled at it, the public tends to lose sight of the fact that organized labor is still in a distinct minority.

Large industries, large areas and the largest majority of the workers of our country are still behind the curtain of employer reaction and resistance.

The Taft-Hartley Act and the new board that administers it has certainly been of no help in stripping down these obstacles to union organization.

The proof is in the fact that since the Taft-Hartley law went on the books the rate of growth of the organized labor movement has been at a virtual standstill. In my judgment, this sorry result under the Taft-Hartley law points up the greatest merit of the Wagner Act.

The worker already in the union movement and getting the benefits of collective bargaining did not need the help of government to protect him in his dealings with his boss. It was his union's job to take care of that.

Rather it was the unorganized worker in anti-union companies and in company towns who needed the help of Government to protect and assure his right to organize.

The Wagner Act really gave this protection. The Taft-Hartley Act, with all its gimmicks and loopholes, only makes believe that it does.

All of which leads me to the second important goal of the merger—effective economic and political action.

There is some talk that we elect a president this year. On the economic front the general approach of the administration now in office has been that what's good for the boss is good for his workers.

This is just another way of describing the trickle-down theory of big business.

It has been the argument of organized labor that the correct approach should be what's good for the workers is good for their bosses.

In other words, it is the increase in mass earnings and improvements in standards of living which make industry prosper and the economy boom. It is the purchasing power of the people which pays the steady dividends and not the giveaways by Government to a few of its favored friends in big business.

We don't make any idle boast as to the political meaning of the merger. The American workers, thank God, has a political mind of his own.

But now that old man AFL and his fresh young CIO mate have joined forces, you can be sure that organized labor will be in a better position to get its political message across to the American worker.

Acting together and working together, we shall tell our fickle political friends that we are not stirred by their trickle-down political anthem.

The merger is a splendid reunion.

Let's now move on to richer rewards for the American worker.

A Time for Reason: No Klan—No Carpetbaggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a recent cartoon appearing in the press depicted three large volumes for present-day reading was entitled "Patience, Reason, and Tolerance." It seems to me these volumes need to be read today by all our citizens for today indeed is a time for reason and it is a time when we want or need no clans and no revival of carpetbaggers in the South or any section of our country.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, under unanimous consent, I ask that there be reproduced in the RECORD two excellent and well-written editorials recently appearing in the press of my State. The editorial entitled "No Klan—No Carpetbaggers," appeared in the Nashville Banner February 10 last, and the editorial entitled "A Time for Reason," appeared in the Nashville Tennessean under date of Sunday, February 12, 1956. I commend the reading of these editorials to my colleagues and others.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Banner of February 10, 1956]

NO KLAN—NO CARPETBAGGERS

If the people of the South were to speak with one voice and in one paragraph the majority sentiment on the biggest question confronting us at this moment, we believe their uncompromising reply would put equal emphasis on two big points:

1. Never again an era of Ku Klux Klan.
2. Never again government by Carpetbag.

Both the law-abiding and the agitators know what we mean.

One is not the answer to the other at this stage of history.

Both were interred by decency and conscience a long time ago. Let's leave them buried, along with the spirit of hate and force and violence which—with the help of some reckless hands—have shown signs of stirring for another fling at dangerous mischief.

The convulsion that rocked the University of Alabama this week was an example of what can happen—not just in that sister State, but a lot of places—by impudent forces moving impetuously in their frenzy to stake out a claim on new-found treasure of social gains whose possession is still a matter of legal controversy.

The voice of reason would admonish them to slow down. Even the Supreme Court which construed the point initially in their favor sought to avoid excitement and turmoil—and specified a reasonable period of adjustment. Such an interval has not elapsed. Mountains do not wear down in a day; wide gulfs are not spanned in so short a time. Even if tomorrow is on the calendar, impatience doesn't hasten it.

We hope that never again will the battle flag of the Confederacy be dragged in the dust as it was at Tuscaloosa—misused as an emblem of mob psychology.

It deserves honor as the symbol of a cause for which brave men laid down their lives so short a time ago. It was desecrated by hands that by inference associated it with malice and cowardice.

It is unfortunate that it had to be the University of Alabama that was such a testing-ground for inflammatory actions. It is a great institution in a great State. It has undergone a trying ordeal not of its own making, but in a sense forced upon it and then magnified by elements ever ready to exploit an area of strife.

It is not surprising that Alabama has manifested a reluctance to yield to coercion in an affair that resembles, however unwittingly, the force tactics of Carpetbagism. The latter still is fresh in the minds of the States whose recent generation suffered it. These are people whose fathers and grandfathers fought and bled and died for a principle in which they believed with all their hearts. They will not willingly submit to anything even remotely suggestive of a replay of Carpetbagger days.

That does not excuse retaliatory violence—acts begetting shame—some of which undoubtedly were committed or incited by outside elements.

It is not, strictly speaking, any of our business what the State of Alabama does in this matter. The institution is a State university, owned there and maintained by Alabama funds. We hold unreservedly to the opinion that a State can best run its own schools, and equally to the conviction that the Constitution itself clearly draws a line between State business and Federal business—and the domain of supervision over which, respectively, each exercises proprietary control.

The Banner has led in the long fight for defense of States rights. We yield to none in the championship of that basic premise.

At the same time, we have said from the outset of the Supreme Court's integration edict, May 17, 1954, that this matter must be calmly handled; that it must be adjucated most carefully in the interest of justice to all concerned. There is nothing more dangerous just now than a wave of recklessness, mob psychology, hysteria, or incitement to passions on either side. This is a Government of law; when it ceases to be that, it will be anarchy. A nation in its right mind will avoid that precipice.

We do not want to stumble over it in a moment of wild excitement. We do not intend to be pushed over it by any pressure group believing it now can take charge as if by coercive privilege.

Calm appraisal and cautious handling of this problem—the course of action recommended by the Banner at the outset—have spared Tennessee such ugly experiences as have marked some other areas. For that Governor Clement is to be commended. As he told a delegation calling on him some 2 weeks ago, Tennessee does not intend to yield to either pressure group, but to abide by the law once the law has been clearly established.

This has not been done to date. But certainly the law against violence is clear enough.

Manifestly it forbids a reign of terror, mob rule, and surrender to hooligans.

The States can solve their own problems, individually, as conditions and considerations of peace and safety require. No blanket ordinance laid down by Washington—for instant and universal application—can do that.

We are not in contempt of court in saying that we do not believe it was ever intended to be handled that way—or that the Constitution so specifies. We believe with the interpositionists, headed by the great commonwealth of Virginia, that if it is to so specify, it must be by an amendment clearly and unmistakably saying that.

We deplore the violence that has occurred. But we hope that both sides have learned from it. We know that in Alabama as in Tennessee the decent, law-abiding, consecrated citizens of both races are righteously concerned about working out together any problem that exists. They are not the ones fomenting strife, erecting challenges, laying down an ultimatum, and invoking the services of self-appointed carpetbaggers.

It would be good for unity and the foundation of law on which America rests if both sides of the extremist elements would quietly retire from the scene and let the program of orderly adjustment proceed—the mob constituents narrowly skirting anarchy at Tuscaloosa, and the NAACP whose questionable zeal so far outruns the dictates of judgment.

There is no room for either among people of good will earnestly seeking the proper solution to this vexatious problem, whose injudicious determination could be calamitous and catastrophic.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 12, 1956]

A TIME FOR REASON

It is now almost 10 months since the United States Supreme Court handed down the second of its two historic opinions declaring compulsory segregation in the public schools unconstitutional. With the resulting controversy becoming more heated by the day, the time plainly has come for the South to do some sober thinking about where it is headed.

As recent events in Alabama have demonstarted, the situation has reached an explosive point. The balance between the orderly processes of a lawful society on the one hand and the anarchy of mob rule on the other proves to be delicate indeed and easily tipped.

What happens now will determine whether the dangers of civil chaos will be increased or diminished.

Surely among thoughtful people there can be but one choice—respect for the law. To choose otherwise would be to invite a reign of terror and violence which could do untold damage to the democratic system under which the people of this Nation have been so richly blessed.

It becomes supremely urgent, therefore, that the citizens who understand the alternatives confronting the South today assert themselves lest they be swept up in the consequences of unbridled warfare between extreme elements on both sides.

For if one thing has been made unmistakably clear, it is that the problems of the South are not going to be solved either by mobs like that which defied all recognized authority at the University of Alabama or by NAACP lawyers like the one who made the completely untenable charge that university officials had conspired in the ugly disorder there.

Reason must prevail. And if it is to do so, it is imperative that the Supreme Court decision be reexamined so that neither more nor less than it actually said will be read into it.

In their bitter crossfire, extremists on both sides often create the impression that the Court ordered immediate compulsory integration in all public schools and that the ruling must be resisted or complied with on that basis.

But the Court ordered nothing of the sort. Judge John J. Parker, of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, has helped put the ruling in its proper perspective by stating:

"It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided. * * * It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools. * * * Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation. The 14th amendment is a limitation upon the exercise of power by the State or State agencies, not a limitation upon the freedom of individuals."

Even within this framework, the Court did not order an immediate end to all compulsory segregation everywhere. The Supreme Court does not operate in a vacuum, unmindful of the problems created by its decisions.

In respect to the segregation question, it specifically asked the Southern States to outline their individual problems. And then in its decision it took into account "the complexities arising from the transition to a system of public education freed of racial discrimination."

Requiring only that "a prompt and reasonable start" be made toward compliance with its decision, the Court authorized district Federal courts to consider the "varied local school problems" that must be solved to permit "full implementation" of the ruling.

The test the Court prescribed was one of good faith in complying with constitutional principles which it correctly said could not be abrogated simply because of disagreement with them.

Surely an honest effort to work out solutions within this pattern is not too much to expect of a lawful people.

To defy the Court with violent refusals to accept its decision in good faith is to create a situation from which no one will profit but the enemies of this great democracy.

The inheritance of our democratic Government and the freedoms it provides does not guarantee their preservation. They must be safeguarded by every generation with vigilant respect for the legal traditions and institutions upon which the United States is built.

No greater tragedy could befall the South than to permit obstinate groups with strident voices to trample on these traditions and institutions with ruthless abandon.

Keeping Career Military Personnel in the Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Army Times of February 11, 1956. This editorial makes clear the fact that the military services have progressively lost the advantage in competing with industry and business for career men. This trend must be reversed if we are to attract and hold competent, skilled, and highly trained personnel. The House has passed the survivors benefits bill, and it is pending action by the other body. My subcommittee has completed action on the dependent medical care bill and has reported it to the Committee on Armed Services. These are two steps in the catching-up process. These must be completed and others must follow.

All Members concerned over our loss of career personnel and repeated extensions of draft laws should give serious consideration to these problems.

The editorial follows:

THE GOOD LIFE (INSIDE AND OUT)

In the years before World War II gave industry that massive shot in the arm, it was generally conceded that such military benefits as pensions and medical care for dependents were generally better and broader than those offered on the outside. This is still more or less true of retirement benefits. But in the past 10 years an expansion of fringe perquisites offered to civilian workers has brought about an almost complete reversal of the picture.

Recent surveys show that money-saving supplements to the worker's pay check have tripled since World War II. They now account for one-fifth of the employer's payroll. Much of the expansion has been in health and insurance. Four times as many workers (in 1954) were covered by a health plan than was the case in 1948. And more than 70 percent of those workers also have coverage for their dependents. Other benefits extend to subsidized meals, discounts on company products, paid sick leave, annual bonuses, etc.

The increasing betterment of the civilian worker's lot is, in effect, a worsening of the military man's since—all else being equal—the latter is interested in getting as much of the world's goods as any of his peers. And, to the extent that his dissatisfaction grows, he presents a problem to our defense leaders who have the job of manning the services and keeping them at strength.

Yet the disparity in benefits has been so feebly publicized that a number of self-interested groups in recent years have been

able to attempt further erosions of the military's rights. In some cases, like the attack on post exchanges, they have succeeded in putting their hands into the soldier's pocket. That has been done by placing surcharges on commissary sales, restricting the types of goods that can be sold in exchanges, and even by putting several commissaries out of business entirely.

Fortunately, the Defense Department seems now to be alert to the dangers posed by such groups as the retailers association and the Hoover Commission. It has prepared a report documenting the increase in fringe benefits for industrial workers and has contrasted it with the leveling-off trend in the military. Armed with this, the Department intends to remind Congress of the situation on every possible occasion.

We hope this is done, for the Defense researchers have come up with some telling figures. For instance:

In 1948 only 3 million workers were covered by some sort of company group insurance. Today, 11.3 million are, and "more and more" firms are providing this insurance free.

In 1954 some 7 million workers were covered by pension plans, under collective-bargaining agreements. This was a 40 percent increase over 1950 and the figure has probably gone up even more since 1954. Eighty-five percent of the workers covered received the benefits without contributing a penny. Disability features have been added to many of the plans.

A survey of 519 companies showed that 240 of them sold company products at discounts ranging up to 80 percent off the retail price. Many served free lunches.

Civilian firms pay workers an "overseas differential" of 21–25 percent above State-side pay. Military officers receive no extra money for foreign service; enlisted people get about 8 percent of their base pay.

Of 500 firms studied, 24 percent paid employees a year-end or Christmas bonus.

Among career measures now awaiting congressional action are the survivor benefits, dependent medicare and housing improvement bills. If passed, these will probably help keep more careermen in service. But if they do not have the requisite effect, then some other means must be found to do so. A general raise in the military's standard of living, along lines suggested by the Defense Department study, may be just the ticket.

If MacArthur Had Had His Way, America Would Have Become Exhausted—Lost in a Chinese Swamp Thousands of Miles From Its Home Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the February 12 issue of the Washington Post, entitled "The Great Debate—Continued."

The editorial follows:

THE GREAT DEBATE—CONTINUED

There seems no end to the argument over the war in Korea and the dismissal of General MacArthur. However, it is an argument so closely tied up with the American destiny that the fresh outbreak between Mr. Truman and General MacArthur is to be welcomed. The unfortunate thing is that for years to come the merits of the controversy will be obscured by prejudice and passion. In the present exchange both parties are guilty of overstatement and misstatement which history in due course will correct.

The point to fasten upon is the rival concepts on the object of the war. President Truman, for the United Nations, fought the war for a limited objective, and this he achieved. He achieved a successful result moreover without damaging our dominion in world strategy. Actually that dominion was improved, and, in the process, Mr. Truman kept the Russian intervention limited with his atomic deterrent. On the other side of the argument, General MacArthur wanted to push on across the Yalu in addition to bombing the bridges and dams (for which in retrospect he had a good case) into the Chinese mainland to what he now declares would have been "sure victory." He dubs anything short of this victorious objective "appeasement."

Here the great issue is drawn, and all the remainder of the MacArthur case—which is becoming more and more studded with innuendoes plainly demagogic in appeal—is subordinate to it. How sure would have been the victory if the MacArthur idea had been carried out? Nobody can be certain about the answer, least of all MacArthur himself, but a mere smattering of knowledge of the past shows that history is not on the side of MacArthur. Japan affords the latest instance of rebuttal. For 7 long years the Japanese were drawn into a fruitless war on the Asiatic mainland within the present generation, and, if any lesson can be learned from it, surely it is that their campaign was a vast mistake. Hitler made the same mistake (forgetful of Napoleon in 1812) against continental Russia.

Classic military doctrine was against Japan and Germany in these enterprises—a doctrine stated by Clausevitz when he said that neither Russia nor China is a country that can be counted according to the rules, that is, by occupying it. It is supreme folly of MacArthur to insist that he could have succeeded where Tojo and Hitler failed. Look, for one thing, at the odds. MacArthur expected to establish himself with only a dozen divisions on the border frontier of nearly 700 miles when his predecessors had at their command 50 times more divisions.

Superior air power would not have made up for the deficiency. Tojo and Hitler had a great preponderance in the air, but this did not suffice to offset the enemy's advantages in space and possession of hordes of manpower. If MacArthur had had his way, America would have become exhausted—lost in a Chinese swamp thousands of miles from its home base. Athens made precisely the same mistake when it issued forth for the conquest of faraway Sicily, and its doom, as Thucydides recounts, was sealed. MacArthur says that if his ideas had been accepted "the threat of global war would have receded, and the world would be a radically different place today." This newspaper begs to differ. It is more likely that Russia would have left China and America to kill themselves off, and, profiting by the American preoccupation would have overrun Europe, where we would have had no allies left.

To be sure, American experience is on the side of MacArthur. Except for the war in 1812, the victory formula he enunciates has prevailed in all the wars that America has undertaken. But this was before America became a world power with responsibilities everywhere. Now this country must not only adjust means to ends; it must limit its engagements with a sense of priorities and a wisdom dictated by the need always to keep its world position intact. Moreover, addiction to the MacArthur formula in the past two world wars has helped bring the world to its present pass. For the other side of the MacArthur coin is unlimited warfare and unconditional surrender. In the Pacific, for instance, it left Japan prostrate, so that all eastern Asia became a vacuum into which the Communist power poured. In today's nuclear terms unlimited warfare would mean unlimited annihilation. Peace, even more than victory, is the ultimate object of war, and the sooner this becomes gospel in America the less chance there will be of the American heritage being frittered away. Even Sherman had to admit that after his experience in the Civil War.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave,
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*----------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*------The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*-----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*------1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*------
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*----------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*--------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*-----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*---------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*------
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*---------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*-------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*-------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*--------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*-----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*---------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*------The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*---------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*---------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*---------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*-------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*--------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*-------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*------The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*---------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*-------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*------------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*--------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*----------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*--------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*---------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3063 Ordway St

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase. Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*

Quigley, James M., *Pa.*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*

Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Address by Senator Wiley Before the Optimist Club, Oshkosh, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Optimist Club at Oshkosh, Wis., on February 16, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PLEDGES CONTINUED BATTLE AGAINST YOUTH DELINQUENCY; SAYS YOUNGSTERS AND ADULTS TRULY INSPIRED BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S LEADERSHIP

I am happy, indeed, to be in Wisconsin again, and to have lunch with you here.

I want to say that, in a world with too many cynics and pessimists, it is a pleasure to be among optimists.

All of us need to be optimistic, in facing the challenges, difficulties, and opportunities of our times.

NUMEROUS ISSUES FACING CONGRESS

Indeed, there are so many challenges facing us that it is almost hard to choose among them and decide which particular one to discuss with you today.

In Washington, for example, the Senate has pending before it right now a new farm bill. This farm bill incorporates a new soil-bank idea to conserve the Nation's soil resource, as well as to reduce the surplus problem. We are certainly going to pass some form of the farm bill, and definitely, some form of the soil-bank idea.

Not long after we finish the farm bill, we are going to take up the social security bill. Beyond question, we are going to extend coverage to upwards of a million more employees and self-employed, including lawyers, accountants, and other professionals. Moreover, we are going to liberalize pensions for widows.

Meanwhile, the House of Representatives is going to put the finishing touches on the Nation's new highway bill. The only big controversy that remains is how to finance the program. Highway taxes are going to have to increase, but it is still uncertain as to how much the average motorist will pay, and how much heavy trucks will have to pay.

Another issue engaging our attention is a study of the work of the oil and gas lobby in connection with the recently passed natural-gas bill.

These, then, are but a few of the topics which we face in Washington, and which you face here in Oshkosh.

OPTIMIST'S CLUB WORK FOR YOUTH

One problem in which Optimist Clubs have rightly been interested is, of course, the problem of juvenile delinquency.

I want, at this time, to highly commend your club for the great and admirable youth work you are performing.

The boys of America, and the country itself, owe Optimist Clubs a great debt of gratitude for your splendid efforts in providing our promising manhood with hobbies and vocational guidance and recreational opportunities and facilities, including such things as sports, woodworking, and swimming.

This is the kind of guidance and leadership we need for the youngsters of America.

DELINQUENCY IN AMERICA

As many of you know, I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. For the past year, we have had the unpleasant job of investigating delinquency among the youth of our country.

We discovered many sobering and shocking facts. There were:

Over 485,000 youngsters brought before juvenile courts.

Over 200,000 young folks had run away from home.

Over 100,000 youths had been confined in common jails, usually with hardened criminals.

ACTION ON BILL FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

To help prevent delinquency among our young folks, I have sponsored legislation to provide grants-in-aid to States and local communities for delinquency prevention programs.

Other Senators have sponsored companion measures, and it appears certain that some form of this legislation will be enacted before the end of the session.

Meanwhile, the life of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, itself, should be extended, so that we can complete our study and our legislative recommendations. We have numerous reports soon to be released on motion pictures, education, religion, pornography and related phases.

In any event, we need continued constructive activities by groups such as your own.

YOUTH NEEDS OPPORTUNITY

The difficulty, of course, is not basically with our youth.

I believe, instead, that we as a Nation, are unfortunately not providing them with sufficient challenge and opportunity, with ample outlets for their boundless energy.

As a result, we are wasting a vast reservoir of new thoughts, ideas, talents, and skills. I believe that our youths could learn more of the mechanical skills and of the arts at a much earlier age; could be better prepared, by training, for adulthood; could assume greater responsibilities than they now do.

MOST YOUTHS ARE NOT DELINQUENTS

The statistics on juvenile delinquency throughout the country seem large and startling; yet, these are usualy small in contrast to the successful and wholesome millions of youths who have fine records of home and community activities, who resolve their own problems, who are independent, responible individuals.

These will become the outstanding citizens of tomorrow.

In Milwaukee County, for example, it was discovered that only 2½ percent of the youngsters get into trouble with the law. That is, of course, 2½ percent too much, but at least it indicates that 97½ percent of the youngsters are getting along all right.

IDOLS OF YOUTH: LINCOLN AND WASHINGTON

As you well know, most of our young people have a habit of adopting idols from both the present and the past. These help to mould the character and life of the youngster.

We, ourselves, serve as examples, so we must all constantly strive to live up to the high principles we teach our young folks.

Not only youth, but also nations, have their idols—men and women whom they admire and respect.

We all know that in the month of February, we celebrate the birthdays of two of our greatest forefathers: George Washington, the Father of our County; and Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, whose birth date was honored on Sunday.

The spirits and beliefs of these two great men still guide our Nation and strengthen the sense of patriotism in the hearts of our countrymen.

Over the years they serve as symbols of genuine leadership and statesmanship.

CRISIS: PAST AND PRESENT

Both Washington and Lincoln faced crisis—different in scope, but similar in gravity—to those we face today.

For example, George Washington fought for freedom and independence of our country. We now are engaged in striving for freedom and survival for the free world.

Abraham Lincoln faced the problem of a divided country. Today, President Eisenhower and our Nation face the problems of a divided world.

In 1861—seemingly a long time ago—Abraham Lincoln emphasized the need to keep abreast of progress. He expressed a great thought that is especially true today. He said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew, and act anew."

THINKING ANEW AND ACTING ANEW ON SLAVERY

"Thinking anew and acting anew" means, for example, continuing our bold program to keep alive the spirit of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

As we are all aware, the Soviet Union has recently protested against our relatively new device—the propaganda balloons sent by the Crusade for Freedom behind the Curtain.

As for our governmental activity, and the Red protests against weather balloons drifting over Russia, we are trying to keep these balloons along the routes for which they were basically intended.

But there should be no interference with the right of a private organization, the Crusade for Freedom, sending encouraging messages to the enslaved peoples of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, and Russia itself, urging them to keep the flame of liberty bright in their hearts.

We, who pay homage to the Emancipator, Abe Lincoln, can hardly fail in our responsibility to the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe or eleswhere.

We must think and act boldly in their behalf and on behalf of peace and freedom throughout the world.

OTHER DYNAMIC RESPONSES TO TODAY'S NEEDS

The occasion is still piled high with difficulty. So, thinking anew and acting anew requires also:

(a) Speeding up America's scientific research, particularly in the field of guided missiles and nuclear weapons, as well as in peaceful application of atomic energy.

(b) Strengthening the Nation's Reserve forces, which are presently, according to all reports, in sadly undermanned strength.

(c) Keeping our domestic economy rolling in high gear with 65 million employed; keeping all segments—industry, labor, agriculture strong and prosperous.

IKE—AN INSPIRATION TO ALL AMERICANS

But before I learn the matter of inspiring examples, I want to point out that we have today another great symbol in the office of the Presidency.

I know that you will believe me that I am sincerely not making a partisan reference when I say this:

History will record Dwight D. Eisenhower in the ranks of our greatest Presidents, as it records the names of Washington, Lincoln and others.

Regardless of how you or I may have voted in November 1952; regardless of how you or I may choose to vote in November 1956, I believe that you may feel as I do, that America can be proud of the man who now occupies the White House.

Public opinion polls have shown that he is still at the peak of his popularity. These polls reflect the fact that the American people clearly recognize the honesty, the selfless dedication, the strength, the judgment which Dwight D. Eisenhower has brought to his office.

My friends who may be Democrats in this audience, or any audience, may and do differ with the President on various issues. Indeed, we Republicans have our intra-party differences, as well. But we Americans do not allow our party affiliations to befog our eyes on true examples and patriotism.

There are few Democrats among us who would, for example, dispute the greatness of Republican Teddy Roosevelt, or few Republicans who would dispute the greatness of Woodrow Wilson.

So, too, with admiration and respect, we will all wait the President's decision as to whether he will or will not run again.

I personally don't know what that decision will be.

I earnestly hope, however, that wholly aside from any partisan consideration he will decide to run again. To do so would, in my judgment, be another great forward step for peace. It would be also a dramatic demonstration of the power of a man's spirit, or of a man's moral strength—the power of a man's soul in action, to reduce the significance of any imperfections in a man's bodily condition.

AN AMAZING CHAPTER IN PRESIDENTIAL PRESS RELATIONS

Meanwhile, however, the President's utter frankness about his health, his willingness to talk about this delicate matter completely, openly, frankly, is another magnificent demonstration of the straight-shooting character of this man in the White House.

The man from Abilene has not tried to withold a single fact. His tireless Press Secretary, James Hagerty, has helped him write one of the most amazing chapters in presidential relations with the American press in our entire history. Day after day, night after night, side by side with his Chief, Jim Hagerty has literally exhausted himself, to comply with the press' every wish, to know the up-to-the minute facts about Ike's condition.

By contrast, in the world of dictatorship, there would never be the slightest inkling of the true physical conditions of the head of state.

Even in the free world, great leaders have suffered disabilities which have often been withheld from public knowledge.

But we have been witnessing today one of the most remarkable demonstrations in our history, of the strength of our own free Nation. The people have been entitled to the facts. The people have received the facts—straight, impartially, accurately, promptly.

We may all be proud that this Republic is so strong, that there has never been fear in anyone's heart concerning our people's getting the facts on this matter.

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free"—free of fear, free of doubt, free of misunderstanding.

Whatever Ike's decision, he will have earned his lasting place among the most honored of American Chief Executives.

Whatever the decision of the American electorate next November, we will not soon forget this great term of office of a great man.

THE WORLD OF TOMORROW

Now and in time to come, we must and will remain strong.

Meanwhile, to those of us who are optimists and I assure you I am a member of your club; in spirit, if not in fact—we must look forward confidently to the future, to the great things of tomorrow.

The world of tomorrow will be a fascinating place in which to live. There will be stirring advances in all the things we are enjoying today.

There will be more jet propulsion, atomic power, and electronic devices.

There will be new food for higher nutritional levels and better standards of living.

There will be new forms of pleasure and entertainment, such as "regular" color TV.

We will have better disease control and longer life expectancy.

Our culture will be further enriched with the best thoughts, arts, and ideas of all cultures.

LIFE IN THE NEW WORLD

To live in this great, new, challenging world, we must adapt ourselves to its needs and its fast moving pace. The spirit of youth must never die within us.

We must never cease to be imaginative, to "dream dreams and see visions," and to be attuned to the progress of our times.

CONCLUSION

If we dedicate ourselves to progress, to high ideals, to improvements of our way of life, we can—to quote Lincoln—be assured that, under God,

"This Government, of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Democratic Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the February 1, 1956, issue of the St. Petersburg Times, St. Petersburg, Fla., entitled "Democratic Responsibility":

DEMOCRATIC RESPONSIBILITY

Two actions last week are clues to the quickening tides moving within Florida's Democratic Party.

The party's State executive committee censured Richard D. Barker, national committeeman, who in 1952 repudiated his party's presidential ticket.

And, furnishing the second clue, the party's governing body rejected the idea of trying to send an unpledged slate of delegates to the national convention.

Both actions suggest the party, long a mere traditional and rather disorganized group of people who call themselves Democrats, is beginning to awaken to a sense of its responsibility.

There is no reason to suggest that the Barker resolution and the rejection of the unpledged delegation will amount to more than ripples in 1956's stormy politics.

But those ripples may be taken as surface manifestations of important undercurrents which have been reshaping both the form and direction of the State Democratic Party since 1952 and especially in the last year.

Jacksonville's rebellious Richard Barker is not the important element in the resolution of denunciation.

The personal feelings of anger and resentment toward him will, like all of the sort, dissolve in the wash of time.

Of top importance is the principle implicitly expressed in the action. It was a simple principle.

In a State the good citizen submits to the rule of law whether it is enacted by a majority he opposed or supported.

Similarly in a political party the member who accepts the benefits and offices of the party should submit to the decisions of its majority.

In 1952 the national party had enunciated certain principles (its platform) and named certain men (its candidates) to lead a fight to write those principles into Government. For publicly repudiating both, Barker, an officer of the party, was censured.

In shouting approval of the censure resolution the State committee was saying: We no longer wish our party represented by men who reject it without leaving it, who use their badge of party office to advance their personal political whims rather than the objectives of the party.

It was no demand for blind loyalty. In government we Americans boast we have rule by law, not by men. In party affairs it is sound to seek rule by principle, not by men.

Let those of all minds impress the party with their views. But when the party majority has accepted a view, approved a principle, its program and its purpose breaks down if the minority will not at the least silently submit to that larger will.

The demand is not for subservience. It is for a belief and sympathy in the party's desire to carry into governmental action the principles endorsed by most of its members.

There we are speaking of an ideal. A look at the Democratic Party in Florida will return us to more difficult realities.

Despite recent signs that political ferment is nudging the State party toward that more meaningful form for which the Times has long fought, the party is just beginning to move.

By no means has it arrived, as is shown plainly by the fact there are no answers to such questions as:

What are the principles of the Florida Democratic Party? What governmental programs does it support? What, in short, are the planks of its platform?

There is no platform. The same State committee last weekend decided to wait until after the national convention to formulate a platform. At that time, of course, it will be much too late to pledge State candidates for Democratic nominations to a party platform.

But the State committee, when its members gathered here, did lay down a broad principle which will be the best foundation on which eventually a full program can be built.

In first endorsing the new presidential preference primary and, second, voting against the idea of an unpledged slate running in that primary, the committee was saying: "Let's leave the affairs of party as directly as possible in the hands of the voters."

Any candidate for President can be placed on the primary ballot. Among those named the voter can pick the one he likes best,

and his vote will be reflected in the makeup of the delegation, which will be bound at the convention to carry out the will of the voters.

Advocates of an unpledged slate are merely demanding that the voters be asked to send to the convention a bunch of politicians who will be free to trade and bargain with their votes for reasons of personal power and without referring at all to the will of the people.

In rejecting that plan the State committee made a start toward bringing the party to its true purpose, to serve as an agency for translating the desires of the people into political action.

It was not a bad start.

Third Party for Ike?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the straightforward editor of the Morning News, of San Leandro, Calif., spoke out on February 9, in answer to a front-page editorial that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune January 30, calling upon the President to seek reelection.

The Morning News editor makes no claim that the Tribune is not within its rights in urging the President to run. However, he draws some conclusions that are worthy of serious consideration.

The two-party system is the foundation of our American form of government. We should do nothing which would contribute to its breakdown.

I believe this editorial deserves the attention of a wider audience, and I commend it to the Speaker and my colleagues:

THIRD PARTY FOR IKE?

The New York Herald Tribune on January 30 published a front-page editorial calling on President Eisenhower to seek reelection if his health will possibly permit.

That action of the Herald Tribune was treated as top news in the press, on radio, and on TV.

The full text of the Herald Tribune front-page editorial has been mailed to every daily newspaper. We had expected it to be equal to the Herald Tribune's high reputation.

But to us it is a disappointment. Not because it says that a majority of the people are giving him a decisive vote of confidence in his handling of public affairs. It is a disappointment because the Herald Tribune bases its call upon sloppy thinking which does a discredit both to a great newspaper and to the President himself.

Presumably it may not be reprinted in full, because it is copyrighted. But it can be quoted in part for review and criticism.

The Herald Tribune says, "It is one of the best of our traditions that the two parties want their elected President to give the Nation the continuity of 8 consecutive years of service if he can possible do so. To give the American people the opportunity to have a two-term Chief Executive is normal and desirable and constitutional."

This is nothing more than guff.

If the 2 parties wanted an 8-year Presidency, they would lengthen the term. They do not want 8 years, nor do they want 2 consecutive terms. They agree that every administration should be put to a periodic test of an election, to make sure that it represents the will of the people.

Until the time of Franklin Roosevelt, the George Washington tradition was strong enough to prevent any President from seeking more than two terms. There was never a tradition that he must have a second term. Only 1 President in 3 served as much as 8 consecutive years.

Death or defeat is the tradition—reelection is unusual.

After Roosevelt's death, both parties joined in amending the Constitution. They did not extend the term to 8 years. Instead, they wrote into the Constitution limitations to 8 years or less.

Herald Tribune is false to history.

To be accurate, both parties recognize that any President has enough political power to dictate his own renomination, and that this power repeatedly used might work to the detriment of the people.

Therefore, Republicans and Democrats alike joined in putting the country's welfare above party succession. It was Harry S. Truman, Democrat, who urged adoption of the amendment while he was in office. He deliberately cut himself off from any possibility of serving 8 consecutive years.

The Herald Tribune is much more candid when it quotes with approval the statement by Vice President NIXON: "The Republican Party is not strong enough to elect a President. We have to have a presidential candidate strong enough to get the Republican Party elected." It goes on to say for itself: "The blunt and objective truth is that the Republican Party faces the very real danger of defeat this fall unless President Eisenhower remains as its head, its prestige-laden leader, its two-term presidential nominee."

The Herald Tribune says it does not ask Mr. Eisenhower to run primarily to save the Republican Party. Instead, it asserts one of the compelling reasons why he should accept renomination is to secure the two-party system—by making sure that the Nation has a party which is liberal and effective because it is freed from the extremes of either the right or the left.

In plain language, it asks Mr. Eisenhower to save the Republican name, though not the party. It asks him to use his incumbency to capture that party name. It asks him to create a third party, to contest Democrats on one side and the Knowland-McCarthy wing on the other.

All this is legitimate. It may attract voters. But it parades under false colors. This is not the two-party system. This is a call for a third party, under false colors with false history.

Timely Warning on Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present herewith a very timely editorial taken from the New Orleans Item of February 13, 1956, entitled "Better Roads Aren't Sure Cure":

BETTER ROADS AREN'T SURE CURE

In Congress, there has never been any real question about a highway program except how to finance it.

Nearly all Congressmen favor modernized highways, and now that President Eisenhower has given up his bond idea and come round to the Democrats' way of thinking, there may be speedy action.

The higher gasoline tax may run into some objections. But on the whole, good highways are a popular cause in this car-happy land. As highway congestion increases, so do demands for better roads.

There is, in fact, a tendency to consider wide, well-engineered highways the answer to all traffic problems, and to look to them as guaranties against accidents.

So general is the idea that new highways are the shortcut to safety that the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies while backing the highway improvement program—thinks this word of warning is timely:

"In the last analysis, the accident reduction impact of better roads will be determined less by how well they are engineered than by how adequately they are controlled and how lawfully and intelligently they are used."

This association, made up of representatives of 133 casualty insurance companies, recommends that the new highway program should require each participating State to establish safe speed limits and enforce them through adequate police supervision and strict law enforcement by both the police and the courts.

It's a sensible suggestion.

I certainly commend the New Orleans Item for writing such a timely and needed editorial.

Can H-Tests Be Stopped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., on January 13, 1956, entitled "Can H–Tests Be Stopped?" I should also like to include a resolution adopted by the Oregon Council of Churches at its annual convocation held recently in Portland. This resolution likewise relates to test explosions of nuclear weapons.

The editorial and resolution follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of January 13, 1956]

CAN H-TESTS BE STOPPED?

The unanswered question, at least from the presumed final authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, is this: Are additional hydrogen bomb tests essential to continued development of nuclear weapons.

Members of Congress have been informed that an H-bomb or bombs dwarfing those previously exploded by the United States and the U. S. S. R. will be tested in the Pacific this year. Secretary of State Dulles stated Wednesday the United States will continue to make such tests until the Soviet Union accepts an iron-clad system of controls and inspection of nuclear weapons.

But the whole world—not only the Communist nations—is crying out against the nuclear explosions. People we know are dismayed by the prospect of bigger and bigger hydrogen bomb blasts in the Pacific and Siberia. Nations allied to the United States and neutral nations are apprehensive and resentful.

Has the attempt sincerely been made to get the Russians to agree to stop the bomb tests, as a step toward agreement on in-

spection and arms reduction and control? We have not been so informed. Each side in the cold war would be handicapped equally were the tests to be stopped. A violation by either side would be detected instantly by instruments now in use.

We do not believe that the explosion of a superduper H-bomb by the United States will make it easier to obtain Russian agreement to arms control. It may make this more difficult. The Russians will feel that they, too, must trigger a deadlier blast to save face. And the two world forces are moving rapidly into the same kind of competition with intercontinental missiles.

We should like to see the United States propose, right now, a cessation of all tests of superbombs. The Soviet peace and prosperity salesmen would find it difficult, if not impossible, to say "No."

RESOLUTION OF OREGON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Resolution No. 1 (test explosions of nuclear weapons).

Whereas we view with alarm the competition among nations for superiority in the development of mass-destruction weapons; and

Whereas nuclear weapons of astronomical strength are being stockpiled and occasionally exploded for test purposes by the leading powers of the world; and

Whereas we have learned something of the deadly effects of radioactive fallout and have been warned by scientists of the potential danger of radioactive contamination of the earth's atmosphere; and

Whereas the great powers agreed at the summit conference in Geneva that no nation can achieve its purposes by engaging in nuclear warfare; and

Whereas the peace of the world rests precariously on a "balance of mutual terror" (Winston Churchill) with nations possessing the destructive power to annihilate much of our civilization: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this convocation assembled appeal to the governments of all nations through the United Nations to refrain from any further test explosions of nuclear weapons whether within or without their territorial boundaries;

That we appeal to our own Government to intensify efforts to reach agreement on international control of the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons; and

That we pledge to the President of the United States of America, his staff, Members of Congress, and the United Nations our united support of all honest and sincere efforts to achieve universal disarmament under international control.

Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Anniston Star entitled "If Stevenson Had Been President," appearing in the January 29, 1956, issue; an article by Raymond Moley appearing in the February 12, 1956, issue of the Florida Times-Union entitled "Stevenson Looks Good by Comparison"; an editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., entitled "Man of Courage," appearing in the February 13, 1956, issue, and an article by Joseph C. Harsch, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, appearing in the February 10, 1956, issue of the Christian Science Monitor entitled "State of the Nations; Social-Political Notes.:

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star of January 29, 1956]

IF STEVENSON HAD BEEN PRESIDENT

Shortly before he left for Rio de Janeiro last week to be present at the inauguration of the new Brazilian President, our young Vice President and Eisenhower's heir apparent, indulged himself in a precampaign address, in which he said he had just been thinking what would have happened if Mr. Stevenson had been President for the last 3 years.

We, of course, cannot advance any irrefutable assertion as to just what Mr. Stevenson would have done; but there are a few things, we know, he would not have done. In the first place, he would not have consulted Dunn & Bradstreet or the membership roster of the Union League Clubs to select 10 of the richest Republicans in the United States to occupy most of the places in his official Cabinet.

He would not have kept on the payroll that battery of advertising agents, ghostwriters, television experts, etc., who were in the employment of the Eisenhower campaign in 1952, and who are now trying to build up a mass psychology that will force Ike to seek reelection at the risk of his life, merely in order that those who have been plundering the public domain might continue their depredations.

He would not have kept in office a Secretary of State and a Secretary of Defense who have kept us on the brink of war or in a state of equivocal peace for 3 long years. He would not have negotiated a phony peace that has turned North Korea into a Communist arsenal and directly contributed to the loss of Indochina and practically all of southeast Asia to the Communist forces, not to mention our losses in the Middle East.

He would not have had a Secretary of Agriculture and a Secretary of Commerce who would have caused our farmers to forfeit most of the gains they achieved under Democratic administrations, and who have so unbalanced our economy that the rich have gotten richer while the poor have suffered neglect. Otherwise, great States, like Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts would not be burdened with unemployment.

He would not have sold down the river our vast offshore oil deposits, which the Supreme Court repeatedly had declared to belong to all the people. He would not have turned over our public parks for private exploitation. He would not have concentrated most defense contracts in the hands of General Motors alone, nor would he have appointed a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to upset the South's way of life.

He would not have had a "hound's tooth" Secretary of the Air Force like Talbott, a double-dealing Buildings Commissioner like Stroebel, nor a Budget Director, a Security and Exchange Commissioner, plus an atomic energy chief who would have stood for an Adolphe Wenzell's chicanery in the dire effort to put over the Dixon-Yates deal as a preliminary to the destruction of TVA, which has been worth so much to the South and the Nation in time of war and of peace.

We say these things advisedly. For we know what Adlai did do when he succeeded one of the most corrupt administrations in the history of his home State—that of Gov. Dwight H. Green, a Republican. Stevenson then set about cleaning the Augean stables of their filth. He stopped crookedness in State purchasing, took the State police out of politics, appointed an honest man as mine inspector, so as to stop a rash of fatal accidents, and so forth.

The first thing Stevenson did when he took office was to appoint able and honest men to all public offices, sometimes disregarding any party affiliation. He revolutionized the public-school system, took road building out of politics, and completely overhauled the States system of highways; he improved the care of patients in public hospitals, gave more aid to the cities and stopped the yearly increase in taxes.

In other words, Stevenson kept his campaign promises. And if anyone wants to know more about what he would have done had he been President the last 3 years, we refer him to the book of Adlai's 1952 campaign speeches, which became a best seller for nearly a year; his college and university lectures, his contributions to Fortune, the Atlantic, Look, Harper's, and other standard publications.

In fine, Stevenson is not only a successful lawyer, a trained executive in political life; a defeated candidate who has raised millions by way of paying his party's debts—he is highly literate, widely read and traveled and, indeed, qualified as few American Presidents have been for the high office of Chief Executive.

And when he speaks, you may know that the words he utters are his words and not those of some ghost writer or advertising agent.

Even now Mr. Stevenson enjoys the confidence of the chancelleries of the world, and we believe he would be able to keep the peace without a MCCARTHY at home, a Cohen and Schine abroad and a saber-rattling Secretary of State who has caused us national humiliation by his constant threats of massive retaliation, which have brought us to a state of "agonizing reappraisal" almost every month of the last 3 years.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of February 12, 1956]

STEVENSON LOOKS GOOD BY COMPARISON

(By Raymond Moley)

Adlai Stevenson may not get the nomination. I am inclined to believe that in one of more of the many primary contests Senator KEFAUVER may deal him a mortal blow without, however, bringing the nomination to himself. But as excesses of Author Truman and Aspirant KEFAUVER grow greater, the moderation of Stevenson becomes more and more soothing to the ear. If anything can bring the man from Illinois to the brink of statesmanship, it is the dismal prospect offered by the tactics of Truman-KEFAUVER.

"A man's moderation," said Irving Babbitt in his almost forgotten book, Democracy and Leadership, "is measured by his success in mediating between some sound general principle and the infinitely various and shifting circumstances of actual life." Of course, as Babbitt added, the man of moderation "must dispose of the question of truth or error before he can properly begin to moderate at all. Otherwise he will run the risk of resembling the English statesman of whom it was said that he never deviated from the straight and narrow path between right and wrong."

It is not clear what the philosophical home base is from which Stevenson judges the immediate problems that confront the Nation. Perhaps he would if put to it decide that his ideology differs very little from that of Eisenhower. Perhaps his home philosophical stance is identical with that of KEFAUVER, except that Stevenson is more honest in his criticisms of the opposition. In any event, he is a man of sensitivity and truthfulness who is unwilling to prostitute his position by making promises that no rational person could expect to fulfill.

Nothing of the sort can be said of the Truman-Kefauver line. The Tennessee Senator had the gall to stand before an informed audience in California and bring up the Trinity River project as an instance by which to condemn Secretary McKay as a faithless custodian of the Nation's resources. Eastern readers may be induced to subscribe to that conclusion only because they do not realize that the Trinity River project was passed by the last Congress and that the Democratic Congressman who was its immediate sponsor has no reproaches for the administration in the circumstances surrounding its passage.

More serious than this attack by innuendo was KEFAUVER's bald statement that the Eisenhower administration "has not made a single start on a water resource project since it came into power." The fact is that the Eisenhower administration has, in some cases I believe unwisely, presented to Congress a number of projects for authorization which the Truman administration had consistently sidetracked. If they failed, it was because of the opposition of Members of Congress, mostly of KEFAUVER's own party.

Meanwhile, in the East Mr. Truman indulged himself in an orgy of billingsgate. One charge, for which he was unable to produce a single scrap of evidence, was that somewhere, sometime Vice President NIXON had called him a traitor. When in Boston the former President was pressed for exact specifications he said merely that NIXON had said it "all over the West." When he returned to New York, he said in reply to the same question that "All I did was read the papers." Later, some unnamed spokesman for the unreliable man from Independence, apparently trying to perform a rescue operation, said that NIXON had said "traitor" in private conference, not in speeches, and that unnamed prominent people had reported it to Mr. Truman.

At any rate, Author Truman made plenty of headlines which should sell plenty of books when his opus is placed on the market next month. Perhaps it was the enterprising author, rather than the statesman talking.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 13, 1956]

MAN OF COURAGE

Adlai Stevenson has taken a stand on the school-segregation issue which is as courageous as it is correct.

In brief, he has served clear notice that he is not going to play politics with the race question for the sake of votes. And he has appealed to all candidates to do likewise, pointing out that there could be no greater disservice to the country than to exploit for political ends the tensions that have followed in the wake of the Supreme Court (school) decision.

Unfortunately, there is abundant evidence that some other candidates are not going to follow the Stevenson example. They will bid for Negro votes even though, in doing so, they may impair national unity and actualy set back the legitimate aspirations of the Negroes for full equality. As the campaign moves along, this is going to subject Mr. Stevenson to the heaviest sort of pressure. We hope that he will be able to hold the high ground that he has occupied, and that at least some of the other political hopefuls will lend a helping hand by refusing themselves to play the dangerous game of racial exploitation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 10, 1956]

STATE OF THE NATIONS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

SOCIAL-POLITICAL NOTES

WASHINGTON.—On the morning of Thursday, February 2, in New York City, the following succession of "social" events occurred:

Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States, shared breakfast with Averell Harriman, Governor of New York, at the Governor's New York City townhouse.

After breakfast Mr. Truman returned to his hotel, where he spent a half hour with Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Senator KEFAUVER took a taxi from the Truman hotel to Governor Harriman's house. He returned to his own hotel from this meeting in Governor Harriman's limousine.

Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, former friend and speech writer for Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, happened to be present at all three meetings.

The three principals at these meetings described them as "social," although they also said that political issues but no personalities were discussed.

Judge Rosenman stayed for lunch with Governor Harriman, and the two were joined by George Backer, a patronage adviser to Governor Harriman, and by Leslie Biffle, former secretary of the Senate, political adviser to Mr. Truman, Governor Harriman, and to many another Democrat, but particularly to Democrats of the Truman persuasion.

As any lawyer knows, an event which follows another does not necessarily happen because of the other (post hoc is not ergo propter hoc). It may well be that there was no cause-and-effect relationship between these events in New York City on February 2 and another sequence of events soon thereafter in California.

It is only an isolated fact, which may or may not be related to the level of gasoline consumption by some Democrats in New York on the first date with which we are concerned here that—

1. On Sunday, February 5, the Reverend L. Sylvester Odom, pastor of an Oakland, Calif., Negro church and president of the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, entered a private conference with Senator KEFAUVER wearing a Stevenson button, and emerged wearing a Kefauver button, and

2. On February 7 Mr. Stevenson addressed a Negro audience in Los Angeles with markedly unsuccessful results. He said firmly in answer to questions that if he were President of the United States he would not cut off Federal funds from segregated schools nor use Federal troops to enforce integration.

There is no public record that Senator KEFAUVER had said during his California sojourn that he would do such things, but it seemed plain to reporters that Mr. Stevenson's Negro audience of February 7 thought that Senator KEFAUVER would be willing to do things which Mr. Stevenson avowedly, and, I think, most properly, is not.

Did the New York meetings result in putting Mr. Stevenson on the spot on what we, in an election year, euphemistically call the civil rights issue?

Perhaps only a cynical reporter is capable of such suspicions.

However, Mr. Stevenson was on the spot, and he must have gulped hard and at least twice before he crossed his Rubicon and said flatly that he would not, if President, use Federal troops to enforce integration.

A Stevenson worker earlier in this campaign remarked wryly that there are many pitfalls ahead of Mr. Stevenson. This, it seems to me, was more than a pitfall. It came fairly close to being a Scylla and Charybdis situation, or at least a Rubicon.

It is one which will plague Mr. Stevenson again before the campaign is over, and the whole Democratic Party as well, for if the New York "social" events of February 2 did not intentionally arrange the Los Angeles ordeal for Mr. Stevenson, the Republicans of Washington will certainly arrange others like it.

The Powell amendment to the school-construction bill (providing for denial of Federal funds to nonintegrated schools) will obtain many Republican votes and very probably will be passed in the House, if not in the Senate, and may well wreck the school-construction bill in process. Republicans have little to lose and perhaps much to gain by putting the Democratic Party on the spot on this matter.

The puzzle is over what the Truman-Harriman-Kefauver coalition (if it exists) stands to gain by arranging pitfalls for Mr. Stevenson (if it did). One theory is that these three are only trying to nudge him gently leftward for the sake of the party's position in the big northern cities. The other is that they are using KEFAUVER to stop Stevenson in order to clear the way for Harriman. But Governor Harriman would not necessarily be the beneficiary of a Stevenson crash landing.

It is a known political fact that in Mr. Truman's opinion the Democratic Party can win elections only by being aggressive and by being boldly solicitous of the interests of groups of voters.

The Farmers' Own Farm Program—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent address by Mr. Howard A. Cowden, president and general manager of Consumers Cooperative Association, the headquarters of which is located in my district in Kansas City, was delivered before the 14th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., January 24, 1956:

THE FARMERS' OWN FARM PROGRAM

(Address by Howard A. Cowden, president and general manager, Consumers Cooperative Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., January 24, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, it is a high honor, I assure you, to have a place on your program. I have watched your organization from the very beginning and I salute it today as one of the great forces on the side of what is good and right in our great country.

Though I have not been active in rural electric work, I hope you consider that I am one of you. There is a strong bond of kinship between your organization and the farm supply cooperatives with which I am associated. Our goal is a higher living standard for the men and women who toil in the fields and feed lots of rural America. Our faith is in the ability of farm folk generally to attain for themselves, through cooperatives, many things that otherwise might be denied them.

Yes, we have common aims and basic principles. And because these aims and principles sometimes run contrary to certain powerful forces in our national economy, we have some enemies in common, too. We are both confronted by a dogged group that dislikes our mode of operation to the point they would destroy us if they could. And they never stop trying. That, I would emphasize, is more than a passing comment. Before I finish I hope to impress upon you the importance of unity among the various groups and organizations that speak and work for farmers. If we cannot attain a greater degree of unity than we have had in

the past, we stand to lose ground in the years immediately ahead. May I speak therefore as one who knows many of your problems and headaches as well as one who shares all your hopes and aspirations?

While I come from the opposite side of the State, I want to join with the others who have welcomed you to St. Louis and Missouri. Ours is known as a border State, whose people were sharply divided a hundred years ago over the question of slavery. Out of those bitter experiences came many traditions and attitudes that survive to this day.

Some of the laudable traits and characteristics of Missourians, I think, will be found in the men of this State who have led the rural electrification movement down through the years. Like their grandfathers before them, who had to choose between the northern or southern armies that swept back and forth across the State, Missouri farmers have had little chance to be neutral in the conflict between the REA co-ops and the forces that would like to throttle them. Most Missouri farmers, I am proud to say, took their stand with the co-ops, but the battles they have had to fight have been bitter nevertheless. They have been pressed from the east by the powerful private utility centered here in St. Louis, from the west by another powerful company in Kansas City, and from the south by these and other companies that have teamed up to keep the co-ops from getting full benefit of Federal power projects. I think you know what I am talking about when I tell you that Missouri has had to have some real fighters among its leaders to accomplish what it has in rural electrification.

I am proud to know some of these fighting leaders of the rural electrification movement in Missouri.

I am proud, too, to have had a long acquaintance with Clyde Ellis, whose brilliance and courage are an asset that I hope your national organization fully appreciates. You are fortunate indeed to have him as your representative in Washington. He has already earned his place in rural electrification's hall of fame.

No listing of individuals associated with the development of rural electrification down through the years would be complete without mention of the late George Norris. He represented the neighboring State of Nebraska in the United States Senate, but on great issues he spoke for all mankind, as he most surely did in his campaign to bring electric light and power to the Nation's farms. I consider it one of the great experiences of my life to have known George Norris, and I trust that the memory of him and what he stood for helps light the way for all of you who are today's leaders in rural electrification.

I have been asked to direct my remarks to the management of cooperatives. I approach the subject with full awareness that some of the management problems in your organization are strictly technical and clearly beyond the scope of my experience and understanding. I shall confine my remarks therefore to those aspects of management we have in common.

In a cooperative the lines of management extend to two major groups—the employees and the members. The extreme importance of those lines that reach out to the members is one of the great distinctions between cooperative management and private-business management. I shall devote most of my discussion today to management's relations with the membership. I emphasize in passing, however, that employee relations are important, as they are in any business. Don't neglect them and don't hesitate to apply progressive policies in employee relations.

There is an old story about a factory foreman who had been a sergeant in the Marine Corps. His supervisor called him in one day and pleaded with him to lead his people rather than drive them. The foreman listened attentively. At the end of the 30-minute lecture he jumped to his feet and shouted, "If you want me to lead them, boss, that's what I'll do—and I'll lick the first one that doesn't follow me."

Well, we do not want to adopt the sergeant's tactics, but we must learn to lead. We must learn to inspire men to do a full day's work. And I happen to believe that a manager who really knows and believes in cooperatives can get more out of his employees than a manager who is indifferent toward the things cooperatives stand for.

Your electric cooperatives, like the farm-supply cooperatives that I represent, have a common heritage. Both are the outgrowth of long-felt needs. But the present memberships of both, I know too well, are inclined to forget the reasons for their existence. It is important in cooperatives, therefore, that we constantly remind the membership of the conditions that brought our co-ops into being. We must be constantly mindful of our past.

Now don't misunderstand me. I'm not one of those who longs for the good old days. In most respects the old days were not good days at all, when we get down to realistic comparisons.

Let me tell you about an experience of some years ago. I made a trip down into the Missouri Ozarks to spend a night with my brother, who still lives on the farm where eight of us boys were born and reared. That old farm brings a rush of fond memories every time I visit it.

On the night I have in mind I went with my brother to the barn. It was the same kind of barn I knew as a boy, but how different it was at evening choretime in the middle of winter. In my days there, we did the chores by the light of a coal-oil lantern. The barn is electrically lighted now, and all my brother had to do was turn a switch and the whole place was flooded with light.

We used to milk cows by hand, but my brother milked them that night with an electric machine. And as the milker lines throbbed away, we sat and visited.

Naturally, I commented on the convenience of electricity—for this was my first visit since the place had been connected to the cooperative powerlines. The change was amazing.

But the change in the barn was even less amazing than the change that had been made in the house. The old wood cookstove my mother used was replaced by a shiny electric range. A big refrigerator filled one corner of the kitchen—and I couldn't help thinking of the thousands of times my mother had carried food to and from the old cellar that was the only spot on the premises where we could begin to keep the butter from melting on a hot day.

At one end of the old hall there was a bathroom—and I thought of the times we went to the creek or the horsetank for a Saturday night bath. And in all the rooms, from which my mother's best oil lamps could never quite drive the evening shadows, there were electric lights that brought the brightness of day.

I have thought many times about that visit to the old home. I have marveled at the transformation that electricity has brought to our American farms. And I have swelled with pride over the fact that farmers themselves—through their cooperatives—made the great transformation possible. Farmers did it when nobody else would assume responsibility for building powerlines into rural America. Farmers did it in the face of direct opposition from the private power companies and gloomy warnings that they couldn't possibly pay off the loans made possible by a friendly Federal Government.

Your electric cooperatives have a success story that is almost without parallel in the annals of American agriculture. Your organizations are the outgrowth of what is probably the greatest attack ever undertaken against a nationwide social problem. You changed the whole way of life on millions of farms and did it in a matter of a few years.

But in the very ease with which you have come through this first phase of your history are the seeds from which monstrous troubles could easily sprout in the next few years.

As I go about the country I detect among some of my farmer friends some disturbing conditions:

First, there is a tendency to take their electric co-ops for granted—an attitude of outright smugness in some cases.

Second, there is an amazing degree of complete unfamiliarity with what constitutes a cooperative organization and a lack of interest on the part of farmers in what goes on within the cooperatives.

Third, there is alarming evidence that some farmers would give up their cooperatives in favor of service from privtae companies and think little about it.

These conditions are the direct concern of management. They exist in many cases, I am certain, because of management's shortcomings.

I have heard some discouraging reports—or at least they are discouraging to me—about the actual conduct of some managers and directors of electric co-ops.

I am told that there are managers who try to operate independently of their boards and that there are boards that sit through lengthy discussions of policy without ever calling in their managers.

In one instance I was told of a cooperative that hadn't had a true annual meeting for several years—that its directors had managed to avoid a meeting of the membership and had in that way perpetuated themselves in office.

Wherever boards or managers conduct themselves in such manner there is bound to be indifference on the part of the membership, and I repeat what I have said over and over down through the years: Where the membership is indifferent, the co-op is in danger.

Wherever managers and boards fail to keep in close communication with their members, they bring about a gradual weakening of the foundations of their organizations. It is not enough for the farmer-patron of your co-op to have a dependable supply of power. It is not enough that he gets good routine service. If he is to be a good member and contribute his share to the good health of your organization, he must know what's going on inside the organization. He must know what makes it tick. He must be reminded regularly of his relationship as an owner as well as a patron. He must have a sense of participation in management. He cannot have that sense unless he is properly and fully informed about your operations your problems and your plans.

I cannot overemphasize when I discuss management of an electric co-op that I am not thinking solely of the general manager. The managerial responsibilities in any cooperative extend in part to the board of directors. And they extend beyond the boards to those segments of the membership that take active part in the formulation of general policy.

There is a tendency in your co-ops, as in some other kinds of co-ops, for the management to forget—or try to ignore—the distinct differences between a business that is cooperatively owned and one that is privately owned. Whenever the management of any cooperative takes the attitude that there are no distinctions between it and another business engaged in the same lines of production or service, it is planting dynamite in the foundation of its organization.

A cooperative must have a good balance sheet. It must be competitive as to price and service. It must have good employee rela-

tions and all the other things the management experts advise. But if it has all these and does not have good member relations, it is on precarious footings. And in the case of your rural electric co-ops, I fear the weaknesses show up sooner than in other farmer cooperatives.

The vigor of a cooperative must not be measured solely in dollars and cents or even in the size and splendor of physical assets. It can be measured accurately only in terms of the temper and activity of its members. Balance sheets and operating statements reflect bone and sinew, but they do not always reflect the strength of the heartbeat and the fervor of the soul. Because cooperatives are people working together in a common purpose, moods of the membership are all important. And good co-op management, I submit, must direct a lot of attention to developing the proper attitudes on the part of the members.

The Farmers Own Farm Program—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part II of an address by Mr. Howard A. Cowden, president and general manager, Consumers Cooperative Association, delivered before the 14th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., January 24, 1956:

What is the proper attitude on the part of members, and how can management bring it about?

In my opening remarks I referred to the common aims of all farmer cooperatives, which are to improve the living standards of farm people—to enable farmers to have some things they would not otherwise have.

There was a period following World War II when those aims seemed to lose significance. Farmers—along with the rest of our economy—were doing pretty well, and reference to anything like a "farm problem" seemed quite out of date.

Then came the 1950's and some gradual changes that farmers themselves were slow to recognize. Up until the middle of 1955, in fact, there was very little public recognition of what some of us were warning against as early as 1952—the cost-price squeeze on agriculture.

As recently as last September I encountered seemingly well informed people who refused to believe that farmers had fallen behind the rest of the economy. Let me tell you one particularly interesting observation.

Returning from Europe, where we attended some international cooperative meetings, Mrs. Cowden and I got acquainted with a family whose company on shipboard we enjoyed very much. The head of the family was an executive in a large oil company. He conversed brilliantly on many subjects, but one day he undertook to discuss the so-called farm problem. He couldn't understand why anyone should be concerned about farmers. And he tried to clinch his point with the remark that "most farmers even have running water and bath rooms." And he went on to complain that he thought he was helping pay for all this rural luxury with his high income taxes.

That story seems quite appropriate today. For one thing, I feel that I am in the presence of people who have had a large part in giving farmers something better than a washtub for their Saturday night baths. But more important on this occasion is the illustration of how easy it is for the nonfarming majority of this country to misunderstand the aims and needs of the people who produce our food and fiber.

Most of you, I am sure, have heard about the New York Times reporter who wrote that most Iowa farmers had a minimum of two new cars and that they were usually brand-new Buicks, Oldsmobiles, or Cadillacs—and how one of the farm papers checked up and found that the average Iowa farm car was 5 years old and that 3 out of every 4 were Fords, Chevrolets or Plymouths. (The Cadillacs turned out to be just four-tenths of 1 percent of all the cars found on all Iowa farms.)

I relate these incidents because I think one of the important responsibilities of cooperative management is to make sure that it is tuned to the realities, the interests, the needs and the peculiar problems of farmers.

In our farm supply cooperatives some of us handle more petroleum products than anything else. We operate refineries, oil leases and pipelines. But we must guard against the assumption that our primary interest is in the oil business.

We are in the oil business all right but we are in it as the representatives the hired hands if you please—of farmers. In like manner we are in the fertilizer business or the feed business—but our primary interest is on the farm and in the feed-lots of our farmer-members.

You managers here today are in the electric power business. But you are in that business not just to see how efficient an operation you can develop. You are in that business not to see how much money you can save or how big a load you can handle—you are in it to serve farmers. Your cooperatives are a means to an end. When you lose sight of that fact—or when your boards of directors lose sight of it, you lose that higher concept of management that is essential to long-run success in a cooperative operation.

For many weeks now we have heard and read a lot about the farm programs offered by one group or another as remedies for the aforementioned ills of agriculture. There is a wide range of opinion, and great disagreement, as to what should be done. I am not here to discuss any of these programs in detail. I am not here to pick flaws in any of the proposals that are likely to be written into new farm legislation in this year of great anxiety in Washington about the farm vote.

I do think, though, that we need a change of emphasis and, to a certain extent, a new approach to the farm problem.

If one analyzes all the proposals that are being publicized these days, one will find that they can be divided under two main approaches:

First, is what I call the political approach. It stems from the notion that all we have to do is set up the right kind of price supports, acreage regulations and the like—by Federal law—and farmers will be back on easy street.

I am not against the idea of Federal farm programs. The complexity of our modern society makes it necessary that the Government exercise certain controls in almost all areas of production. And agriculture is important enough to our national welfare that the Government certainly must be prepared to offer relief in times of crisis. Yet I hope we can follow a course that does not put agriculture completely at the mercy of politics.

Congress can change every 2 years. If we become completely reliant on Government programs, we run the risk of getting a new one every other year. And farmers can't stand to be buffeted about like that.

There is a second approach to the farm problem which in final analysis can be called the do-nothing approach. Its proponents would ignore completely the current distress of farmers. They say in effect that if a farmer isn't making a living, he should quit and move to town. They believe in survival of the fittest to the extent that they would sacrifice the family-type farm to a system of centrally managed corporate farms. This idea seems to appeal to many big-business leaders, especially those who boast of their "rugged individualism."

But it is a cold and heartless approach. It ignores the family farm as a social institution and a source of character and vitality in our people. It dismisses the fact that there are millions of men and women who have chosen farming as an occupation because they prefer to live in the country rather than the city.

Many people have left our farms already. More will be leaving in the next few years. Our agriculture has attained an efficiency that enables fewer persons to do the work. Much of this efficiency is a direct result of rural electrification, and I am thankful for it. Yet I believe we should seek by every possible means to keep as many as possible of our families on the soil and directly involved in the business of agricultural production.

And that brings me to a third approach to the current farm problem that is a vital concern of all who are engaged in the management of rural electric cooperatives and other farmer-owned businesses.

In our cooperatives we have a time-tested farm program, a program that has meant dollars and cents, service and convenience and a vast measure of independence to farmers. This program was started many years ago by farmers themselves with organization of our first cooperatives. It got a big boost in 1922 with the passage of the Capper-Volstead Act, which clearly defined the legal status of farmers' cooperatives and encouraged farmers to organize them. It was enlarged and broadened by subsequent legislation, including establishment of the Farm Credit Administration. Then in 1935 came the Rural Electrification Act and the subsequent mushrooming of your cooperatives which have, in the words of your general manager, "changed the face of rural America."

The contribution of cooperatives to the welfare of the Nation's farmers is one of the most underrated stories of our time. In fact, one gets the impression sometimes that there is a nationwide campaign of silence to keep the people from knowing what cooperatives have done and can do.

In the region where Consumers Cooperative Association operates we have made some studies of cooperatives on a county-by-county basis. We found several counties last year where the savings of the cooperatives amounted to 5 and 6 percent of the gross income of all the farmers in those counties. Savings of that kind mean much in this period of the cost-price squeeze.

In one county in Iowa last year the total savings of all the co-ops—including the electric co-op—was calculated at well over a million dollars. Those savings, in my opinion, took a lot of the cost-price squeeze off the farmers of that county.

If co-ops can make an annual saving of a million dollars in one county, can we not assume the possibility of developing our co-ops to the point they could account for a saving of one thousand times that—or a billion dollars? Just let someone in Washington mention any program that involves a billion-dollar estimate, and we see big headlines. But when we talk about cooperatives—which certainly have a billion-dollar potential in savings for farmers—we get very little recognition. There are too many people who don't want the word about co-ops

and what they do to become public knowledge.

The savings, or patronage refunds, paid by co-ops, are not the only measure of a co-op's influence. There is an unseen saving—we call it a community dividend—that comes to every farmer in a co-op neighborhood. This may be from the co-op's influence in holding down the prices of gasoline, or fertilizer—or electric power—or it may be from the influence on the prices farmers get for grain, butterfat and other products. In any event, co-ops have demonstrated that they help cut farm costs and help increase farm prices. (And, of course, they also bring comfort and convenience, when it is the electric co-ops we have in mind.)

When co-ops are doing all this, why don't we hear more about them? Why aren't they headlined along with soil banks, domestic parity, price supports and all the other devices that are put forth as remedies for the current farm situation?

I have a double answer to those questions:

In the first place, our cooperatives—all kinds of cooperatives—have been subjected to vicious propaganda campaigns, supported by the contributions of business interests that don't like cooperative competition.

In the second place, we who manage and direct cooperatives have been less than diligent in our efforts to sell cooperatives to our members and the general public. The effects of our enemies' propaganda have reached into the management of some co-ops, I am convinced, to the extent that managers and boards are lukewarm in their support of the basic principles of their business.

Somewhere, somehow, there have crept into the cooperative movement influences that tend to dull the desire of our leadership to grow and expand. Maybe the anti-co-op propagandists are responsible. In any event, I am distressed to hear of co-op boards and managers who refuse to join in fights to protect their sources of electric power.

We learned long ago in CCA that it pays to carry our operations all the way back to raw materials. We do it in petroleum, through the ownership of oil wells and refineries. We do it in fertilizer through the ownership of our own nitrogen plant at Lawrence, Kans. It is not just a coincidence, I assure you, that the price of nitrogen to farmers has gone down as much as $10 and $20 a ton since that plant went into operation.

It is good management to defend your cooperatives as cooperatives. It is good management to protect their independence by protecting the publicly owned generating plants that have served cooperatives so well. It is good management to work with other cooperatives through State and national organization for the good of all cooperatives—and all farmers.

A few weeks ago I read the Secretary of Agriculture's latest list of suggestions for helping farmers and observed that there was no mention of cooperatives so I wrote the Secretary a letter. Let me quote one paragraph from that letter.

"Cooperatives are the farmers' own farm program. We ask you to give the full blessing of your office to cooperatives as the most effective weapon available for coping with the cost-price squeeze. Speak boldly on the subject. Too many men in high position have been inclined to speak timidly in the past, fearing they might offend the business interests that look upon farmers' cooperatives as deadly competitors. Speak boldly and thus give courage to millions of farmers, some of whom have been half-hearted in their support of cooperatives."

I quote from that letter because I believe that it sums up one of the great needs of our organizations. We need to speak boldly in support of what we have done and what we can do. We must encourage our members and our friends to speak up for what we are doing.

Recently I sat in a meeting of representatives of just about every kind of cooperative we have here in the midwest. The discussion centered on the need for an intensive campaign to show the public what cooperatives have done for farmers and what they can do to ease the cost-price squeeze. Every person in that meeting spoke of the need for more cooperation among cooperatives, more pooling of our resources to bring about a better understanding of what co-ops mean to American agriculture. I hope the spirit of that meeting can spread from coast to coast.

We are in this fight together, as farmers and spokesmen for farmers, as cooperative managers and spokesmen for cooperatives. The most important management problem you have today is the problem of holding your members firm in the conviction that rural electric cooperatives are right and good. It is your first line of defense against the kind of campaigns that recently killed off one of your cooperatives in the State of Washington.

I invite you—I urge you in fact—to recognize your common cause with all farmer cooperatives. Together we have a farm program that has proved itself and one that will win greater public acceptance in direct proportion to our ability to explain it.

We must talk not just in terms of our own particular cooperatives, but in terms of all cooperatives, their savings and their services. We must do this if we want the general public to understand our organizations.

As the Nation's population shifts more and more to the cities we farmers are losing some of our numerical strength. We must offset this with a greater unity. "Divide and Conquer" is the watchword of those who would destroy every farmer cooperative if they could.

Let me close, therefore, with a verse from Kipling:

"Now this is the law of the jungle
As old and as true as the sky,
And the wolf that shall keep it may prosper,
But the wolf that shall break it must die.

"As the creeper that girdles the tree trunk,
So the law runneth forward and back—
For the strength of the pack is the wolf
And the strength of the wolf is the pack."

The Fabulous Case of United States Against Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the subject of the fabulous case of United States against Hughes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

The fabulous case of *United States* v. *Hughes*, concluded last week in New York, indicates the unconscionable lengths to which powerful liberals in this country have gone, and will still go, in order to discredit and defame those who are attempting to expose the Communist conspiracy.

The United States prosecuting attorney, in his opening statement at the Hughes trial, described the case as "one of the most fantastic schemes * * * in all the annals of political intrigue." This was, if anything, an understatement.

Paul Hughes came to my office late in 1953 seeking a job. I never saw the man; but members of my staff interviewed him and turned down his application. He then went to a number of prominent liberals, posing as a McCarthy investigator. The liberals paid him handsomely for a mountain of scandalous and defamatory information about me and the committee—information that is now admitted to be completely false. (An example of the sort of information Hughes peddled: The McCarthy committee maintained an arsenal of submachine guns and lugers in a secret cache in the Senate Office Building.) All in all, the anti-anti-Communists paid their secret spy $10,800 for such information in an effort that they now admit was designed to eliminate McCarthy.

The names of the men who were involved in this attempt to defame a committee of the United States Senate and its chairman read like a Who's Who of my leading political opponents over the past 6 years: Joseph L. Rauh, chairman of the ADA; Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the Democrat National Committee and editor of the Democratic Digest; Telford Taylor, chairman of the National Committee for an Effective Congress (which masterminded the censure movement); James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post; Philip Graham, James Wiggins, Alfred Friendly, publisher, editor, and managing editor, respectively, of the Washington Post; and Paul Porter, partner of the law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, attorneys for Owen Lattimore.

The main issue in the Hughes' trial was whether Rauh and his cohorts knew that the information they paid for was false—or whether, through their unreasoning hatred of McCARTHY and congressional investigating committees, they had been duped into believing that Hughes' manifestly ridiculous reports were authentic. The verdict, which resulted in the freeing of Hughes, indicates that an impartial jury believed the liberals were in the plot as deeply as Hughes. Hughes was indicted for perjury on six counts. Four of them charged that he had lied when he told a grand jury that several of these liberals were involved in an attempt to get Harvey Matusow to repudiate his testimony against Communists. The other two counts charged that Hughes lied when he testified that Rauh knew that fictitious documents furnished by Hughes were indeed fictitious, and that Rauh knew that the name "Bill Decker," which was affixed to the documents as an attesting witness, was a fictitious name, and was in reality an alias for Paul Hughes.

On 2 of the 4 counts involving Matusow, the jury voted unanimously to acquit Hughes; on the other two it split. On the remaining two counts, involving Rauh, chairman of the ADA, the jury voted 11–1 that Hughes had not lied when he said Rauh was aware that the documents were fraudulent.

Even if the liberals are to be believed when they claim they were innocent dupes (which the jury verdict makes difficult), they stand convicted of hypocrisy and duplicity of the worst sort. For years they have attempted to frighten the American people with concocted stories about paid secret informers; then, on their own showing, they turn around and hire one of their own. For years they have railed against smearing people on the basis of unsubstantiated evidence; yet on their own showing, Rauh and Fritchey paid $10,800 for smear material to an imposter whose credentials they never bothered to verify. For years they have piously pleaded for fair play in politics; yet

on their own showing they paid thousands of dollars for such items of advice from Hughes as that "McCarthy will not be defeated by extensive use of fair play (or) squeamishness," and that a Senate committee and its chairman can be discredited only "by relaxing somewhat on ethics."

I am convinced that the full truth behind this ugly attempt to discredit a Senate committee has not yet been revealed—that probably many prominent people are involved beyond those already named. I believe, therefore, that a congressional committee ought to be instructed to investigate the entire matter. I wonder if you agree with me. Since I want you to have all the facts, I regret that space does not permit more than a brief explanation of the case in this letter. A detailed and revealing account of the case can be found in the February 8 and February 15 issues of National Review magazine, 211 East 37th Street, New York City.

A Bill To Restrict and Limit the Use of Government-Held Real Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1956, I introduced H. R. 9131 which would restrict and limit the use of Government-held real estate.

This bill is simply a matter of good housekeeping. It was introduced for the purpose of preventing the Government from using its land in any way that would contribute further to the huge supplies of agricultural commodities that are creating distress in our farm markets. Passage of this bill would demonstrate the good faith of the Congress is recommending the soil-bank program. By retiring its own land, the Government would be taking the lead.

American farmers have been asked by this administration, and by the Agricultural Committee of the United States Senate, to stop producing a large number of their cash crops on nearly 40 million acres of land, under the premise that an oversupply of livestock and a mountainous surplus of certain supported commodities have caused the prevalent agricultural distress. The Government can make a substantial contribution toward the success of the soil-bank program and toward relieving the congestion in the farm market place by passing H. R. 9131.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest landholder and landlord. It owns more than 456 million of the Nation's 1.9 billion acre total. In other words, the Federal Government owns or controls approximately 25 percent of the total land area in the continental United States, and nearly 50 percent of the total farm land area in this country.

A substantial portion of this Government-held land is not being used for governmental purposes. Instead, much of it is now outleased for the production of crops—principally wheat and corn, which make up a large part of the $8 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities.

The Defense Department is one of the chief offenders. Beginning on January 4, 1956, and continuing for several days thereafter, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings into the land-use policies of the military departments. The testimony and records submitted reveal many interesting things, but it was especially impressive to me that the Defense Department, as only one agency of the Government, holds more than 24 million acres of land in the United States, as well as an additional several million acres in Hawaii and Alaska and the Trust Territories. By way of comparison, these holdings in the United States exceed in area the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, Delaware and Connecticut. Or, put another way, these land holdings are the equivalent of a strip of land 11 miles wide from New York to San Francisco.

This empire has been created ostensibly for natural security reasons, but it is astonishing that more than 10 percent of the military land is being used in competition with private farm operators. The following table shows the extent to which military land is being out-leased for agriculture and grazing. It also shows the annual income to the Federal Government from those sources:

Outleasing of Defense Department landholdings in United States, June 30, 1954

Branch	Acres held	Agriculture acres	Grazing acres	Total acres	Consideration
Army	8,253,298	366,299	538,816	905,116	$1,156,384.72
Navy	3,778,417	70,135	111,282	181,418	655,146.06
Air Force	12,141,024	15,923	495,847	511,770	169,622.30
Army civil works		742,390	188,173	930,563	1,311,287.94
Total		1,194,747	1,334,116	2,528,867	3,292,441.02

The Department of Defense holds land in each of the 48 States and the District of Columbia, from a mere 1,335 acres in Vermont to a tremendous 3,886,067 acres in Nevada. Its land-use policies are felt in every State, and it would be safe to assume that crops are being produced in great quantities on military land in nearly every State.

In my own State of Nebraska, the Defense Department owns or controls 107,168 acres of land for defense purposes. Only 20 acres were acquired through withdrawal from the public domain. The balance has been acquired by condemnation, purchase, grant, lease, or other means from choice privately owned farmlands in the heart of an outstanding agricultural region. Military installations now occupy some of the finest farm ground in the State of Nebraska, near Wahoo, Hastings, Grand Island, and Sidney, although military use extends to only a small portion of the areas. As a matter of fact, approximately 77,500 acres of this total are being used to produce crops, and more than 6,000 acres are being used to graze livestock. In other words, 72 percent of the military land in Nebraska is being farmed, and 6 percent is being grazed.

The investment of the United States Government in this land and the fixtures located thereon is appraised by the Department of Defense at $207,700,000. This, Mr. Speaker, equals 8 percent of the 1950 appraised valuation of all farmlands and buildings in my State.

The principal crops that are grown on this military empire are wheat and corn, and they are the 2 commodities that make up a great part of the Government's $8,666,309,000 investment in farm products. One leaseholder, with more than 3,000 acres of military land under his control, last year received a price support loan of $96,521 on 42,671 bushels of wheat. Other military leaseholders approached these figures, and I am sure that the records for other States will show that this situation is not extraordinary.

These lands are also being used to produce crops such as alfalfa, grasses, legumes, and nitrogenous plants that are not in critical oversupply, and I have no objection to a continuation of these practices. I do feel, however, that if the soil-bank program is adopted by the Congress and becomes a part of the law of the land, these practices should be made to conform to the prescribed soil-bank regulations.

The Federal Government cannot continue to talk out of both sides of its mouth. It cannot continue a "do as I say, not as I do" attitude. If it advocates a program that requires a more limited production of supported commodities, it should be the first to show the way.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 9131 will receive the careful consideration and strong support of every Member of Congress who is willing to help relieve distress in the vital farm sections of our economy.

Federal Aid to Distressed Economic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Thomas Kennedy, vice president, United Mine Workers of America, before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United

States Senate at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., February 10, 1956, in re Senate bill 2663, a bill to establish a Federal program of assistance in the areas of excessive unemployment:

I have very carefully read Senate bill 2663, introduced by Senator DOUGLAS and others, and also its companion bill, H. R. 7857, introduced in the House by Congressman FLOOD. Speaking of the Senate bill, it is my judgment that it has a great deal of merit but, in light of the situation existing in the anthracite coal fields, I doubt that it can reach far enough to alleviate conditions in that region. I am herewith listing some of the facts with relation to the unemployment situation in the anthracite and will follow with some suggestions with respect to remedies that might be applied to correct and stabilize the economic situation in these anthracite counties.

According to our records the number of idle members of our organization in the 3 anthracite districts is substantially as follows:

In district No. 1, Lackawanna County has 4,723 unemployed members and in the Wyoming Valley section of Luzerne County there are 9,479 unemployed members. Idle members under major coal companies in these sections are as follows: Glen Alden Coal Co., 3,174; Hudson Coal Co., 2,663; Lehigh Valley Coal Co., 1,483; Moffat Coal Co., 1,456; Pennsylvania Coal Co., 1,062; Pagnotti Coal Co., 849; Susquehanna Collieries, 687.

District No. 7, which is the Lehigh region, with members in lower Luzerne County, Carbon County, and part of Schuylkill County, has an idle membership of approximately 6,000 men. In district No. 9 comprising Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties with some members in Columbia and Dauphin Counties, we have an idle membership of approximately 7,000. In many of these sections unemployment-compensation payments have been exhausted and in many other sections payments of unemployment compensation will be soon terminated. For instance, in Schuylkill County there is a total unemployment of 13,450, of which 11,700 are males and 1,750 females. Of this number 3,654 individuals are receiving unemployment compensation, while 1,328 receive partial unemployment compensation. These figures would fairly represent the number receiving unemployment compensation in the other districts, or relatively about one-third of the total unemployed are receiving unemployment compensation. While it is true that some of the slack of unemployment has been taken up in the anthracite region through the acquisition of new industries, the fact still remains that anthracite coal is the basic industry and it will require a great deal of planning in the application of remedies before the economic situation can be stabilized in the anthracite counties.

While we are in favor of the provisions of Senate bill 2663 for the establishment of new industries and other public-work enterprises, we also believe that some attention should be paid to the situation as affecting the basic anthracite coal industry itself. This leads into the avenue of the possible creation of a national fuel policy. Likewise, the attention of the Government should be called to the possibilities of exporting coal to Europe and Asia, as well as to some of the unfair competitive factors involved in the dumping of residual oil on the eastern seaboard, principally from Venezuela; and the promiscuous use of gas as boiler fuel, which is also dumped at frequent times, regardless of price, in some sections of the consuming territory, principally to public utilities. I believe that this committee should and no doubt will give some consideration to these factors.

Representatives of the United Mine Workers of America, who probably have been more affected by the reckless importation of foreign fuels to this country than any other group of citizens, have appeared before countless congressional committees over the years in opposition to such ruthless tactics. However, up until now special interest groups have been catered to on a selfish basis rather than having a policy adopted whereby the country in general would be the beneficiary. As a further insight of this statement, I might refer to a letter released under date of January 18, 1956, by Mr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization when he sounded a note of warning that the unusually cold weather of this winter has increased the demand for fuel oils. In his announcement, Mr. Flemming emphasized he was acting on the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy by requesting oil-importing companies to indicate any additional imports of residual fuel oil beyond what was already specifically programed which they might deem necessary to meet current and prospective consumer demand from now until April 30. This alarmist attitude, in my estimation, is utterly ridiculous and probably the most one-sided statement ever issued from any Government office. The viewpoint is without foundation because the facts of the situation indicate that the available supply of coal in this country is of such sufficiency to meet the fuel requirements of the Nation that there need be no worry about the importation of residual oil at all. Emphatically speaking, it looks to me as though this statement was a sounding board for the oil companies which control tremendous wealth and power in the Nation. In a nutshell, the Flemming statement was little concerned about the coal industry or its problems.

When the reciprocal trade bill was up in the last session of Congress, the figures on residual oil showed that it displaced roughly 30 million tons of coal, most of which was bituminous. The figures for 1955 will show the displacement of about 36 million tons of coal; so, the dumping of residual oil has increased, rather than decreased.

All of these problems are looked upon with little interest at the moment by the administrators of the Federal Government, who seem to be more concerned about oil and gas than they are about coal; and yet, if we were to get into any national difficulties resulting in a program of national defense or war effort, the whole burden of heat and fuel for power would be thrown back upon the coal industry. This happened in World War II and the coal industry met the challenge by increased productivity to the extent that we were able to not only take care of our own needs, but to export approximately 50 million tons per year to our allies. Under present conditions I doubt that this performance could be repeated because of the shutting down of mines and the unemployment that results; and it would take months to rehabilitate shut-down mines. So I submit that the problem should not only be approached on the basis of alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment, but that the question of national defense with an adequate supply of coal in any emergency is likewise important.

The situation in the anthracite region with respect to unemployment has been worsened by the damage done by the recent Hurricane Diane. Several coal companies in the anthracite have suffered heavy damage as a result of the rainfall of 11½ inches within a short period of time. To illustrate one particular happening, the Hazleton Shaft Colliery of the Lehigh Valley Coal Co. employed approximately 800 men with approximately 1,000 affected in the overall picture. This mine was drowned out, the pumps were lost and the mine is now idle and has been since last September. This was the basic industry in the city of Hazelton with a payroll of over $3 million per year. The coal company claims it does not have the money to dewater this mine and have operations resumed. The work incident to resumption not only involves pumping out the water, but the rehabilitation of underground machinery amounting to close to $1 million.

We shopped around in Washington, without results, following the hurricane to find out if any branch of the Federal Government could do anything to put this mine back in operation. We also approached the State administration in Harrisburg, and the matter is still under consideration, but with the present tax budget problem of the State very little can be done until the legislature fixes the tax program and other fiscal matters.

Senate bill 2663 provides for loans for the acquisition of new industries; yet here we have an industry located in the anthracite region employing approximately 1,000 people and no means can be found to rehabilitate this industry and put these 1,000 men back to work. It seems to me that somewhere along the line there should be some agency of the Government to provide for the rehabilitation of this mine and others like it involving any other companies in the anthracite region that were similarly affected.

Unemployment compensation as affecting the Hazleton shaft employees will run out shortly; after that what is to be done with respect to taking care of all these people? Surely, it is a problem which demands the consideration not only of the Federal Government, but of the State government as well.

Senate bill 2663 provides for the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation for 13 weeks for unemployed persons who are taking vocational training under the bill. Here we have a situation in the anthracite where in the mining industry there are approximately 25,000 unemployed persons with ages ranging from 18 years up to 65 and sometimes more. Many of these unemployed persons would be unable to take up vocational training and only the younger persons, in my judgment, would be covered by this section of Senate bill 2663. Why should not the same principle be applied to all unemployed persons and arrangements made by the Federal Government and the State to pay supplemental unemployment compensation to all such persons during the total period of their unemployment or until they can qualify for Federal old-age security?

I recommend this thought for the consideration of the committee with the hope that in the final determination of the bill favorable consideration could be given to this suggestion. My further recommendation would be for an intensive research study for greater uses for anthracite, especially in the metallurgical field, and some consideration should be given to increasing our export trade in anthracite. I also recommend that the Government should give some consideration to this stricken industry in bringing about the resumption of operations at idle mines, and that a national fuel policy should be studied and agreed upon which would establish and set a fair competitive situation among the various fuels—liquid, gas, and solid.

The situation is serious enough to challenge the Government to evolve remedies that will bring about stability and relative comparable prosperity in the anthracite coalfields. We are lending hundreds of millions of dollars to European coal districts to rehabilitate their mines and even to provide housing in countries affected by the Schuman plan. Why not do a little of that at home where it is badly needed?

During the past few days in Washington, Réné Mayer, of France, President of the

High Authority of the European Community for Coal and Steel (the Schuman plan), has had many meetings with high United States Government officials. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is quoted in the press as favoring the Coal and Steel Authority and takes credit in substance for the loan of $100 million that was made by the Export-Import Bank to the Coal and Steel Authority which, of course, was underwritten by our own Government. This aid has been given to the countries under the Schuman plan to strengthen their economy and to sidetrack the inroads of communism. The fact remains, however, that communistic influence in the trade unions of France is as great today, if not greater than ever before. In fact, the French Government recognizes the leader of the miners Communist union in that country and selects him as their delegate to International Labor Organization meetings which I have personally attended.

In other words, people leaning to the Communist theories of dictatorship receive better treatment at our hands than real honest-to-God Americans, who believe in our form of government and the American way of life. People in countries affiliated with the Coal and Steel Authority can get a loan of $100 million for these two industries, while we here at home cannot get enough money to even begin to rehabilitate some of our own mines and relieve unemployment.

We are not in opposition to the retention of aid to these countries, but we still believe that our own needs and requirements ought to also be taken into consideration and be provided for, because this Nation must remain strong in order to protect the weaker countries in Europe and Asia.

Speaking for the anthracite mineworkers and their families, I express my thanks and theirs to the committee, whose chairman is Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and to this subcommittee, presided over by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, for coming into the region to get first-hand information, which shows their sincere interest in trying to do something for this fine cross-section of people making up our anthracite communities.

True Significance of the Paul H. Hughes Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hughes' Trial," published in the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y., on February 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HUGHES' TRIAL

The true significance of the Paul H. Hughes trial is that it has exposed with startling clarity the personal and intellectual dishonesty of those who have been in the forefront of the anti-anti-Communist drive. The men who have led the fight to impugn the Government's security system, to eliminate the use of former Communists as Government witnesses, to discredit the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to destroy Senator McCARTHY have been revealed in an unenviable light.

Mr. Hughes, posing as an investigator for Senator McCARTHY, was paid almost $11,000 by the Senator enemies for secret "information" on the Senator. The "information" supplied by Hughes was a fantastic mixture of foul lies and vicious distortions, but the more incredible his tale, the more eagerly did Senator McCARTHY's foes snap at the bait. Mr. Hughes even convinced them that the Senator maintained an arsenal in the basement of the Senate Office Building.

Thereafter Mr. Hughes testified before a grand jury that he had overheard conversations indicating that these enemies of the Senator had known that Harvey Matusow, a former Government witness in Communist trials, was in the process of recanting his testimony and had been supplying financial assistance to him. These accusations resulted in his indictment for perjury.

Arrayed against Mr. Hughes at his trial were the following Government witnesses: Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., cofounder of the Americans for Democratic Action and its present chairman; Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the Washington Post and an ADA member; James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, cofounder of the ADA and member of its national advisory committee, and Telford Taylor, member of the advisory committee of both the ADA and National Committee for an Effective Congress.

In summing up his defense, Mr. Hughes' attorney admitted that his client was a forger, unethical and "a louse" who was "engaged in filthy practices" for personal gain, but stated that the evidence adduced from the major Government witnesses "was deliberately false and an insult to your intelligence." "It is your duty," he asserted, "to repeat by your verdict your refusal to convict on perjured evidence gotten from men in high positions."

The jury chose not to accept the words of the above-named prominent self-styled defenders of civil liberties over the word of a "louse" and acquitted Mr. Hughes of two of the major charges against him.

It is no wonder the jury reached the conclusion it did, for the performance of these individuals on the witness stand was utterly disgraceful.

For example, Mr. Rauh swore that he had given but two hints to his good friend, Mr. Wechsler, that he was working with a man who was acting as an informant on Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Wechsler then corroborated Mr. Rauh's testimony, but when confronted by the assistant United States attorney, Thomas A. Bolan, with statements made by him earlier he admitted that Mr. Rauh had given him many details concerning the Hughes project.

Mr. Rauh reasoned on the stand that it was all right for him to have a spy on Senator McCARTHY but improper for the Senator to have a spy on the New York Post (as Hughes had falsely stated to Rauh to be the case).

On three occasions Alfred Friendly swore before the grand jury that he had destroyed all his memoranda relating to his meetings with Mr. Hughes. However, some 6 months later, and after the indictment against Mr. Hughes had been filed, he stated that he had not in fact destroyed the memoranda.

Mr. Friendly swore before the grand jury that he did not know whether a pending recantation of Matusow had been discussed during his meetings with Mr. Hughes, but during the trial (some 9 months later) he denied emphatically that this subject had ever been mentioned.

Mr. Friendly stated he was "embarrassed" when Mr. Hughes would bring in typewritten memos relating to legitimate activities of Senator McCARTHY, as he was not interested in such reports. However, on one occasion Mr. Hughes came in with an oral report, and Mr. Friendly manifested his "embarrassment" and "disinterest" by writing out in longhand 14 pages of notes recording Mr. Hughes' information.

Mr. Rauh testified that Mr. Friendly informed him that $1,000 was loaned to Mr. Hughes in his, Mr. Rauh's name, in order to repay Mr. Hughes for a loan he had made to a McCarthy investigator. Mr. Friendly, on the other hand, testified that the $1,000 was paid to Mr. Hughes to help him move his family out of town.

Mr. Rauh and Mr. Friendly swore that their only interest in dealing with Mr. Hughes was to obtain evidence of illegal activities on the part of Senator McCARTHY and that no political considerations were involved. Such contentions were manifestly absurd and must have appeared so to the jury, as the overwhelming bulk of the material furnished by Mr. Hughes in no way pertained to illegal conduct.

By having a paid spy on the Senator McCARTHY committee, Mr. Rauh and Mr. Friendly were doing exactly the sort of thing they have publicly accused Senator McCARTHY of doing and their obstinate refusal to admit this obviously had considerable effect on the jury.

Apart from the issues involving Matusow, Mr. Hughes also asserted that Mr. Rauh had instructed him to fabricate certain statements derogatory to Senator McCARTHY and members of the staff. Mr. Rauh denied that he knew the statements to be false. However, 11 of the 12 jurors disbelieved him and voted to acquit Mr. Hughes on this particular issue. Thus, after hearing all of the evidence, all but 1 juror could not conclude that Senator McCARTHY's arch-enemy, Mr. Rauh, did not knowingly pay for fictitious documents condemning him—a fine commentary on the caliber of men who have sought to silence Senator McCARTHY and, indeed, a finer commentary on the methods used by them in that endeavor.

"No one can guess where this process of informing will end," wrote Mr. Rauh in a 1950 article attacking the use of informants by the Government. The humorous irony of this statement is apparent. One can be sure that Mr. Rauh never dreamed that the "process of informing" would lead to the exposure of him and his friends as deceitful. Hypocrisy suffered a defeat.

If Senator McCARTHY had testified during the Army-McCarthy hearings or during his censure hearing as falsely and evasively as did the proponents of "liberalism" at the Hughes' trial, he would have been buried in an avalanche of scorn. If it were discovered that Senator McCARTHY had a paid spy in the employ of the ADA or on the Washington Post, the roar from an outraged "liberal" press would have been deafening. However, so far we have heard not even a peep from "liberal" sources in criticism of Messrs. Rauh, Friendly, et al. But, of course, that is not surprising, for the "liberal" press has always been ruthlessly one-sided in matters McCARTHY.

It is a great pity that all issues involving Senator McCARTHY and his enemies cannot be resolved as was the Highes' case, with all parties involved under oath and with a jury of 12 impartial Americans to determine who is telling the truth. Instead, the pious mutterings of leftwingers of the like of Mr. Rauh will continue to be treated as gospel in the "responsible" press and anything done by Senator McCARTHY to expose the Communist conspiracy will be regarded as the machinations of an evil man. However, the Hughes' case, with its amazing revelations, should cause all thinking Americans to pause and reflect. Messrs. Rauh, Friendly, and Wechsler have been responsible for a gret deal of anti-anti-Communist and anti-McCarthy propaganda. In the light of their exhibition at the Hughes' trial, one may well wonder what value to put on any of their previous utterances.

Lincoln Day Address by Governor Smylie, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee at San Francisco on February 9, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GOV. ROBERT E. SMYLIE, OF IDAHO, AT THE ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., FEBRUARY 9, 1956

Words will not tell you how thrilled Mrs. Smylie and I are that you invited us to dine with you tonight. Like millions of other Americans, this lovely city by the bay holds a special place in our lives. It was here that we tarried a while in 1945 before I flew from Oakland to Tacloban in Leyte Gulf. True, the days of that visit were few; but the mind invests them now with a splendor born of the always fleeting sweetness of those troubled war-torn years.

And so we come happily back to San Francisco. The bustle of your commercial life intrigues us. Your devotion to the arts, to entertainment and good living, coupled with happy memories of a decade ago, make your city a capital of our hearts. And with tonight we can write another chapter in our lives entitled "San Francisco."

Speaking personally, I must tell you that I am flattered and honored to be asked to speak in San Francisco and in California. The strength and muscle of California's republicanism is a national legend. That time after time you win elections against great odds is a testimonial to the brilliance and depth of your leadership. It is important to California, to the West, and to the Nation that your record of achievement continues. It is only a question of time now until California is our greatest State. Then the balance of national power will swing westward even more rapidly. Then, as now, California will have many leaders to give to the Nation.

In Idaho, our admiration for your great leaders is total. We know them all. We admire their courage, their skill, and their devotion to the cause of liberty and individual human dignity.

California's brilliant 31st Governor, Goodwin Knight, is adding a splendid chapter to the history of California's service to the Nation.

Your two Senators, WILLIAM KNOWLAND and THOMAS KUCHEL, are towers of strength for the Republican Party.

Our great Vice President, RICHARD NIXON, has brought talent and distinction to his office that it has lacked for many years.

Congressmen like BILL MAILLIARD, who represents you, and LEROY JOHNSON, in whose district I visit tomorrow, have helped make the story of California republicanism an envied legend in the land.

And California gave America a man to whose name no words that I can utter would add luster—our great Chief Justice, Earl Warren.

A decade ago we lived in Washington, D. C., on the far side of the continent. In those war years, you'll remember, travel was anything but easy. We tried to fly. We did for a part of the way. But I had to leave Lucille in Denver to try and get here by train, while I flew on ahead. For me that first trip all the way was a sort of review of all the history and geography I ever knew.

You move swiftly away from the seaboard as you head west by air. Below you are all the hallowed shrines of the first years of our nationhood. Now they are scattered among great cities and the industrial plants of the East. You pass the Blue Ridge and move westward over the steel furnaces of Ohio and Pennsylvania. After a bit the land levels out, rumples up around the rivers, and the vast and fertile Corn Belt is below you. Then the ground really gets flat and the Great Plains mount toward the front range of the Rockies and in some places still you can see the ruts of the wagons that carried America west. Now the high upland plains are below you as you wing westward, rimmed by mountains majestic in the sun. Then quickly you drop over the Sierra and your great city by the bay glows like a chain of pearls along the neck of all the golden valleys of northern California.

You land, and in one short span of hours you have traveled the whole stage of our history as a nation, you have seen the productivity and mighty capacity of the fairest and strongest land the world has ever known.

This is our America—productive, strong, and free.

This is our America—great enough and big enough and courageous to rise to the challenge of stirring times.

This is our America; custodian of a world leadership that we did not seek but which came to us out of the superb heroism of our people and from their devotion to duty both public and private.

This is our America; where the dynamic ferment of a people's greatness has been their acceptance as a basic item of faith of the proposition that man's genius for betterment cannot grow and flow and produce except in the free, clear air of political and economic freedom.

It will be good for our Republican Party—and good for America—to have our convention meet this year in your great city. This convention will be the 26th. One hundred years will have passed since the first convention nominated General Fremont as our candidate against Buchanan.

And this journey of our party is symbolic. Fremont, who helped your great Stockton win the Bear Flag War, was nominated in Philadelphia, a continent away from San Francisco.

That Republicans gather a century later in the great State that Fremont helped make a part of the United States is symbolic of our devotion to liberty and individual human dignity that have made America great.

It will help us all remember our great beginnings. It will keep us true to our first principles.

We gather here this evening with no one's permission. That is our American freedom of peaceful assembly.

No one has even vaguely suggested what I should say here, and this is our American freedom to speak and think as we will.

And certainly long years ago, or so it seems to me that it was long ago, no one told a schoolmaster's son in Iowa that he might or might not aspire to high places in this free land of ours. And yet in a few short years I can come before you as the Governor of one of our great States.

And this, of course, is proof positive that the incentive system is still a ferment in our America and illustrates more clearly than any shining word could do that most precious of American freedoms—the right to aspire to be something more than you are.

Of course there is a reason for all this. The philosophy of freedom that has welded us together as partisans of dynamic middle-ground conservatism is easy to trace. It found its first place on the world stage in the mind and heart of our party's first President. There is an obscure quotation from Mr. Lincoln's papers that seems to be to be most appropriate to this time and place.

In 1864, just as they departed to join the Army of Northern Virginia then commencing its campaign through The Wilderness, Lincoln said to the 184th Ohio Infantry on the lawn of the President's house in Washington:

"I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here, as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance * * * that the struggle upon which we are engaged should be maintained."

Drawn from the deep springs of Lincoln's humility and his communion with the spirit of our Nation's greatness, that statement is a beacon that any one of us can follow. It speaks the ancient command that we must so honor our freedom that no act of ours shall ever leave that heritage less secure than it was when we received it from our fathers. And that spirit guides us now.

In the hustle of day-to-day life we sometimes miss those kernels of thought and expression that history will later mark with greatness. Let me take the liberty of inviting your attention to a modern statement of American sentiment that I think history may rank alongside the magic words of the great Lincoln.

This was the President of the United States to the 84th Congress. This was his message on the state of the Nation:

"The obligations upon us are clear:

"To labor earnestly, patiently, prayerfully for peace, freedom, for justice, throughout the world.

"To keep our economy vigorous and free, that our people may lead fuller, happier lives.

"To advance, not merely by our words but by our acts, the determination of our Government that every citizen shall have opportunity to develop to his fullest capacity."

In what more sparkling dress, in what more faithful words could the hopes and aspirations and the dreams of the people of this Free Republic be expressed? The yearning for domestic tranquility, for the freedom to aspire, for a just and lasting peace—all of them are there in that simple paragraph.

Perhaps unknowingly—but I think otherwise—the great human heart and mind of the President identified him with the dynamic ferment, the driving principle of this Nation's greatness. For his paragraph speaks our acceptance as a Nation of the credo that man's genius and strength will not produce except in the clear, free, tranquil air of freedom.

This world in the mid-twentieth century is not just as you and I would like it. That is well—if all were right there would be an end to aspiration. I am glad that I was born in this age and that as Governor of my great State, I am permitted to join my efforts with those of our great President to continue the peaceful prosperity we now enjoy. I will not attempt to turn the clock back because the good of yesterday will not always fit the problems of today. I will put forth the best efforts of my life to assist anyone who desires to go forward toward continuing peace and contentment for free people everywhere.

We Republicans know that government is a human problem and we will do all we can to promote the happiness and contentment of our people. We realize that in order for man to be happy he must have something

to believe in, someone to love, and something to possess.

And we know that there is stretch and muscle left in this dynamic America. We are not in a boom period. The current upsurge in our economy is backed by the strength of necessity. The personal income and purchasing power of our people is well ahead of any period in our history. More people are at work and more goods are being produced than ever before in the history of the world.

As this new era of peaceful prosperity continues, the fear of socialistic schemes and of resurgent communism itself will grow ever more remote.

This might be a good time for you and I, as partisans of President Eisenhower's program of dynamic conservatism to really take stock—to use the phrase of that happy warrior in the brown derby, who might well be one of us now if he were still among us, "Let's take a look at the record."

Do you remember that wicked and divisive phrase that the Democrat high command tried to make into campaign slogan. They spent millions to say, "Don't let them take it away."

Take what away? —Look at America in 1956. Measure the might of our production. Use the yardstick on our prosperity and then turn the slogan around. We Republicans know how to keep America free and prosperous and peaceful too. And the people like it—they'll remember how it was—and they won't let anybody take this away.

Do you remember that in 1952 the guns were blazing in Korea as you voted? Those guns are silent now.

Do you remember that in 1952 the dollar that filled the workingman's envelope was getting slimmer with each paycheck? For 3 years now the purchasing power of that dollar has remained nearly constant, and the wage increases have been wage increases—not just figures on a check that bought less and less—for more and more.

Do you remember that in 1952 Government spending hit an all-time high, and tax relief seemed all but impossible? Now that budget is in balance and the largest single tax reduction in the history of America has helped every individual in the land enjoy more of the fruits of this more productive America.

Do you remember that in 1952 we were all apprehensive that our greatest concern might well be to defend America from traitors already within the door? Now the people's confidence in their Government is restored and the worry about Communist infiltration in high places is ended.

And remembering all of that—do you suppose that any slogan will confuse the people? I think not.

The American people know which kind of government makes America best for Americans and they'll vote for it again.

And no amount of whistlestop bombast will confuse them. Neither will clever quips amuse them. In these last 3 years Americans have witnessed the benefits of constructive, conservative government. They have found it good—and good for them.

As good Republicans, remember that these 3 years were Republican years, and let that be an answer to the prophets of gloom and doom who would have you believe that we must turn the clock back to all the tired old panaceas and that there is no future for our American incentive system.

These have been a brilliant 3 years, studded with the accomplishments of a free people, born to persevere and prosper. They have been the accomplishments of men and women true to the heritage of liberty and enterprise bequeathed to us by the great Lincoln. And the future that lies ahead will be just as bright, and brighter. We face great challenges, but the history of this country is the story of difficulties met and mastered. We have the vision, the courage, the ideals and the spirit with which to face these bright tomorrows and to make them our years of historic growth and development.

But let the President himself sum up this record. Hear now his summation of these last 3 Republican years in his address to the Nation last January 20 as we saluted the 3d anniversary of his inauguration:

"At home we enjoy prosperity; not the false prosperity of a dizzy inflation or of economic activity based mainly on arms spending; not the tragic prosperity of a few who can squander and of millions who must pinch; rather the genuine and widely shared prosperity of an immense productivity for peacetime satisfaction of human needs.

"This record is the product of an industrious citizenry, supported in the Federal Government by a program designed for progress and dedicated to integrity, to concern for every individual, to faith in America and its principles."

The people approve that record. I hope he will let us celebrate his inauguration five more times.

But I trespass overlong in a discussion of those thinsg that lie closest to my heart these days—the tremendous contribution that President Eisenhower's concept of dynamic conservatism has made to a free, vigorous and productive America.

We are met tonight to honor the memory of the first President which our Republican Party installed in the White House. It is true that Abraham Lincoln belongs to the ages—to the history of a free world whose brilliant concept of liberty is encrusted with Lincolnesque devotion to the Christian dignity of the individual human being. But history will understand in this hour of commemoration in the anniversary year of our party's first national convention, if we remember with glad hearts that peculiarly and historically, the great Lincoln belongs to us—to the Republican Party. He spoke our first principles and he first set our party's feet firmly on the path that led to service to our Nation. And in this hour of dedication and commemoration, it is fitting that we look to the greatness of his spirit for guidance and for inspiration.

In the Book of Ecclesiastes there is a somber passage about the "time of little hope," which is described as the day when the clouds return after the rain. In some ways it fits this time of stress all too well. The immediate, deadly danger from the storm is over. Yet the clouds return and instead of the sunshine of enduring peace we live under the gray overcast of stern, implacable tension.

It was in just such a period that Abraham Lincoln came to the White House almost 100 years ago. The storm had not burst, but the clouds hung low and were growing thicker and blacker. The hearts of brave men failed when they tried to look into the future; and cowards were already whimpering and whining on street corners, in partisan rostrums and in the editorial columns.

Yet had the Nation but known it, on March 4, 1861, the Nation was already saved, for the man had arrived. It took a long time for people to realize it, long years of blood and fire and anguish; and longer years for the dust of battle and the clouds of passion to drift away. But when we could see clearly again, the truth was plain—from the moment that Lincoln took the oath of office as President, the Union was saved.

I draw the parallel no further. I dare not. Men of Lincoln's stature are God's gifts to a nation, bestowed when and as His wisdom, not our wishes, may determine. He may not grant us another or, perchance, He may have already sent us one whom we have not yet recognized.

But this we do know—in times when the road ahead is shouded in mist, it is the spirit of Lincoln that this Nation needs above all else, and it is the gift of that spirit for which it should pray.

Carl Sandburg has published as a book the preface that he wrote for his great life of Lincoln but later for some reason discarded. In it he has a description of Lincoln that may strike you at first as merely curious, but which, when you study it, will find to be great. Sandburg said, "He was not only a genius in the science of neighborly human relationships and an artist in the personal handling of life from day to day, but a strange friend and a friendly stranger to all he met."

Translate that into national terms and see what a lordly thing you get. Imagine, not a man, but a nation infused with the spirit of that man—a genius in the science of neighborly human relationships. How soon the worst of its problems dissolve and vanish. Imagine the Government of the United States as an artist in the personal handling of life from day to day—how magically our public life would be transformed, how quickly the screaming and vituperation would die away, how rapidly we would suppress the merchants of hate, how we would scorn the sowers of suspicion and prejudice. Imagine us as strange friends and friendly strangers—the Samaritan among the nations, never identified with any, never inseparably bound to any, always a stranger but always a friend.

Somewhere in that picture I believe you will find every good thing that the United States has done in this blasted and twisted century—the bloodiest in human annals; in which good deeds, God help us, are few and far between. A great deal more is in the picture—it includes every good deed we might have done, but didn't. Take such splendid moments as we have had, such fragments of nobility as we have managed to achieve and fit them together, discarding the weaknesses and villainies, and you have a portrayal of the grandeur of Lincoln's spirit.

Then add the lost opportunities—the times when we didn't quite understand, or didn't quite dare, or weren't quite generous enough to do the great thing we really wished to do—and you will have the sorrow that brooded over his spirit.

In 1861 it was Lincoln's wish to purchase the slaves and set them free at the expense of the whole country, not at the expense of the Southern States alone. But he was not permitted to do it. Passions ran too high. Misunderstanding was too thick on both sides for calm reason to obtain a hearing. So, while the evil was eventually eliminated, it was at the cost of fearful agony and loss.

In 1956 we are facing the same old evil. It has a new name, but that doesn't matter. They call it communism now, but it is slavery. It must be and it will be eliminated; but I believe, as Lincoln believed, that there are better ways of eliminating it than by fire and sword. The best and wisest among us know that there are better ways than by hammering out a solution on the terrible anvils of atomic war.

So while I dare not claim that there is a Lincoln among us, I have faith to believe that some men among our leaders are imbued with the spirit of Lincoln to the extent that they will not accept war as the solution of our problem until the last honorable alternative has been exhausted.

You will find such men in both parties, but conspicuous among them is the President of the United States. Under intense provocation at home and abroad, he has yet to utter one inflammatory speech or commit one rash or blundering act. With firmness in the right as God gives him to see the right, he is yet convinced that hatred and suspicion, to say nothing of the wild passions of war, are poor instrumentalities to advance the fight. He knows that there is a better way and, like Lincoln, he seeks desperately to find it, and then persuade his countrymen to follow it.

It is no partisan appeal to call upon all men of all parties to sustain him in this endeavor. Disagree with him on everything else, if you please, but follow him in his effort to make reason the rule and charity toward all, the spirit of our foreign relations; for this is the spirit in which Lincoln acted, and, so acting, rose above all parties, all sections, all economic interests. In that spirit there is neither Democrat nor Republican, no North, no South, no East, no West, only Americanism.

It was in so acting that Lincoln acquired the piercing vision before which the mists of passion, the dust and smoke of battle that blinded other men, became the thinnest of transparent veils through which he could see that Nation that was to be—indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

In the century since the Lord took Lincoln from among us we have learned to know that his real genius was his onenees with his people. Sprung from the most humble among us, born to suffering and privation, touched with an inspiration that had its source in divinity and took its strength from our whole concept of individual freedom and dignity, Lincoln lives in history as the really great example of the brilliance of the American way. He had the enduring patience to live with a problem until it could, and would be solved; and he knew that no issue, no question, would long be mistakenly decided if it were submitted to the patient wisdom and the ultimate justice of the people themselves.

It is fitting then that we should come here to do honor to this greatest of all great Americans and that the brooding and somber spirit of the Emancipator can look down upon us to see if we remember his sacrifice and if the love of liberty and human freedom still burns in our hearts.

Look down, Lincoln, look down upon us. This is more than an anniversary—it is a rendezvous with your spirit—an occasion for reporting that for another year we have kept the faith.

May God preserve the memory of this great and gallant American.

May God preserve the land and the principles for which he lived and died.

May God bless our Nation, and give to each of us the strength to answer whenever duty calls, and to say by deeds, as well as words, "Lincoln, we are here, and we remember."

Address by Archbishop O'Boyle Before the American Committee on Italian Migration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on December 5 of last year His Eminence, Archbishop O'Boyle, of Washington, delivered an address before the American Committee on Italian Migration. It was a spiritual address, dealing with the subject of immigration, among other things. In the course of the speech, Archbishop O'Boyle took occasion to criticise the national origins quota system. I ask unanimous consent that his fine address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP O'BOYLE BEFORE THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ITALIAN MIGRATION, DECEMBER 5, 1955

It is rather fitting that a priest like myself, the son of Irish immigrants, should have the honor of addressing the sons and daughters of other immigrants, and particularly those of Italian extraction, since the experience of the Irish and the Italian immigrant in this great land of ours has been so similar. If we were given to boasting, we might say, though our trials and tribulations have been many, we both have done our share to make America great. For many other reasons, I naturally feel very much at home here.

In the first place, as you all know, I have the honor to be the spiritual son of the esteemed and distinguished Archbishop of New York, His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, who year after year has shown his interest in your aspirations and objectives by presiding over your dinners. His presence here is another manifestation of his deep and abiding desire to help in the easing of all world tensions, a desire attested to by his many self-sacrificing journeys to all quarters of the globe and by the assistance he readily lends to any program that will relieve the suffering people of the world.

It is only a few short years since I was associated with the leader of this movement, the indefatigable Judge Marchisio, in another venture—that of American relief for Italy. Many of you here this evening joined with us in those efforts, and now you find yourselves united in a new attack on one of Italy's most basic problems—the emigration of its surplus millions. This sunny land, whose shores look out on the blue Mediterranean and the sparkling Adriatic, has always had to depend upon emigration so that all her people might find the sufficiency of life which is their God-given right.

From the dawn of the industrial revolution in the mid-19th century, when the first big waves of emigration began until this very moment, sailing ships and modern ocean liners, all have been carrying the children of Italy not only to the countries that make up the Americas, but to far away New Zealand and Australia. To every land and clime, they have brought the richness of their culture and tradition.

Like a mother, whose love knows no sacrifice too great, she has had to stand beside ship after ship in Genoa, Naples, Reggio, and Palermo and bid goodbye to hundreds of thousands of her children who were forced to look, many for the last time, on the Italy that gave them birth, and then turn their eyes courageously toward some new land in which they might obtain, at least, a measure of adequate livelihood and an opportunity to rear and educate their children at a standard that is every true parent's dream.

Here in our own beloved United States, some of her sons were already distinguishing themselves in the days of the American Revolution, a fact that is not surprising when we consider that it was an Italian, Christopher Columbus, who first claimed this land of ours for another foreign sovereign, and it was still another Italian sailor, Americo Vespucci, who gave this country his name.

All through the early days of the new Republic's beginnings and right down to the Civil War, we find the names of distinguished Italians adding to the glory of our history. However, it was only in the 1870's that we began to experience the first great influx of Italian migration. From then on down through the first decade of the 20th century, adverse economic, social and political conditions in Italy brought hundreds of thousands to our shores. And to the everlasting credit of America, it did its share in helping to ease the burden of one of that country's greatest problems.

The Italians were not alone in their coming for all of Europe was encouraging its children to seek freedom, hope and security in the new Nation that was pioneering its destiny to the Mississippi and beyond to the Pacific. The greater part of 40 million immigrants that have been our rich heritage came to America in the last 3 decades of the 19th century and the first of the 20th before, as one author puts it, "the lamp that lights the Statute of Liberty was virtually extinguished by the anti-immigration laws" that were passed in the 2 decades that followed.

The period between the two World Wars saw all immigration from Italy practically cut off so it is little wonder that we find the American Committee on Italian Migration coming into existence at a time when the emigration of her citizens has again become one of Italy's greatest problems.

Synonymous with immigration is the great name of Scalabrini.

It is proper and right that here this evening, through the Very Reverend Father Francesco Prevedello, Superior General of the Pious Society of the Missionaries of St. Charles, you should honor the Servant of God Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini, its founder. In every country to which his spiritual sons have gone they have been celebrating this year the 50th anniversary of his passing, and more and more people have come to know the life and labors of this saintly man, truly and justly called "Father to the immigrants." While multiplying the prayers for his accession to the honor of the Altar, these celebrations also have helped to focus the eyes and minds of many on the problem of emigration.

John Baptist Scalabrini was born in Fino Mornasco, a little village near Gomo, in the Lombardy region of Italy, in the year 1839. Early in his childhood, he showed signs of an uncommonly brilliant mind and a keen sense of right and wrong. It was no surprise to anyone when at 18 he entered the seminary to study for the priesthood to which he was ordained in 1863, at the age of 24. Even as a student, he gave his time to the teaching of catechism which was no more popular then than the vocation he had chosen for himself since anti-clericalism was abroad in the land. He grew up in an age that took courage, determination, and vision for the enemies of the church were many.

All through his life—as a parish priest, rector of the seminary and as bishop—he built upon the foundation he had laid so well, and pressed the study of the catechism for he knew that education alone without sanctity could not produce the strong faith and the integrity in men's hearts that his age required. But it is for his work among the emigrants that we hail him this evening. Here particularly were his courage and vision most noticeable. He saw the hundreds of thousands that of necessity were leaving the mother country, and he realized probably better than anyone else the spiritual as well as the social and economic problems that would be facing them in the new world.

It was for this reason that he organized missionaries to work among the Italians who were finding new homes and planting new roots, not only in other countries of western Europe, but in North and South America and Australia. He knew that priests would have to accompany them on the ships and remain with them in their new homes if they were not to be lost to the faith. Today his spiritual sons in these lands are legion, and their seminaries have another thousand students preparing to replenish and strengthen their ranks.

It was this saintly bishop who first suggested to St. Frances Cabrini that she lay aside her dream of a missionary post in China to follow the Italian emigrant to the West, and who finally persuaded Pope Leo XIII to order her to go west. Little did she dream that soon she would be taking her little community to the harbor of exiles and immigrants, the great port of New York,

where one day she herself would be hailed as the "Mother of the immigrants".

Unwilling to send others where he himself would not go, Bishop Scalabrini came to America in 1901 where he visited all of the establishments that had been set up by his followers and where he talked with everyone who would listen, even the President of the United States, about the problem of the immigrants. In 1904, he followed his missionary sons to South America where he visited their houses in Brazil and the Argentine. The strain of that trip was to shorten his life for he barely returned to Italy in time to complete the report on his journey when this faithful and loyal servant of God was called to his reward on Ascension Day, June 1, 1905.

By example as well as word, he had personally fulfilled the mandate he had given to his spiritual sons and daughters—"Wherever there be an Italian immigrant, take to him the comfort of his faith and the smile of his native land." Bishop Scalabrini's works were prodigious and many. It was not without reason that he was called the Apostle of the Catechism, and his voice was heard, not only in inspiring talks and sermons, but also in numerous pastoral letters rich in doctrine and in practical teaching.

He promoted social and economic action, a good Catholic press, and introduced Catholic action in every parish at a time when it was practically unknown in the form which is so familiar in our day. But it was in the problem of emigration that Bishop Scalabrini was a true pioneer in Italy. He awakened the authorities and the entire nation to the needs of the emigrant. These needs became the subject of lively and effective discussion in the public press, in the Parliament, and in every city. What an example and inspiration he provides for our day when our own thinking and feeling in regard to immigrants and immigration right here in the United States could stand more serious introspection.

The pages of our immigration history do not always make the most pleasant reading. They are sometimes filled with accounts of prejudice and discrimination, mistreatment and exploitation, restriction and isolation, of racism and nativism. Fear and distrust of the stranger has not been the least of our sins. The American of today, no less than the descendant of the early colonist, seldom takes an idealistic view of immigration. Over the past 175 years, all of us have been too prone to forget that the only native American was the American Indian. Although our land was peopled by the oppressed, we need to be urged that it is a duty and a privilege to offer a home to others who are oppressed.

Even during those days when immigration was at its height here in the United States, the Italian, the Pole, the German, the Irishman and other nationalities who came to this country in such great numbers received at best a grudging welcome. And all during those years there were forces at work that would destroy entirely, if they could, the "melting pot" that in God's providence had been forged on these shores. It did not matter that the immigrant came with his tradition, his culture—his faith—all of which he desired not to be melted away, but to be woven into a mosaic, rich and colorful, of Old World custom adapted to the New World.

It did not matter that the immigrant came with his thrift, his industry, and his sense of destiny. There were those who saw in him only an instrument of cheap labor and of exploitation.

It did not matter that the immigrant came prepared to make every sacrifice that the lot of his children might be better than his own. There were those who would relegate him to the slums and the ghettos, then rave and rant because the products of these same slums frequently found their way into the children's courts and, now and then, into lives of crime and violence.

It did not matter that the immigrant came with a deep and abiding zeal for the religion into which he had been born. There were those who claimed that this religious fervor would be used to stir the immigrant's imagination to a point where he would help to overthrow this country's established norms and institutions.

The general terms of the great immigration restriction laws of the early 1920's stare up at us from the pages of every textbook in American history. A student of the subject knows that the groundwork for these restrictions was laid as early as 1880, and that they were only the culmination of false fears, prejudices, and hatreds. More than a quarter of a century has passed since these laws were first enacted, and the saddest aspect of all is the fact that it took the McCarran-Walter Act, which was designed to be nothing more than a recodification of these laws, to awaken us to the thought that there is something contrary to the ideas of our Founding Fathers—something very un-American and un-Christian about our immigration policy.

It is true that in the year following the war America has provided a home and a sanctuary for thousands of people who were displaced by the war, but our legislators made it clearly understood that their entry would be charged against the quotas set up in our sacrosanct national origins quota system. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 places no such mortgage on the quotas, but it places so many other restrictions and prohibitions on a person's entry that the act is almost inoperable. It will be nothing short of marvelous if every one of the 209,000 for whom it provides finds his way into this country.

Nevertheless, there is always a silver lining in every cloud, and we are told that at least the 60,000 Italians for whom this latest law provides, since many of them will be coming to relatives, will all be admitted before the act expires at the end of next year. In a sense then, the secondary aim of the American Committee on Italian Migration has been achieved.

Your committee's primary objective of helping to bring about a change in our basic immigration law is going to take a great deal more doing. Under Judge Marchisio's leadership, you have set a great task for yourselves. Your very presence at this dinner is an encouraging indication of your determination to accomplish that task.

Following the example of John Baptist Scalabrini, you will have to interest the leaders in your communities throughout the United States in this problem, for, after all, it is an educational job. But let us be clear in what we are seeking. No one would be so foolhardy as to ask for unlimited, unscreened, uncontrolled immigration.

An American immigration policy that would permit the entry of, say, 250,000 people a year, would be reasonable. The admission of the immigrants could be based upon our needs, their need for asylum, their relationship to others already in the country, and finally their economic needs. It seems that such a system of selection could be established that would be a realistic substitute for the National Origins Quota System, which is so heavily weighted in favor of those who have no need or desire to come to the United States.

We are all aware that our beloved America, with its expanding industry, its farm problem where so many young people are deserting the farm for the cities, still can use and is in need of additional manpower. We know that countries like Italy have more people than their economies possibly can maintain. Some countries have the products of their factories, their mines, and their farms to export, the better to maintain their own people. Italy is relatively poor in natural resources, but she is prepared to give up the most precious of her possessions—her cherished sons and daughters.

May America, the bulwark of freedom, the guardian of liberty, be once again the hope of those who only ask that they, too, may contribute to her goodness and her greatness under God, our Father, to whom belongs all the nations of the world.

Return of Rear Admiral Byrd From the Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, many thousands of us throughout the Nation have noted with interest and satisfaction the safe return of Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd from the Antarctic to New Zealand, and the news of his early return to the United States.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I had some advance information about this expedition, in preparation for International Geophysical Year. The selection of Admiral Byrd to head this mission to the Antarctic was very gratifying because this is a field where his attainments have been so great and so broad and of such lasting value to the United States and the rest of the free world.

All of us have watched with interest and good wishes the progress of this mission, and we await with equal interest the admiral's report. The findings and results of this expedition, Admiral Byrd's fifth to the Antarctic, will be one more major contribution in a long and faithful career of patriotic service above and beyond the call of duty.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of November 21, 1955, and reprinted in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on November 28, 1955, in tribute to a great American. The editorial will be of interest to all the Nation.

Mr. President, the official mission to which Admiral Byrd was designated and which he has been carrying out, is reflected in a letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD TURNS SOUTH AGAIN

Richard Evelyn Byrd is carried on the Navy's rolls as retired. This seems reasonable enough. At 67, which is this admiral's present age, few officers feel the urge to command a fleet in action. But Admiral Byrd's notion of retirement has expressed itself in accepting the overall responsibility for a new expedition to the Antarctic.

This will be his fifth visit to the southern reaches of the earth. It is nearly 30 years since he flew over the North Pole, more than 26 since he and his companions circled the South Pole. The aim of exploration has

changed. Man can now go anywhere he wants to, and even Antarctica, as the admiral suspects, won't be such a lonely place.

But innumerable questions remain to be answered. The present expedition is part of a 40-nation preparation for the International Geophysical Year. As the admiral says, "The biggest thing we're after is just plain scientific data."

Some politics is mixed in, too. The southern continent has strategic values, in which not only the United States and its friends but Russia and her friends are interested. Admiral Byrd, who might have stayed in Washington making up grocery lists and studying charts, leaves next Friday by air for New Zealand, whence he will go by sea to the neighborhood of Little America. It is a big neighborhood—1 million square miles explored by Byrd out of Antarctica's 6 million. The United States hasn't claimed this territory yet. Perhaps it soon will.

Good wishes will follow the admiral and his crew across thousands of stormy miles—good wishes, and a specially warm admiration for this modern Ulysses, who would not rust unburnished. Over the Antarctic camp where explorer Robert Falcon Scott and his men died after their own tragic journey to the pole is a memorial carrying Tennyson's lines: "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield." Let us hope that these same words may hereafter be remembered of an expedition with a happier ending: Byrd and his men have earned them, too.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, October 21, 1955.

Rear Adm. RICHARD E. BYRD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL BYRD: By direction of the President of the United States, and upon the recommendations of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Naval Operations, you are designated officer in charge, United States Antarctic programs. In this capacity you will consider yourself the senior United States representative charged with maintaining effective monitorship over those political, scientific, legislative, and operational activities which comprise the total United States Antarctic program. You will report to the Secretary of Defense and through him to the Operations Coordinating Board on matters pertaining to the United States Antarctic program.

You will advise the Operations Coordinating Board in the preparation of its overall plans for the implementation of United States Antarctic policy. You will assist the Secretary of Defense and his assistants and the Secretaries of appropriate military departments in the development of necessary legislative programs, including the establishment in concert with other departments of the Government of a permanent unit for Antarctic activity, and you will also provide technical and scientific advice on Antarctic matters to the operating agencies conducting United States Antarctic activities.

In addition, in respect to specific operations and expeditions in the United States Antarctic programs, you will advise the military commanders thereof in the preparation of plans and as to the technical suitability of their plans and projected operations. You will insure that such operations and expeditions, the public information programs relating thereto, and the scientific endeavor involved, shall be correlated. You will advise the appropriate military commanders and, as appropriate, the Secretary of Defense and other elements of the Department of Defense if, in your judgment, the technical aspects of such plans and operations require modifications or adjustment. You are authorized to request and have access to and to examine any or all documents, staff studies, plans, or public releases which may be relevant to your mission.

You will make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense concerning such additional or supplementary action with respect not only to the expeditionary activities but to all related matters concerning the Antarctic when, in your judgment, such recommendations will, if adopted, further the United States Antarctic programs.

You are authorized such personal staff as may be approved by the Chief of Naval Operations and are further authorized to undertake such travel, including participation in the Antarctic expeditionary activities of the United States Government, as you may deem necessary to accomplish this mission.

Sincerely yours,

REUBEN B. ROBERTSON, Jr.,
Deputy.

Unjust Exclusion Under the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the February 11 issue of the weekly publication, the Saturday Review, there is a very fine editorial, written by Mr. Norman Cousins, dealing with the exclusion of a Soviet violinist, Mr. David Oistrakh, under the terms of the McCarran-Walter Act. This is but the latest instance of a long and shameful series of such incidents. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cousins' thoughtful editorial on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POVERTY OF IMITATION

Mr. Erich Leinsdorf, the distinguished conductor, recently invited David Oistrakh, a master of the violin and a citizen of the Soviet Union, to appear as guest soloist with the Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra. Mr. Oistrakh was willing but the United States State Department vetoed the concert. It ruled that Rochester was out of bounds for the Russian violinist.

Rochester is neither a center for the production of fissionable materials nor a launching site for intercontinental guided missiles. The city specializes in photographic equipment, good music, and excellent education. David Oistrakh commands only the science of the violin. Yet the State Department banned his appearance. When it was argued that Rochester had cultural rather than military significance, the State Department replied that it was "retaliating" because some of the Russian cities have been declared out of bounds to American tourists.

Whom are we retaliating against? Whom are we hurting in this childish game of last tag? By depriving the people of Rochester of the privilege of hearing 1 of the 3 or 4 greatest living violinists, do we thereby teach the Russians a painful lesson and win a point in the cold war? Is this our idea of an intelligent and imaginative approach to the competition with the Soviet Union for world leadership? If the Communist rulers make a prodigious mistake, can we think of nothing more exalted for our own role than the imitation of error?

Congressional committees have been concerned with un-American behavior. Here is a large, clear, and fully visible specimen that we commend for investigation. It has nothing to do with secret meetings or spying or plots to destroy the Government. Yet what is involved can be just as serious. We refer to an un-American smallness—an un-American shortage of the kind of moral imagination that went into the making of America and that will somehow have to be rediscovered if America and its values are to survive, no matter how many atomic warheads we fashion.

It is un-American to act like frightened pygmies. Can anyone imagine Abraham Lincoln suggesting we should cope with the stupidity and narrowness of our foes by measured imitation? Does anyone suppose that Thomas Jefferson, if faced with a similar situation, would have advocated acceptance of the twisted standards of a totalitarian state operating out of fear and collapse of a compassionate intelligence? One can hardly imagine that Dwight D. Eisenhower could have had anything to do with such puny ideas; and we can only suppose that because of illness this matter did not come to his attention.

Here was the ideal stage for dramatizing to the entire world the largeness of spirit that must flow out of the history and vital purpose of a free people. Much has been said in Governemnt and the press about the need to point up the moral factor in the Democratic equation. Why could we not have used this as the occasion for opening our doors in a way that would have been in obvious contrast to the conditional parting of the Iron Curtain?

In this respect, the smallness is not the exclusive copyright of either political party. Ever since the end of the war, we have hurt ourselves by an unthinking, negative approach to the challenge of communism. Some of the leading sponsors of such a powerful idea as point 4, for example, deprived the plan of much of its moral power when they sought funds from Congress by claiming that this was a cheap way of combating communism and helping ourselves, instead of standing bold and firm on the proposition that this was something we should do because it was the right thing to do.

Our leaders may hold the American people too cheaply. It is not necessary to disguise good purposes and objectives in the slick clothing of national self-interest in order to win support. The overwhelming majority of the American people are not crass or cynical; they have a historical sensitivity to human needs and will respond when those needs are honestly and frankly described and tied to a plan for effective and competent action. Yet it is supposed to be smart, realistic politics to affect tough self-seeking arguments in order to achieve broad human goals. It so happens, however, that the people whom we want to help are listening too.

In place after place in Southeast Asia where we spent point 4 money, I would meet people who would ask in effect: "This is wonderful assistance you are providing; but is it true that we do not really figure in this aid as human beings, and that you are really trying to help yourselves in your contest with the Soviet?"

I met the question as best I could, but more than once I was tempted to say that actually we were all playing a game. The men who conceived of the idea of foreign aid did so out of decent impulses but found it hard to believe that enough men in Congress could be similarly motivated. Meanwhile, the men in Congress who were decently impelled would echo the tough arguments because they didn't feel they could appeal to the decent instincts of the people at home. And in the public debates, many of the citizens supporting foreign aid seemed content to cut themselves down to the size of their opponents by arguing out the issue on the grounds of self-interest. Then, having won, they somehow expected that the recipients abroad would know it

was only a game and that the real intent was noble. But it didn't quite work out that way. The others played it straight.

National policy by imitation and the negative approach to worthwhile goals are exercises in national shrinkage—shrinkage in strength, shrinkage in values, shrinkage in prospects. The times cry for growth.

Agricultural Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Henry Benge, of Flaxton, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAXTON, N. DAK., *December 23, 1955.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OLD FRIEND BILL: Of course you know Bill, the farmers are jealous of each other and some of your neighbors or my neighbors don't think as I do. Some are not interested only in themselves and some of us will help and furnish money and men to fight our battles in Washington. And 3 out of 4 of our neighbors will set back and do nothing, all they want is the price our men in the farmers union are doing in Washington for them as well as us. Such fellows as Glenn Talbolt and Jim Patton are fighting tooth and toenail for all the farmers. But 3 out of 4 just set back and make fun of them and laugh at the rest of us for fighting their battle as well as our own. But how can we do it any other way. You can use this letter you returned me or the one I wrote to you I presume you meant or any other letter I write to you in any manner you wish or any other letter I may write you if you can read them. I am in my 75th year and failing in my writing and spelling. And I only went in school to the 6th grade to a teacher that received $28 a month for teaching and walk a mile or 2 to school to a cold schoolhouse in Iowa with no roads to walk on, build her own fire in an old coal stove, sweep her own floor for $28 per month. Now they tell us all the time on the radio our teachers are poorly paid, getting from $300 to $600 a month, living right by the school with janitor clean-swept floors, always warm and good electric lights at hand at all times. And they tell us our teachers are underpaid if we would pay more taxes and pay our teachers higher wages we would get better teachers. Who is going to pay them? Our Government is putting $36.5 billions into war materials each year. Robbing us of the youth of our Nation to fight foreign wars and telling us dumb farmers we are not going to have any war. But we must be ready with our loved ones to give their lives and money to foreign countries, we must build them up—countries such as Russia—bring them over here, show them how to farm, how to build tractors and raise wheat to kill our foreign trade. I say live without Russia, leave them alone, we have lived without them before and can do it again. Well Bill, we have had some very cold snowy weather for about 2 months now, has been down to 34° below zero, and the 13th and 14th of December we had the worst blizzard I have seen in North Dakota in 52 years, winds from 50 to 70 miles an hour. And snow just like flour, could not see 10 feet. I have one son. Bill as you know he was married June 6, 1954, got a boy 9 months old December 29, weighs 21 pounds, lots of dark hair, about 12 teeth, laughs out loud and is about the cutest little guy you ever saw. Don is in class 1A in his service rating, they have not called him yet. But he is such a home-loving boy and thinks so much of his family, I think he would almost lose his mind if they tear him away from his 19-year-old wife and baby. Why do they talk peace all the time and prepare for war all the time. We don't want war. We don't want our boys to murder people they never saw and if they leave them alone never would see. My son don't want to murder anyone. He just wants a home and peaceful life. Well, Bill, if there are any questions you want answered and I can answer them, just write me and I will be pleased to try. Excuse this awful writing and spelling. I have 12 pens and I cannot find 1 to write with. Any office you run for I will vote for you. I voted for Ike before in 1952, but never again, when he put such fellows as Benson and lied to us about parity prices.

Sincerely,

HENRY BENGE.

Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with its 75th anniversary, the Marquette University has recently sponsored a 4-day conference on the subject of Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare, thereby rendering a magnificent contribution to our Nation's various programs in this vital field.

I am pleased and honored to have this opportunity of calling this significant event to the attention of the membership of this House, and I wish to commend the conclusions reached during the conference to my colleagues' careful study.

For some time, it has been apparent that there exists a serious need for the development of a spirit of cooperation in the health and welfare fields. This need was created by the continuing trend toward a high degree of specialization within the medical and paramedical professions, and the increase in the number of nonmedical specialists. The situation has been further complicated by the rapid growth of the many special disease interest groups.

Cognizant of the existence of these problems, and desirous of disclosing their full complexity in order to aid in their solution, Marquette University recently invited many of our Nation's recognized leaders in the medical, dental, hospital, and rehabilitation fields for a 4-day conference.

A panel of six speakers, and a group of discussion leaders and participants, were entrusted with the task of seeking the answers to such important questions as: How should the boundaries between specialists be established? Who should be responsible for hospital operation, medical education, and the dispensing of drugs? Is the importance of some diseases being overemphasized? Who should raise and control funds for medical research? and the like.

Out of this important conference, there came suggestions of a program for establishing cooperation among the many specialists and agencies in this general area. The result should be improved patient care and health service.

I wish that it were feasible to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete record of the conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare. I am certain that Members of Congress, and many persons throughout the country who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would like to review that very interesting and informative document.

Because of space limitations and other factors, I shall limit the extension of my remarks on the subject of the conference to the inclusion of 6 brief releases, containing the highlights of the 6 major presentations made at Marquette University. The first two releases follow in this extension of remarks. The next 2 will appear in part II of my remarks on the subject of the conference, while the last 2 will be included in part III.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the first two releases on Marquette University's conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare, entitled "Dr. Robert Moore Speaks" and "Dr. Robin C. Buerki Speaks":

DR. ROBERT MOORE SPEAKS

MILWAUKEE, January 23.—"What the United States needs today is not a legislated program of health care but a program led by the health professions which will bring about a decrease in costs," a University of Pittsburgh medical authority declared tonight in the opening address at a Marquette University conference on health and welfare.

"The American people demand and deserve the best of health, and if we, the members of the health professions do not provide it at a reasonable cost, they will turn to the Goverment," Dr. Robert Moore, vice chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh Schools of the Health Professions, stated.

Dr. Moore was the first of six leading medical educators and administrators scheduled to deliver public addresses during Marquette's 4-day conference on "Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare." A panel of 30 selected members of the medical and para-medical professions will probe further into the problems behind such cooperation in closed discussions.

"The health professions have increasingly accepted the objective to minister to the physical ills of man but this curative medicine represents only a small part of our responsibility to society," Dr. Moore said. Other major responsibilities, he said, are preventive and comprehensive medicine, teamwork, and utilization of health care.

"We are just making a beginning in the prevention or early detection of disease in individuals," he said. "A part of this lack of progress is lack of application, a part is our present inability to apply known facts on a large scale and a part is the lack of

knowledge concerning the causes of a given disease or means to control it."

Dr. Moore said great strides have been made in the last few decades in preventing infectious diseases in childhood and in tuberculosis. "I have no doubt," he added, "that the coming years will see techniques for the early detection or prevention of great killing and crippling diseases such as arteriosclerosis, hypertension, rheumatoid arthritis, to name a few."

He defined comprehensive medicine as a return to the position and attitude of the general practitioner of the last century without loss of the gains of this century. He declared members of the health professions must consider the whole human being and the interrelation of mind and body rather than merely the disease afflicting the person.

Dr. Moore declared the need for teamwork in the health professions is obvious when you consider how the health professions have drifted apart into specialty and subspecialty groups and even into sub-subspecialty groups.

As for the responsibility to utilize health care, Dr. Moore said "We must in the future give equal attention to the administration and utilization of health care as we have in the past to the science of health care."

"Already," he said "we know more than we can use. We can use more than we have the manpower and resources to use. We have more resources than the people can afford."

DR. ROBIN C. BUERKI SPEAKS

MILWAUKEE, January 24.—Dr. Robin C. Buerki, executive director of the Henry Ford Hospital of Detroit, said this afternoon that without medical teamwork in the modern hospital "we will find ourselves in real trouble shortly."

Speaking at Marquette University's health and welfare conference, Dr. Buerki told representatives of the health professions that "the problem is growing and we are not doing much about it."

The goal of the medical teamwork must be improved patient care and reduced costs, he declared. This teamwork does exist in hospitals but there is not enough of it, he added. Doctors, hospital administrators and trustees, nurses and allied technicians must plan now how to secure better care at less cost, the Detroit administrator said. "The future of medicine and the health of the public is at stake."

Dr. Buerki said as far as doctors are concerned the lack of teamwork in hospitals could be traced to the fact that doctors are not trained to work with others. They have little appreciation of the problems of hospitals, he said.

Another factor in the problem, he said, is the dollar sign. "There's fear by the doctor that the hospital dollar will not be divided in his best interest; by the hospital administrator that he won't get as large a cut as he should have; by the hospital trustees that the hospital won't operate in the black; by everyone on the hospital payroll, who realizes that he or she could be getting more money outside."

Hospital administrators are too frequently suspicious and afraid to act and often they are elected not to enforce the rules laid down by the medical board but to wink at the rules so the doctors can practice as they see fit, Dr. Buerki went on.

"And we are totally neglecting the education of qualified hospital trustees," he said. Dr. Buerki called the trustees "the greatest hope doctors and hospitals have if we are to accomplish greater things in the future."

Marquette's 4-day conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare opened Monday. Six leading medical educators and administrators are exploring the problem from various aspects in public addresses with selected national and local leaders from the health professions discussing their views in subsequent closed seminar.

Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to commend to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the following two releases, dealing with the presentations of Dean Stanley E. Dorst, of the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, and of Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman of the department of physical medicine and rehabilitation of the New York University Bellevue Medical Center, at the conference sponsored by Marquette University on the subject of Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare:

DEAN STANLEY E. DORST SPEAKS

MILWAUKEE, January 24.—Dean Stanley E. Dorst, of the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, tonight urged reorganization of the Nation's medical specialty boards to provide an integrated, intelligent authority.

"The magnificent achievements of medicine in the past 40 years would never have been possible without specialization both in the clinic and in the laboratories," Dr. Dorst declared in an address at Marquette University's conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare. But excessive specialization will explode the profession into chaotic fragments, he warned.

"I have no fault to find with special training in restricted fields leading to superior technical competence," he told representatives of the health professions attending the conference. "My objection relates to the machinery which has built itself around the methods of specialization, and the subsequent consolidation of those specially trained into organized groups who seek, first, rigidly to control the training of specialists and later to control the hospitals in which the practice of medicine is carried on.

"This is all done in the name of better medical practice and is justified only so long as it is compatible with fair treatment of the physicians who must use the hospitals for the proper care of their patients and who are qualified to treat them."

Dr. Dorst pointed out that 26 autonomous boards and sub-boards exist to govern various medical specialists in this country. "The Advisory Council for the Specialty Boards has not the power or the authority to achieve the necessary integration of these boards," he said. "I am not so naive as to suggest the abolition of specialty boards, but I plead for a reorganization which will provide an integrated, intelligent authority, an authority whose basic concept of its function will be the wise and thoughtful moderation of the last phase of professional medical education, not an agency making rules to produce skilled technicians and craftsmen."

The danger is that in operating more and more exclusively through technical means, specialism with its ever-narrowing vision and increasing organization will no longer occupy a subordinate position, Dr. Dorst declared. "To see that this does not happen becomes the heavy responsibility of medical education," he said.

The physician's primary concern must be for human welfare, said Dr. Dorst, treating Joseph Smith, who is ill with a myocardial infarction and not treating only a myocardial infarction. Treating the "case" instead of the human being is "part of the price we paid for the very great advances which laboratory science brought to medicine," he said.

"Except for the problem of undue specialization, medical education may be said to be meeting its challenges quite adequately," Dr. Dorst stated. "If we can bring this one phase of medical education under control, we need not have much fear concerning interprofessional relationships, for I am confident they will fall into place once medicine's house is in order."

Marquette's 4-day health and welfare conference, wich opened Monday, is part of the university's 75th anniversary observance. The need and means of securing cooperation between the health professions is being analyzed by 6 leading authorities in public addresses and by 30 representatives of the health professions in closed seminars.

DR. HOWARD A. RUSK SPEAKS

MILWAUKEE, January 25.—Despite tremendous advances in rehabilitation medicine in the past 15 years, too many patients, particularly older persons, have been allowed to become unnecessarily dependent, an authority in the field told Marquette University's health and welfare conference tonight.

"These patients are absorbing the services of a vast corps of health personnel who could be freed for other essential services if some new approaches were made to patient care," said Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman of the department of physical medicine and rehabilitation of the New York University Bellevue Medical Center, New York City.

"If we are to make any broad-scale attack on the problems of physical disability, we must broaden both our understanding of rehabilitation and its application in both hospital and adult institutions, so that the costly economic, psychic, and social costs of chronic disease may be prevented," he said.

Addressing selected representatives of the health professions on the semifinal day of Marquette's 4-day 75th anniversary conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare, Dr. Rusk declared:

"As yet too few hospitals and adult homes provide dynamic, integrated services which will permit such patients to lead independent lives of dignity outside of the hospital. Until we find the solution to degenerative disease, the only answer is a dynamic approach to the problems of the chronically ill and the severely disabled.

"Rehabilitation medicine is concerned with the reintegration of the chronically ill and disabled into active living. The degree of such activity is limited only by the capacity of the patient. Such reintegration concerns the development and use of the maximum potential remaining in that patient. The physical, vocational, and psychological areas must all be utilized in the total approach."

Dr. Rusk said a large percent of all rehabilitative procedures could and should be handled by the physician responsible for the primary patient care as an integrated part of total medicine. For the severely handicapped, he said, there is a need for a special rehabilitation program and service.

This need cannot be met without a concentrated long-term program and special

techniques which must include full utilization of all auxiliary disciplines, he added.

"Rehabilitation not only requires interprofessional and patient cooperation but the utilization of all the tools in the community—voluntary agencies, labor and industry, government, family services—if the total needs of the severely disabled are to be met."

Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of our Health and Welfare—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the final two releases describing the major presentations made during the Marquette University's recent conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare.

These last two releases summarize the highlights of the addresses delivered by Dr. Maynard K. Hine, dean of the School of Dentistry of Indiana University, and by Dr. Herman G. Weiskotten, dean emeritus of the University of Syracuse Medical School.

I commend them earnestly to the attention and study of my colleagues:

DR. MAYNARD K. HINE SPEAKS

MILWAUKEE, January 25.—"Deliberate efforts to draw the professions of medicine and dentistry closer together" were recommended at Marquette University's health and welfare conference this afternoon by Dr. Maynard K. Hine, dean of the School of Dentistry of Indiana University.

"Because of a lack of information, the physician many times has no confidence in or understanding of the contributions a dentist can make in the treatment of oral disease, so proceeds with a treatment plan without consulting the dentist," Dr. Hine said.

"Even more often the dentist fails to consider the patient as a whole and does not ask for consultation from the physician. The result is often inadequate care of the patient, since for proper care of a patient close cooperation is often required between a physician and a dentist.

"All modern dental curricula include courses on medical science, but few medical schools include even a series of lectures on dental science. Joint meetings of both professions should be encouraged and interchange of ideas and techniques encouraged. Close cooperation between both professions must be based upon understanding and respect.

"Another reason for close cooperation between all of the sciences is the need for more knowledge about oral physiology and oral pathology, to make possible even better methods of preventing oral disease."

Dr. Hine outlined dentistry's role and responsibilities in the health sciences as 1 of the 6 major speakers in Marquette's 4-day conference on the theme of Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare. The various aspects of the problem considered by the respective speakers are being further analyzed by a panel of 30 selected representatives of the health professions in closed seminars. Marquette, which called the conference as part of its 75th anniversary program, intends to publish the conclusions and recommendations of the panel. The conference ends tomorrow.

Dr. Hine urged dentists to place greater emphasis on prevention of oral disease. "Little progress has been made in the field of preventive dentistry, although one of the most promising developments in the past two decades has been the success encountered in the search for procedures to prevent dental caries," he said.

"Fluoridation of communal water supplies deserves special mention since it is perhaps the most effective and most needed dental public-health preventive measure. * * * It is established beyond doubt that fluoridation will consistently reduce the prevalence of tooth decay often as much as 65 percent so is an effective and safe preventive and control method."

Dr. Hine said it is the responsibility of the dental profession to furnish the community with information regarding the value of fluoridation so its residents can decide intelligently whether to utilize this method of reducing dental caries.

DR. HERMAN G. WEISKOTTEN SPEAKS

MILWAUKEE, January 26.—The medical profession is vitally interested in contributions from ancillary fields but the doctor must remain responsible for treatment and prevention of disease.

This was the statement of Dr. Herman G. Weiskotten of Skaneateles, N. Y., dean emeritus of the University of Syracuse (N. Y.) Medical School, in the final address tonight at Marquette University's 4-day conference on interprofessional cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare.

"In rendering a high standard of medical care, the profession has required the services of a considerable group of nonmedical persons especially trained in fields ancillary to medicine," Dr. Weiskotten said.

"Upon request, the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals has cooperated with the national organizations concerned with the training of such personnel, including medical technologists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, medical record librarians and X-ray technicians. * * * The council has cooperated in formulating standards of training and in accrediting institutions offering training in these fields.

"The national groups involved believe that the cooperation of the council has been an important factor in placing training in these fields on a sounder basis and has made more effective the contributions that these services are making to the overall health program. At the same time the medical profession had received a clearer understanding of the nature and standards of service these various groups are prepared to render.

"There have been many conferences and much discussion in regard to the most mutually satisfactory and effective relationships which could be established between these groups and the organized medical profession.

"Neither the American Medical Association nor its Council on Medical Education and Hospitals are in themselves qualified or have any desire to set educational or training standards in these specialized fields. These standards should be established by those entirely familiar with the particular fields involved and with the objectives of their educational and training programs.

"However, the medical profession is vitally interested in the contributions which individuals from these fields can make in assisting it in meeting its responsibilities to the public. * * * It continually looks forward to expanding its relationships with all other groups which have as their objective the improvement of the health and medical care of the American people."

But, said Dr. Weiskotten, "all groups involved must realize that pooled abilities cannot be a substitute for the physician's capacity and responsibility in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease."

Marquette University, observing its 75th anniversary, invited six leading medical and dental educators and administrators to the campus to outline the vital need for interprofessional cooperation. Thirty prominent national and local representatives of the health professions considered means of attaining that goal in closer seminers. The university will publish their conclusions.

Integration in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Integration in Politics," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION IN POLITICS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is mounting evidence of grave trouble ahead over integration in the public schools of the Southern States. For in recent weeks we have come nearer to the question which can divide the country dangerously. Is the decision of the Supreme Court to be put into effect gradually and with the eventual consent of the leaders of southern opinion or is the Federal Government to be called upon to enforce integration against the resistance of the South?

This question poses as fateful a dilemma as any internal American question that has arisen for several generations. It arouses great human passions which cannot be reconciled, which can only be assuaged and accommodated in this generation. They are passions which boil up quickly into violence, and they can be kept within bounds only when and only while there is great wisdom and resolution in the leaders of the country.

The temptation to play politics with these passions is almost overpowering. And it is the approach of the national election, the struggle between the two parties and also the struggle within the parties, particularly within the Democratic Party, which have brought the dilemma to the surface.

It is significant that the closer a public man is to the Presidency, the more will he shrink from the idea of Federal enforcement, as distinguished from persuasion and accommodation. Governor Stevenson has been notably firm and decisive and the President, though his words were a bit cloudy, is certainly not considering intervention by the Federal executive power. It is the politicians, the men who have little or no prospect of themselves being in the White House and bearing the President's responsibility, who are heating up the issue.

There is no likelihood that the Republicans in Congress will agree to take the issue out of politics. For it is a most damaging issue to raise among the Democrats. Nor is there much likelihood that Governor Stevenson's rivals for the nomination will forbear to raise it. It is such an easy way to make things difficult for him.

The issue will have to be debated in the open. The fundamental question to be debated is whether integration is to be promoted by persuasion or by Federal enforcement. These are two different roads, and no one should think he can go down both of them at once.

Consider, for example, the Powell amendment which would withhold Federal aid from States or school districts that do not integrate their schools. Let no one suppose that the Southern States will give in and accept integrated schools because some Federal money is withheld from them. To suppose that they will give in is to mistake the temper of the South, particularly the temper of the Deep South.

What, then, are Representative JOSEPH L. MARTIN and Governor Harriman going to propose next, once they find that withholding money does not induce the Southern States to yield? If they start on the path of coercion, the authority of the executive power will be engaged and new measures of coercion will be demanded to uphold that authority. For unless the Federal Government is going to confess that it is beaten, it must—taking the path of Federal enforcement—become more and more coercive.

No one should doubt that the attempt at Federal enforcement will intensify and harden the resistance of the South. Those who are disposed to try to work out integration gradually will resent the Federal Government's efforts to coerce them. The problem of integration will become progressively more insoluble in the South, the racial passions will become increasingly sharp, the sectional feeling increasingly disruptive.

Let us stop and think before we let irresponsible politicians push us into the whirlpool.

The way things are developing is a reason for asking ourselves whether the decision of the Supreme Court does not need to be supplemented. As it stands now, the question of what constitutes a "prompt and reasonable start towards full compliance" is left to the judgment of the Federal courts. Now what would be a prompt and reasonable start, say, in the District of Columbia, might well be impossibly hasty in Mississippi. Success in putting into effect the principle of the decision requires a program which must vary with local conditions. It is, for example, an enormous step forward when universities in the South admit Negro students. And it would be the part of wisdom in a State like Alabama to regard admission to the university as being for present purposes "a prompt and reasonable start."

The question is whether through some sort of council of eminent citizens guiding principles might be agreed upon which would give to American opinion a standard around which it could rally.

Farmers and the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. and Mrs. Carl Gust, of Durbin, N. Dak. Their letter deals with the problems faced by older farmers, particularly with regard to the social-security program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DURBIN, N. DAK., *October 17, 1955.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR FRIEND: Sorry that we did not get to see you while in North Dakota but know you are a busy man.

Just where do we oldsters fit in the social-security program?

If our farm program does not allow us to put in more than 60 acres of wheat, and 2 families must live on the income from a half section, how long will our savings last, if we are compelled to draw on that year after year?

Sure we've paid taxes for old-age pensions but we never want to go under that program, for that is not even an existence.

Keep up your good work and we do hope you'll run again.

Respectfully,

Mr and Mrs. CARL GUST.

The Doctrine of Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Norfolk Journal and Guide, a weekly newspaper which has a wide reading audience throughout the South. I wish to place these in the RECORD for the benefit of my own constituents and others who are interested in the discussion which is now going on in this country relative to the so-called doctrine of interposition.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Journal and Guide of January 21, 1956]

INTERPOSITION DOCTRINE

Since Virginia suddenly sidetracked consideration of the Gray plan constitutional convention—at least temporarily—to ponder the notion of having the General Assembly pass a resolution of interposition by which backers of the idea think that the State could avoid compliance with Supreme Court decisions on school desegregation, it is in order to clarify what the doctrine of intersition, revived from pre-Civil War days, is all about.

At least four States, Virginia, Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina, are considering resolutions of interposition by their legislatures. Delegate Boatwright offered a bill on interposition on the opening day of the current session of the Virginia legislature. It was promptly declared to be a "fantastic" project by the principal antiorganization Democrat in the House of Delegates, Robert Whitehead.

"Interposition is popularly equated with the doctrine of nullification," says the January issue of Southern School News, established to give nonpartisan reports on the school segregation issue.

The first proponent of the idea in this State was the Richmond News Leader, and it commented that "this plan contemplates an assertion of fundamental principles, coupled with an appeal to our sister States to decide, by ratifying or rejecting a proposed constitutional amendment, whether the power to operate racially separate public school facilities should be prohibited to the States."

In Mississippi, however, the plan is opposed by the incoming governor, James P. Coleman, although its chief advocates in that State are two members of its congressional delegation, a judge, and a former governor.

The Cyclopedia of American Government offers the following definition of interposition:

"The Virginia Resolution of 1798 declared that the powers of the Federal Government result from the compact to which the States are parties, and 'that, in case of a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the social compact, the States, which are parties thereto, have the right and are in duty bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil' for maintaining their rights.

"What was meant by interposition? It has sometimes been asserted that it meant nothing more nor less than nullification by a single State. Madison declared, in later years, that such was not the meaning. It is not unlikely that nothing more was intended than to secure, by cooperation among the States, a general expression of opinion.

"But it is possible that the framers had in mind a convention of the States to pass upon the Constitution or that they planned authoritative interpretation by amendment."

And the New Dictionary of American Politics gives this definition of nullification, which interposition effectively is:

"An alleged right of a State in the American Union, acting in a sovereign capacity through a convention of its people, to declare an act of Congress 'null, void, and no law, not binding upon the State, its officers or citizens.' "

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Journal and Guide of January 28, 1956]

INTERPOSITION IS NULLIFICATION

Those who are advocating interposition (nullification of the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954), are ignoring the 14th amendment entirely. True, some of them express the opinion that the 14th amendment has been incorrectly construed by the present Supreme Court. They place their own private opinions above the considered decisions of the unanimous Court.

The interpositionists are bent upon invoking theories about the rights of States which were debatable issues long before the Civil War occurred, resulting in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The Civil War and the incorporation into the Constitution of these amendments cut the ground from under the doubtful validity of a State's right to interpose itself between the Government of the United States and the people of a single State or a group of States, in the matter of individual rights conferred by the United States Constitution.

It is clear that the issue which prompts the present interposition movement is one of race. The theory or contention of those who wish to interpose or to nullify is the right of States to deny certain minorities within their borders due process of law, or equal protection of the law.

Without citing them (they are there in the records for all to examine) enough decisions were made during 25 years of Chief Justice John Marshall's tenure to firmly establish the right of the Federal Supreme Court to review the laws of the 48 States composing the Union, and to pass upon their constitutionality.

The claim that the decision of the Supreme Court on the school segregation matter was made on a basis of sociological theses written by "foreigners" is the height of absurdity. The decision was made on the content of the 14th amendment. The States attorney generals, especially Virginia's, used many sociological arguments in presenting their case to the Supreme Court in behalf of racial discrimination.

It is just as logical to say that the Supreme Court "legislated" in 1896 when it established the doctrine of "separate but

equal" is to say that the Supreme Court "legislated" or amended the Constitution in 1954.

The Constitution was originally drafted when slavery was an established legal institution in the United States. It is unreasonable to suppose that the framers of the Constitution did not intend that it would apply to all free Americans if and when slavery was abolished; and many of the framers had disturbed consciences on the slavery question when they drafted the Constitution.

There was nothing inherent in slavery which placed upon the Government of the United States the responsibility to keep an American minority from enjoying equal protection of the laws as free men.

There are no good reasons to suppose that the framers of the Constitution intended that the separate States should keep a minority in civil slavery after chattel slavery was abolished.

Questions now bothering Virginians are:

1. If interposition (nullification) is a part of the Gray commission's plan, why was an extra session of the general assembly called for the purpose of authorizing a referendum on repealing a section of the State constitution?

2. If the State intends to nulify the Supreme Court's decision, by interposition why adopt the Gray proposals?

What the general assembly is doubtless giving serious thought to is the obvious fact that interposition now would be just as much of a step toward secession as it was in 1832, the last time it was tried.

There is litte sentiment in the South, other than among a few extreme racists of the Griffin-Eastland type, who would want to put themselves in the position of appearing to favor a step in that direction.

The Hells Canyon Dam Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial on the Hells Canyon Dam issue, published in the February 3, 1956, issue of the Boise Journal. The editorial was written by the editor of the Boise Journal, Mr. Ed Emerine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY THE EDITOR
(By Ed Emerine)

PLENTY OF WATER, BUT WHERE IS INDUSTRY?

In a recent column in the Idaho Daily Statesman, John Corlett stated: "In the arid and semiarid West, the inhabitants don't realize that water often is the key to industrial development; that industries often locate in certain areas only because of abundant water supplies."

The comment could have been carried further, of course, for abundant water alone does not attract industry. But the full development and use of streams do induce industries of all kinds. We have seen how the great dams and powerplants on the Columbia River attracted industries to Washington and Oregon, giving them new population and wealth. Likewise we have seen that partial and incomplete development and use of Snake River waters have held Idaho back.

We have consistently opposed small dams on big dam sites. Likewise we have fought for multiple-purpose dams and full development of our streams and natural resources. We see no way for such development except through the people's own Federal Government. Dams that control floods, that develop hydroelectric power, and irrigate the deserts, also provide low-cost power and abundant water to attract industry.

We confidently believe that one large Hells Canyon Dam would attract more industry and do the entire area more good than a dozen little Idaho Power Co. dams. Call us a dirty name if you will, but you must admit that Idaho, with water running out of its ears, has no industry. There must be a reason.

A PHILOSOPHY THAT LONG AGO LOST ITS PUBLIC APPEAL

Our peripatetic young Governor, Robert E. Smylie, in his most recent series of nationwide speeches, has declared that the building of large dams by the Federal Government is a "philosophy that long ago lost its public appeal." Those who advocate a dam like Hells Canyon "are living in the past," according to Mr. Smylie.

At the very moment our Governor was uttering his immortal words, great floods were tearing out the fields and forests in California, inundating cities, taking lives and doing millions of dollars in property damage. In the great State of California, the philosophy of our Governor has prevailed. Large federally constructed dams, for multiple purposes, have been frowned upon, and the bright, new "investor-owned" little dams idea has prevailed. But even before the crest of these floods had passed, that State had held its hand out to the Federal Government and said "gimme, gimme, please; we need help."

Back in 1943, before Anderson Ranch and Lucky Peak dams were built, Boise Valley lost heavily in a flood from the Boise River. And just a few weeks ago the Payette River went on a rampage and destroyed thousands upon thousands of dollars' worth of property. But when we point these facts out, the Governor mumbles about "the events of a decade and a half occurred without their notice."

So, those of us who "harp back about things that are past," as the Governor says, must point out the facts. In our opinion, there is still great need for multiple-purpose, federally planned and built dams that will control floods, generate hydroelectric power, and irrigate the lands.

The "Get McKay" Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Get McKay' Movement," published in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal of February 8, 1956. It contains some very appropriate comments upon the splendid record being made by Secretary of the Interior McKay, and also contains reference to some very fine and pertinent source material which will be enlightening to those who consider his record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "GET-MCKAY" MOVEMENT
(By Raymond Moley)

Attacks upon Secretary of the Interior McKay are proceeding from several quarters, but the general pattern is to portray him as a faithless custodian of the precious natural resources entrusted to his Department. There is the constant effort to win votes in the West by saying that this administration has initiated no new water resource projects, when in fact it has recommended several which Congress has failed to act upon. There is the Al Sarena case, about which a joint subcommittee has been conducting an investigation, with Senator KERR SCOTT in the chair and the loquacious NEUBERGER acting as prosecutor. There is also an effort, zealously promoted by NEUBERGER and aided by MORSE, to prove that adequate care has not been observed in protecting the fish and wildlife reserves from improper exploitations by oil and gas leases.

The fact is that oil and gas leasing of public lands in fish and wildlife reserves has been the policy of the Federal Government for many years. By law, since the passage of the original Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, these lands are "subject to disposition * * * to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof." An act of 1946 which amended the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 reaffirmed the authority for such leasing, and in 1947 Department of Interior regulations were issued which defined conditions under which the leasing would be permitted.

STUDY BY EXPERTS

More than 2 years ago, because Secretary McKay felt that the regulations of the Truman administration did not provide the refuges with adequate protection, he issued a stop order which halted all leasing until a thorough study by experts could be given the matter and a set of strengthened regulations worked out. Participants included department officers, specialists from its Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Land Management, its solicitor, and the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation.

Finally, regulations with stringent provisions to assure maximum protection of refuges were ready. In December the Secretary's Advisory Committee unanimously approved them. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, of the Wildlife Management Institute, was present at this meeting, but raised no protests. A few days later, however, Gabrielson and the Institute made a bitter attack on the regulations and charged among other things that oil operators can now get an immediate lease with no prior submittal of any operating plan. As Secretary McKay countered, "No prospecting or drilling operations may be conducted on lands administered for wildlife conservation without the consent and approval of the Fish and Wildlife Service as to the time, place, and nature of such operations."

BOUND BY LAW

During the past week Senators NEUBERGER and MORSE indulged in a display of malicious banter on the floor of the Senate. NEUBERGER accused the administration of pursuing policies designed to destroy our natural resources: "The accelerated onslaught against our resources which we have witnessed in the past 3 years give rise to genuine concern over the national welfare of the future."

Besides these attacks, there has been some irrelevant discussion about the "philosophy" of putting oil wells on any of our refuges. By law, over the years Congress has expressed its will that leases be granted. And the Secretary of the Interior is bound by the law. It is to Secretary McKay's credit that he has seen to it that the regulations implementing the law are both wise and exacting.

Let's Expose the Communist Capitalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Expose the Communist Capitalists," which appeared in the February issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine.

This dynamic, thought-provoking article was written by Kenneth L. Myers, an attorney of Wichita, Kans. The article represents the fruits of study, observation, and investigation which Mr. Myers has carried on for more than 25 years. This work by him started during his years at Harvard University in the early thirties, and was brought into sharper focus by personal experiences with Communist workers in over 4 years of civil affairs and military government work in Europe, during and following World War II.

It is a thought-provoking article, and I commend it to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S EXPOSE THE COMMUNIST CAPITALISTS—RUSSIA'S SYSTEM OF "COMMUNIST MONOPOLY CAPITALISM" THRIVES ON THE MANY EVILS THE REDS PRETEND TO BE FIGHTING AGAINST

(By Kenneth L. Myers, Post 112, Wichita, Kans.)

It was springtime in 1944. I was temporarily stationed on the lovely southeast coast of England. One day, as I watched a particular V–1 approach, an anti-aircraft battery opened up on it. A partial hit caused the V–1 to make a complete U-turn and fly back toward France, still carrying its cargo of destruction.

In idea warfare, the supreme art is to make use of the enemy's own major weapon so that it injures the enemy himself.

Hitler employed the concept of the "Herrenvolk" (master race) to rekindle the spirit of German conquest. However, the application of this concept to conquered peoples brought on a reaction of hatred and opposition which contributed greatly to the downfall of the Nazi state.

In their great enveloping drive in the Pacific, the Japanese announced the policy of "Asia for the Asiatics." But when it became obvious that what the Japanese really intended was "Asia for the Japanese"—many Asiatics, who had supported the Japanese, turned to disillusionment and thence to active opposition.

Just how can we execute a play which will successfully exploit the very propaganda strength of the enemy? Theodore S. Repplier, with his concept of our "people's capitalism," as presented in the December issue of the VFW magazine, proposes a strategy which can gain us invaluable yardage. In addition, we require an accurate definition of the Communist system that we can use in the present war of ideas.

Communist propaganda experts know that their battle is facilitated when, in describing their own system, they employ terms which, by historical usage and custom, have already been accepted with favor by most people everywhere.

The other angle of this technique is to label all non-Communist systems with terms which, by historical usage and custom, provoke disfavor and repugnance by most people everywhere.

This, plus the deliberate intent to confuse, is the real psychology behind Communist appropriation of terms like: "People's Democratic Republic," and "People's Court" in referring to their own system; and the incessant libeling of non-Communist systems with such words as "monopoly capitalists, capitalist exploiters, capitalist colonialism, capitalist decadence, and capitalist landlords."

The damage occasioned by this technique has been compounded by many of our own newswriters and radio people through their use in articles, news reports, and newscasts of the labels which the Commies deliberately planted to assist their subversion program.

During the Korean war I heard many American news broadcasts which contained this phrase: "The People's Democratic Republic of North Korea announced via radio that . . ." I have before me a news article clipped from the paper of an American church which opens with:

"LONDON.—Jan Izydorczyk, Polish Ambassador to the East German People's Republic."

In the battle for men's minds, the major Communist target has been what they call, "monopoly capitalism." They have caused millions of people throughout the world to hate and fear all that which is labeled "monopoly capitalism." And exactly herein lies the great vulnerability—the soft spot of the whole Communist campaign. Our great and pressing job is to make certain that men everywhere understand exactly that which is monopoly capitalism and that which is not monopoly capitalism.

Our first task is to determine the meaning of the words: "monopoly capitalism." In Russia or the United States, "capital" consists of the tools and facilities which are utilized in the productive and distributive systems—plus the produced end items which people use for their health, welfare, recreation, and protection.

Thus, "capital" includes groceries on the shelf of a store as well as plants, machinery, land, mines, and communication facilities. To "monopolize" capital is to take its control and management out of the hands of the many and centralize it in the hands of a few. The fewer the hands which control, the greater is the monopoly.

This matter of the degree of monopoly control is not limited merely to economic operations; it can likewise be applied to the cultural, educational, religious, military, and political systems of every nation. The tests of the relative degree of monopoly are: what proportion of the citizenry individually owns, manages, and controls our economic enterprises; what proportion is freely associated with organized and competing political parties; what proportion may freely choose their own occupation, place of dwelling and bargain freely for wages and working conditions?

Now the Communists allege that under their system capital belongs to the state, as the representative of the people in common. But the state never did anything; it is a fiction, an abstraction. The crux of the whole matter of monopoly is that all decisions affecting the life and welfare of the people of any nation are made by persons—not states. Some person or group of persons is responsible for every decision made.

Who makes the decisions in the Soviet Union? All impartial authorities agree that, after the great purge killings in the thirties, every important decision affecting the welfare and economy for the peoples in Russia was subject to the approval of one man. This man personally held the power of life or death, prominence or oblivion over every man, woman, and child in the Soviet Union, including the members of the Communist Party. His name was Joseph Djugashvili (alias Stalin). And because of the great technological advances in communications—his vast network of police agencies gave him the kind of absoluteness of control which the czars never enjoyed.

Currently, the monopoly powers which Stalin wielded are exercised by a group of 5 or 6 monopoly capitalists. No important action can be taken in any field of Russian activity which lacks their approval. These few rulers direct, control, and manage production, wages, prices, capital expenditure, employment, taxes, the spending of the profits earned by economic enterprises—plus the cultural, political, religious, educational, and military life of the Soviet Union. These men dominate the Communist Party, which in turn has a monopoly over all organized political activity.

Who is permitted to make decisions which affect economic life in our "people's capitalism"? Who is permitted to own, control, and manage "capital"? Who is permitted to give employment to others? The answer, of course, is every adult citizen—and this is precisely why we are a "people's capitalism." We permit those individuals whose savings, and whose management, have produced profits to retain a portion of those profits for further use and investment. Communist enterprises often produce profits, too—but these profits are spent by Khruschchev et al.

And what about the Communist slogans of "land reform" and "colonialism"? Can the propaganda value of these appeals be reversed to our own advantage? Lenin used the slogan of "land for the peasants" in his revolutionary seizure of power. After Communist control was sufficiently entrenched, the farmers were robbed of their land and personal ownership of land was made a crime. Nonetheless, the Communist monopoly capitalists are still using the old Lenin technique of "land reform" with great international success. Actually—"land reform"—meaning to take the ownership and control of the land away from the exploiting monopoly Communist landlords, and returning it to the individual farm families who occupy and till it, should be another of our great mass motivating weapons.

A costly error has been made in permitting the Communists virtually to monopolize the evil aspects of the word "colonialism." Russia itself has practiced the cruelest extremes of colonialism against her captive slave satellites. We and our allies should be hammering day and night against the unspeakable exploitation of "Communist colonialism."

How were Lenin and his successors able to accomplish their system of Communist monopoly capitalism? They acted on two basic facts: (1) men have a natural will to live—self-preservation; and (2) if you monopolize the control of the economic system in your own hands—the citizenry will do your will in all matters in preference to dying for want of food, clothing, shelter, and medical attention. Control the bread and you can control everything else. Lenin actually starved hundreds of thousands of Russians to death by the simple trick of seizing control of food supplies, and then by denying ration cards to those whom he wanted dead.

The terrible fraud of the technique of nationalization, which is also demanded by fuzzy-minded collectivists and self-styled liberals as a means of eliminating the evils of monopoly, is that it worsens monopoly by increasing the centralizing of control. Thus, the State economic planning commission, with perhaps 10 members, supplants the economic judgment of the millions.

Communist capitalism is the system of the supermonopoly of economic and political power which Karl Marx foresaw would inevitably result in the unparalleled exploitation of the masses. This monopoly capitalism did not, as Marx predicted, emerge as a result of gradual economic processes oper-

ating in a highly industrialized state. It resulted from the sudden legislative process of decreeing laws which transferred the ownership of property from the many little capitalists to a handful of Communist monopolists.

The great and incessant Communist effort to eliminate God is intimately related to the survival of Communist monopoly capitalism. As long as there are men and women who look to a source of guidance and inspiration, which is beyond the immediate regulation and control of the Communist leaders, their monopoly is incomplete. And to the degree that it is incomplete, it is endangered. Thus the dynamic of Communist control must ever be toward a more and more absolute monopoly. This dynamic explains the high death rate among the supercapitalists of the Communist system. It is necessary to kill one Communist monopoly capitalist before another can be squeezed in. And what is the contrasting dynamic of our people's capitalism? You can observe it at every corner of America. Our dynamic is: every citizen a bigger and better capitalist.

The law of peace is reverence of the rights and dignity of all other individuals. People's capitalism is in harmony with this law. The law of war is the will to force others to submit to unwanted controls. Communist monopoly capitalism is both a creation, and a proponent, of this law.

For us the concepts of people's capitalism and Communist monopoly capitalism constitute a double-barreled weapon for the war of ideas with Russia. One barrel reveals the fraud of the Communist system. The other reveals the moral superiority of our system.

Now that we have the tools—how and where can they be used with maximum effect? A great educational crusade on a global front is required. Even here in our people's capitalism much work is needed. Thirty-eight years of Communist propaganda and subversive have created a confusion and misunderstanding which must be overcome. Required are the inspired efforts of a host of educators, ministers, news writers, radio commentators and directors of film and television presentations.

Are we, perhaps, overestimating the importance of the ideas which motivate peoples? In the summer of 1945, another American and I were conferring in Cologne with the now German Chancellor, Dr. Konrad Adenauer. Dr. Adenauer rose from his desk, walked slowly to a partially repaired window, and contemplated for a moment the terrible wreckage of his home city. Then he turned toward us and said:

"Ruins, terrible ruins. But I am not the most deeply concerned about them, for the city can and will be rebuilt. The problem with which I am the most deeply concerned is: What great ideas and concepts will motivate the German people, and, indeed, the peoples of other nations, in the years which lie ahead? This, gentlemen, is the only really important problem."

Great ideas do not grow and spread by themselves; they are propagated through the works of dedicated people. But for His disciples, the great teachings of Jesus would have perished. Without a masterful educational effort the dignity, worth, and self-expression of the individual, which people's capitalism both recognizes and promotes, will be lost in a godless world state of Communist monopoly capitalism, wherein the individual is but a source of physical energy to be allocated, conditioned and exploited in the service of a handful of monopoly capitalists.

The program of enlightening the people as to the facts of people's capitalism versus Communist monopoly capitalism must be carried abroad by our public and private information services.

In addition we require an adequate program of training leaders in: (1) The strategy and technique of Communist subversion; (2) the countermeasures required to cope with such subversion; and (3), as conditions permit, the building of people's capitalism.

We must have this program because on virtually every front of this war the anti-Communist native leadership has proven incapable of coping with the tactics employed by the foreign Communist graduates of Moscow subversion institutes. After having trained cadres of foreign natives, and their return to their homelands, we must be prepared to support their anti-Communist leadership to whatever degree is required to make it effective. In this we shall be doing no more than meeting the challenge of the effective support which Moscow gives to its foreign agents. There will, however, be this fundamental difference. The objective of Moscow support is always to create permanent, slave satellites. The objective of our support is to preserve, strengthen, and create free and independent people's capitalisms.

United States gifts of cash, and technical assistance, are not enough. The UNRRA millions poured into Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary did not save these nations from Communist subversion. World events strongly argue that aid programs alone may be only fattening the geese for the Communist monopoly butchers. The crucial factor is not so much dollars, or even hydrogen bombs, as it is effective anti-Communist leadership. Secretary of State Dulles recognized this truth when he said: "The Communists, too, can be infiltrated."

The program outlined above is more than an immediate necessity. It is a matter of life or death, freedom or slavery to millions of God's people. It merits the very best organizational and educational effort which those who love freedom have to give.

A national educational "Institute for People's Capitalism" could mobilize an unmatched faculty from amongst the scores of persons who have been personal witnesses to Communist deceit, cruelty, and subterfuge in every part of the globe. Foreign students, brought here on scholarships, can experience with their own senses the fruits of people's capitalism. With a proper example in this country, the lovers of freedom in many other countries would move to establish similar institutes in their own Communist-threatened homelands.

What agency could possibly undertake the domestic educational aspects of the program? Would this task be in keeping with both the purposes of the Ford Foundation, and with those highest traditions of a people's capitalism through which the Foundation became a reality? Do we not already possess overseas diplomatic, intelligence, and military agencies which are in position to support trained anti-Communist leadership?

Could not the proper implementation of this program hasten the collapse of monopoly Communist capitalism and usher in a new dynamic of individual freedom, responsibility, and creativity which is inherent to people's capitalism, and which would make this world a better abode for all men?

Inaccurate and Unfair News Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inaccurate and Unfair Coverage," which appeared in a recent issue of the bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The article was written by one of our Nation's most distinguished editors, Mr. Samuel L. Latimer, Jr., of the State, Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INACCURATE AND UNFAIR COVERAGE

(By S. L. Latimer, Jr.)

I agree with Mr. Archer that "newspapers ought to decentralize their sources of (national) political information."

I think the newspapers themselves are greatly to be blamed. We all too often give importance, beyond its due, to the opinions of political figures or to a certain dateline, and the wire services are too prone to attach more significance to a story that breaks in a big center, such as Washington and New York, than to a story of equal value originating elsewhere.

Mr. Archer says there must be in every State or at least in every region some newspaperman who knows what the people are thinking and whose skills and presentations are fully equal to those who write in Washington. I should hope so. But if these correspondents had the same difficulty getting their stories printed as now is the case with favorable news about the South their time would be wasted.

I cite the South since it at present is a political football and because if there ever was an area that has failed to get accurate and fair coverage it is this section of the country. Let something take place that throws a good light on the South and see what happens to the story. But let something happen that reflects upon the South and immediately the story gets big, and often distorted, treatment.

I wish our paper could afford to have a bureau in every section of the country to tell us what the people are really thinking, not what the politicians and the progagandists want to ram down the peoples' throat. But if we had such a service we would feel obligated to print the reports, whether we agreed with them or not, so that our readers could be informed.

Unless the newspapers change their attitude toward grassroots information, the situation of which Mr. Archer complains will continue to exist.

Proposed Commission on National Housing Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to create a Commission on National Housing Policy.

This bill is identical with S. 3186 introduced Tuesday by the junior Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, and cosponsored by seven other Senators. It is designed to provide information as to why there are threatened cutbacks in the vital housing industry and to provide logical moves to correct any shortcomings.

Part of the trouble, I believe, can be traced readily to uncertainty about the status of Government-supported mortgages in the money markets under the

Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration programs.

More will be found in the capital-short areas of the Nation—for the most part those sections showing fastest growth—where the Federal National Mortgage Association has not been functioning as intended.

This bill is broader in scope than H. R. 9053, which I introduced on February 2. The purpose of H. R. 9053 was limited to amending the FNMA Charter Act to make that agency function as the Congress intended, to stimulate home construction capital-short areas instead of depressing it by policies which aggravate the shortage of mortgage funds.

I have in mind particularly the FNMA policy of requiring that common stock in FNMA be purchased by the local primary mortgage buyer before the agency will—in its secondary market function—buy the mortgage.

In addition to this, there is the widespread practice of discounting Government-supported mortgage loans in the money market.

Elimination of this practice was one of the major aims cited by Senate sponsors of S. 3186. Because the supply of money is short in many areas, discounting on VA and FHA insured loans is prevalent, reaching as high as 12 percent in some parts of the country.

I was pleased to note the concern with this situation evinced by Senators sponsoring S. 3186, as well as their interest in expanding the function of FNMA in stabilizing the mortgage market.

Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be early and sympathetic consideration of both of these measures by appropriate committees of the House. The housing industry's health has an important effect on the Nation's economy.

Industrial Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the November 5 issue of Business Week, regarding a study of industrial mental health which is being conducted by the Menninger Foundation and Clinic, in Topeka, Kans.

The Menninger Foundation and Clinic, in Topeka, under the able direction of Drs. Will and Karl Menninger, is rendering outstanding service in the mental health field, nationally and internationally. We in the State of Kansas are indebted to them for guidance and direction in programs which have materially benefited the mentally ill people of our State, in assisting us to establish at our State institutions programs which have resulted in our State's moving from among the lowest in mental health care to one of the top States of the Nation.

It is of great personal satisfaction to me that this program was initiated in 1946–50, during my administration as Governor of the State of Kansas. We had splendid cooperation from the legislature, the Kansas Medical Society, the Menninger Foundation, and our people generally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW STUDY MAY GIVE ANSWERS

Enlistment of psychiatry in the fight against the manifold industrial problems listed above has become a fact—and a fact that seems bound to grow in importance.

The Rockefeller Brothers Foundation took a major step to make it grow when it granted $105,000 for the establishment of a division of industrial mental health at the Menninger Foundation and Clinic, of Topeka. The sum is not a large one, but the grant gives a hefty shove just the same, for it means that the famous doctor team of the Menningers—Karl A. and William C.—will be able to expand their specialized training of industrial psychiatric personnel.

The grant, made 4 weeks ago, was followed by some icing for the Menningers' cake. Last week the American Public Health Association conferred an Albert Laskar award on the Menninger Foundation.

PUBLIC RECOGNITION

The significance of the Rockefeller grant and the award lies in the public recognition it will bring preventive psychiatry. The Menningers are the leading exponents of the idea that psychiatry should come out of the hospital and contribute whatever it can to the well-being of mankind.

Actually, it's going to take a lot more than $105,000 to do very much about industrial mental health. This sum is little more than a drop in the bucket when you consider that maladjusted workers annually cost industry at least $3 billion through job changes, absenteeism, alcoholism, goldbricking, sabotage, vandalism, interpersonal frictions, executive breakdowns, and other manifestations of emotional difficulties. But, at least, it's a sign of a growing realization that something should be done about attacking these problems.

I. THE PROBLEMS

In the last 15 years or so, the language of pschiatry has become almost commonplace in America. The facility with which the average high school student tosses around the once taboo subjects and words often comes as a shock to the older generation. But the language is used not only at home or cocktail parties. It's all around us.

Those partially overhead conversations in streetcars, elevators, rest rooms, frequently consist of an amateur analysis of the speaker's associates in terms of complexes, drives, and sex life. And the fearless hero and pure heroine have almost disappeared from fiction, to be replaced in novels, TV, and the movies by characters torn by all manner of psychoses.

Extent of maladjustment

Still, most people retain a sneaking suspicion that mental health or maladjustment is something involving only crazy people and perhaps the slums, something far removed from their daily lives. Statistics provided by, say, the National Mental Health Committee ring no bell for them, although the chances are about 1 in 4 that they are one of the statistics. While maladjustment may not be the only cause, it is certainly a major factor in all of these situations:

For every 4 marriages a year, there is 1 divorce.

About 50,000 Americans are addicted to narcotics.

About 1,750,000 serious crimes are committed every year.

About 265,000 children between the ages of 7 and 17 are brought into juvenile courts each year.

About 12 percent of the 15 million men examined for induction into the Armed Forces during World War II were rejected for neuropsychotic disorders.

One out of every eighten persons now alive will spend some part of his life in a mental hospital.

Worker dissatisfaction

In industry, more than in any other area of American life, we are constantly being reminded of the dissatisfactions, strife, and violence that occur between groups of our citizens.

In the words of Dr. Will Menninger: "Many jobs don't offer a very adequate outlet for some of the instinctive energy that is in all of us.

"True, there are some compensations. Sometimes we feel that our work is sufficiently worthwhile to make up for the fact that we don't have the outlet we need. Often we gain satisfaction from the very happy personal relationships we have on the job. One of the most advantageous aspects of any kind of job is the feeling that we 'belong.' Monetary gain, too, is often a source of satisfaction.

"In the opposite direction, we see, across the country, very many evidences of dissatisfaction with work. In management-labor difficulties, labor often appears to be fighting for material returns when it is actually striving for job satisfaction. The restrictive nature of work as we enforce it upon ourselves—the regimentation, the routine, and often the lack of opportunity for creativeness—adds, I think, to job dissatisfaction."

Cost to industry

What does Dr. Will's theorizing mean in dollars and cents to industry? It shows up in the surveys that have been conducted with increasing frequency by industrial researchers in the last few years:

In a study of 127 plants, a group of industrial psychologists found that the workers were galled by rules that assigned them to dining rooms and toilets inferior to those of their bosses and that left them to scramble for parking space in lots where stalls were reserved for executives. The worker, the research team said, was frustrated, made to feel like an inferior creature, a number in a department. As a result, there was greater pressure through the union for more money to make up for an emotionally dissatisfying work atmosphere, and meantime the workers continued to exhibit all the hostility, sloppy production, inefficiency, and lack of motivation that resentment can produce.

Statistics on accidents indicate that some 30 percent of the workers become involved in 85 percent of the accidents, as a result of emotional troubles. Additional research has shown that the seriously troubled employee had 3 times as many safety violations, shop rule violations, and disciplinary contacts; 2½ times as many grievances and medical dispensary visits, and 1½ times as many minor surgical requirements, sick days, and absences for personal reasons as other employees.

In a study at a major oil company, character traits were said to represent 90 percent of the causes for discharge and 76 percent of the reasons for which promotion was not granted. Another study of 4,000 cases of discharge in 76 companies indicated that 85 percent were fired primarily because of character traits.

II. THE MENNINGERS

The Menninger Foundation and Clinic in Topeka has been described as America's psychiatric, and psychoanalytic, powerhouse. And the phrase is apt.

The foundation, a nonprofit professional organization dedicated to the conquest of mental illness and improvement of health, was established in 1941. But its history

starts in 1908 when Dr. Charles Frederick Menninger visited the Mayo Clinic and dreamed that his young sons, Karl and Will, should be doctors and that together they would establish the Menninger Clinic.

The dream came true in 1919 when the clinic was founded, but it adopted psychiatry as its specialty. At the time, psychiatrists going into practice in the big cities were having a difficult time making a living. Few professionals expected a clinic to endure long in the land of tall corn and sunflowers.

Psychiatrist's mecca

The flow of patients, however, soon contradicted the experts. The Menningers were forced out of their downtown office into a remodeled farmhouse on the edge of town. Additions have been added steadily. In 1941, the Menninger Foundation was incorporated as a nonprofit institution and absorbed the properties of the clinic. Today, the foundation with a dozen buildings occupies 40 acres and the Child Psychiatry Department has three buildings in a separate location.

Other hospitals have been built in the area as Topeka became a mecca for psychiatrists. Psychiatry is now the city's second largest industry, involving as patients, doctors, technicians, and maintenance personnel close to 10,000 people.

The foundation today is a training and research center as well as a hospital and clinic. The training program began in 1946 and since that time has graduated about 500 students. Industrial preventive psychiatry bolstered by the recent Rockefeller grant, is primarily a research activity.

Application to industry

The industrial program had its roots in Dr. Will's military service during World War II (brigadier general). As director of the neuropsychiatry division in the Surgeon General's office, he was in charge of the mental health of some 10-million GIs. After the war, he helped set up Winter General Hospital in Topeka, which was taken over by the Veterans Administration.

"The Army functioned as a huge industry does," Dr. Will said recently. "In it, psychiatry played a relatively prominent role. Why could it not contribute to civilian industry and business?

Gaining perspective

To obtain information for establishment of the new division, Dr. Harry Levinson, a foundation graduate and a clinical psychologist particularly interested in the problems of industry, was added to the staff. In the last year, Dr. Will and Dr. Levinson have traveled about 20,000 miles observing, asking questions, looking for leads, trying to obtain a perspective on industrial mental health. Together they visted almost all the psychiatrists working full time in industry, many industrial health departments. They talked with professors teaching labor relations, industrial psychology, industrial medicine, human relations. They sat in on union meetings and counseling programs. They talked to personnel directors and business executives. They've scoured the literature.

The advice they got from persons concerned with emotional problems in industry boiled down to this: "The only way to study and attack such problems from your point of view is to begin some small service to industry. Once within the plant, your own experience will make certain problems immediately apparent to you that are not apparent to those without psychiatric understanding."

III. THE NEXT 3 YEARS

How do the Menningers propose to get the newly established unit moving on industrial mental health?

Dr. Will sees first the recruitment of a staff of trained personnel to assist Dr. Levinson. He believes in the team approach and wants the staff to include a psychiatrist, a sociologist, and a management specialist. This team would choose an industry and study it for 2 or 3 years. Several industries already have volunteered to be used as guinea pigs.

Fact gathering

In addition to the firsthand accumulation of facts and experience, the data of published research and contemporary thinking will have to be studied and integrated to make the survey complete. This means building up a library of books and journals devoted to industrial problems.

After 3 years of study and research, Dr. Will believes that the team will be able to launch a program that will have far-reaching effects on many of the problems of industry. For this later program he hopes to get support from industry not only in the form of money for research and training, but also for putting psychiatric consultants on the company payrolls and establishing emotional-aid stations in the plants.

Character analyses

While a scientific program is 3 years away, the prolific writing of the Menninger brothers provide some interesting analyses of character traits and what they now consider important characteristics of good mental health.

"The kind of leader that I would wish in many, many high places," Dr. Will wrote last year, "is the man who has some understanding of personalities, their structure and function, how they work, and who knows of the unreasonableness in all of us and the hostilities we all have."

Of motivation in industry, he said: "Unless we help a man understand what his job is and give him a total picture what his part on the team is, he can never really be a member of the team. * * * While there may be effective communication from above down, there are rarely any communications from below up."

A Reply by General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "General MacArthur Makes His Reply," written by Douglas MacArthur, and published in the February 13, 1956, issue of Life magazine.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the article will make 3 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $240.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR MAKES HIS REPLY—HE ACCUSES TRUMAN OF FALLIBLE MEMORY AND OF DODGING COURT OF INQUIRY BY WAITING UNTIL NOW TO BRING UP THIS BELATED CLAIM OF INSUBORDINATION

(By Douglas MacArthur)

I had sincerely hoped that in his memoir narration of the Korean war and the facts and circumstances surrounding my relief from command in the Far East, Mr. Truman would be animated by a high sense of dedication to the historical record and proceed with restrained concern for truth and accuracy. Possibly I should have been forewarned that such was not to be when distinguished Americans and the Ambassador of a neighboring state, among them former Secretary of State and Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes, former Vice President Henry A. Wallace, former Attorney General Francis Biddle, former Foreign Aid Administrator Leo T. Crowley, President Truman's own Chief of Staff, Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, Mr. Bernard Baruch, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, and former Secretary of War and Ambassador to China Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley found it necessary, generally with incontrovertible supporting documentation, publicly to challenge the integrity of his work. Even so, I would not join in such an arraignment were it not that Mr. Truman's narration does such violence to the truth that to remain silent would be a disservice to the Nation.

I will not be so brash as to attempt to diagnose the animating impulses which have led him into such a labyrinth of fancy and fiction, distortion and misrepresentation. Suffice it to suggest that a well-known quotation may provide a clue to the answer: "Everything looks yellow to a jaundiced eye." For such does seem peculiarly applicable to Mr. Truman's memoirs in the writing of which he has been unable to rise above those petty instincts based upon spite and vindictiveness which have so frequently led him into violent and vulgar public controversy. The more the pity, for in a discussion of these events of recent history the record is replete with original documentation which Mr. Truman has largely ignored in favor of his own fallible memory and gift for twisting the facts to serve his own ends. If left unchallenged, he would indeed establish a mastery of fiction over fact, thus altering and slanting the record in his endeavor to explain the aftermath of tragic reality which has followed.

Were I to attempt to correct Mr. Truman's many inaccuracies and distortions concerning the Korean war and my relief from the Far Eastern scene, I might as well attempt a rewrite of that part of his memoirs. I therefore confine myself to certain basic facts which, because of their warped treatment, need to be restated and reelucidated.

To begin with, Mr. Truman seeks to involve me in the responsibility for South Korea's inability to meet the North Korean assault in late June 1950 by slyly referring to my approval of the withdrawal of our XXIV Corps from Korea in 1949.

He attempts in this way to divert attention from the fact that the project was initiated in Washington and that my approval was based upon the assumption that there would be created in its place 10 full divisions of trained South Korean troops equipped with all modern weapons of war. This was not done. With the withdrawal of the XXIV Corps over-all responsibility for South Korea was transferred to the State Department. In Washington the fatal decision was then made that the South Korean troops should not be supplied with such weapons as tanks, long-range artillery, adequate heavy trucks, large-scale engineering and signal equipment, aircraft and general supply and maintenance resources. This amazing policy was based apparently on the fear that otherwise these troops might be used to march north in an attempt to unify the country by force of arms.

Under such drastic limitation of armament, South Korean units were little more than a constabulary force and were unable, in spite of their bravery and excellent training, to cope with the North Korean army with its full complement of heavy armament, including hundreds of tanks and long-range artillery pieces with supporting aircraft in overwhelming force. In addition, these South Korean divisions were not brought to full strength. At their peak they never numbered more than 65,000 men—about half the numerical strength of the North Koreans.

Had the South Koreans been organized up to 10 fully equipped divisions, which would have brought them up to the enemy's strength, in all probability the North Koreans would not have dared to attack. But even had they done so, it is my firm belief that the South Koreans would have repulsed them.

Mr. Truman's relief of me on April 11, 1951 was important not because of the personalities involved but as a symbol of a basic change in his attitude toward Asia since entering upon the Korean war and the calamitous events which resulted therefrom. It set off a chain of reaction which has prejudiced to its very foundation the struggle between the free and the Red world. Mr. Truman's decision to meet Communist aggression in its military effort to seize Korea would have been a noble one indeed had it been implemented with unswerving courage and determination. But he proved unequal to the task. After Red China entered the conflict, he yielded to counsels of fear and abandoned pledged commitments to restore to the people of Korea a nation which was unified and free.

A CATASTROPHIC BLOW TO THE FREE WORLD

Such abandonment of principles by a President in whom the peoples of Asia had placed such trust and faith was a catastrophic blow to the hopes of the free world. Its disastrous consequences were reflected throughout Asia. Red China promptly was accepted as the military colossus of the East. Korea was left ravished and divided. Indochina was partitioned by the sword. Tibet was taken almost on demand. Other Asian nations began to tremble toward neutralism.

Mr. Truman's action wasted the opportunity to retrieve our basic mistake of the 1946 Marshall mission in offering appeasement to the Red Chinese at the expense of Nationalist China beguiled by the naive concept that the Reds were only agrarian reformers. It confirmed Red control of continental China and fostered the growth of a powerful ally of Soviet Russia which well might tip the balance of military power in the struggle for the world. It signaled the artificial restraint of our forces in Korea which could have attained victory without recourse to other than conventional warfare and with much less loss than actually occurred under protracted negotiations. Aproximately three-fifths of our casualties were suffered during the indecisive aftermath following my relief. Mr. Truman's policy reversed United States military doctrine of a century and a half from reliance on attack to defense, although the history of warfare shows the latter never attained more than an indecisive stalemate. It accepted at tragic cost the thesis of indecision that in war there can be a substitute for victory; that enemy leaders who violate the conventional laws of warfare by savage brutalities need not be held to ultimate responsibility; that the rights of honorable prisoners of war are no longer a sacred trust.

All of this destroyed Oriental faith in our fortitude, in our determination and in our belief that the Far East was comparable in importance to Europe. It confirmed their fear of allied concentration on the Atlantic Ocean area and a much lower priority for the Pacific Ocean area. This largely lost us the psychological results of our World War II victory in the Far East.

Mr. Truman failed abysmally to comprehend the Soviet strategy in the latter's continuing and relentless effort to control the world, although that strategy is clearly expressed and delineated in the public writings of the Soviet leadership. He failed to understand that the global panorama has long encompassed three great areas of potential struggle: in the center, Europe; on the flanks, Asia to the north and Africa to the south. Mr. Truman apparently thought of the center as the area of supreme interest and potential struggle, believing that if it could be held safely all else would fall into place. This concept was fostered and encouraged by the constant propaganda pressures of the Soviet designed to convey the clear impression of aggression there and thus concealing his real objectives on the flanks.

What the Soviets sought were the economic frontiers of the world—Asia to the north, Africa to the south—frontiers which possessed such a mighty reservoir of the world's potential wealth in raw resources. The center represented little in economic advance, the flanks everything. The Soviet strategy was merely to defend in Europe, but to advance by way of the flanks; to cause the free world to concentrate its resources at the center to the neglect of the vital ends. It has worked even beyond his wildest expectations. Our main priority, even with war raging on the north flank in the Far East, has been the center, Europe, although practically free from battle combat. And now, with the north flank turned in Asia, the Soviet has started to envelop the southern flank in the Middle East.

All this and more has followed from Mr. Truman's fatal decision not to see it through in Korea. It plunged us from an invincible position of moral strength into the confusion of uncertain bewilderment, the practice of doubtful expediency and the eventual misery of timid appeasement. Seldom in history has national prestige dropped so precipitously from the top toward the bottom.

Mr. Truman is angry with me for regarding the Korean conflict as a war and not, as he termed it, a "police action." He imposed drastic restrictoins on the use of our air and naval power, established sanctuary zones protecting the enemy's supply depots and lines of communication, and, by prohibiting the employment of Chinese Nationalist troops, neutralized the half million soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek. My many protests that such decisions would cost us the lives of thousands of our soldiers and deprive us of our victory were disregarded. In his memoirs, Mr. Truman defends his decisions by stating that otherwise we would have caused war with Red China. How could Red China have been more at war against us? Every ounce of her military and economic force was thrown into the Korean struggle. Lacking naval and air power, she was incapable of anything more. She was already strained to the breaking point in a 100-percent war effort against us.

How can one reasonably say it is not war when 134,000 Americans and many times that of our allied South Koreans were killed, maimed, or captured? The preponderance of these casualties were inflicted by Red Chinese and were largely due to Mr. Truman's unprecedented restrictions. Can such arbitrary decisions with such fatal results be regarded as right, or logical, or even rational? I am sure no man who fought in Korea will ever think so.

Mr. Truman further attempts to justify his extraordinary military policy, which literally placed our arms in a straitjacket, by arguing the possibility that if we had followed our tradition and fought to win it might have precipitated Soviet Russia's entry into the war. But the entry of Soviet Russia, or Red China, was a risk inherent in his original decision to intervene in Korea. Then is when he should have weighed the possible consequences and taken his decision with full acceptance of all the circumstances involved.

Mr. Dulles, our present Secretary of State then on a special mission to Korea, understood the risk of possible Soviet involvement and so informed the President by cable from Japan prior to the decision to intervene. But Mr. Dulles stated that he believed the risk of global war would be less if we intervened than if we abstained, and he advised the President that we should go in.

For myself, I have never felt, because of the realities involved, that there was serious danger of active Soviet intervention. In Korea the Soviet would have been at his weakest. The long and tenuous supply lines and other difficulties inherent in fighting a Far Eastern war were coupled with Moscow's psychological tendency to back down before a determined show of force. Moreover, Russia's policy is not to sacrifice its own troops but to use those of its friends. The enormous expansion of Soviet influence since the end of World War II has been brought about without the Russian soldier firing a shot.

Over the years many conflicting reasons have been given by Mr. Truman, or his supporters, for my abrupt relief when victory was in our grasp. Now, for the first time, he bases his action upon what he terms insubordination, one of the most serious of all military offenses and one which throughout our military annals has never been made without the officer concerned being given a hearing and the opportunity to defend himself. Indeed, the code which the Congress enacted to establish the laws governing the Military Establishment specifically makes such a hearing mandatory. Had Mr. Truman made such a charge against me at the time of my relief, or even later during his tenure of office, I would have had the right and privilege to ask that a court of inquiry sit in judicial judgment upon his allegations. But he made no such charge, confining himself instead to administrative reasons for my replacement by an officer of his selection—a decision which violated no military code or constitutional prescription and left me with no remedy, either in law or tradition.

This belated claim of insubordination is made by him not as a public official but as a private citizen. In making it he conveniently ignores the fact that the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, my military superiors in the conduct of the Korean war, specifically, categorically and unanimously denied under oath before the joint senatorial committee investigating the reasons for my relief that I had ever been guilty of insubordination, and that the joint committee members themselves in the report made at the conclusion of the hearings were in complete agreement upon this point. Nevertheless, Mr. Truman categorically states that General Bradley charged me with insubordination. This is in direct contradiction to General Bradley's sworn testimony in the Senate hearings. In answer to direct questions by Senators GEORGE, BYRD, and MORSE he three times denied there had been any insubordination.

Mr. Truman bases his charge upon the writing of three documents, viz: my message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of August 1950, my call on the enemy commander to capitulate on March 24, 1951, and my reply to an inquiry from then Minority Leader Congressman JOE MARTIN, of March 20, 1951.

The message of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was a strategic study of the island of Formosa as a link in our defensive chain in the western Pacific which both explained and supported our Government's enunciated policy concerning that island. It was a rountine message which normally would have attracted little attention other than from those who might have secretly harbored the ultimate intent to surrender Formosa to Red Chinese control. These latter would naturally react against such a strategic study for it emphasized the policy that Formosa must not be yielded to Soviet influence.

The charge that I was insubordinate because I called upon the enemy commander to surrender and stop further bloodshed is even more grotesque. Twice before had I done so: after the Inchon victory and after our capture of Pyongyang, the enemy's capi-

tal city in North Korea. In neither instance had there been the slightest whisper of remonstrance from any source; indeed, quite the contrary. And actually how could it have been otherwise? From the beginning of warfare it has not only been a right but a duty for a field commander to take any steps within his power to minimize the bloodshed by the soldiers committed to his command. Mr. Truman has complained of my emphasizing the enemy's weakness; but my statement was not only factual but intended to present to the enemy the basic reasons why he should agree to stop the war. Mr. Truman further complains that my proposal interfered with one he himself contemplated making for an armistice. Such a complaint is unexplainable. How could any proffer of peace by me possibly interfere with a similar purpose or move on his part—unless, of course, he were secretly entertaining the idea of appeasing the Reds by an agreement short of the declared objectives of the United Nations in the unification of Korea? Less than 4 months later the Soviets' initiation of a conference was avidly accepted by him.

The third document which Mr. Truman calls insubordination was my letter in reply to that of Congressman MARTIN asking my views on the employment of Chinese Nationalist troops which had been offered for the Korean front. It has always been the practice and became the law that military officials, when called upon by Members of Congress for information, shall give it without reservation, but here again Formosa loomed up as the focal point to Mr. Truman. For in that letter I agreed with Congressman MARTIN's logic that the loyal Chinese troops on Formosa should be utilized to support our own forces in the battle for Korea. Indeed, I believe the decision not to do so at that critical time was one of the most ill-conceived and illogical ever made by a President of the United States. In ultimate effect, we were protecting the Red Chinese against troops allied with us in the same common cause.

Mr. Truman takes particular exception to my statement in the letter to Congressman MARTIN that "in war there is no substitute for victory." The absurdity of such a complaint is apparent. As events since my relief have so clearly demonstrated, the only substitute for victory lies in appeasement. A great nation which enters upon war and does not win always suffers the ultimate consequences of defeat. Stalemate may end the casualties on the battlefield but marks the military collapse of the purpose which induced entry into combat. Mr. Truman had by this time apparently reached a point in his career as President where the slightest divergence in view by any subordinate was regarded as a personal affront to him. The disease of power was coursing through his veins. To apply such a dogma to political appointees of temporary length of service was one thing, but to require complete conformity from those permanent members of the government whose services lie in the field of a profession is to introduce the very essence of absolute government. The oath they take is not to an individual but to support the Constitution and the laws of the land. They are the servants of the people and ultimately responsible to their Congress, however much they may be subject to the lawful orders of their superiors. That is what differentiates a democracy from a tyranny.

Quite apart from what Mr. Truman has to say in his memoirs, I have searched in vain for some loigical explanation for my abrupt relief from command in the Far East. I am sure that it was influenced by my firm convictions against appeasement of any sort and by my objective of victory. I am sure that my view that Formosa should be held as an integral part of our defensive chain in the western Pacific and that once Red China initiated hostilities against us we should regard it as an act of war aroused many influential persons in Washingon and other capitals, and probably the President himself, against me. That I did not—and could not—alter my professional military convictions to conform to the political expediences of others was to them unpardonable. But what may well have triggered my removal was my recommendation, made in January shortly before my relief, that a treason trial be initiated to break up a spy ring responsible for the purloining of my top secret reports to Washington. My campaign plans, including those of the Eighth Army, were transmitted daily to Washington. General Walker complained constantly to me that the enemy was receiving prior information of his movements. We could find no leaks in Korea or Japan. Then suddenly one of my dispatches concerning the order of battle was published in a Washington paper within a few hours of its receipt. I insisted that those responsible be prosecuted in order that such subversive activity be stopped but the case was never processed and I was shortly relieved of my command.

LINKS TO THE ENEMY

It was not until the recent exposure of the British spies, Burgess and Maclean, that the true facts began to unfold. These men with access to secret files were undoubtedly links in the chain to our enemy in Korea through Peiping by way of Moscow. I believe my demand that this situation be exposed, coming after the Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White scandals, caused the deepest resentment and that it probably was branded a political move to embarrass the administration.

I myself have long been convinced that Red China's decision to commit its forces to the Korean peninsula was predicated upon assurance previously given through Moscow that such intervention would not precipitate retaliation against its attack bases. I do not intend to impugn in any way the loyalty or patriotism of President Truman and his high associates, and above all not to reflect upon the integrity and unquestioned greatness of the Democratic party which was then in power. But the obstinacy which dictated the failure of President Truman to recognize the damage that could be done by Red infiltrators and his "red herring" characterization of all efforts to unmask them are among the astounding features of an astounding epoch.

President Truman's legal authority to relieve a field commander, irrespective of the wisdom or stupidity of his action, has never been questioned by anyone. The supremacy of the civil over the military is fundamental to the American system of government and is wholeheartedly accepted by every officer and soldier in the military establishment. It is not an issue in this case. But in exercising his constitutional power to relieve me Mr. Truman did so in a way which amounted to drastic summary punishment without hearing or trial.

This was no mere change of command. It was a vengeful reprisal. Since the beginning of time commanders have been changed, some through whim, some through cause, but never in history was there such a savage and brutal method employed. It followed the practice of our Soviet adversaries: no hearing, no opportunity for defense, no consideration of the past. It was accomplished without the slightest hint to me that my service had become unsatisfactory. Indeed, had I had the least inkling of dissatisfaction, I would have instantly applied to be relieved. Up to the moment of my relief I had been receiving laudatory commendations from the President, publicly and through his liaison officer at my headquarters. No slightest opportunity was given me to explain my position, to answer allegations or objections, to present my future concepts and plans.

CALLOUS DISREGARD FOR ORDINARY DECENCIES

I was first apprised of the President's action through a press dispatch over the public radio. Mr. Truman claims that he tried to inform me through the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, then on a visit to Japan and Korea, but could not reach him. This is incredible. Secretary Pace had been with me in my office just before and had reflected a most complimentary attitude in Washington. In Korea, where he was at the moment the news came, he was in direct contact with my headquarters, which had similar contact with Washington.

The actual order I received from the President was so drastic as to prevent the usual amenities incident to a transfer of command and practically placed me under duress. No office boy, no charwoman, no servant of any sort would have been dismissed with such callous disregard for the ordinary decencies.

President Truman attempts to spread the responsibility for his action to his immediate subordinates by revealing what purports to be the details of a conference called by him on April 6, 1951, to consider the question of my relief. He refused to reveal such details when called upon to do so by the Joint Senatorial Committees inquiring into the causes of my relief, throwing up the shield of constitutional privilege arising from the duly ordained separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of Government. Now, after having denied such information to the Congress, he has blandly released it to a publisher for a price. At the same time he explains his refusal to give the information to the Congress by saying "advisers, to be of value, must feel that what they say or write will be held in confidence." He thus betrays the very principle upon which he denied the information to Congress; he betrays the very conferees he says it was his duty to protect; and he betrays the Congress by selling at a price information it had sought to obtain in the public interest.

Mr. Truman claims that the conferees, all of whom were his appointees and beholden to him for past favors and dependent on future support—General Marshall, then Secretary of Defense; General Bradley, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Averell Harriman, an exeutive assistant; and Secretary of State Dean Acheson—all acquiesced in my relief from command. I suspect that all knew, despite his disclaimers, the decision the President had already reached.

The two military men, Generals Marshall and Bradley, officers of high distinction and notable service, were both personally hostile to me. General Marshall's enmity was an old one, but General Bradley's was more recent. It undoubtedly had its origin in my refusal to accept him as my senior ground commander for the invasion of Japan when he was recommended by General Marshall. I frankly preferred my own commanders, Kruger and Eichelberger. I was doubtful of General Bradley because of his decisions and actions connected with the Battle of the Bulge, where he was the ground commander, and which resulted in approximately as many American casualties as were sustained in the entire southwest Pacific area campaigns from Australia to Tokyo. General Bradley was a candidate for promotion to the rank of General of the Army and Mr. Truman now discloses in his memoirs that as far back as my message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars he had contemplated appointing him to replace me. Moreover, the victory at Inchon had exploded General Bradley's previously stated view, entirely contrary to my own at the time, that amphibious warfare was a thing of the past never again to be resorted to on a major scale.

A PAROXYSM OF ANGER

Averell Harriman, a distinguished diplomat, had called on me in Tokyo shortly after my visit to Formosa and just before Inchon. He pointedly cautioned me of the extreme dislike with which President Truman regarded Chiang Kai-shek. He said that the mere mention of the Generalissimo's name aroused in the President a paroxysm of anger.

To illustrate his point Harriman told me that the then Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, despite his long and proven devotion to President Truman, was on his way out because the President suspected him of being on too friendly terms with the Generalissimo. Within a month his prediction was fulfilled. I felt that I was being pressured because of my openly expressed admiration and personal regard for the Generalissimo. In effect, it was a warning to be a conformist or risk following Louis Johnson. The interview was distasteful to me and Harriman probably recognized my distrust. His prejudice could have resulted.

Secretary Acheson had frequently exhibited petulance and impatience with those phases of the occupation of Japan which did not follow certain socialistic concepts which the State Department was endeavoring to force upon the Japanese people. Like Mr. Truman, during his long tenure of public office he had never visited Asia and therefore had no personal knowledge of its peoples or its special problems and was a complete stranger to Oriental psychology.

These are the four men with whom the President conferred, although he himself states with cynical inconsistency that he had already definitely decided to relieve me.

PERVERSION OF MY COMMENTS

Mr. Truman asserts that at the Wake Island conference I misled him by assuring him that Red China would not enter the Korean war. This is a peculiar perversion of my comments. The President asked what were the chances for Chinese or Soviet intervention. I replied that my answer could only be speculative, but that my guess would be very little.

I then explained that I could not only speak from a military standpoint with its manifest limitations and the question was one which involved a fundamental political decision; that I had had no intimation from either the Defense Department, the State Department, or the Central Intelligence Agency, my sole sources of political information, that such a move was in contemplation; that large concentrations of Red Chinese troops were on the Manchurian side of the Yalu but that with our complete command of the air, if they crossed the Yalu in force, we could isolate and completely jeopardize their safety by destroying the bridges and Manchurian supply bases; that such a move would be an act of war by Red China and that our power of retaliation would be overwhelming. I assumed under such circumstances that all prohibitive restrictions would be removed. This view was not questioned by anyone at the conference and was later supported by the Central Intelligence Agency's report of November 24 that "there is no evidence that the Chinese Communists plan major offensive operations in Korea." Had anyone intimated to me that our country might suffer the Chinese Reds to strike us in full war force and retaliate only by trying to ward off the blow as it fell without striking back on our own, I would not have believed so preposterous a suggestion. I knew that any military commander could not but regard as sheerest folly a peninsular campaign which so extended and exposed his bases and supply lines to destructive retaliation.

What then was the unparalleled circumstance—and the only circumstance possible—which induced the Chinese to enter the Korean war? They must have been told by someone and they must have known what I did not know, that even if their armies swept across the Yalu by the hundreds of thousands, even if they struck without warning as at Pearl Harbor, we would ensure their forces sanctuary in Manchuria. Only if he were certain that we would continue to protect his bases and supply lines would a commander have dared to throw the full weight of the Chinese Army into Korea. Indeed, the Chinese commander in chief of the forces which entered North Korea is reported to have publicly stated he had definite advance information that my hands would be tied by this sanctuary doctrine. Otherwise, he is reported to have said, "I would not have dared risgk almost certain destruction by crossing the Yalu in force. No competent commander would have been such a fool." The Maclean-Burgess defection has shown how he could have known.

THE FATAL MOMENT

This was the moment—the fatal moment—when the tide throughout the world began to turn against us. Had we gone on to what was sure victory, the entire picture would have been changed. The threat of global war would have receded. The world would be a radically different place today.

One of our distinguished authors, Louis Bromfield, a most substantial Democrat, sums up President Truman's memoirs far more concisely than can any words of mine. Writing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin he says: "Its principal value will be, not to throw any illumination upon the events of the times but simply an exposition of what Harry Truman really is, how he thinks, how he is able to twist the record of events to his own ends. In this he was far from a novice—even while he was President. * * * As to those aspects of the book that deal with facts and the reality of events, it is curious that Mr. Truman's accounts of what really happened differ so widely from the accounts of a number of honest and honorable citizens who have served their country well. Not everybody can be out of step but Harry. * * * Contradictions are not vague ones nor even statements which might be misinterpreted: They are flat-out head-on collisions of fact. Truth may be interpreted or shaded according to feeling or wishful thinking, but fact is fact * * * a matter of date, of spoken or written words. It is not easily shaded or misinterpreted as time is likely to show in the Truman record."

Just a Simple Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we are now giving some consideration to a means by which the postal deficit can be reduced. It is most vital that this be done, because the precariously balanced budget which the administration was finally able to send up, is predicated on the elimination of such deficit.

If it is possible to solve some grave problem by a simple program and without burden to our people, it should be followed. I noticed just such a simple program recently in an editorial of the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo. I pass it along here so that it can be seen before we rush into a solution which will increase the burden of our people.

JUST A SIMPLE REMEDY

Once again the talk of raising postal rates comes along, and the suggestion is being made—again—that first-class letter postage go from 3 to 4 cents, and that newspaper and magazine rates be sharply raised.

None of us can complain too bitterly against the idea that the post office ought to be more nearly self-supporting, although delivering the mail is certainly a service which we have come to accept as a function of the Government—for which we pay in part through taxes.

However, none of us ever takes from the mail box an armload of "junk" mail, solicitations for this, that or something else, mailed out by the hundreds and traveling the mail routes for practically nothing, but that we wonder whether a ruling which would make all such mail have to go first class—at first-class rates—would not immediately solve the problem of the deficit.

These flyers are mailed out by the millions. The man on one mailing list gets onto scores of others. He may get as many as 4 or 5 solicitations from 1 house—and within a few days. No attempt to check the lists is ever made. In fact such solicitations often contain a little slip saying that it is too expensive to check the list. It's cheaper to send out 5 or 10 of the folders and let Uncle Sam pay the cost.

A rise in postal rates for such mail would (1) cut them to an absolute minimum and thereby save postal work and costs, and (2) bring in more income. We don't expect that anything so simple will be adopted, but it would be more sensible than adding that extra burden to John Q. Public's cost of living. And it would save a lot of paper too.

Address of O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, at the Annual Meeting of the National Western Mining Conference, Denver, Colo., February 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. O. R. Strackbein at the National Western Mining Conference at Denver, Colo., February 4, 1956:

A year ago I had the pleasure of speaking in Salt Lake City to another group, the National Wool Growers' Association. At that time, as I recall, the title of my address was "Look Out for the GATT; It's Loaded."

My reference was to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT. It was and still is loaded. Later I spoke before another group in Fort Worth under the title "Unloading the GATT."

Several additional pages of tariff history have been written since that time, and I shall try to bring you up to date.

One of the developments since then is the new agreement to set up the OTC, or Organization for Trade Cooperation, which would be a specialized agency of the United Nations dedicated to the administration of the general agreement, or GATT. This is the new international trade organization that Congress is now being asked to approve. The bill is H. R. 5550 and is now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The new OTC represents a resurrection of the ITO, or International Trade Organization, that died before Congress in 1950. It represents the effort to unload the GATT on the United States in a form that will make it permanent.

But let us go back a bit in order to gain perspective.

The so-called reciprocal-trade agreement, of which all this is a part, is now 21 years old. That represents a considerable span of years and has given us enough time to test the program and particularly its administration.

There can today no longer be any doubt about the meaning of this trade program so far as Congress is concerned. What the final objctive is, no longer lies hidden—it no longer can be hidden. It is open to view for anyone to see. I refer to the administration of the Trade Agreements Act and the separation of Congress from its constitutional authority over the regulation of our foreign commerce under the administration of the trade program as it has been carried out.

Nor can there any longer be any doubt about the meaning of the trade program and the character of its administration to American industry, to American agriculture, to mining, fishing and grazing operations—to those who work at these pursuits—millions of men and women whose incomes and livelihood depend upon employment in domestic plants, mills, and mines and on the land and sea in other gainful occupations. Import competition is not a matter of indifference to them. The trade agreements program and how it is handled is of the greatest importance and concern to them.

The unfolding of this program, the trade agreements program, especially after abandonment of the bilateral agreements and the substitution of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade for them when the Geneva agreement went into effect 8 years ago, left many of us with the gravest misgivings, wondering how far it would go.

Now there is no longer any mystery about it. With the resurrection of the badly defeatd ITO proposal, now again rearing its head, as already pointed out, in the recently negotiated OTC, there no longer remains a shred of doubt what the plan is.

To refresh your memory to a little history, let me repeat that the letters ITO were the initials of the International Trade Organization, the charter for which was signed in Habana, Cuba, in 1948. This ITO charter, which called for a world trade organization under the United Nations designed to lead us to free trade and global economic planning, was brought to Congress for approval. However, it never got beyond the House Committee on Foreign Affairs where it was pigeonholed after full hearings in 1950.

That was the end of the ITO. It died because no other leading country was interested in it without United States membership.

Now six years later the OTC is brought before us, dressed in innocent garb and trotted out as a harmless lamb.

The fact is that the proposed OTC or Organization for Trade Cooperation, is in point of fact the abandoned ITO all over again in essence and potential, but has the deceptive advantage of being more attractively packaged.

OTC has been advertised as calling for no supranational power; yet that is exactly what it would have in practice and in fact: and that is also exactly what the State Department wants it to have. Otherwise the Department would not be interested in it. Since the OTC would have an assembly, which means a law or rulemaking body, it could turn itself into the ITO at any time it saw fit to do so and make no mistake about it, that is the intent. We would have 1 vote out of an initial total of 35.

Unquestionably this resurrected International Trade Organization would make a meek beginning, as a fledgling of the United Nations. Once more the Members of Congress would lose sight of the body sitting in Geneva. Before many years, however—in fact, quite soon—we would find that the coils of the python had been silently but thoroughly thrown around us.

The authority that we find, when we read our own Constitution, conferred upon Congress in unmistakable black and white, to regulate foreign commerce and to lay and collect duties on imports, would then become little more than so many words.

That is the prospect that faces Congress during this session. The OTC bill, to repeat, is H. R. 5550.

But there is more.

Congress has legislated repeatedly since 1951, when the escape-clause amendment to the Trade Agreements Extension Act of that year was adopted. Congress has made its will known repeatedly in legislation, in many amendments to that escape clause, to make sure that all American producers faced with hurtful import competition have a reasonable remedy.

Just as surely this legislation has been batted down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. The prime mover has been the State Department—a Department that seems to find it hard to believe that American producers are entitled to the most elementary considerations of fair treatment.

It is my opinion that Congress has exercised great patience and restraint under the circumstances—in fact entirely too much patience. The power and responsibility of Congress in the field of trade has already been taken over so far by the State Department that what it has left is a mere shadow. Even this will disappear into the twilight if OTC is approved and then into the night, to be lost for good, beyond recovery. I say to you that this is indeed the year of decision in this most important struggle.

Because of the repeated, conscious, and stubborn blocking of the will of Congress in this field of its undoubted authority, by the executive, it has become obvious that the escape clause has little value in the area of its intended application. It has been overridden, ridden down, and mauled, much to its indignity and dishonor. Its treatment represents a clear case of executive nullification of a law of Congress.

How does this reflect upon the integrity and standing of the Congress? The escape clause, in its present form, is the product of Congress. It was adopted by a heavy majority of both Houses, and was amended from time to time to make clear the intent of Congress. You would not believe this from the treatment it has received. The State Department has shown it neither honor nor respect. Quite the contrary.

The fact is and, as I have said, it can no longer be hidden: the State Department has not only undertaken the regulation of our foreign commerce, but has been most diligent and tireless in throwing a high fence of international moral obligations around Congress against the day when Congress awakened to its loss of power. This usurpation of power by the State Department accounts for the attempted resurrection of the ITO in the form of the OTC. Congressional approval of the OTC would confirm the State Department's role as the maker of our tariff and trade policies.

Now let us see where we are today as a result of the executive practices and maneuvers that have just been described.

Our experience with import competition during the past few years has shown that import quotas would in a considerable number of cases offer a better way of regulating the flow of imports than does the tariff, hacked, slashed, and bound as it has been in the past 21 years.

Therefore, efforts have been made to place import quotas on different products by direct legislation. This has been piecemeal legislation and Congress did not accept it.

Now, however, a general import quota bill has been proposed and it was introduced as H. R. 7925 by Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia. The same bill has been sponsored by a number of his colleagues of both political parties.

What do we find?

This will come as a shock to all who have not made a specialty of tariff and trade legislation and who have been absorbed in other activities.

The Congress cannot legislate quotas or provide the mechanism for their imposition by an administrative agency without violating the letter and spirit of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This is the agreement, previously mentioned, which was entered into by the State Department in 1947 and which became effective January 1, 1948, known as GATT.

By just what pattern of reasoning the State Department could arrive at the notion, that they could properly bind Congress against any particular type of legislation on quotas, or anything else, has not yet been explained—neither who originated the idea, who propagated it or who executed it. But it has been given effect in the tainted majesty and unabashed illegitimacy of the general agreement which has never come near Congress for approval, not even in the OTC proposal.

I commend to you the general import quota bill as a method of dealing with import competition in a reasonable and liberal fashion in those instances where the tariff for one reason or another is relatively useless. It will meet many of the problems of import competition that cannot be solved under the restrictions that have been fashioned for us by the State Department.

True, the Department of State is opposed to such quotas and has promised GATT that the United States will eliminate the few that we have. This promise emphasizes again how far the State Department usurpation has gone. According to that Department the people of this country have no longer anything to say about the matter. In other words, "The American people be damned. We in the State Department know what is best for you."

As well close the doors of Congress and forget our election of representatives every 2 years.

Unless I am much mistaken you will not accept this philosophy. You, as the people the State Department wants to forget, will not care to be so handily overlooked. You have something at stake that is not easily forgotten, namely, your livelihood.

Therefore we should not feel too badly that the State Department does not like the general import quota bill. Some of us might even regard that Department's dislike of quotas as a recommendation.

It is the simple purpose of the bill to make it possible for domestic producers to live with import competition by setting aside a reasonable share of the market that may be supplied by imports.

The bill would therefore measure the importance of imports by the share of domestic consumption supplied by them, i. e., 5 percent, 10 percent, 25 percent or the like. Next, the bill calls for measuring the trend of imports in terms of their share of the market. Have imports been gaining on domestic

producers and taking more and more of the market from them? If so, to what extent? If they were taking 10 percent of the market, are they now taking 15 percent or 20 percent or more?

The bill would throw a ceiling over imports and prevent their taking over progressively more and more of the market. On the other hand, it would not take away what they had already gained. Only if imports had gained rapidly on domestic producers or had taken away more than 20 percent of the market would there be any cutback. From that level on the bill gets tighter, as it should, if the interests of our domestic producers are to mean anything.

However, to avoid freezing imports at a particular level, the bill provides for flexibility of three kinds: (1) Short-term flexibility to meet surplus or shortage conditions; (2) long-term flexibility to adjust to technological trends, consumer preferences, etc.; and (3) to meet the requirements of national defense.

One of the chief sources of injury from imports comes from the wide gap between foreign wages and those paid in this country. The bill recognizes this fact and provides for a bonus to be given in the form of higher quotas to any country that raises its wage levels sufficiently to narrow the gap appreciably. The different levels are spelled out in the bill.

If the American market is as important to other countries as they say, the incentive contained in the bill should help to bring up wages in other countries and to narrow the wage gap.

Other features of the import quota bill are that an agency of Congress, rather than the State Department or the White House, would establish the quotas, guided by the specifications in the bill. That would be the Tariff Commission. The tariff itself would, however, not be touched by the bill.

Thus Congress would recapture its constitutional authority and responsibility and once more you and others like you, the producers of this country, would regain your lost voices in the determination and direction of trade policies that are of the greatest importance to you.

Lincoln's Birthday and Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 13, 1956, the Textile Workers Union of America, in conjunction with their education program, conducted for the benefit of their rank and file members of local unions, a ceremony during which a wreath was placed at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D. C. Because of the close proximity of Lincoln's birthday and the specially designated week known as Brotherhood Week, I prepared the following brief remarks for delivery on that occasion:

Brotherhood Week comes as a timely and forceful reminder that we, in America, must take a spiritual inventory and rid ourselves of any prejudice that we might be inclined to harbor against any religion, race, or group.

Never in the history of the Nation has the need been greater for a unified people joined together in the bonds of common understanding. Prejudice is a hateful business at any time. It is even more hateful these days, when people of all faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—are considered dangerous by those biased persons who believe that man was made for the state and not the state for man.

The occasion for a needed spiritual inventory is Brotherhood Week. This special week, designated as February 19–26, is an annual observance sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which is now celebrating its 28th anniversary.

Every race, every creed has contributed its heroes to the advancement of mankind. Courage and integrity are the monopoly of no group. Why should we be prone to condemn races or creeds for minor prejudices, when there is greater opportunity in honoring them for their achievements? Why not seek the good and ignore the evil? We are together in this journey toward a better civilization for all mankind. Should we not strive to make it as pleasant a journey as possible?

In paying tribute to Brotherhood Week, we are in keeping with the traditions which have been handed down to us by the architects of our freedom. The spirit of brotherhood is not new. It is best exemplified for us in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution.

Brotherhood Week emphasizes one of the great principles of the American way of life. We believe in the principle that the dignity and worth of the individual is important. We believe that he is endowed by our Creator with certain rights and our Constitution guarantees those rights to him.

There is more to brotherhood than a willingness to "tolerate" people whose skin color happens to differ from one's own or who choose to pray to God in a different way. True brotherhood is understanding.

All that is best in America stands with increasing strength in firm opposition to forces of retrogression and despair. The dignity of man requires firm adherance to the principles and practices of civil and political liberties—freedom from bigotry. Those who belong in the free world understand this.

One of the best preparatory steps for enduring peace is to exemplify the spirit of good will and brotherhood in our daily lives. With that spirit we should be nothing but optimstic about the future. Understanding between peoples is indicative of progress.

It is my hope that all Americans will join in wholehearted support of Brotherhood Week, so that we may become fully aware of the need for the preservation of that spirit of fellowship and understanding so essential to our well-being as a Nation and as a community of the world.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley, Chairman of the Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Washington Chapter of the American Marketing Association last October:

First let me congratulate the Washington Chapter of the American Marketing Association for its enterprise in focusing public attention on this very important phase of Government's contribution to business by holding this fine awards meeting. I want to pay my respects and good wishes particularly to the two men who are cowinners of the association's top award—Mr. Henry Wulff, of the Department of Commerce, and Mr. D. M. Shuffett, of the Department of Agriculture, for their outstanding contributions to business and industry.

And special acknowledgement is due also to the heads of these departments—who are represented tonight by Mr. Carl Oechsle, Acting Secretary of Commerce and Mr. O. V. Wells, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture. It is testimony to each of your abilities to bring inspirational leadership, to organize special talents, to produce the knowledge needed so vitally in today's changing world.

I understand that one of the factors your awards committee feels important in evaluating Government marketing contributions is the degree of cooperation with industry and others who have a direct interest in the marketing problem under study. This, I think, is excellent. Professional marketing people like yourselves in Government can provide technical know-how and academic background while industry can provide a marketing laboratory with real marketing problems and the facilities for their solution, which cannot be obtained in any other way. The combination certainly permits the most effective and valuable marketing research.

In tonight's recognitions I see a particular significance. In my mind, I see a word that goes to the very core of what this gathering is all about. The word is "teamwork"—enthusisatic cooperation between Government and business to produce valuable information which can be translated into consumer benefits.

The miracle of American know-how and enterprise has been told many times over, but I wonder if the story of painstaking research and fact finding that is behind this wondrous acumen has been given the credit it deserves.

Without the good work of Government departments and agencies which provide a steady flow of statistical information, would it have been possible for industry to reach its present heights?

I can tell you from experience in my own company that Government information stands side by side in importance with research and statistics developed within our organization. Together they place at the hands of the Coca-Cola management and divisional heads a fund of knowledge that has enabled us to create markets and increase sales throughout the world.

There is always great concern about increased corporate taxes, the number of restrictive measures placed on business by Government and the instances where Government actually competes with private enterprise. But no one can say that the service agencies of this Nation have not contributed gloriously to business and industry and brought aid and comfort to risk capital.

We can applaud as well as deplore Government actions and services. Tonight's gathering is an example of our appreciation of those in Federal departments whose efforts provide fuel rather than obstacle to the free functioning of world trade.

I feel especially honored to be invited to address this illustrious gathering and welcome the opportunity to be with men and women to whom this Nation owes so much—experts whose specializations contribute heavily to the dynamics which have made this country the greatest on earth.

Your skills have helped produce and speed the greatest flow of products and services in

the history of mankind. Because of specialists such as you, the United States stands today at the helm of civilization. Your thirst for knowledge, your creative skills, your understanding of the psychology of selling have stimulated world markets, built faraway outposts of American progress.

Think back on the fashioning of the first crude wheel. Envision the earliest cart. Conjure up memory of early century sailing vessels. Then go forward to the transportation wonders of today. Marvel at the promise peaceful atomic application holds for tomorrow. And you have the measure of human advancement.

Contemplate the wonders of huge cargo planes, high-powered trucks, modern railroads, gigantic freighters, and you have only a limited canvas of the workings of God and the embodiment of His power in the knowledge of man.

We are today on the threshold of boundless accomplishment. If mankind could banish the selfish obstacles it has itself imposed, if self-seeking voices were silenced, if political and military curtains were lifted, if peaceful measures and scientific knowledge were given full sway, there could be no limit to achievement.

You, my friends, are important architects of this kind of better world—where dictatorship would give way to the dictates of brotherhood and recognition of human dignity.

Perhaps such divinity is too much to hope for. And, if human frailty and lust for power can never permit it, then praise the Almighty your kind of talents are at hand to fuel the forces that have made this Nation invincible.

New manufacturing skills, modern merchandising and distribution, productive media are enabling us to deliver more products to every corner of the earth. Accelerating this widespread trade is greater earning power among more people. As universal demand increases, so does the challenge to experts like yourselves. Your resourcefulness in applying the science of marketing can give this increasing prosperity 7-league boots.

Today, a powerful new medium is adding millions of new sales of every possible variety. I speak of television. Radio's $64 question has given way to TV's $64,000 question. Fifteen-minute broadcasting segments have been enlarged to hour-and-a-half spectaculars in color.

Television reproduces images that move and breathe. With nearly 36 million American families owning television sets today, with foreign nations increasing their output, it can be appreciated how much the demand for products of all kinds will spread and how the problems of production and distribution will rise in direct ratio.

And as we head into the future, the challenge to those engaged in marketing and allied effort will increase. Perhaps only 5 years from now, maybe sooner, the world may be spending billions of dollars on products that today have only the merest foothold in world markets.

Development of new forms of distribution; new techniques of warehousing, stocking, and display; new advertising and sales approaches; new delivery methods—a whole new marketing outlook may be required.

In the past, the Coca-Cola Co. has never been complacent with progress or smug in appraisal of its competition. Certainly, its talents and facilities will be applied even more ambitiously in an ever-changing future.

Because of today's competitive pressures—even with something so simple as a soft drink—we are pursuing every approach to sales here and abroad.

In a recent talk before the Georgia State Chamber of Commerce, H. B. Nicholson, board chairman of the Coca-Cola Co., made some very significant statements about future prospects for our business, and in effect, they reflect a confidence expressed by many organizations whose products are deep-rooted in American life.

Mr Nicholson said, "We look forward to the time when 50 million drinks a day," the present rate of coke consumption, "will seem like a drop in the bucket. It was only 9 million a day in the depression years when we were told that, as a business, we had leveled off.

"Like any business, we resented such predictions. Especially since the product we sell answers such a basic human requirement as the need for refreshment. Like most selling organizations, we have looked for greater growth in more distribution and better merchandising.

"This Georgia-born product has spanned this continent from one end to the other. It has crossed the oceans and conquered the barriers of foreign languages and customs to bring the pleasant pause that refreshes to some 89 different countries and geographical regions."

Continuous study of marketing conditions and testing new methods is as much a characteristic of the Coca-Cola Co. as hard work and manufacture of a prime and wholesome product.

Year after year, since the very beginning of business, searches have been made to find even better ways to make it convenient for people to enjoy Coca-Cola.

I am sure you've all seen the everimproving self-service coin coolers in stores, business establishments, and on roadsides across America. We have gone on to such innovations as coke in new-size bottles, larger fountain glasses, new take-home cartons, plastic and metal picnic coolers, and, recently, another stimulating merchandising development—premix, a method of distribution which enables the bottler to handle almost any selling situation imaginable. Coca-Cola sirup and carbonated water are premixed at the bottling plant, delivered to the outlet in sealed tanks and dispensed at just the right temperature in a paper cup.

As a business, Coca-Cola is fortunate to be based on so common a denominator. Everybody gets thirsty. Every throat has a palate. Every palate can judge the pleasure of good flavor. Everybody has a dime or a nickel. And so everybody is a customer of Coca-Cola.

The universal appeal of good taste to a thirsty palate—plus almost 70 years of foresighted marketing effort—is back of the story of how Coca-Cola is deployed across the vast expanse that is America; over the seas to foreign lands on every continent.

Retailers of Coca-Cola are in every State of the Union. Over 140,000 soda fountains dispense it. Over 1,500,000 retail outlets sell it.

Few products have had such dynamic effect on the whole economy of a nation, nor greater recognition as a joy in the daily habits of people. Perhaps a short anecdote will convey the impress Coca-Cola has made.

When Life magazine sent a reporter to Emporia, Kans., to interview William Allen White on the occasion of his 70th birthday, the famed editor of the Gazette proposed that his photograph be taken beside the Coca-Cola dispenser at the local soda fountain.

"It was a picture of my own choosing," he explained. "Coca-Cola is such a sublimated essence of all that America stands for, a decent thing honestly made, universally distributed, conscientiously improved through the years, that I thought it would be fitting and typical to have the word in the picture that portrayed the average American town—too big for a hamlet, too small for a city, the breeding ground of the middle class."

Nowadays Mr. White could enjoy "the pause that refreshes" from the rim of the Arctic to the Cape of Good Hope. It is an accepted custom, popular in North and South America, Europe, Africa, Asia and the far islands of the Pacific.

The Coca-Cola Co. and its subsidiaries have the distinction of dealing in more countries at one time and on a larger scale than any other single trade-marked product in world history. Yet everywhere you find Coke, you find it is a local enterprise. With very few exceptions, the bottling plants are locally owned and locally operated—and then there is local management.

The whole business structure is often compared to a pyramid, because the Coca-Cola Co. and its suppliers take a small share from the top, the bottlers and their suppliers take a larger middle share, and the dealers responsible for retailing our product take the largest share at the broad base of the business. Undoubtedly, this working democracy, this business commonwealth wherever Coca-Cola goes on sale, has contributed immeasurably to the acceptance of our product everywhere.

Economists struggle with the shifting boundaries of "class markets" and "mass markets," but for Coke there has always been just one market—people everywhere. For years, we have pointed out the fact in our ads: "Whoever you are, whatever you do, wherever you may be, when you think of refreshment, think of Coca-Cola—for Coca-Cola is everywhere."

We have reiterated that theme in magazines, newspapers, highway signs, and point-of-purchase lithography, radio, and more recently television. As the means of communication for reaching more and more people have developed, we have made the appropriations necessary for telling more and more people about our product.

People like Coke. And we like getting it to them—within arms reach, and wherever people are. My responsibilities, in the main, are concentrated in the wherever phase—the export end.

As somewhat of a globetrotter in this function, I have been placed in proximity to all manner of people. And in these countries of varying degrees of civilization and culture, I have come face to face with the great glory of this Nation's ingenuity and its far-reaching contribution to global progress.

I believe one of the things that has given me the most gratification about my own product and what American enterprise can do has been in the provincial towns of the Philippines.

Here one gets on a plane in the modern, up-to-date city of Manila and rides 400 or 50 miles to Cebu or Bacolod, or any 1 of 5 or 6 other provincial towns of some 200,000 Filipinos.

Way back in these islands, the provincial cities consist mostly of nipa huts which are homes on stilts, constructed of bamboo and grass. Living space in each hut is at a premium. The natives are shabbily dressed. The children mostly wear no clothes at all. The settlements usually have streets of mud and one-story shacks.

But you turn a corner in all this poverty and suddenly you catch sight of a beautiful Coca-Cola bottling plant. These plants to me are amazing. Well built and freshly painted in sparkling white, they are equipped with the latest and most modern bottle fillers, bottle cleaners and water treating equipment and all the things that go to make up a modern Coca-Cola manufacturing plant.

At every plant there is a doctor's office with a doctor and a nurse to meet any emergency.

Shower baths in our plants are mandatory for the employees. In the beginning it was hard to get workers because showers were required. But today, the natives come and inquire at this plant for work, giving as a reason the fact that they can take a shower.

Certainly these plants have raised the standard of living in each of these islands where they are located.

Here, I wish to ask you please forgive the frequent reference to the trademark I represent. I do this because, naturally, it is what I know most about. I am sure many other products have a similar influence on similar communities, but I do not know as much about them as I do my own product.

Getting back to my travels—in India, to the average mind, there are three major products which represent America—more than all the political talk of Nehru or Bulganin or even our own Mr. Dulles. To them America is represented primarily by American automobiles—Buick, Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors, by American oil companies—predominantly, I think, Caltex, and by Coca-Cola, which is on sale in some 10,000 or more outlets in Bombay, Delhi, and Calcutta.

About the time that the Mau Mau trouble was beginning in Kenya, but while it was still comparatively safe to travel, I was in that part of the world. One of the boys I was traveling with took a trip from Nairobi, 100 miles inland, to the treetop hut over the famous waterhole where nightly hundreds of wild animals come for water. This hut is well known because, the night that her father died, Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh were in that hut and it took many hours to locate them.

To reach the treetop hut from Nairobi my companion traveled over a corduroy dirt road in a Coca-Cola panel truck for some 80 miles without seeing any kind of real civilization. There were no towns and no civilized settlements other than some native huts scattered along the road. Suddenly he came upon a small trading post that looked like a second-rate general merchandise store at some crossroads in deep Alabama.

He was amazed to find there, some 80 miles from anywhere a Coca-Cola cooler; and, as he stopped for a refreshing pause, he casually looked around the shelves of the trading post. He was particularly impressed by the sight of four American products on sale—the Coke he held in his hand, a large box of Gillette razor blades, a dozen cans of Heinz' soup and, to his utter amazement, four boxes of Toni.

How heartening it is for a world traveler to see the widespread distribution of American products. It may be an International Harvester combine at work in the wheatfields of Argentina. It may be a GMC truck along the dikes of Holland. Or perhaps it is a Singer sewing machine, humming busily away in a little Italian tailor shop.

Maybe it's a pack of Luckies, jealously hoarded by a Nile boatman at Cairo, or a Hershey bar held in the tight fist of a hungry little child in West Germany. In Brisbane, in Calcutta, in Rio, Rome, or Paris, American products are making friends for America.

It is a well-known fact that people understand things much better than they understand ideas. When we speak to a man in another country about democracy, he may or may not understand us. But when you give him a ride in your Buick, Ford, or Chrysler, or offer him a Chesterfield, Lucky Strike, Camel, or Old Gold or a Coke, he can easily judge for himself.

This is democracy at work. This is America with its hard fist in the eye of greedy ideology. This is the Lord, the image of man, spreading subsistence, comfort, and joy.

To you men and women whose know-how is responsible for such good works there can be no question that we must remain the greatest producing nation in the world. We must march down all avenues of freedom, bringing the good things of the earth, embracing all peoples, insuring free flow of ideas and trade, enhancing our prestige as a champion of peace and humanity.

In such determination, in such enlightened action, lies the hope of the world.

Tariffs and Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a statement by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education on tariffs and trade policy which has been submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress. The Committee on Foreign Trade Education is a volunteer, nonprofit organization, in existence since late 1953, which has contributed much in thoughtful analysis of our vital trade policy.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN
TRADE EDUCATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 8, 1956.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: "The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. * * * The Soviet Union * * * (is) using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. * * * We are in (an economic) contest * * * which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race."

This statement of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, we feel, perfectly hits the nail on the head. They add: "We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications."

Aiding in the wakening process is just what this organization was set up to do. In late 1953 a small group of men and women, primarily drawn from both the Young Republican and Young Democratic Clubs of New York, formed the committee as a volunteer, nonprofit association to stir public interest in United States tariff-trade policy (a key to our foreign economic program) and to mobilize wide support for a liberalization of that policy.

The committee, filling an apparent vacuum, has been extremely successful. It now represents a membership, still completely volunteer, that has spread through 31 States, and, besides the national headquarters in New York City, has branches in Washington, D. C., New Orleans, La., and suburban Chicago.

The reason for our existence is expressed in our prospectus for 1956:

"Impressed by the appalling fact (disclosed by the Gallup poll) that 48 percent of the public know nothing of the national battle on tariffs, the committee has given its entire program a 'grassroots' orientation—the campaign is taken right to the general public. The appeal is to the man in the street from fellow citizens whose only interest is civic. The average family is shown its stake in expanding United States trade—and that if it is to be effective in bringing about trade policy reform it must become articulate. The three main premises of the committee's argument are—the grave and urgent necessity of cementing the free world coalition by trade; the importance of trade to an expanding national economy; and consumer interest."

Conscious of our responsibility to our membership and in order to satisfy the very wide audience that has come to look to us for information on the tariff-trade question, our program for 1956 has these four main goals:

1. To stir public opinion to demand that political candidates make their position known on the tariff-trade question.

2. To intensify the committee's public education program with the aim of promoting general knowledge of and concern with United States tariff-trade policy.

3. To support customs simplification (H. R. 6040); United States adherence to the Organization for Trade Cooperation (H. R. 5550); and similar legislation that may be presented in the current congressional session.

4. To expand the committee's national chain of community chapters.

Point 1 means this: While maintaining a scrupulously nonpartisan position, we will aim to induce political candidates to air their views on trade, and, by that, stimulate public consideration of the economic contest to which the President attributes so much importance. As a part of this, we will, therefore, provide platforms from which presidential aspirants can state their position; survey all congressional candidates and release the results thereof to both the national and local media; and stage other provocative and informative rallies, including the committee's 1955–56 presentation of its annual Cordell Hull award for leadership in building United States foreign economic policy.

Trade and tariffs, we acknowledge and fully appreciate, are not in this century a popular issue. We believe, however, that the subject is preeminently important because of its implications on our international political program (in fact our very survival) and our continued economic expansion and health. It is our responsibility, therefore, in terms of foreign-trade education, to make tariffs and trade an issue that all political aspirants will take to the people. Allowing tariffs and trade to remain as something too tough or abstruse for a politician to take his stand on has caused the vacuum of public opinion in which the powerful, well-financed, high-tariff lobbies and special-interest groups have so successfully operated. We hope that your colleagues and, also, their potential opponents will cooperate with us and with the Nation in bringing the facts on the tariff-trade controversy out in the clear.

The reasons we urge prompt and favorable congressional action on H. R. 5550, H. R. 6040, and H. R. 229 are these:

H. R. 5550: The Congress should, before the end of the current session, authorize United States adherence to the Organization for Trade Cooperation. OTC will give added strength to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and increase the value of the agreement beyond the very considerable benefits already derived.

Mr. John S. Coleman's splendid statement, The Choice Before Us, correctly describes just one of the benefits GATT has already provided. GATT, Mr. Coleman says, is "the most effective machinery for dealing with * * * remaining trade barriers, especially those directed toward American products. In early 1953 only three European countries permitted purchase of significant quantities of American goods without license. Now there are 14."

Beyond the outstanding positive advantages of OTC, we recall President Eisenhower's warning that "failure to assume membership in OTC would be interpreted throughout the Free World as a lack of genuine interest on the part of this country in the efforts to expand trade. * * * It

would strike a severe blow to the development of cooperative arrangements in the defense of the Free World."

OTC, and the Congress' prompt passage of it, will be, in the President's mind, a major addition, "in the struggle against Communist domination, to greater security and greater prosperity of all."

H. R. 6040: To the objective observer the situation in regard to Customs Simplification is ludicrous. The House has four times passed a Customs Simplification Bill which would have dealt meaningfully with that wondrously potent begetter of red tape, the difference between foreign value and export value. The Senate Finance Committee has, unfortunately, three times allowed this legislation to die.

As they now stand, customs procedures are not only a significant detriment to the profitable flow of trade but an insult to the intelligence. Indeed, as we explained in one of our first publications, Advance America, Advance Trade, by the pace of customs court adjudications in 1953, at least, a businessman getting on the end of the line could wait 28 years before a duty on his specific import was finally determined.

H. R. 229: The committee has constantly endorsed and again this year hopes for favorable action on the Trade Adjustment Act proposed by the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, an honorary member of the committee. It is our position that if the economic contest is of major importance to the progress and security of the United States, then those few who might face some dislocation brought on by a national desire to lessen the contradictions between our foreign economic policy and our foreign political policy should receive some compensation for their sacrifice in the national interest.[1] There was ample precedent for this sort of adjustment during World War II and the Korean war when both employees and employers were given considerable aid in facing disclocations precipitated by military requirements. And, indeed, the President's economic report for 1956 urges a somewhat analogous sort of aid for depressed areas, the area aid program (or so-called domestic point 4).

We also hope that either the administration or the Congress will take some step to reduce the impossibly high tariffs on laboratory and scientific training equipment. This has a bearing, of course, on what Admiral Strauss and other observers have depicted as our growing failure in the competition with Soviet Russia in training engineers and scientists. The fact is that schools and colleges, at the very least, should be exempted from tariffs on this laboratory and experimental equipment. If the self-seeking lobbies representing domestic optical and laboratory manufacturers will not relent and give the entire public a chance, schools, at least, should not be denied the full meaning of their very limited moneys. This whole question, as pointed out by the American Association of Physics Teachers, has real meaning and a very immediate financial relevance to the dismal and embarrassing fact that approximately 50 percent of United States high schools are unable to provide their students with physics and chemistry courses.

We, also, strongly urge that you reject in any shape or form the bill submitted by Mr. LANHAM, of Georgia, which proposes import quotas. This bill, in the minds of our national membership, is a presposterous throwback to the economic nationalism which has destroyed so many nations in the past.

This is, we admit, an imposing program for a group of several thousand men and women, who have, in terms of self-interest, no concern with foreign trade.

We are asked what motivates us, what stirs our workers (all volunteers) who have put so much time into building public interest in United States tariff-trade policy and in mobilizing support for its liberalization.

One thing that keeps us going and constantly growing are the outrageous fantasies that the high-tariff bloc so assiduously spins.

Here are just a few examples:

Fantasy: The National Association of Blouse Manufacturers, perhaps, is even beginning to believe their plaint that Japanese import competition is ruining the industry.

Fact: Despite a significant increase in Japanese imports, the domestic production of blouses was up from 12½ million of dozens in 1954 to approximately 15 million of dozens in 1955.

Fantasy: Oversea competition (principally from Britain) has almost driven the domestic bicycle industry into extinction.

Fact: Official figures make it explicit that European bikes did not reduce the domestic market for the producers, but, rather, served to stimulate and build a far larger market than had previously existed.

Fantasy: This Nation's multi-billion-dollar electrical machinery industry is menaced by oversea imports.

Fact: In 1954 (the last year for which complete figures are available) United States exports of electrical machinery totaled approximately $723 million, while the domestic producers only had to buck $46 million of imports.

Nor can we find any excuse, even on the basis of a perverse sense of humor, when the so-called Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy describes their dangerous and destructive import quota bill as one designed to "provide an instrument for a liberal import policy."

And, as we have been at pains to point out before, the United States jeweled watch industry must have known that they were off beat when they attempted to buttress their "defense essentiality" claims by stating that "only 4,000 precision watchmakers are left in America." The United States Tariff Commission says, instead, that our domestic timing industry in 1954 employed 21,519 precision workers and that the jeweled watch companies, themselves, employed 9,754.

And, of course, the rallying cry of "defense essentiality" is now being so used, with a sublime faith in Barnum's famous maxim, that the lace industry, the wool glovemakers, the cutlery industry, the tunafish producers and even the lead-pencil manufacturers solemnly witness their indispensability for national defense.

But we are not in this, however, to titilate our sense of righteous indignation or to take your valuable time with mere expressions of civic outrage.

We know that Communist Russia, by its very ideology, believes that international, capitalist trade provides a basic "contradiction" by which the free nations will ultimately fall on one another. Rather than waiting for the "inevitable sweep of history," the Communists are trying to precipitate the "capitalist crisis" and have launched an economic war against the West whereby they hope to engulf the "neutrals" and separate us from our allies.

We cannot survive by ignoring the challenge.

If our nationally accepted foreign policy is correct, if this Nation must bastion its strength by a system of alliances with the free nations, then the retention of even the vestiges of a petty, out-of-date "protectionist" United States foreign economic policy can only be described as the sabotage of that foreign policy.

This Nation, which we are informed has so often during the last few years been close to war, simply cannot afford the luxury of any longer appeasing the interests that so indifferently call for continued high tariffs. We must mobilize every possible facet of national policy in the effort to win over communism.

The committee will continue to work toward the goal to which the United States delegation, the President and Secretary Dulles have pointed: of waking the country as a whole to the United States-Soviet economic contest and all its implications.

We are completely convinced that the Honorable J. K. Javits, attorney general of New York State, said what is right, when he last week courageously told a meeting of executives of the chemical industry: "The day of protectionism should be as dead as the day of isolationism and for exactly the same reason—because it is inimical to the national security of the United States." We fully endorse Mr. Javits' statement: "Today the question is one of defeating communism. In this fight we have sacrificed, and must continue to be prepared to sacrifice, far, far more than is involved in the protectionist views of some segments of United States business."

We hope this statement will be worthwhile to you and your colleagues as an advisory on the sentiments of the membership of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc. We thank you very much for the consideration you have given our opinions.

I am,

B. A. RITTERSPORN, JR.,
Executive Director
(For the Committee.)

[1] But we appreciate that those who could suffer dislocation are an exceedingly small group. We know, for instance, that the number of workers employed in tariff-dependent industries totals about 100,000. This figure, which equals the Nation's average monthly job-turnover, must, for real perspective, be measured against the more than 4 million American families whose incomes are directly dependent on export sales. But, no matter how small the group, we feel that the spirit of American fair play should be extended to them and, by the means of technical aid, retraining, community development, etc., they be given an opportunity to undertake an economically valid role which is consonant with the national interest.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article on capital punishment, written by Evelle J. Younger, judge of the municipal court of Los Angeles, which appeared in the American Bar Association of February 1956.

This article is most timely in view of the many bills that have been filed in the legislatures of various States on the subject of the abolition of capital punishment.

The article follows:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: A SHARP MEDICINE RECONSIDERED

(By Evelle J. Younger, judge of the municipal court of Los Angeles)

(Capital punishment is older than recorded history, and it was apparently accepted without question for many centuries as a perfectly natural form of punishment. In modern times, however, both the wisdom

and the humanity of such drastic retribution have been challenged. Judge Younger has written this article reexamining the whole question of capital punishment, its historical background and the arguments pro and con.)

"It is sharp medicine," said Sir Walter Raleigh, as he tested the keen edge of the axe while awaiting execution. Since 1618 we have changed the medicine, utilizing allegedly more humane methods, and have greatly limited the occasions which call for such drastic treatment; but executions are still carried out by the state in the name of justice and argument concerning the death penalty continues. Bills outlawing or further limiting capital punishment were introduced again this year in the California State Legislature.[1] Also, the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the execution of Barbara Graham and the details concerning the frequent stays of execution granted in the Chessman case have become matter of common knowledge. Consequently, and fortunately, our citizens—both lawers and laymen—have shown increased interest in this problem of capital punishment during these past few months. I say "fortunately" because public interest encourages official attention. The more we study this problem, the more we learn; the more we learn, the closer we come to answering the $64 question.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: THE HISTORICAL ASPECT

Before considering that question, some attention must be devoted to the historical aspect of capital punishment. We should realize that our reaction to the executions carried out by our predecessors may be prophetic of the reaction that our successors will have to our present-day system. Bloody Queen Mary, who caused thousands of executions, undoubtedly was activated by the noblest motives. The lawyers and judges who participated in the Salem witchcraft trials would strenuously resent any suggestion that we are more honorable or conscientious than they. If we can't claim more noble motives, we can at least hope that our judgment as reflected in our system of punishment better stands the test of time.

Originally the death penalty rested primarily upon man's effort to placate the gods, lest their beneficent solicitude for the group be diverted as a result of apparent group indifference to the violation of the social codes supposedly revealed by the gods. The complete blotting out of the culprit was a practical demonstration of group disapproval. Later the individual came to be looked upon as a scoundrel, capable of free choice in every aspect of his conduct, who had wilfully chosen to do wrong. The theory of capital punishment which evolved in this period was based on man's natural desire to return blow for blow, injury for injury. In order that desire for revenge would not develop to the point where every killing resulted in family feuds and wars of varying sizes, restrictive laws were introduced,. Gradually, it was realized that crime was more than a personal affair between guilty party and victim, and the state took over the responsibility for punishment. Action was still purely retaliatory. Later, however, the concept developed that in punishing, the state provided protection against potential injury. A penal system evolved, featuring three clearly defined aims: (1) prevention, (2) punishment and (3) indemnification. It was contended that only the death penalty achieved these objectives. As deterrence ranked higher and higher, more and more crimes became capital crimes. Torture before, and degradation after, were added to the punishment of death.

According to the Bible, the punishment of death was inflicted for a large number of offenses against the laws of Moses. Among these offenses we find, on the one hand, so serious a crime as murder, and, on the other, so petty an offense as gathering sticks on the Sabbath day. Later, when the population was sparse and men were needed for armies, executions were rare. William the Conqueror, for example, used the death penalty only to punish conspiracy against his rule. His successors, however, reintroduced it for other crimes, and the pendulum swung. In the days of Blackstone there were 160 different felonies for which the penalty was death. The trend continued until there were 222 capital crimes (including the shooting of a rabbit, the theft of a pocket handkerchief and the cutting down of a cherry tree). Only in the last century has there been definite and permanent recognition of the supreme value of life to the extent that capital punishment has been virtually restricted to the crime of murder.

Notwithstanding other indictments we may level at those responsible for the bloody orgies of the past, we cannot deny that they possessed imagination.

Included among the earliest methods of execution were crucifixion, stoning, poisoning, starvation, drowning and burying alive. Condemned criminals were sawed or chopped in two while still alive by the ancient Persians, Hebrews and Chinese. Flaying (skinning) alive was a common method of execution in the Far East. The European variation on this method involved the victims being subsequently impaled; i. e., stuck on a sharp stick. Another oriental favorite consisted of the victims being eaten alive by insects or sewn in a bag with poisonous snakes. The Chinese torture of the knife, the Japanese execution of the 21 cuts, and the Peruvian method described as slicing to death all involved the victims being cut to pieces as slowly and painfully as possible. From 1426 to 1772 criminals were sometimes pressed to death in England.

This method was also used at Salem in 1592 during the witchcraft trials. Boiling, which had at one time been in frequent use by the Chinese, became the punishment for poisoning in England in 1530, and was used on the Continent from the 13th to the 16th centuries, although some rulers considered frying preferable to boiling.

"Drawing and quartering," French style, involved pulling the criminal literally to pieces, after preliminary torturing, utilizing four of the strongest horses available. "Breaking on the wheel" was popular during the 18th century in France and Germany. The customary procedure was to bind the criminal, face up, to a large wheel and beat him to a pulp with a sledge hammer or iron bar.

Burning alive was one of the first and most widely used methods of execution. We find mention of it in the Old Testament as a punishment for incest and prostitution. Every year during the Holy Inquisition scores of persons were burned at the stake. The Protestants adopted a similar method in dealing with those who plotted against the true faith. Burning was by no means reserved for heresy, however. Witchcraft in particular was punished in this manner.[2]

AN HONORABLE DEATH: EXECUTION BY BEHEADING

Beheading is one of the most ancient and popular of all forms of capital punishment. It was used by the ancient Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Chinese, and Japanese. Here again there were variations. The method most susceptible of error on the part of the executioner involved the use of a rather light sword and required considerable strength and good timing—so much so that the condemned on occasion would offer a bonus should the man handling the knife sever the head with one stroke.[3] There were many cases of bungled executions. This unfortunate situation led the French Government to seek advice from the secretary of the French Academy of Surgery, and resulted in the development of the guillotine in 1792.

Like beheading, being shot to death by a firing squad is considered an "honorable" way to die; and this method is and has been for many years favored in the case of a military execution. Hanging, on the other hand, is considered a dishonorable way to meet death. This distinction seems to me to be highly academic.

Hanging, in many and varied ways, has been the most popular, if not the most foolproof, method of execution. In England the practice developed of letting the bodies hang and rot in order to bring the message more forcefully to the populace. Early hangings resulted in death by strangulation. The modern method, dating from the time the "long drop" was originated, consists of dislocation of the neck, by breaking the spinal cord. An executioner named Berry, in Yorkshire, did considerable research to the end that the drop should be long enough to bring about "instantaneous death" but not so long as to cause mutilation; and he published a "drop table" in 1885, containing considerable helpful information concerning the rope, scaffold, technique, etc.

Centuries ago animals were treated like human beings—or vice versa. Pigs, horses and cattle were frequently executed for murder.[4] In 1474 a male domestic fowl was tried "for the heinous and unnatural crime of laying an egg," and sentenced, together with the egg, to be burned at the stake.[5] In cases of bestiality, both the man and the animal, on being found guilty, were sentenced to death, usually both being burned alive together. Inanimate objects were sometimes tried and executed (e. g., "haunted house", wherein a murder had occurred). Allied to the capital punishment of animals and inanimate objects was the practice of disinterring human corpses for the purpose of posthumous execution, sometimes by hanging, in other cases by burning. Today we utilize all our resources to keep a condemned man healthy till the fatal day; but if he should die, or manage to commit suicide, we dispense with the formality of execution.

Penological reform started with the repeal of torture as an additional punishment and continued with the repeal of capital punishment for petty crimes, eventually leaving murder as the most outstanding of the few crimes involving the death penalty. The trend throughout the world appears to be toward the abolition of the death penalty. In approximately 30 countries the death penalty has been eliminated by law or tradition.

There has been a fluctuating tendency toward abolition in the United States. From the first, America has had fewer capital crimes than England. The English colonies in this country had from 10 to 18 capital offenses. Today there are 7 capital crimes, excluding treason, in the 48 States. California lists five in addition to treason.[6] In this connection it is interesting to note that all of the 110 men executed in California from 1938 to 1953 were sentenced to death for the crime of murder in the first degree.[7]

The death penalty may now be imposed by 42 States, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. Of these, 35 States and the United States provide that the jury shall determine when the death penalty is to be imposed; 4 States provide that the jury may recommend the death penalty, but the judge is not bound by the recommendation; and 3 States require capital punishment. Twenty-six of the thirty-five States (and the Federal Government) that allow the jury to determine punishment divide mur-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

der into degrees and allow the death penalty only in the case of first-degree murder. Nine States abolished the death penalty but later restored it, with life imprisonment as an alternative. One State, Maine, abolished, restored, and again abolished the death penalty.

Electrocution, hanging, lethal gas, and shooting, are, in the order of their popularity, the methods of execution in the United States. The electric chair was first used in New York in 1890. Twenty-two States now use this method of execution. Eleven States execute by hanging. Eight States, including California, use the gas chamber. Lethal gas is reputedly the most humane method of execution. There is considerable argument on this point, however; and unfortunately, there are no living experts available to settle the dispute.[8]

THE MODERN TREND: NO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The trend toward abolishing capital punishment is also reflected in the fact that only a small percentage of those persons who commit murder are actually executed. Most murderers are never sentenced to death, and many who are sentenced to death manage in one way or another to escape that penalty. Statistics on this point are not consistent and are obviously not completely reliable. Raymond T. Bye,[9] basing his figures on 1917 statistics, says that 1 man in 70 who commits a homicide in the United States suffers death for it. Warden Lewis E. Lawes [10] sets the figure at 1 in 85. Harry B. Chamberlin, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission and an ardent supporter of capital punishment, utilizing Cook County figures for the year 1921, found that less than 3 percent of those who committed murder were executed.[11] Dr. Joseph Catton, clinical professor of medicine at Stanford University, in his book Behind the Scenes of Murder, takes the homicide rate for 1938 and shows that only 1.8 percent of the murderers were executed. In 1953 there were 62 persons executed in the United States. In that same year there were over 7,000 cases of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.[12] At that rate the criminal's chances of escaping execution are better than 100 to 1. Obviously not every homicide is willful murder, but even if half of them can be so classified, the odds favoring the criminal are still 50 to 1. In California, during the 10-year period 1945–54, there were at least 3,500 homicides compared to 87 executions.[13]

Still further evidenec of the growing reluctance to execute criminals is found in statistics relating to the time which passes between a sentence of death and actual execution. Undoubtedly, most of the time is consumed by conscientious lawyers and judges working tirelessly to eliminate any possible error and prevent a miscarriage of justice. I suspect, however, that some of the delay can be blamed upon a natural reluctance on the part of an appellate court judge to take action which would cost a human life when there is any legal justification, however slight or obscure, for referring the matter to an entire court or higher tribunal. I hope this suggestion does not offend any of my superiors. Actually, if I were a supreme court judge and if someone were to accuse me of being sentimental, I would not be insulted. Sentiment and practical commonsense exist side by side in every decent human being. Only nazism, communism and similar totalitarian doctrines rule out all sentiment as a reason for human action. In any event, for whatever reason, it does take a long time to execute a criminal. You may remember the Sacco-Vanzetti case. They were arrested on May 5, 1920, tried in May, June and July 1921, and executed on August 23, 1927. Here in California, Caryl Chessman, on January 22, 1948, committed the crime for which he was sentenced to death on June 25, 1948; and he is still alive in "death row" today. These are admittedly exceptional cases. Let's examine the statistics then covering the period 1938 to 1953 in California. One hundred and ten persons were executed. Each one spent an average of 16 months in condemned status—the range was from 6 months to 6 years 1 month. Five men each spent over 1,000 days in death row.[14] This is about par for the course, although it may seem at times that the wheels of justice move at an exceptionally slow rate of speed in California. Twelve Federal prisoners were executed throughout the United States during the 10-year period from 1945 through 1954. Each prisoner spent an average of 16½ months in condemned status. Bonnie Heady and Carl Hall were executed in less than a month. Excluding them, the average time elapsing between sentence and execution was 19½ months. [15]

A BIBLICAL SANCTION: THE ARGUMENTS PRO

The arguments in favor of capital punishment are quite persuasive. The abolitionists have no copyright on the Bible, as the following quotations indicate: "Who so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." [16] "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." [17] Many New Testament references recognize the divine appointment of human government, and the validity of the penalty of death.[18] Eminent theologians assert that quotations used by the abolitionists are wholly misapplied when used against capital punishment and the penal institutions of lawfully constituted governments, whose authority was never challenged by Christ.[19]

The swift and certain execution of the ancient law, punishment by a means bearing a just proportion to the enormity of the crime, is the best deterrent known. Death is still the king of terrors, and the only terror that holds some men in check. Under the modern system of pardons and paroles, turkey dinners and cadet uniforms, there is in reality no such thing as life imprisonment. The fiends are often released, only to commit more murders. There is too much loose talk about the sacredness of human life. A life is sacred only when it makes itself sacred; when it respects the lives and rights of others. Capital punishment should be abolished, but not until the murderers of the world abolish it first. Desperate murderers, like venomous reptiles and wild beasts that prey on men, should have no place in the society of peaceful men. A cold-blooded murderer, having cunning intelligence without moral restraint, is infinitely more dangerous than any other animal on earth. Why slay the man-eating tiger and carefully preserve the human beast?

Although capital punishment does not restore the life of the murderer's victim, neither does any other punishment. The death of the murderer, however, does secure society against him. Too many persons indulge themselves in gushing sentimentalism over criminals. They overemphasize the fact that life, education, and environment are the forces that victimize and penalize every criminal. If society is wholly responsible, why not apologize to the cutthroat and pension him for life? If you don't hang him, why imprison him? He surely needs neither gallows nor cell if the blame is all on the universe at large.

The death penalty cannot be condemned as ineffective in those jurisdictions where persons in authority fail consistently to invoke the penalty. Those States which have abandoned capital punishment without a resulting increase in the murder rate had failed for a long period prior to its final abolition to enforce the penalty effectively. Uncertain, tardy justice is the cause of most anarchist outbreaks in which lynchings occur.

Even the most ardent advocates of life imprisonment as punishment for murder admit, without hesitancy, that it is necessary to provide the death penalty for murders committed by men under life sentence. This in itself is a complete admission that life imprisonment does not produce sufficient horror in the mind of the killer to deter him. The importance of the death penalty for murder lies in the fact that it has proved to be a deterrent. The abolition of the death penalty in this country usually has been for short periods, followed by its restoration when the murder rate rose. Specific cases can be cited to prove that in particular instances an individual planning murder would commit his crime in a jurisdiction that did not apply the death penalty, thereby proving that the greater penalty would deter him, whereas the lesser would not.

There is still one more reason for retaining capital punishment: The people—those whom we seek to protect—want it. In 1948, in England, capital punishment proposals in connection with the criminal justice bill before Parliament for consideration were the subject of wide discussion. Most of the people were against abolition. A Gallup poll conducted for the Daily Telegraph, showed 69 percent for retention and 13 percent for repeal.[20] Abolitionists say the public is not enlightened. That argument is always used to rationalize a minority point of view; but it is no more valid in this case than in any other case where two points of view exist and the question is resolved in accordance with the democratic process.

ANOTHER BIBLICAL QUOTATION: THE ABOLITIONISTS' ARGUMENT

The abolitionists are equally persuasive. They, too, open their argument by quoting Scripture: "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." [21] He says further, "Judge not that ye be not judged." [22] No human instrumentality is fit to pronounce and execute an irrevocable judgment. Only God with His infinite wisdom and charity should wield that awful power. It is part and parcel of Christian belief that any idea of vengeance for the commission of criminal or sinful acts is the privilege of God Himself. Christ repudiated the old principle of lex talionis in the well-known passage: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." [23] That no human being is beyond all hope of reformation is implicit in Christianity.

The punishment of criminals is based on one or more of the following theories: retribution; deterrence; reformation; and, in the case of capital punishment, the need of eliminating those who menace the life and security of society. The idea of punishment solely as retribution, which is merely a polite word for revenge, is gradually disappearing. This idea is yielding to the more modern, progressive, and scientific attitude that retribution is not justification for any system of punishment, nor are its results beneficial.

Historically, capital punishment has failed as a deterrent. According to Hume, the historian, 72,000 thieves were executed in the reign of Henry VIII; and 19,000 criminals of one sort or another perished at the end of a rope during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. These are truly appalling figures, and yet we can find no evidence that these extreme measures caused crime to diminish.

From all available statistics we must conclude that capital punishment, as applied today, still fails as a deterrent. Warden Lawes [24] concluded, after extensive research, that the death penalty has no apparent ef-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

fect as a deterrent. Karl F. Schuessler,[25] basing his conclusion on appropriate statistics covering the period 1931–46, and comparing States that have retained the death penalty with abolition States in the same section of the country having similar social and economic characteristics, states that his "studies * * * disprove the claim that the death penalty has any special deterrent value." The Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, studying the problem in Great Britain during the period 1949–53,[26] observed that "there is no clear evidence in any of the figures we have examined that the abolition of capital punishment has led to an increase in the homicide rate, or that its reintroduction has led to a fall." Barnes and Teeters [27] state, after considering available statistics, that "the rate of homicide is approximately the same in each of the States within a given area. * * * The presence of the death penalty appears to have nothing to do with the amount of homicide."

Those who favor the retention of the death penalty make much of the fact that some States abolished and later restored the death penalty. The conclusions to be drawn from these experiments are, however, by no means so decisive as would at first sight appear. In each case the cause of the restoration was the occurrence of some sensational or particularly brutal crime, and there is no evidence that the particular crime would not have occurred had the death penalty been part of the penal code. Missouri, Oregon, Arizona, and Washington deserted the abolition column shortly after World War I. The rise in the number of murders was mistakenly attributed to the absence of capital punishment, though there was a general increase in crime throughout the United States at that time and other States were going through the same experience.[28]

Justification for abolishing the death penalty does not rest alone on statistics. Other compelling factors should be considered. Those who favor the retention of the death penalty can point to isolated and very rare instances where a paroled murderer repeated his crime, or where an individual contemplating murder sought to accomplish his crime in a State where the death penalty did not exist; but there is neither reason nor justice in the policy of hanging or electrocuting a hundred men for the sake of deterring one monster. Furthermore, for every one of these cases, abolitionists can cite a case where orgies of homicide have followed a single execution. Actually a killing—legal or otherwise—encourages more killings.

If the death penalty is a deterrent, we should logically let the public witness an execution so that the spectacle might save someone from a crime he might otherwise commit. Felony prisoners should have reserved seats. We shouldn't put a prisoner to death as painlessly as possible. If the efficacy of punishment be found in its severity, such severity should be increased until it results in minimizing crime. By making our executions as private and as humane as possible, we admit that if any influence at all is exerted, it must be debasing or positively harmful.[29]

When cornered, a proponent of capital punishment will admit that the death penalty may not presently be an effective deterrent because it is so seldom imposed; but he hastens to assert that it could be a deterrent if used more often. Well, it will not be used more often. Human nature being what it is, the situation will not change. The trend is in the opposite direction. If it is to prove a deterrent, it must be carried out so rigorously that it inevitably involves a grave risk of the innocent being executed; and if it is to be surrounded by sufficient effective safeguards as to avoid this risk, then it has to be carried into effect so seldom that it loses practically all its reputed deterrent effect.

Retentionists base their argument on the supposition that life is man's most valuable possession, and that the death penalty is the only effective deterrent of capital crime. How then do they explain the fact that we must guard a condemned prisoner night and day to prevent suicide. The argument is seriously weakened, also, by the undeniable fact that many are perfectly willing to risk death in order to retain, or obtain, their liberty. And if we want him dead, why must we work so hard to keep the condemned healthy till his execution? One night, at Sing Sing, three eminent surgeons fought around the clock to save Frank Piala from dying of appendicitis so he could be electrocuted.[30]

Murder, of all crimes, is the one where fear of the penalty, under any circumstances, is least likely to be present. No person who kills another in a fit of overmastering passion, anger, or hatred can be influenced in any way by the fear of execution. The act is over and done with before reason returns. The insane murderer, whether the insanity is permanent or temporary, is in a similar position. As regards the premeditated and carefully planned crime, here again there is no thought of consequences, for the murderer is convinced that having planned the perfect crime, discovery and punishment are impossible. This latter type of murderer is impossible to deter. The more brutal the man, the more appropriate the subject for a death penalty, the less likely the subject is to be deterred. The odds in his favor—50 to 1—satisfy him. Fortitude is not a trait possessed by only good people. True, this type of murderer is apt to repeat the crime; but if we execute him for that reason, why not execute the homicidal maniac, or the person who has attempted murder and failed, or the 17-year-old murderer.

Most murderers are not likely to repeat the crime. In the great majority of cases the murderer is not a criminal by nature, as we understand the term. Most wardens agree that, as a group, these individuals are the most reliable and dependable in the institution.[31] Most convicted murderers have never before been convicted of a serious crime. Information available from those States that have substituted life imprisonment for the death penalty does not suggest that the prisoner serving a life sentence for unlawful homicide is more likely to commit murder than the prisoner serving a similar sentence for any other crime.[32] The reformation of the individual offender is usually regarded as an important function of punishment. But it can have no application where the death penalty is exacted, if "reformation" is taken to mean not merely repentance, but reestablishment in normal life as a good citizen. Experience indicates that the prospects of reformation are at least as favorable with murderers as with those who have committed other kinds of serious crimes.

There is another compelling reason which cries out for the abolition of the death penalty. Many of those persons executed in the past have been mentally ill, though legally sane. For over a century, our criminal law has clung to the so-called right and wrong test of sanity laid down in McNaghten's case in 1843. Psychiatry has long since discarded such concepts of responsibility. Mental disturbance has little or no connection with ability to distinguish right from wrong. Recognition that there is a type of person who, despite being entirely cognizant of the fact that an act is homicidal and punishable, cannot refrain from its commission, is essential to a proper understanding of the problem of murder. The Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, 1949–53, concluded that, "The test of responsibility laid down by the McNaghten rules is so defective that the law on the subject ought to be changed." [33] A recent remarkable decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in the Durham case criticizes our present concept of criminal responsibility and presents a more enlightened formula.[34] In my opinion, the fact that in some States, including California, the "irresistible impulse is not legally recognized," is further evidence that our legal definition of insanity is inadequate and not in accord with medical knowledge and experience.[35] No doubt about it, the "right and wrong" test must go, and it will. Meantime, however, it's the law and the hangman is skulking in the background whenever a mentally ill person is tried for murder.

As we seek a better solution to this problem, the theory of diminished responsibility should receive consideration. This doctrine is of fairly recent birth, and it recognizes the existence of a type of criminal who, while being neither entirely responsible for his actions, as in the case of the normal individual, nor altogether irresponsible, as in the case of the insane person, is of a state of mind which signifies the existence of such a degree of weakness of intellect as to justify a reduction of the crime with which the culprit is charged, from that of murder to culpable homicide. The death penalty prevents any concept of diminished responsibility, short of full responsibility or exculpation, being acceptable.

Along this same line, the "old" law with respect to provocation required in order to reduce a killing from murder to manslaughter [36] should be changed to permit a jury to return a verdict of manslaughter when they are satisfied that the accused was deprived of his self-control by provocation, and that a reasonable man might have been so deprived, notwithstanding that the provocation was by words alone.[37] Granted, words alone will seldom constitute adequate provocation to a reasonable man; but the question should be left to the jury.

Occasionally, those who advocate retention of capital punishment argue that taxpayers should not be required to support a murderer for life, when execution is so much cheaper. This argument has frightening implications and, I trust, appeals to very few people. In any event, we execute, on an average, seven persons a year in California. This doesn't even put a dent in our felony prisoner population of approximately 16,000.

When we speak of the sacredness of human life, we think rather of the innocent victim and of those bereaved by his slaughter than of the fate which society pronounces on the slayer. But no pity for the victim, no sentiment or horror which the crime arouses, can absolve us from the obligation to deal with the offense and the offender in the interests of humanity and of the welfare of the community.

Finally, in defense of abolition, we must realize that innocent persons have been executed. We don't know how many. We only know of a relatively few cases where by some stroke of fate, the innocence of a wrongly convicted and executed person has been established. Perjury is not unknown. Juries do make mistakes. An appeal does not ordinarily mean a retrial. Appellate courts—for good reason—cannot second-guess the trier of fact. The question is not, Is he guilty? but rather, Was he lawfully convicted? Admittedly any case of wrongful conviction is monumentally rare. But such cases have occurred, And they almost certainly will occur again.

Most of our States allow the court or jury to impose life imprisonment or the death sentence. This is proof that most people

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

recognize the existence of a distinction in degree, even in premeditated murder; and that there are murderers (the majority if judged by the percentage who receive life sentences as compared with those condemned to death) who, even in the opinion of its advocates, do not deserve the death penalty. But what man, or group of men, is qualified to determine the precise point at which this fine line should be drawn?

We have briefly considered both sides of the argument, and can safely draw certain conclusions: Although it may appear that the death penalty should be the most effective deterrent, there is no proof that it is. On the other hand, there is no proof that it is not. Capital punishment has obviously failed as a deterrent when a murder is committed. We can number its failures, but not its successes. We do not know how many people have refrained from murder because of the fear of execution. The death penalty can be justified only if it is proved to be necessary and effective as a deterrent. If two alternative measures will serve equally to protect from or suppress crime, the adoption of the lesser of the punitive measures is indicated. Apart from the questions of humanitarianism, justice and ethics, the risks inherent in the adoption of any stronger measure to the freedom of the individual are ever present. Here then is the $64 question: Is the death penalty the most effective deterrent? We can't answer that question definitely one way or the other on the basis of available statistics.[28] I neither propose nor predict the early abolition of the death penalty. On the contrary, human nature being as it is, the burden of proof seems to be on the abolitionists; and it is likely that capital punishment will be retained (possibly in a more limited form) unless and until it is proved not to be the most effective deterrent.

---

[1] Assembly bills 2089, 2090, 2091.

[2] The usual procedure was to strangle the criminal immediately before lighting the fire. In this connection, Blackstone says: "But the humanity of the English nation has authorized, by a tacit consent, an almost general mitigation of such part of these judgments as savor of torture or cruelty * * * there being very few instances (and those accidental or by negligence) of any person's being emboweled or burned till previously deprived of sensation by strangling."

[3] The Autobicgraphy of Sir John Bramston, K. B. (Camden Society, London, 1845), p. 192.

[4] E. P. Evans, The Criminal Prosecution and Punishment of Animals (Heineman, London, 1906), p. 140.

[5] Evans, p. 162; see also S. Baring Gould, Curiosities of Olden Times (1869).

[6] First-degree murder (P. C. 190); kidnaping (P. C. 209); train wrecking (P. C. 219); perjury in a capital trial resulting in the execution of an innocent person (P. C. 128); and assault by a life prisoner (P. C. 4500).

[7] Robert M. Carter, Capital Punishment in California; 1938–53, thesis, University of California School of Criminology.

[8] See Nicola Tesla in the New York World, Nov. 17, 1929, and the San Diego Sun, Dec. 3, 1938.

[9] Capital Punishment in the United States.

[10] Man's Judgment of Death (1924) p. 34.

[11] Proceedings of the Annual Congress of the American Prison Association (1922), p. 361.

[12] National Prisoner Statistics, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

[13] Statistics supplied by the California State Department of Corrections.

[14] Robert M. Carter, Capital Punishment in California 1938–53, thesis, University of California School of Criminology.

[15] Statistics supplied by the U. S. Department of Justice.

[16] Genesis, ix: 6. See also Exodus xxi: 12, Leviticus xxiv: 17, and Numbers xxxv: 30–31.

[17] Revelation xiii: 10.

[18] See Romans xiii: 1–4 and Acts xxv: 10 and 11.

[19] See By Right of Sword, by Leigh H. Irvine (1915) p. 17.

[20] George Ryley Scott, the History of Capital Punishment (1950) p. 233.

[21] Romans xii: 19.

[22] St. Matthew vii: 1.

[23] St. Matthew v: 38–39.

[24] Man's Judgment of Death, 1924, p. 21.

[25] Deterrent Influence of the Death Penalty, the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (November 1952).

[26] Commission report, par. 65.

[27] New Horizons in Criminology (1943) p. 432.

[28] Lewis E. Lawes, Man's Judgment of Death (1924) p. 23, table XIII and chart III.

[29] A century ago in England, in order to produce the maximum deterrent effect, the execution of a criminal was made a public spectacle, attended by curious or morbid crowds, in which thieves and robbers plied their trade. Pickpockets had a field day, for example, whenever one of their associates was publicly hanged. As death penalties multiplied, capital offenses multiplied, until the whole abominable system collapsed. In 1868 public executions were abolished in England. New York State discontinued public hangings in 1835; and one by one most of the other States followed this example.

[30] Springfield (Mass.) Republican, September 16, 1929.

[31] Lewis E. Lawes, Man's Judgment of Death (1924) p. 49.

[32] George Ryley Scott, the History of Capital Punishment (1950) p. 275.

[33] Report, paragraph 333; See also paragraph 317 suggesting new test: "The jury must be satisfied that, at the time of committing the act, the accused, as a result of disease of the mind (or mental deficiency) (a) did not know the nature and quality of the act or (b) did not know that it was wrong or (c) was incapable of preventing himself from committing it."

[34] *Durham* v. *United States* (214 F. 2d 862) at page 875: "Unless you believe beyond a reasonable doubt either that he was not suffering from a diseased or defective mental condition, or that the act was not the product of such abnormality, you must find the accused not guilty by reason of insanity."

[35] *People* v. *Morisawa* (180 Cal. 148); *People* v. *Spraic* (87 Cal. App. 724).

[36] The rule in many States, and in California until 1946: neither words nor insulting actions nor gestures, alone are sufficient—*People* v. *Bruggy* (93 Cal. 476); *People* v. *Turley* (50 Cal. 469); *People* v. *Jackson* (78 Cal. App. 442).

[37] See *People* v. *Valentine* (28 Cal. 2d 121, 137–144 (1946)).

[38] A recommendation has been made to the American Bar Association's Committee on the administration of criminal justice that this matter be given further study.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a pleasure to joint with my fellow Representatives here today in honoring the noble and courageous people of Lithuania who today commemorate the 38th anniversary of their declaration of independence, which was proclaimed on February 16, 1918. Their observance of this great day will be celebrated silently in the homeland, for the Communist oppressors have forbidden the Lithuanians to express the love and devotion they hold for the principles of freedom and democracy.

The Soviet Union applied the typical Communist methods in an effort to enslave and destroy the will of the sturdy people of Lithuania and has sought to force them to give allegiance to Moscow. Despite the loss of their liberties and the brutal treatment they have endured, the Lithuanians refuse to recognize Communist Russia as their overlord. They continue to offer resistance to the Soviet Union. Their determination not to yield to the aggressors exemplifies the strong character of these extraordinary people.

The Lithuanians have, since 1940, offered active resistance to Soviet rule of their homeland. Well aware of the consequences of acting against the Soviet rule, they continue in their drive for freedom. Despite a 15-year program of Russification, we read press reports in 1956 which indicate that the spirit of these heroic people has not broken. They stand ready, fortified by their belief in Christian ideals, to shed their blood to achieve independence and break away from the Communist yoke. They have faith and hope and they will not despair before they see the dawn of victory.

The history of Lithuania has been mixed with both glory and tragedy. In their early history the Lithuanians were called upon to defend Europe when the Tatars came from the East and threatened western civilization. They suffered persecutions beyond human endurance during their 120 year subjugation under Russia.

When they achieved their independence in 1918, the Lithuanians lived a happy and prosperous life. They made much progress and added many contributions to the culture of Western Europe. Lithuania became a respected member of the League of Nations in 1921.

Once again after two decades of a happy experience under a freely elected government of their choice, they were engulfed by the tyrants of Soviet Russia. They were incorporated into the Soviet Union against their will, without even the opportunity to express themselves in the matter. The United States, as well as other democracies who espouse the cause of freedom and justice, continue the policy of nonrecognition of Russia's aggression in the Baltic States.

The desire of these gallant people to obtain their liberties and freedom is so strong that they will never succumb to the principles of communism. Our sincere wish on this solemn occasion is that the flag of freedom will soon wave again over this gallant nation.

I am confident that their untold sacrifices will not be in vain for their determination and faith in God will lead them to victory over the aggressors and right will prevail over evil.

Nepal's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to the people of Nepal, His Majesty Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva, and Mr. Iswary Raj Misra, First Secretary, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim in the United States, sincere felicitations and best wishes on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of independence, February 18, 1956.

From 1846 to 1951 Nepal was virtually ruled by the Rana family a member of which always held the office of prime minister, the succesion being determined by special rules. The ruling Rana family had seized power and installed themselves as hereditary prime ministers and commanders in chief, and in other key positions. The king was maintained as a figurehead. His life and contacts were supervised by the Ranas.

In 1950 events moved fast. His Majesty the late King Maharajadhiraja Tribhuvana Bir Bikram Jang Bahadur Shah Bahadur Shamsher Jang escaped from the clutches of tyranny and became the symbol of the revolutionary movement to oust the Ranas. The revolutionists recalled King Tribhuvan back to his throne, where he presided over the first year of Nepal as a democracy.

On February 18, 1951, His Majesty the late King Tribhuvan announced far-reaching constitutional reforms. By his forthright actions, the King successfully overthrew the rule of a Nepali clan and so freed the country from a feudal yoke. The Ranas held Nepal together because they ruled with a strong hand, spent much on the army, and had a short way with political opponents. The new government tries to win popular support by spending money on education and social services.

Nepal is passing through a difficult period of transition from an autocratic to a democratic regime. In March 1955 King Tribhuvan passed on, and Prince Mahendra became King of Nepal. The revolution freed the country, but Nepal remained in political turmoil. Nepal's new King, His Majesty Mahendra Bir Birkram Shah Deva, is working hard to solve the political crisis which he inherited from his father.

King Mahendra is devoted to his responsibilities of leadership of his people. Despite opposition, one of his first acts was to call a conference of all political and social organizations in Nepal to request from them suggestions pertaining to the establishment of a stable democratic regime. King Mahendra is trying to evolve a stable democracy in a country which, in a few years, has risen from almost obscurity to a key strategic position. He has promised to hold the first ever general elections in Nepal, and strive for the maintenance of democratic government.

For the present King Mahendra, while desiring to place power in the hands of a popularly elected prime minister, is left as Nepal's supreme ruler. Meanwhile the eyes of the world are fixed upon Nepal until the stable regime of King Mahendra's dreams is firmly established.

Nepal is one of the United Nations' new members. She is also an associate member of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, an agency acting within the framework of the policies of the United Nations, designed to assist the governments of the region in their efforts to reconstruct and develop the economic structure of their countries. Under the Colombo plan of aid to south Asian nations, Nepal receives substantial financial help.

The United States heartily supports the ideals of democracy everywhere. East and West meet in Nepal in a very specific way. From the United States and other sources emanate programs to help Nepal emerge out of feudalism; to strengthen its economy; encourage it to set up democratic institutions, and so ward off infiltration which threatens everywhere on the periphery of communism's empires. The hundreds of miles of the Himalayas stretching across Nepal's frontier no longer constitute an impregnable fortress. The United States realizes this fact and is trying to help this nation overcome its lack of defense—economic, military, and geographic.

I salute Nepal on this momentous occasion of independence day and pray for her continued peace, prosperity, and progress as she embarks upon a new year of national life.

Frank Sinatra Plans Worldwide Entertainment Tour for Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Education and Labor is currently considering legislation to provide for the interchange between the United States and other countries of creative and performing artists in the field of art, drama, music, and the dance. This program has been proposed to meet the challenge of communism and to promote goodwill and understanding between the United States and other nations of the world by a greater exchange of cultural ideas which reflect national character and custom.

This is, in my opinion, an excellent proposal for improving international relations and is, to some extent, an extension of the overseas tour program in which many American artists in the entertainment field have already participated.

I have been apprised of the fact that Frank Sinatra, perhaps the most popular entertainer in the world today, currently is in contact with our State Department in arranging a forthcoming worldwide tour of charity performances, the first ever undertaken on such a scale by any top-name American entertainment figure. In this highly commendable project, Mr. Sinatra would take several weeks out of his very busy professional career to tour the world late this year in a series of benefit appearances, with all proceeds going to a major charity in each country visited. If this tour, which Mr. Sinatra proposed, materializes, he will indeed become a great goodwill ambassador for our Nation.

It is worthy of remark how frequently Mr. Sinatra and his fellow artists in the realm of show business offer their time and talents to public-spirited enterprises, and how infrequently the general public learns of their unselfish generosity.

Frank Sinatra, long an international favorite, is motivated in this undertaking by his determination to show the rest of the world what can happen in America to a boy born in humble surroundings. To this project he is contributing more than his time, talent, and prestige. The time which he will take out of his busy and lucrative work schedule in order to make this tour, which he himself proposed, will mean thousands of dollars out of his own pocket. However, he believes that the benefits that could accrue to the United States in terms of good will and improved world relations as result of this tour cannot be measured in dollars.

The sincerity with which artists like Frank Sinatra bring their services to good causes is amply demonstrated by the fact that they are busy at it the year around. Within just the past few months, for instance, Mr. Sinatra has actively campaigned for and aided such projects as the American Heart Fund, the sale of Bonds for Israel, the Peanuts for Polio, and other phases of this year's March of Dimes, and other worthy causes, not to mention numerous personal appearances in behalf of charitable benefits. Within the past few weeks he took the time to appear in a special short subject sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and shown in the theaters of the Nation as part of Brotherhood Week.

Frank Sinatra's activity in these fields is the more remarkable when considered in the light of the tremendous demands and obligations exacted by such a successful professional career.

Recently this actor and singer added to his already full schedule the new responsibility of motion-picture production. His new company, Kent Productions, Inc., has just completed its initial motion-picture production, a film titled "Johnny Concho," for the United Artists Co. In addition, he is about to add musical conducting to his professional activities with an album for Capitol Records which will feature not Mr. Sinatra's famous singing voice, but rather his conducting the original compositions of a group of great but underrated people, the composers in Hollywood, whose works contribute so much to present-day motion-picture enjoyment. And, in addition to all these activities, Mr. Sinatra

still takes time to respond generously to worthwhile and public-spirited undertakings.

Mr. Sinatra has long been a true crusader for a better world. The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences has given him a special award in recognition of his film The House I Live In, a short subject devoted to furthering tolerance and a better understanding between peoples. In another recent instance he was selected as star of the year by the Interstate Circuit, one of the Nation's largest thater chains, a tribute citing the fact that he never rejects a request from any meritorious cause.

Having done so much for good purpose here in America, Mr. Sinatra now seeks, through his proposed tour, to aid worthwhile causes in other countries as well.

The fine citizenship and unselfish spirit manifest by Frank Sinatra and by many other outstanding figures in the entertainment world are indeed deserving of the sincerest commendation, as well as the warm appreciation of the people of the United States.

In the motion picture and recording industries, Mr. Frank Sinatra today is considered tops at the box-office. With his great contributions to aid in worthy causes, he should also be considered a top humanitarian and a great American.

Sour Bridge Harmony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last session of Congress created a special committee to investigate the finances involved in the toll collections of the White County Bridge Commission, which operates the bridge over the Wabash between White County, Ill., and Indiana.

Our colleague, Congressman WINFIELD DENTON, has been doing great work as chairman of this special committee. Important facts and revelations have been uncovered regarding the fantastic methods used in disposing of these toll receipts over the years in order to postpone the day when toll collections would be abolished.

The following news article by Fred Othman, which I hereby submit, contains some interesting comments on the White County Bridge:

SOUR BRIDGE HARMONY
(By Fred Othman)

NEW HARMONY, IND., February 15.—The Rappites came to New Harmony in 1821 with the first purely communistic settlement in the world. It didn't work. Came then the Owenites, who believed in brotherly love, and this wasn't successful, either.

Finally there arrived Roy Clippinger with his bridge across the beautiful Wabash, the best established toll bridge there ever was, and harmony in pitcuresque New Harmony is hard to find today.

This bridge was built in 1931 at a cost of $600,000 and since then it has collected more than $3 million in tolls. The bonds have been retired, but the cash registers of the toll collectors continue to rattle.

This has been an expensive bridge to operate. An audit by the General Accounting Office back in Washington indicates that it is the only bridge that ever bought itself an encyclopedia. This bridge sends flowers to its friends. It owns a baby blue Cadillac. It is the proprietor of 60 bottles, or $71.40 worth of Hadacol, an alcoholic tonic that used medicine shows a few years back to extol its virtues.

The white-haired Roy, who hails from Carmi, Ill., across the river, and who used to be a Congressman, himself, is manager of the White County Bridge Commission, an official body created by act of Congrecs.

When the Hadacol show came to town, Mr. Clippinger thought it would be nice to invite the local orphans to see it. To get 60 youngsters inside the gate, he—or the bridge—had to buy 60 bottles of highproof tonic.

So Congress is investigating, and on hand is its demon investigator, Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, Indiana, who can't understand why Mr. Clippenger still charges 30 cents for a round trip across his bridge. Representative DENTON insists it ought to be free.

He held his formal inquiry in the annex to the high-school gymnasium and on tap were a couple of dozen irate toll payers. They agreed with Representative DENTON that this bridge has paid for itself so many times over that the payees ought at long last use it without charge.

Representative DENTON said the bridge should be turned over to the States of Illinois and Indiana. Engineers from both testified they didn't want it until it was put in safe condition. Other engineers said it would cost about $1 million to fix that bridge. Mr. Clippinger said he only had $25,000 in the till.

He said he didn't see any way of repairing it, unless the tolls were doubled to 60 cents a round trip. He said he only took in $10,000 a month in tolls now and he needs $20,000.

"How long will it take you to pay for the repairs?" asked Representative DENTON.

"We'll never pay for it at the present rate," snapped Mr. Clippinger.

"That's just what I was afraid of," said Representative DENTON. "Now, Mr. Clippinger, you already have collected more than $3 million. The way this thing is going our children's children will be paying to ride on this bridge. It is the longest established toll bridge there ever was."

"If we could raise the tolls again, we could get the work done," Mr. Clippinger insisted. He thought a moment, and he said he had insurance on the bridge and that would pay for anything that happened to it.

"I mean I did have insurance until you started talking about it being unsafe," he added. "When I get back home, I probably won't be insured at all."

The proceedings ended on an inconclusive note. The big bridge man and assistants headed west across their bridge in the Cadillac; the customers in New Harmony walked out of the gymnasium, muttering.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the Ukrainian Independence Day, on January 21, an impressive commemorative dinner was held under the auspices of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian Association of Washington at the Mayflower Hotel. The occasion was the celebration of the 38th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, and it was dedicated to the liberation of all captive nations in the Communist colonial empire.

This message of Communist colonialism and imperialism is being carried forward by the Ukrainian Congress Committee under the leadership of its national chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is professor of economics at Georgetown University. It is stressed in a memorandum sent to President Eisenhower during the recent Anglo-American Conference, in which excerpts are cited from significant messages sent by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Under Secretary of State Herbert H. Hoover, Jr., on the occasion of the commemorative dinner.

Because of the importance of this memorandum with regard to Communist colonial domination of the Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, I am inserting it into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

JANUARY 28, 1956.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the occasion of the Anglo-American Conference attended by Prime Minister Churchill 2 years ago, it was our dutiful privilege to submit for your studied consideration and that of the Secretary of State certain views regarding the moral and political bases underlying the struggle of the free world against Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism. The publication of the full text of the communication, under the caption of "Unity Based on Principle," was sponsored by the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, Senator of Massachusetts, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1954 (pp. A5366–A5537). In general form, the agreements reached by the conference on principles of action seemed to accommodate our views insofar as Ukraine and the several other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are concerned.

The second Anglo-American Conference with Prime Minister Anthony Eden affords us the opportunity to reaffirm all the basic views expressed previously on the hard reality of the Russian Communist empire, the universal application of the traditional American principle of independence and national self-determination, and our unshakable dedication to the spirited meaning of your own words, "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves." No event or development has occurred in the past 2 years to alter in any shape or form the views advanced by us during the first conference. On the contrary, world developments in this period have only served to justify them further and to reinforce our complete support of the peaceful liberation of the captive peoples which, as you have recently declared, "has been, is, and, until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of American foreign policy."

However, the known concern of the British Foreign Minister over the effects in Asia and elsewhere of the spurious propaganda unleashed by the Russian Communist leaders, Khrushchev and Bulganin, on the subject of colonialism and imperialism leads us to

stress here the urgent need for exposing to the world the full depth and breadth of Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism since 1920. Our most potent weapon in the informational and propaganda field is truth, but in this vital respect the West has scarcely made full use of it. Merely to counteract with proper denials on the contemporary impact of western colonialism is plainly inadequate for us to win the minds and hearts of millions in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere. Positive and courageous steps in unraveling the truth about the colonialism and imperialism of Moscow, which in nearly 40 years has formed an empire unsurpassed in the pages of history, appear necessary to impress upon the nations of Asia and Africa the prospect that faces them in the event of continued neutralism or appeasement. Such steps would begin to implement the sense of Congress expressed in the last session by its unanimous passage of the McCormack resolution on Communist imperialism and colonialism.

In a recent policy address Secretary of State Dulles alluded to the empire character of the Soviet Union itself when he stated that "We do not believe that nations and peoples who want to be independent should be forced into unwelcome dominance by others, merely to produce monolithic power" (Confident of Our Future, October 10, 1955, p. 8). History clearly shows that 20 years before the further expansion of Russian Communist colonialism into the Baltic States and Central Europe, an independent Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, North Caucasia, Turkestan, and Idel-Ural were destroyed by the imperialist forces of Russian communism which in the form of the Soviet Union has in vain attempted to produce this monolithic power. The peoples of Asia and Africa would readily understand and appreciate this stage-like development of Russian colonialism once the truth is put before them. For the problem of national independence in Indochina and elsewhere and the surging forces of enlightened nationalism in Asia and Africa are essentially the same as those in the vast Russian Communist empire which includes the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

We shall not succeed in meeting and defeating the psychological challenge of Moscow until we ourselves face up to the truth and use it with operational effectiveness. Countless leading Americans are urging that we do this now. In an outstanding message on the occasion of a recent commemorative dinner in Washington, celebrating the 38th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the eminent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, points out the desire of the American people to promote national self-determination and states, "It is my hope that the time may soon come when the peoples of formerly independent states, such as the Ukraine and the Baltic States, will have opportunity freely to choose their own governments and thereby to give full expression to their national aspirations." On this same occasion, attended by Members of Congress, the executive and judiciary branches, and representatives of almost every captive nation, the message on national independence and human rights, signed by the Honorable Herbert H. Hoover, Jr., expresses similar sentiments and states: "We wish the same advantages for all other peoples of the world, particularly those who are now living under Communist domination."

With much concern for our moral and political position in Asia and Africa, it is our earnest hope that this conference soundly appraising the fraudulent gesture of the recent Bulganin note, will give fitting expression to the cruel reality of Russian Communist colonialism and crystallize the thoughts and feelings of all patriotic Americans in the traditional spirit of anticolonialism, national independence, and sovereignty.

With God's many blessings upon your health and leadership, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Statement of Thomas Kennedy, Vice President, United Mine Workers of America, Before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, February 15, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement of Mr. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on February 15, 1956:

My name is Thomas Kennedy; I am vice president of the United Mine Workers of America. I propose to discuss only those parts of the economic report of the President which have a relationship to the coal industry.

In the letter of transmittal of this report to the Congress, President Eisenhower on page 1 made this observation: "Some groups of people have not, however, enjoyed a full measure of prosperity, and we must keep that fact before us as we build for the future." I represent and speak for one such group in communities in the jurisdiction of the coal industry where surplus unemployment or depressed areas are the rule rather than the exception.

Page 61 of the report deals with the matter of helping local communities reduce unemployment, and it is pointed out very properly in the report that this is a matter of national as well as local concern. The area assistance program referred to in this section of the report, however, does not reach into the heart of the unemployment situation. The bringing of new industries into these areas carries with it the thought and the idea of vocational training; but I submit that in the coal areas vocational training would hardly fit into the picture because we find that new industries very seldom employ persons beyond 39 or 40 years of age. In the mining industry the ages run from 18 to 65 and over. It is not an idle statement when we suggest that such a program would apply mostly to younger employees. However, there is one section of the economic report, which possibly makes it proper or permissible for loans for "the purchase and alteration of existing facilities." My point is that we have idle mines in the bituminous and anthracite coal regions, industries already in existence, but idle now, and which industries, if properly aided by the Federal Government, might resume operations and give employment to thousands of men in the surplus labor areas in the coal fields.

I refer to one example in particular. The Anthracite Hazleton Shaft Colliery of the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., which employed approximately 800 men with approximately 1,000 employees in the overall picture, was drowned out during the recent hurricane Diane. The pumps were lost and the mine is now idle and has been idle since last September. This was the basic industry in the city of Hazleton, Pa., with a payroll of about $3,500,000 per year. The coal company claims it does not have the money to dewater this mine and have operations resumed.

We shopped around Washington, without results, following the hurricane to find out if any branch of the Federal Government could do anything to put this mine back in operation. The matter is also being considered by the administration in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Surely, this is a matter which comes within the purview of the economic report wherein loans or outright grants should be made to put this mine in operation.

In many of the surplus labor sections unemployment compensation is rapidly being exhausted. The economic report suggests that unemployment compensation is the bulwark for sustaining purchasing power. These payments generally run for a period of 26 weeks. It would become a greater bulwark, if these unemployment compensation payments were made for the duration of the period of unemployment or until such persons were eligible for Federal security payments.

Table D, page 186 of the economic report, gives figures on the age bracket and average duration of unemployment compensation payments. From these figures we get the fact that in 1946 we had 141,000 persons with a duration of unemployment over 26 weeks; while we had in the last quarter of 1955 239,000—or an average for the year 1955 of 335,000 individuals affected by unemployment over the 26-week period. These people might be classified for employment purposes as being liquidated.

Surely, there is room here for the Federal Government in conjunction with the States, if necessary, to take care of this situation by the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation for the period of idleness beyond that provided by the various States.

International trade, imports, exports, tariffs, etc., are also covered in the economic report; and on this particular matter I again call the attention of the Congress to the increased dumping of residual or waste oil on the eastern seaboard. In my statement to the Congress when the reciprocal trade bill was being discussed, I pointed out that residual oil dumped on the eastern seaboard, mostly from Venezuela, displaced 30 million tons of coal in 1954, mostly bituminous coal. Recent figures for 1955 indicate that 36 million tons of coal were displaced by the dumping of the Venezuela waste oil. I again call to the attention of Congress that this waste oil is coming not from a free country, but from a country where labor is in chains and where advocates of democracy and justice are refugees.

Evidently, our Government is very anxious to support Venezuela, judging from the statement recently released by Mr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when he sounded a note of warning that the unusually cold weather of this winter has increased the demand for fuel oils. In his announcement, Mr. Flemming emphasized that he was acting on the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy by requesting oil importing companies to indicate any additional imports of residual fuel oil beyond what was already specifically programed which they might deem necessary to meet current and prospective ocnsumer demand from now until April 30. This alarmist attitude, in my estimation, is utterly ridiculous and probably the most one-sided

statement ever issued from any Government office. The viewpoint is without foundation because the facts of the situation indicate that the available supply of coal in this country is of such sufficiency to meet the fuel requirements of the Nation that there need be no worry about the importation of residual oil at all. Emphatically speaking, it looks to me as though this statement was a sounding board for the oil companies which control tremendous wealth and power in the Nation. In a nutshell, the Flemming statement was little concerned about the coal industry or its problems.

To solve some of the problems in the coal industry we should have a national fuel policy which would put each of the fuel industries in its proper competitive position.

Stabilization of the coal industry itself, especially the anthracite, is of utmost importance, if the communities with a surplus of labor are to participate in the general prosperity referred to in the economic report.

The dumping of waste oil should be stopped.

An intensified research program for greater uses of coal should be built up by the Government.

Attention should be paid to the idea of building up our exports of coal to Europe and Asia, with ocean freight rates established on a stable basis.

Action should be taken on the part of the Federal Government whereby supplemental unemployment compensation will be paid for the duration of unemployment beyond the period of duration provided for by State legislation.

The foregoing are suggestions which I shall be glad to amplify in discussion before this committee, and which I hope will meet with the approval of the committee.

Problem of the Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made for publication in the newspaper printed by the East Side Chamber of Commerce of the City of New York. This problem of small-business men has long been a source of concern to me; and it is my hope that this Congress will take appropriate action to assist the small-business man, who is, in my opinion, the backbone of American business and industry.

STATEMENT FOR EAST SIDE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BY CONGRESSMAN ARTHUR G. KLEIN

I hope that Congress, during its second session will give full consideration to the problems and to the needs of the small-business man. I, for one, mean to do everything I can to have this consideration given because I believe it to be basic to the well-being of millions of people and to our general economic welfare.

I expect that Congress will have to make many exertions in this respect. The administration's warmth for big business has been manifest, and has taken many forms. For instance, in the past year, corporation profits have gone up 26 percent; corporation take-home pay has had an equal rise, and big-business failures have gone down 15 percent. As against that, we have the sad fact that small-business failures have gone up by 21 percent.

It seems to me that it is possible to embody in our legislation further help to small business and for the prevention of monopoly. I have nothing against big business as such. But monopoly is another matter and the squeeze on the small-business man must be lifted.

I believe, too, that the small-business man will be helped by economic programs such as increased housing. We learned from the President's state of the Union message that the administration proposes authority to contract for 35,000 additional public housing units. This is utterly inadequate; 135,000 units were provided for in the bill passed by the Democratically controlled Senate in 1955. This should be a minimum figure. For such public housing is indispensable to the broad housing needs of our growing population and constitutes an important spur to small business. Every young married couple that is able to set itself up in a home of its own means a customer for the small-business man who has commodities to provide and services to render. Housing equipment, furniture—all that goes into the maintenance of a home and the growth of a family, are important to the small-business man. They are also a key to the cotninued high standard of the American people which became a goal of government during the F. D. R. New Deal and the Truman Fair deal administrations.

I have also felt it a matter of some concern that provisions should be made for aged widows and widowers, and single people generally, to have access to public-housing projects. They, too, are an integral part of our population; and with the rise in the general age level of the American people, ordinary decency requires that we give some thought to and make adequate provisions for aged, single people to be able to live in the public housing that takes the place of the slum buildings from which they have been evacuated. Theirs, too, is a case of important, economic value to the small-business man. The elderly man or woman who has to move out of his district because of a public-housing project, or that has to move in with a child of the family, has far fewer economic needs than one who maintains a home of his own or her own. Small business, it seems to me, has a vital stake in this, and should give support to the legislation on this score that I have introduced into Congress.

A school-building program of suitable dimensions and adequate to meet the needs of our largely increased school population is still another project that should appeal to the community at large and to the small-business man in particular. They are all interlocked. Adequate school facilities and ample teacher forces mean that much more for the neighborhood store and businessman.

Another concern of the small-business man is the administration's proposal to increase the first-class postage rates. I am strongly opposed to this as unjustified in and of itself, and as imposing a particularly heavy burden on the average family, the average laboring man, the average storekeeper, and the average businessman. As a matter of fact, the Post Office losses are not due to the first-class mail. They are due, largely, to the second-class mailings. In any event, the Post Office is not and should not be regarded in the same way as we regard a private business venture any more than a municipal fire department or police department can be so regarded. A fair and moderate postage rate is absolutely essential to the normal conduct of our business life. It is a stimulant to exchange. It would be an unjustified saddling of still another burden on every individual small-business man, and every individual family to increase the postage rate. I am against it.

Above all, I am concerned with the fact that since the last half of 1952, and under the policies of the present administration, small-business profits are down 66 percent, small-business investors' returns are down 57 percent, and small-business failures are up 36 percent. I am concerned because in 1954 alone there were three times as many business mergers as occurred in 1949. This is a trend toward monopoly that is most disturbing. I am concerned that the small-business man's share in the defense procurement dollar shrank in the years 1954 and 1955. This is a trend that must be resisted. Ours should not be a government of big business any more than that of any other segment of the population. Ours should be a government of all the people. That definitely includes the small-business man.

The Communists Are on the Move Again With Aid, Trade, Arms, Good-Will Missions, Student Exchanges, Athletes, and Neutrality Propaganda, Adlai Stevenson Warns—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Wednesday, February 15, 1956, reports that Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson charged in a speech in Seattle, Wash., that the Eisenhower administration has left the country unprepared for a new Communist cold-war offensive. He described the Nation's situation as more perilous than ever.

The presidential candidate charged the administration was trying to sell instead of explain United States foreign policy to the one-third of mankind not yet committed to the Soviet Union or to the West.

He declared that, because of conflicting ideas in Government departments, the administration is attempting to conduct one foreign policy for the Nation and another for the Republican Party.

Meanwhile—

Mr. Stevenson asserted—

the cold war has entered a new phase. The Communists are on the move again—with aid, trade, arms, goodwill missions, technical missions, student exchanges, athletes, and neutrality propaganda—while people in high places in our Government shout "no help to neutrals—you've got to be for us or against us."

The issues confronting the Nation at this time, are, I believe, graver than at any time in our history. The calm and confident tones with which Khrushchev addressed the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party and the text of the speech shows that the crisis which we face is of a dimension and quality never before encountered.

It is because I believe that Governor Stevenson has made one of the most im-

portant speeches of our time and discussed the problem with dignity and clarity that I include excerpts from his speech here.

I have introduced two measures which I believe will assist us to meet this crisis. One, House Joint Resolution 474, would establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, author of the great act of the Congress on exchange of persons, has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure. In the House Members who have joined with me in sponsoring the joint resolution include the gentleman from New Jersey, HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, the gentleman from New York, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES, and the gentleman from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

I am hopeful that many more of my colleagues from both parties will join in introducing this measure in the House. I am including the text of my invitation to them to join in sponsorship of this joint resolution as part of my remarks. I have developed therein why I believe such a joint congressional committee is highly important now and what I think its functions should be.

A second measure of mine, H. R. 8920, provides for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals. Minnesota's distinguished Democratic Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as S. 3116.

I am confident that if these two basic proposals are enacted into law we would be in a tremendously improved position for meeting the Russian drive at this critical time in our country's history.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs. Such a joint committee will be able to make an important contribution to these international exchange programs.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure.

I am hopeful that you and many other colleagues of mine from both parties will join with us in introducing this measure in the House. The text of our joint resolution is enclosed herewith for your study.

We believe that international exchange of persons has proved to be a valuable means of developing closer cooperation among the nations of the free world. The need for such cooperation is every day more apparent. The United States Government is using this technique both for building better understanding of our country abroad and for technical cooperation and economic development. Large exchange programs are now operated by the Department of State. Students, teachers, prominent specialists and leaders in many fields are exchanged and outstanding cultural performers are sent abroad under these programs. The Congress authorized these programs through the Smith-Mundt Act (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), the Fulbright Act (Public 584, 79th Cong.) and several other acts. American technical experts are sent abroad and foreign nationals are brought to the United States for training under the International Cooperation Administration (formerly FOA and point 4).

The Congress receives reports from the Secretary of State on these programs and reviews their operation annually in connection with appropriations. The Smith-Mundt Act also provides for a United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange which reports directly to the Congress on a semi-annual basis.

All of these programs are reviewed separately, and by different congressional committees. They are extremely complex both from the point of view of administration and source of funds, and all use dollars and foreign currencies and rely to a large extent on the efficient use of private resources here and abroad.

It is, therefore, not surprising that some confusion has persisted in the Congress as well as in the public mind as to the relationships that exist between these programs. Yet broad public understanding and public acceptance of these exchange programs are essential if Congress is to support them. It is, we believe, imperative that this understanding be achieved and the confusion ended in order that these important activities can achieve the most useful results.

No concerted or continuing review of these programs and their relationships to each other has ever been undertaken by the Congress. Such a review is of the utmost importance and would be of inestimable benefit to the Congress and to the public. It would help all of us to make a more realistic appraisal of these programs.

The Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs which our joint resolution would establish will provide the necessary review to insure the most effective planning, operation, and administration of these important facets of our international relations.

Discussing the perennial crisis of exchange appropriations in Congress, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, writing in the October 1955 issue of the news bulletin of the Institute of International Education, points out that although private-exchange programs long antedate Government activity in this field, the role of the Federal Government is most significant and in recent years has become nearly indispensable.

Over the past few years, as he makes clear, a definite pattern has emerged in the process of getting appropriations for the Government's participation in international educational exchange programs, for instance: The President requests funds for an adequate program; the House of Representatives slashes this figure nearly in half. The Senate restores the full amount; and the final figure is a compromise between the two. The result, the Senator observes, is clearly insufficient appropriations, and he calls for grassroots understanding.

May I hear from you as to your interest in this legislation at your earliest convenience?

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times of February 15, 1956]

EXCERPTS FROM STEVENSON'S SPEECH AT SEATTLE DEMOCRATIC DINNER

SEATTLE, WASH., February 14.—Following are excerpts from the text of a speech by Adlai E. Stevenson at a Democratic fund-raising dinner here tonight:

"This is one of our great doors to the Pacific and beyond lies Asia—our customer and competitor, our friend and enemy. And Asia, I daresay, may well be the area of decision in the great conflict of our times between development by consent and development by coercion, between communism and freedom.

"Just as growth and development are the most significant facts about this new western area of the United States, so it is about Asia. There the political revolution has been delayed a century or more and with it has come the technological revolution that, thus redoubling the sudden violence of the transition from the past to the future, Asia means to develop and quickly, for they have discovered from us of the West that misery, oppression, hunger, and disease are not the immutable destiny of man.

"So they mean to improve living standards quickly. Can they do it the western way, our way, with democracy and the voluntary cooperation of the people or must they do it by dictatorship and forced cooperation—the Communist way?

"Well, these are great questions that are going to be answered on your doorstep and sooner, I fear, than many of us think or hope."

DIFFERENCE ON METHODS

"There is no division among Americans on party grounds with respect to our desire for peace or our foreign policy objectives, but there are crucial differences among us as to methods, and the vigor with which we shall pursue them.

"I am not, the newspapers and writers to the contrary notwithstanding, one of those who feels, or says for partisan advantages, that all the Administration, the President and the Secretary of State, have done in this field, is wrong or have wholly failed.

"But, likewise, I am shocked when I read every day that all is well. That any criticism of this administration and its frequent and foolish failures is just campaign oratory, and that whatever a Democrat says about the conduct of our foreign affairs must be taken with a grain of salt.

"If debate and discussion of our most important problem by partisans is to be discredited and ignored, then how, when, and by whom are the people to be informed about their most important concern?

"Because these are our most important concern, because they are the issues of survival and, in need of life and death, I am persuaded that no greater misfortunate could befall us than an electorate asleep or complacent or indifferent about the world and our central position in it. * * *

"The fact of the matter is that as we enter the second debate since the last war, devastated, bleeding Russia is more powerful than ever before and enfeebled, war-torn China is a prevading influence through Asia.

"We have been spending $40 billion a year for peace and security—and there is none. There isn't even preponderant power in the new weapons any longer, as we are now learning from escaping facts. Yes, and resigning figures.

"Instead of resting complacently on last summer's rosy summit, the spirit of Geneva (which was promptly stamped 'made in Washington') has suddenly given way to the realization that our situation is more perilous than ever.

"France is paralyzed and sorely pressed; Germany dismembered and restless; the guns

are rumbling again in the Formosa Straits; nationalism is ready through awakening Islam; Soviet arms and influence are creeping into the Middle East (and we welcome anxiously these days assurances that security of Israel, which we helped create, is a genuine concern of our Government).

"BRINK OF WAR

"And, meanwhile, the uncommitted third of mankind is listening to what we say and watching what we do unhappily. Too often what they hear and see leaves the emphasis on Goa and colonialism, on 'the brink of war.' And atomic devastation of Asians, on more military pacts. And less economic assistance, and finally on confusion and contradictions that reveal all too clearly an administration which tries to sell foreign policy instead of explain it; which tries to conduct one foreign policy for the Nation and another for the Republican Party, at the same time—to the dismay of our friends, the delight of our enemies, and the confusion of the neutrals.

"Meanwhile, the cold war has entered a new phase. The Communists are on the move again, with aid, trade, arms, goodwill missions, technical missions, student exchanges, athletes, and neutrality propaganda—while people in high places in our Government shout 'No help to neutrals—you got to be for us or against us.'

"Our Government is unprepared for this new Communist offensive, which has been in the making since Korea and the death of Stalin. * * *

"On the basis of the record of the past 3 years, and in view of the decline of our prestige and influence, it is small wonder that the administration talks about keeping foreign policy out of the campaign, and its press agents assure us that all criticism is just 'campaign oratory.'

"* * * Too often, of late, we have been urged to forget that the essential quality of democracy—distinguishing it from those societies where citizens are not masters but slaves—is that we trust and rely not on catch words and phrases, like 'peace and prosperity,' but upon a whole people's judgment, because it is a wisdom superior to that of the wisest man or small group of men.

"And I want to affirm, as we start out new on this campaign, the conviction that it's our primary obligation to make the election next fall an expression of a whole people's informed judgment about our problems.

"* * * There are those who say that there is no longer any real difference between the Republicans and Democrats—and I must concede that this is an illusion the Republicans do their best to foster in election years."

THE FARM PROGRAM

"Secondly, a hasty reading of the proposals that are being fed into the congressional hopper these days would lead one to believe that a Republican President is revising recent Democrat platforms.

"But when we look beneath the surface, we see little more than a grudging concession to the minimum demands of political expediency, in a campaign year.

"We see a farm program patched together from old Democratic proposals by a political party in hasty retreat from its own program, which set out to get rid of the farm surplus and a substantial number of small farmers in the process.

"We see an education program advanced only when public demand could no longer be deferred—a program still too small to meet our national shortages.

"We see a highway program offered as a replacement for last year's proposal, which turned out to be a bonanza for the bankers and a device to keep the cost out of the Federal budget.

"* * * But an even more significant index to the present approach is to be found behind the scenes, in the administration of the program the erstwhile 'great crusaders' inherited from the Democrats, and to which they still pay lip service, at least in election years.

"Here we see a steady cutting back and emasculation that affects vital segments of our economy, like soil conservation, flood controls, resource development, food and drug administration, rural electrification, aid to small farmers, and so forth.

"Here we find the Secretary of Interior proposing to put a man in charge of our public grazing lands who has long defended the right of private owners to a feudal interest in the public domain.

"Here we find a long-time critic of public housing in charge of public housing, which already suffers from financial malnutrition that would have been shocking even to the later Senator (Robert A.) Taft.

"Here we find the administration fostering small-scale waterpower developments by private utilities instead of the full-scale multi-purpose projects. Here we find our Government obstructing that great regional development, the TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority)—and winding up in a malodorous mess when the Democrats finally exposed the Dixon-Yates deal.

"New all these things are being done by a regime in Washington that prides itself on its business-like management and efficiency—that, indeed, is manned by its echelon by the biggest of American business. So it is, I think, pertinent to inquire whether this record really can be construed as good business, good business for all the American people.

"I say it can not, that no business ever prospered which suffered from lack of foresight, which attempted to take out today's profits without thought of tomorrw.

"Business in this country is not secure, for example, when the income of American farmers has declined by 27 percent in 3 years, and when this whole, vital segment of our economy is in distress.

"It is the genius of the Democratic Party that we have been able to bring together all the elements in our political economy to put the farmer and the workingman and the consumer at the council tables of Government along with the businessman—and so bring forth programs in which all Americans move forward together, with no single interest gaining ground at the expense of another.

"I submit that this is the way it has to be if we are to realize the full promise of the future that lies ahead—the future of promise and peril in which this Nation is called upon to lead the free world and this, finally, is why I have undertaken this campaign of 1956—in the deep belief that my party, and only my party, can restore to Washington the combination of responsibility and human concern which this age demands of America."

The Communists Are on the Move Again With Aid, Trade, Arms, Good-Will Missions, Student Exchanges, Athletes, and Neutrality Propaganda, Adlai Stevenson Warns—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1954, President Eisenhower sent a message to the Congress requesting the sum of $5 million to be expended at his discretion to meet extraordinary or unusual circumstances arising in the international affairs of the Government. The message stressed the need to participate in international trade fairs, where the Russians had made tremendous gains in advertising their way of life through their products. The President went on to say that in the cultural and artistic fields as well, we need greater resources to assist and encourage private musical, dramatic, and other cultural groups to go forth and demonstrate that America too can lay claim to high cultural and artistic accomplishments.

The funds were appropriated in the closing days of the 83d Congress and the International Educational Exchange Service in the Department of State took charge of the cultural programs. The Department of Commerce was charged with the trade fair program and the United States Information Agency gave strong informational support to these activities overseas.

The administration and the Congress had come to the conclusion that, in the words of the President, "nothing is more dangerous to our cause than to expect America's message to be heard if we don't bother to tell it."

It may be truthfully observed that this represented a complete reversal in Republican thinking. That this is so is shown by the fact that a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee under Republican leadership in 1954 rejected 14 bills calling for a similar program saying:

We cannot endorse any of them. We do not believe this is a proper area for the expenditure of Federal funds.

The 14 bills were sponsored by Democratic Members of the Congress which apparently made them unacceptable to the Republican leadership, yet the Democratic Members of the House voted the funds requested by the President without chiding him for the treatment given the Democratic proposals, or for his failure to mention these measures and the repeated claims of the present administration that this program was conceived by the President in 1954.

In a recent letter to the Congress Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, said this program was undertaken in the face of the urgent necessity of combatting the growing Communist cultural offensive which has posed a great threat to our position throughout the world. The program, he stressed, has been carried out for the past 2 years under the authority of the President's emergency fund for international affairs—Supplemental Appropriation Acts, 1955 and 1956—by the Departments of State and Commerce and the United States Information Agency.

Mr. Streibert said that—

The program has facilitated presentations throughout the world by outstanding United States performing artists and athletes who have been enthusiastically received. It also has supported United States exhibits at important trade fairs and exhibitions in every geographic region, which, likewise, have attracted great interest. Because the program has proved successful and because of increasing Communist activity in similar pro-

grams, it has been decided to request the Congress to place the program on a permanent basis.

The program so authorized will continue to be the President's program, one to which he gives his interest and support. All authorities in the bill run to the President and it will be his decision as to the duties and responsibilities of the departments and agencies which will carry it out. In this way continued flexibility will be insured.

Funds available to this program will continue to be used in part to underwrite performing artists and athletes in their tours abroad to the extent that admission receipts are insufficient to cover the total costs involved. Such funds will also support United States participation in international cultural and sports festivals and competition. The funds will also help finance United States exhibits of varying types at international trade and industrial fairs abroad.

On January 30, 1956, I introduced a bill, H. R. 8920, "to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals." This legislation was first introduced by me as H. R. 6874 on June 16, 1955, and hearings were held on my measure by the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Distinguished Civilian Awards and Cultural Interchange and Development on July 5 and 6, 1955.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the distinguished Democratic Senator from Minnesota, introduced a companion measure to my bill as S. 3116, on February 2, 1956.

It is our hope that the Federal departments and agencies concerned with this program will report on our bills as requested in the very near future in order that the Congress may commence hearings on them. In this connection it is important to bear in mind that the Senate Appropriations Committee said, in its report to the Senate on the President's emergency fund last year, that this fund should be made a part of the regular budget. It is with this recommendation in mind that I have developed and sponsored this legislation.

I include as part of my remarks a letter I have received from Theodore C. Streibert, director of the United States Information Agency, and an excerpt from the fourth review of operations of that Federal agency; an article from the Washington Star by Brian Bell regarding a tour abroad by the Air Force Orchestra of which my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, CARROLL D. KEARNS, was guest conductor; and an article from the New York Times on the Seventh Army Symphony, which musical organization has been highly successful in winning the respect of Europe.

These articles afford striking evidence of the impact abroad of American cultural achievements.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, January 30, 1956.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have read with interest the bill H. R. 8497, which you recently introduced, placing on a permanent basis the program currently being carried out under the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs, to demonstrate American cultural and industrial achievements abroad.

I very much appreciate your long-standing interest in this progrom and your vigorous support of it. As you are aware, the program has been exceptionally successful, and its impact upon world opinion has been gratifying. I am in complete agreement with you that permanent statutory authorization is now most desirable.

Your constructive thinking in this matter has been of great value to us, and I want to express to you the Agency's sincere thanks.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE C. STREIBERT,
Director.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY, FOURTH REVIEW OF OPERATIONS, JANUARY 1–JUNE 30, 1955

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE HALF-YEAR

These were foremost among United States Information Agency activities during the first half of 1955:

The Agency contributed to world understanding of the ratification of Western European Union, admission of Germany into NATO, progress toward a workable plan of world disarmament, freedom for Austria and democratic gains at the Bangkok and Bandung conferences.

The Agency energetically carried out its responsibility of achieving maximum psychological benefit from activities supported by the President's Emergency Fund: United States participation in international trade fairs (administered by the Department of Commerce) and presentation of American cultural attractions to audiences overseas (administered by the Department of State). Using press, radio, films, and personal contacts, USIS[1] representatives increased the size of attending crowds and heightened the favorable impression made by these events.

The Agency stepped up its work of promoting worldwide understanding of the United States' comprehensive atoms-for-peace program.

In the pages that follow, these activities and others are described in greater detail.

America's cultural stature

Through all media the Agency acquainted the public in many foreign cities with the appearances of United States artists and musicians.

One of these events—concerts in the Far East by the Symphony of the Air (formerly the NBC Symphony)—was so popular that 2,000 Tokyo students stood in line for 27 hours for tickets, and a Nippon Times headline proclaimed: "A Nation Falls for 94 Men."

The program to demonstrate United States cultural achievements also included:

USIA's Music in America exhibit, which drew large crowds in India, England, Scotland, Wales, and Sweden.

A display of American watercolors in the Philippines, which earned highly favorable comment from the Manila Chronicle, tireless critic of the United States.

Highlights of American Painting, which went to 22 cities and towns in Turkey, Norway, Ethiopia, and Spain, where Spanish Minister Robert Alcover declared that America exports "more than cannons, arms, and dollars."

Handcrafts of the United States, which brought South Americans evidence that, as Rio de Janeiro's Diario Carioca said, "even in the country of mass production, the traditional handcrafts peculiar to European civilization are maintained."

Among other cultural events publicized abroad were:

Salute to France, Paris performances by top American musical and stage personalities, and subsequent appearances in other cities by many of these artists. Salute attractions included the Philadelphia Orchestra, the New York City Ballet, and performances of Medea, Oklahoma, and the Skin of Our Teeth.

Concerts by the noted American violinist, Isaac Stern, in Iceland and Yugoslavia.

Near and far-eastern concerts of Negro spirituals by the Jubilee Singers.

Spectacularly successful performances of the opera Porgy and Bess in Europe and the Near East.

Of this cultural program, U. S. News & World Report said: "American performers are making a good impression and causing many foreigners to revise their idea of America as backward in the arts."

United States at overseas trade fairs

The agency gave strong informational support to official United States exhibits at 14 international trade fairs. For example:

The United States exhibit at the Verona fair demonstrated American farming methods to a half million Italians.

In Frankfurt, thousands saw a typical American home.

In Paris, the United States exhibit caused the French Minister of Industry and Commerce to observe: "It brings us a lesson in optimism from a people whom we believed a short time ago to be threatened by a depression—which never occurred."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star magazine of February 12, 1956]

CONGRESSIONAL CONDUCTOR

(By Brian Bell)

A Pennsylvania Representative is equally adept at conducting a symphony orchestra and the affairs of his congressional district.

Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, once a professional opera singer, guest-conducts the Air Force Orchestra. Sharing the podium with his longtime friend, Col. George S. Howard, regular conductor, Mr. KEARNS has led the musicians in Europe, Iceland, and this country.

Last year, Mr. KEARNS joined the Air Force Orchestra in Denmark and conducted the Irish Suite by Leroy Anderson at 10 concerts there and in Germany. The sight of an American legislator conducting a symphony orchestra was surprising but appealing to the Europeans.

"It was a thrilling experience," Mr. KEARNS said. "One official told us the concerts were worth more to the United States toward improving foreign relations than 500 communiques or a thousand speeches.

"The orchestra gave an all-American program. The audiences were familiar with Beethoven, Brahms, and the great masters, but the idea was to bring our music to them—show them we had fine composers, too.

"An especially big hit was a solo on the harmonica, a German instrument, from Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue. The audiences also demanded encores from our singer, who did some Negro spirituals.

"When I conducted, I always made a reference to the musicians as our 100 musical ambassadors—which I think they were. The boys said they liked the promotion."

Mr. KEARNS again joined Colonel Howard on the podium earlier this month, in the Representative's home district. They conducted the all-State band, composed of the best high-school musicians in Pennsylvania, at Meadville.

In Congress since 1947, Mr. KEARNS first appeared with the Air Force Orchestra as a baritone soloist, back in 1948.

"We gave the performance at the Department of Interior auditorium after only one rehearsal," Mr. KEARNS remembered. "I forgot the last eight bars of my number but George and the boys played on beautifully."

---

[1] The Agency's overseas personnel and activities are known as USIS (U. S. Information Service).

Mr. KEARNS worked his way through college as a railroader. He received his doctor's degree from the Chicago Musical College.

While at the latter institution he sang in five operas with Irene Dunne, later to become a famous movie star. Mr. KEARNS spent 3 years with the American Opera Co. and was a concert baritone.

He was a teacher and supervisor of public schools in Greenville, Pa.; dean of men and head of the music department of Slippery Rock State Teachers College and Superintendent of Schools at Farrell, Pa., before being elected to Congress. He knew Colonel Howard when the latter was head of a music college.

Mr. KEARNS has high praise for the Air Force Orchestra and believes it to be the third best in the world, rating only the New York and Boston symphony orchestras ahead of it. He says he considers overseas appearances by our military musical groups are fine weapons in diplomatic psychological warfare.

The Air Force band and orchestra can resolve itself into a 100-piece marching band, a 90-piece symphony orchestra, an 85-piece symphonic band, a 25-voice glee club (the "Singing Sergeants") and 5 dance bands including the "Airmen of Note" and the "Crew Chiefs."

The band has appeared on 4 continents and toured 26 countries. It played to 100,000 people nightly for 17 consecutive nights at Chicago's Soldier Field and 50,000 people daily for 34 days in Toronto, Canada. It played before 250,000 people at Soesterburg, Holland, and holds attendance records in 21 foreign cities.

The orchestra's weekly recorded broadcast, A Serenade to Britain, a half-hour show transcribed for the British Broadcasting Corp., is heard by an estimated 11 million listeners. World-wide USAF Band radio programs have 40 million listeners weekly.

Mr. KEARNS is justifiably proud to conduct this fine group of musicians. The orchestra plans to practice more or its musical diplomacy abroad and the legislator-conductor will be with them in the future when he can get off from his full-time job on the Hill for his part-time vocation on the podium.

[From the New York Times of February 5, 1956]

MILITARY ORCHESTRA—SEVENTH ARMY SYMPHONY WINS EUROPE'S RESPECT

(By Paul Moor)

STUTTGART.—Josef Haeusler, music critic on the Badisches Tageblatt in Baden-Baden and a man whose opinions are respected in Germany, recently wrote the following about a concert by an American orchestra in the studios of the Southwest German Radio:

"Characteristic of the orchestra is an exceedingly responsive, bright, at times sharp or even aggressive sonority, which, although it suffers from occasional unevenness of intonation, revels in its brilliance and intensity. This is transmitted through the strong impulses of a deep and vital pleasure in performing, which makes the playing a living expression."

He was writing not about any of the major American orchestras that have toured Europe in the last few years, but about the Seventh Army Symphony, an improbable military organization (the only one of its kind in the world) that is also quite possibly the busiest symphonic group in the world—it played 258 concerts all over Europe in 1954 and 1955—and certainly one of the most successful American good-will ambassadors on the international scene.

HIGH STANDARDS

Providing uncompromisingly high-standard programs for GI and civilian audiences, the orchestra has won enthusiastic audience reception and respectful critical attention wherever it has played during the 4 years of its existence.

It has maintained its excellence in the face of a tremendous problem that no conventional orchestra has to face: when a man's military service is over, he goes home, no matter what time of the year it is. The average time a man spends with the orchestra is only about 14 months, and the turnover is literally constant.

The orchestra was established in the spring of 1952, thanks in large measure to the sympathetic interest of Lt. Gen. Manton Eddy, then commanding officer of the Seventh Army. One story has it that the twitting General Eddy got from his German friends about the cultural level of "Hillbilly Gasthaus," and some other programs on the American Forces network, played a certain part.

ARMY MEN

The orchestra's schedule would probably kill an organization less young and resilient. These men are, after all, in the Army, and their duties as soldiers, on top of their rehearsal and concert activities, result in what would be a punishing routine even if one overlooks the tremendous amount of traveling required of them.

The educational background of its first violinist, 27-year-old Philipp Naegele—he studied at Queens College, Yale and Princeton and has a Ph. D. in music history and was a Fullbright scholar—is somewhat above the orchestra's average, but not terribly much so.

Pfc. Ronald Ondrejka, 23, former violist in the orchestra and its present conductor, has two degrees from the Eastman School of Music and formerly played in the Rochester Philharmonic. His predecessor was the brilliantly gifted Kenneth Schermerhorn.

Schermerhorn took over the Seventh Army Symphony from James Dixon, a Dimitri Mitropoulos protégé now at the University of Iowa. When Ondrejka's service time is completed early this year, his successor will be chosen in open auditions by a group of German symphonic and operatic conductors.

AUDITION WINNERS

In the case of the last three conductors, each was the orchestra's assistant conductor before winning the auditions for the top job. The orchestra's present assistant conductor is Pvt. Henry Lewis, a serious and gifted 23-year-old Negro who played bass in the Los Angeles Philharmonic for 4 years before he was drafted.

Probably the orchestra's greatest advantage, as far as competing artistically with European groups is concerned, is that special verve, dash, flair, or whatever you want to call it that musicians seem to have from being American and being young. They really play American—and this is what makes their audiences in Europe sit up and blink, for it is a quality of zest and alertness not identified with European orchestral tradition. At its best, the orchestra is technically no match for dozens of professional orchestras here, but that special quality, that flair, makes up for many technical shortcomings.

To the orchestra's particular credit is the fact that the Seventh Army Symphony has given many European audiences their first chances to hear works by Aaron Copland, Walter Piston, Samuel Barber and other American composers. But this is only part of the orchestra's accomplishment in the field of goodwill; for, by having won many a European's respect for Americans as composers and performers, it has also won a new general respect for the land whose uniform its members wear.

Readiness in the Furtherance of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, delivered the following address before the national council meeting of the Reserve Officers Association, Sheraton-Park Hotel, February 11, 1956:

READINESS IN THE FURTHERANCE OF NATIONAL SECURITY

(Address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the national council meeting of the Reserve Officers Association, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 11, 1956)

Joined as we are by the comradeship that has linked us in past wars, we can speak candidly and honestly to each other with the cordial understanding that comes from knowing our objectives are the same.

You need not be reminded that we meet in a precarious time. Past wars, together with the tensions of these modern times, have placed strains upon the seams of our world structure. Before the dangers are past, there probably will be further and more trying complications.

Jointly, the first desire of our Armed Forces, active and reserve, is the security and well-being of the American people. Having built an American system of life based on freedom, moral integrity, and justice, we want no alien way of life imposed upon us.

Because we seek the security and well-being of the American people, we must work for peace and strive to prevent war. Our national policies are dedicated to this achievement. Our efforts are bent to this end.

But, unfortunately, the postwar years have ben overshadowed by a world conspiracy which seeks control over all world areas in the name of international communism. Too frequently, this is only a banner for old-fashioned expansionism. Certainly, it is an aggressive conspiracy, as elastic and ingenious as it is persistent.

Today, the Communists are utilizing the more flexible tactics of cultural, economic, diplomatic and technical assistance. They are trying to infiltrate South Korea, southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. They are penetrating the Middle East with military and economic missions.

We know the Communist leaders often practice the tactics of zig and then zag—advance, retreat, and then advance again. Accordingly, it is necessary for us to remain well prepared to meet current and future Communist tactics which pose a less obvious, though no less dangerous, threat.

READINESS ROLE

Because of this, the role of the military in national security, in peace as well as in war, is a tremendous responsibility.

Our first requirement is to be strong enough, and ready enough, in all departments to deter any method of aggression that the potential enemy may choose.

In addition, and in case a deterrent is not enough, we must have a sound foundation of military power with which to counter an enemy's blows, and upon which to build the forces that can win a major war.

Of course, these two tasks are interrelated, and they overlap. Together they indicate clearly our primary role for service to the United States.

Our primary military role in the furtherance of national security is a readiness role. It is to help prevent war if possible; and to be ready to win it is if occurs.

For this, you and I must have the education, the background of military knowledge, and the scope of imagination which will always enable us to perform our roles in military areas.

Readiness is our watchword. It means preparedness. It is your response to your country's call; and it is mine too.

Readiness is fitness and competence. It takes years of practice. It requires training. Training means skill, and skill produces efficiency. From efficiency, we achieve economy of human life and resources.

FORCES

Right now the bill for defense is high.

Security from military aggression is a relative and inconstant condition toward which we strive but seldom achieve. There is no yardstick that one can apply mathematically to a nation and say categorically, "This is adequate" or "That is sufficient" for our security.

Twenty-five years ago the strength we have under arms today would have been adequate for our defense. A force considered adequate today might readily be insufficient or obsolescent a few years hence.

Actually, our security needs change with shifts in the world's distribution of power, with developments in science, with changes in political governments, and with economic fluctuations. For all practical purposes, there is a continuous process of evolutionary change.

Hence, the forces we seek to maintain must be qualitatively select. And so they are. United States Armed Forces today include ground, naval, and air forces in size and capability comparable to our responsibilities and to the threats we face. They are additionally designed to help satisfy our security needs over a long period of time.

All of you here tonight can recall from personal experience how costly military unpreparedness can be. It probably would be safe to say that you can recall personally at least two rapid buildups, and some of you may remember a third.

These peaks and valleys of the graphs depicting our military strengths over the years also depict our alarm in an emergency, and our apathy in peacetime. Such is the graph charted from Lexington and Concord all the way to Korea.

But no more. Gone are the cycles of feast and famine. In their place, we have a defense program which emphasizes an effective flexible type of power which can be maintained for an indefinite future.

Development of sound, long-term security requires stability—stability which is not materially disturbed by every psychological effort of unfriendly nations, or by wishful thinking on our part.

It also requires that we design our forces so as to assure a steadily increasing efficiency in phase with modern scientific advances. In no sphere of life is there greater activity and progress than in those matters which pertain to war.

In this regard, whenever our research and development programs produce improvements in weapons which indicate changes in warfare, the services change the emphasis as rapidly as it is safe to do so.

In fact, an orderly readjustment of our military forces has been taking place for the past 3 years. This adjustment has established a military strength level just below 3 million. The composition of air forces, fleets and ground forces have been affected, both in type and variety. But the changes have been made in an evolutionary manner, and as the result of deliberate and painstaking planning.

Sometimes the forces recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff are criticized by partisan enthusiasts for one service or another as having arisen from a "dividing-up-the-pie." Some critics say: One combat wing for the Air Force, two aircraft and a carrier for the Navy, and a half a division to the Army, plus a small dividend for the Marines—as though dividing up the pie would make everyone happy.

But such criticism is as unfounded as it is ridiculous.

If the Joint Chiefs of Staff could guarantee that any one of the armed services could by itself protect the Nation, we would subscribe enthusiastically to the proposition of putting everything we had behind the one service.

And if we could determine definitely that any particular element of one service were unnecessary, we would scrap it and put the money into something else.

But we cannot. No one weapon, or one service, or one form of military action is considered sufficient to meet all our security needs.

Hence, our program is geared to the maintenance of forces which could be used in a variety of situations whenever and wherever required. Our forces must stand ready to cope with limited wars waged by Communist satellites or a world war III, if one should be forced upon us. As President Eisenhower has said: "We will never commit aggression, but we must always be ready to defeat it."

Currently our primary emphasis is on airpower. We want the greatest airplanes in quality, the best aircraft carriers, the most efficient guided missiles, the finest crews, and a comprehensive system of bases. We also seek increases in the capabilities of other selected forces—armored, airborne, antiaircraft, antisubmarine, and amphibious forces.

Conditions, of course, may change for better or for worse. Should there be a fundamental change in the situation, the military requirements for security would change too.

COLLECTIVE FORCES

As if the determination of United States Armed Forces were not difficult enough, the United States also must continue its readiness to help our much needed allies maintain and build up their armed forces.

Is the money we are putting into our military aid programs a necessary investment? Or would it be better to add this money to the buildup of our own defense forces here in the United States?

In my judgment, it is a necessary investment. For an indefinite period—and that may be a very long time—our job is to stay strong and to help our allies stay strong.

There are many reasons for this. For example, should the natural resources, the industrial capacity, and the skilled manpower of other world areas become lost from the allies, and added to the Soviet Union, you can see that the strength on the Communist side of the ledger soon would be in their favor.

It so happens that the Communists are continuing to work for the piecemeal collapse of our friends and allies. Since this backdoor approach does not constitute a direct attack on us, they hope we will be tempted to sit back and let them undermine Western unity and defense.

Then they could pick off free nations one by one. They think if they can spread fright and disunity, we will become rattled; and some free nations will move in one direction while we move in another.

As it has happened before, so can it happen again. It would be folly for free nations merely to look on and tolerate all this, gazing as if at a hurricane, hoping it will not hit us, but making no real attempt to protect ourselves against it.

No one nation is really in a position to execute all its security tasks by itself alone. To achieve a lasting security, nations who desire to remain free must gear their programs to the requirements for security of others who cherish freedom.

Now the composition of collective armed forces is not a simple or easy decision for free nations to reach. Not all nations see things exactly like. Each has to evaluate the potential enemy and the courses of action he might choose. Each has to consider localized war-by-satellite moves, and the ultimate possibility of total war as well.

And when we put all our considerations together, we all do not necessarily arrive at the same conclusions.

But there are two conclusions which seem fundamental.

First, collective strength is a logical, most persuasive argument to materially minded Communist leaders. Knowledge that the free world can and will retaliate swiftly and decisively at places of our own choosing, is a powerful deterrent to Communist military ventures.

And second, by pooling our resources—material, human, and moral—we can best present a united front. While there must be, of course, certain enlightened limitations on the extent to which any nation contributes material and human resources, there should be no limitations on the extent of its moral contribution.

ROLE OF RESERVES

These are some of the facts of life. These are a few of the concepts which constitute the basis for the defense planning of our United States Armed Forces and the collective armed forces of the free world.

The keynote is readiness to fight today's war when, where, and if called upon.

We want peace—a lasting peace—but not at the expense of our freedom and the integrity of our human liberties. We hope fervently to prevent war by assuring the world that we are resolved to maintain a military and moral strength to meet an attack from any quarter at any time.

To these ends, Ready Reserve forces are essential to our defense posture. They are a realistic component of our current defense program, and they help stabilize our military programs for the long pull.

Gentlemen, this is an important area of military programing in which I hope we never become self-satisfied. Building and maintaining Ready Reserve forces will require constant vigilance, direction, planning, and programing. The heart of your program must be readiness.

We in the Department of Defense know your contribution to the total military strength of the Nation. Your country needs you. You have tremendous responsibilities. I hope you will always do everything possible to help increase your readiness, and the readiness of our Active Forces, in the furtherance of our national security.

H. R. 1823

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, roadblocks are troublesome things. They delay you in getting wherever it is you are going. Sometimes they force you to change your plans because of the delay. Often, of course, they are necessary for

the public welfare or safety, and the inconvenience can be overlooked for a short time.

But a permanent roadblock standing in the path of more than 40 million Americans year after year is another thing. It forces those millions of Americans to seek some detour, some means of reaching a destination they fear can never be reached via the blocked main highway.

It is a roadblock like this that has resulted in attempts for the past several years to build a detour such as H. R. 1823.

The roadblock, so old and solid that it appears incapable of removal even with the concerted effort of these millions of Americans, is the inadequate appropriations granted each year for recreation facilities in the national forests of our country. At first glance this roadblock might appear to be penny-wise and pound foolish. But even that old phrase does not fit the situation—this roadblock is penny foolishness.

The detour has been under construction during four Congresses. It is still not open to traffic, but with one more push during this construction season it can reach its goal.

What is this detour? In the main it is the same route as was proposed in the Tackett bills of the 81st and 82d Congresses and the Baker bill of the 83d Congress.

It establishes public recreation use of the national forests as a congressional policy; there is no such policy now.

It sets aside 10 percent, but not more than $5,500,000 yearly, of the revenues of national forests for development, maintenance, and operation of national forest recreation facilities, safety, and sanitation; for more than 40 years there has been a similar setting aside of forest revenues for roads, schools, and trails, but there has been none for recreation.

It provides that in those few forest areas where fees are charged for use of recreation facilities—and it should be noted such charges already are being made—all of the money received must be spent on recreation facilities. And it limits the recreation fee-charging authority of the Forest Service in two ways. The Service would be permitted to make charges only for use of those recreation areas which are especially equipped and substantially improved. And the Service would be permitted to make charges only for those areas in which the amounts estimated to be so collected would justify the expenditures necessary to make the collections. The Forest Service estimates that only for 200 of the 4,700 improved picnic and campground areas could fees be charged under the standards established by this legislation. At present, the Forest Service's fee-charge authority is not limited by law. Also, it should be pointed out that receipts from such charges as would be made under this bill would be deducted from the amount of funds made available under the other section of the bill which calls for setting aside of 10 percent of all national forest revenues for recreation facilities.

May I point out that the House Appropriations Committee of the 81st Congress, in its report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal year 1950, declared:

> One of the activities of the Forest Service requiring considerable amounts of money is that of the construction and maintenance of facilities in recreational areas on the national forests. The committee believes it is entirely possible as well as right and proper that the Forest Service should impose a schedule of charges upon those using the national forest recreational facilities sufficient to offset the expenditures required for the construction and maintenance of the facilities. The principle of requiring the recreationist to pay the cost of services incident to his use of the facilities is recognized and such requirements are imposed and enforced in many places in the Forest Service.

I have been pleased to learn of the widespread support which is being given this bill, H. R. 1823. Many sportsmen's and conservation organizations have been joined by other groups in backing the measure.

Among the national and international organizations which are supporting this bill are: National Wildlife Federation, Izaak Walton League, Wildlife Management Institute, International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, Outdoor Writers Association of America, National Parks Association, American Nature Association and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Grassroots support is evident in abundance also. Among the many State and local groups which have affirmed their backing of the bill are the Conservation Federation of Missouri, League of Ohio Sportsmen, Vancouver Chapter of the Washington Wildlife League, Montana District Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers, and many more.

The national forests, comprising 181 million acres in 38 States, Alaska and Puerto Rico, provide the last great public-access area for millions of sportsmen. The Nation's farmlands and private forests can no longer accommodate the growing army of Americans seeking recreation in the out-of-doors.

More leisure time, the ever-shortening workweek, longer vacations, better highways, more automobiles, improved living standards—and perhaps above all a deeply felt desire of mankind to get back to nature—explain this movement. Barbecue grates in the backyards, picnics in the city parks, camping trips in the solitude of the forests—all are a part of this trend. It is becoming vital for the health of America that we citizens have opportunity to get away from it all and enjoy our natural surroundings. Many of our social and health problems would be reduced if we could get more people into the open more often. Particularly in this regard, I think of the juvenile delinquency which is a national problem.

The importance of our national forests in this connection cannot be denied.

A major part of our big game herds, as well as large supplies of game birds and small game, are found in the national forests. Within these forests are some 81,000 miles of streams and more than 2 million acres of lakes, open to public fishing.

Over and beyond the millions of hunters and fishermen, many millions of citizens turn to the national forests each year for other forms of outdoor recreation: for picnicking and camping, for nature study, for winter sports, or for plain, unscientific enjoyment of fresh air and the out-of-doors.

Because of their wide distribution, the forests are the most generally accessible large public areas adapted to outdoor recreation in the country. National forests are only a few minutes driving time from urban areas; for example, Denver, Duluth, Sacramento, San Diego, Tallahassee, Spokane, Albuquerque, Butte, Phoenix, Portland—both Portland, Oreg., and Portland, Maine—St. Louis, Asheville, Erie, Houston, Salt Lake City, Seattle. The Angeles National Forest adjoins the great metropolitan area of Los Angeles.

The Forest Service does not encourage urban types of recreation because of a belief these should be enjoyed in city and county areas. The Service tries to keep the facilities simple and appropriate to the environment. The Service does not conduct tours, give lectures, or sponsor organized sports. National forest recreation supplements the recreational facilities of States, cities, and the national parks, and does not compete with or duplicate them.

No one form of outdoor recreation can satisfy all people. The national forest recreation development has been that for which the particular area is best suited and for which the need is evident.

Consider the variety of features and recreation resources of the various forests. Gorges, waterfalls, natural bridges, wildlife refuges, ponds, scenic drives, glaciers, totems, observatories where bear can be watched fishing for salmon, 120,000 miles of riding and hiking trails, cliff dwellings, wilderness areas, buffalo herds, ice caves, medicinal springs, prehistoric ruins, volcanic lava flows, old immigrant trails, Indian pictographs, the last home of the giant California condor, virgin timber, flows of mineral water, giant redwoods, deep canyons, Pikes Peak, cypress swamps, palm forests, scenes of Indian massacres, fantastic wind-and-water-worn rocks, bayous screened with Spanish moss, caves, beaches, fossil beds, ghost towns, ancient pueblo ruins, scenic lookout points, beaver colonies and their many dams, flower-filled Alpine meadows, tropical trees, orchids and tree ferns, huckleberries and mushrooms in profusion, and beautiful stands of all kinds of trees.

Just standing and looking at all those features would take several lifetimes. But the list of what people do in the national forests includes much more than mere looking. Hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, picnicking—all come to mind easily. Add to those such activities as swimming, boating, mountain climbing, horseback riding, pack trips, photography of wildlife and scenery, dude-ranch vacationing, canoeing, skiing, tobogganing, snowshoeing, bow and arrow hunting, wildflower viewing, rock collecting,

trailer camping, "John-boat" float trips, ice fishing, bird-dog field trials. Surely there is something here for everyone—just like a political platform.

People of all walks of life enjoy and use the national forests. For many of the poor people of this Nation they are by far the finest outdoor recreation facilities available. The man who is a low-wage earner is able to go into the nearby forest, camp out inexpensively, and enjoy the great out-of-doors fully as much as any of his more fortunate neighbors. Here he finds the greatest public hunting and fishing areas in the Nation—millions of acres without a "No trespassing" sign. The States manage the fish and game, and State licenses are required for hunting and fishing. The Forest Service and the State cooperate closely on management of the habitat.

The forests are open to all who come to enjoy them. In 1924 there were 4 million recreational visits to the national forests. In 1946, 18 million visits were reported. Last year there were 45 million recreational visits to the national forests. If the present rate of increase merely continues and gets no larger, the recreational use of the forests will be 80 million visits annually by 1963.

Of the past year's 45 millions who used the forests, nearly one-half are credited with having gone to picnic grounds, camping areas, and similarly improved locations. About one-third went into unimproved areas and wilderness areas as campers, hikers, hunters, fishermen, and trail riders. Most of the remainder were cared for at organized camps on land leased from the Forest Service; these people represented the least cost to the Federal Government inasmuch as full responsibility for the care and maintenance of the areas and buildings was assumed by the sponsoring organizations; in such cases the Forest Service usually needs only to follow regular inspections with suggestions for improvement. On the other hand, little is provided for the sanitation and care of camp grounds in the so-called wilderness areas, with the result that too often they are neglected. The heaviest cost to the Forest Service is in connection with the more than 20 million people who use the picnic and camping grounds. Yet the Forest Service in the latter instance is able to spend only some 8 cents per visit.

The importance of the national forests for the many forms of outdoor recreation is a fact created and recognized by the American public.

In my State of Montana, the Forest Service is able to spend only about $60,000 annually on recreation facilities. Only $60,000 for facilities that attracted 1,311,000 persons during 1954.

Tourism is a great industry in Montana. It is estimated that tourists spend $80 million a year in the State, making vacations the State's third largest industry.

National forest recreation is important from the standpoint of the economic well-being of many communities—not only in Montana, but across the Nation.

Because of the importance of the forests for recreation, in some areas the States, counties, and cities have attempted to fill the gap. These governmental units have contributed generously toward the operation and maintenance of national forest recreation areas which are greatly used by local people. In 1954, contributions in money, time and materials which were reported by the Forest Service from these sources totaled $1,250,000. California, Utah, Colorado, the cities of Tucson, Salt Lake City, Ogden, Denver, Los Angeles, and others are helping to keep conditions passable on some heavily used areas. Some 10 percent of this $1,250,000 was turned over to the Forest Service, and the Service performed the work; the remainder was done by the cooperating local governmental bodies and organizations themselves.

These local governmental units have been doing as much for recreation in our national forests as has the Federal Government. Our national forest recreation appropriations for the past 5 years have been as follows:

Year:	*Appropriation*
1952	$611,900
1953	646,000
1954	940,000
1955	970,000
1956	1,670,000

Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, has declared:

> Our most urgent and immediately pressing problem is to get on top of the job of adequate cleanup and maintenance of existing recreational improvements. Although we have had some recent increases in appropriations, although we have shifted part of the load to concessioners, and although we have been getting more cooperation from local agencies, we are losing ground.

Chief Forester McArdle mentioned another way in which the forests have been kept open for public use despite the lack of adequate appropriations. That is the shifting of responsibility onto the shoulders of concessioners. Concessioners have been allowed to operate most of the larger and especially equipped campgrounds and picnic areas—the few locations in which a special charge is made to users. Areas operated by concessioners help by relieving the Forest Service of the cost of cleanup and maintenance at these areas, but it is only a partial solution. As I noted earlier, the Service estimates that at most there are only 200 of the 4,700 improved campground and picnic areas that are large enough and improved to sufficient degree to be profitably operated as charge areas. The public fees at these charge areas now average 15 cents per person per day. In addition, of course, there are concessions for resorts, organizations camps, summer homes and winter sports areas, all authorized by permit. The total annual revenue from these limited charges is some $500,000. It is not being reinvested in forest recreation facilities, but is going directly into the Federal Treasury.

Because the money available from all sources simply hasn't been enough to meet present needs, much less keep up with the growing demand for more facilities, the Forest Service has found it necessary to close a number of recreation areas. At least, we in Montana have been fortunate. Thus far no national forest recreation facilities in Montana have been among those closed because of deterioration and lack of sanitation.

These recreation facilities, built in large part by the CCC and other emergency agencies 20 years ago, are simply worn out. And seemingly no amount of persuasion can wrest the money needed for these facilities from our traditional appropriations process.

Testifying before a Senate Subcommit on Appropriations in 1952, the Forest Service administrators estimated that an immediate capital investment of $7,169,000 was needed to provide satisfactory facilities for sanitation and public safety and to rehabilitate all essential public-use areas. They estimated at that time that $17,135,000 was needed to expand the capacity of existing recreation areas and to construct new areas to take care of the public overload. The total capital investment needed in 1952 was more than $24 million. They did not get the funds.

Now, 4 years and some 150 million visitors later, the Forest Service still believes that approximately $24 million would fill the capital investment bill, and that $3,300,000 yearly would take care of current cleanup and maintenance.

I believe that over the course of several years these needs could be met by reinvesting a portion of the forest receipts in these recreation facilities. Forest receipts in fiscal 1955 exceeded expenditures by some $18 million. The profits went into the Treasury.

It is because of the failure after failure which has been the lot of all attempts to increase the flow of appropriations for forest recreation purposes that I introduced H. R. 1823. The purposes of this bill should be familiar; hearings were held on similar bills during both the 81st and 82d Congresses, the Tackett bills, and during the 83d Congress, the Baker bill. This is not a new proposal.

In the 81st Congress the bill was objected to on the Consent Calendar. In the 82d Congress it was tied up in the Rules Committee. In the 83d Congress it failed to receive consideration in the Agriculture Committee because of the press of other legislation.

In business a continual reinvestment of a portion of the profits is just plain good business. In government, however, it brings forth objections from purists who held that such detouring of the appropriation process is not provided on the map of government. I appreciate their concern for the purity of this theory. But I also know of the crying need for increased funds for recreation facilities in the forests. And I know of the continual failure to win necessary appropriations. Detours are not shown on the road maps, but they exist and they serve a worthwhile purpose.

I believe that if the detour permits the reinvestment of funds only in those cases where the revenue is plowed back into the operation itself, there is a sound basis for distinguishing that practice from that of setting aside funds out of general revenue.

We have several precedents for this reinvestment of revenues.

The Migratory Bird Stamp Act of 1934 allocates funds in this fashion.

The Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937 and the Dingell-Johnson Act of 1950 provide for excise tax on sport, hunting and fishing equipment, and the funds so collected are administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service under a Federal wildlife restoration program.

Above all, for more than 40 years there have been two such precedents right in the national forests themselves.

Ever since 1908, 25 percent of all money received from the forests has been reinvested in public roads and schools in counties in which there are national forests.

And since 1913, 10 percent of all national forest receipts have been reinvested by the Forest Service for construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the forests.

I might note that the reinvestment for recreation of another 10 percent of the receipts or not more than $5,500,000 annually, as proposed in H. R. 1823, will not reduce the funds set aside in the above two acts.

Also it should be pointed out that in those two acts there is no limit on the amount that can be expended yearly. The proposed $5,500,000 limit on recreation facility expenditures in my bill is one the Forest Service believes will be adequate for current work and a reasonable amount of progress on the backlog of needed capital investments—and so that limit on spending is provided in the bill. This is no blank check.

Recently two special governmental commissions—the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, known as the Kestnbaum Commission, and the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, known as the Second Hoover Commission—made comments of interest.

The Kestnbaum report recommended that the allocation of revenues for particular purposes as done under the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts be discontinued, but the Report made no criticism of the allocation of revenues which have been made in the case of the national forests for more than 40 years. Further, in listing arguments against its recommendations, the committee reported:

> The Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts have been supported strongly by State and Federal wildlife and conservation organizations. * * * State fish and game officials, almost without exception, favor the present pattern of operation under these acts. * * * The State conservation officials do not believe that earmarking in itself is undesirable. Many cases of earmarking commonly accepted, such as the apportionment of tax to schools, roads, township, county governments, have been in effect for many years. * * * Earmarking becomes undesirable only when so large a portion of the available total funds are earmarked that legislation looses its flexibility and ability to adjust for changing needs.

The Kestnbaum report also recommended "that recreational programs be formulated and carried out with full recognition of the fact that all levels of Government have a responsibility for developing and maintaining adequate facilities for recreational purposes, and that these facilities be administered with adequate protection against the hazards of fire, bad sanitation and undue traffic risk. Provision of recreational opportunities has become increasingly important because of changes in conditions and ways of life. Our increasing population, urbanization, and mobility, and the advent of the shorter workweek and paid vacations have changed tremendously the recreation habits and desires of the people. All levels of government have a definite responsibility for providing adequate facilities for outdoor recreation."

The Second Hoover Commission's report on water resources and power recognized the need for more funds for forest recreation, noting that facilities in national parks, monuments and forests are overcrowded, that waterfowl numbers and fishery resources are on the decline, that there is a critical present need for great outdoor recreational facilities for both weekenders and vacationers. The Hoover Report declared national recreation needs will be accelerated in the years just ahead because of increasing population, shorter work periods and greater leisure, and advances in spendable income.

Fifty years ago when the Forest Service came into being, it was directed to operate the national forests with this goal:

> All land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people, and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies. * * * and where conflicting interests must be reconciled the question will always be decided from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

I believe that in keeping with this statement of basic policy, our national forests must be enabled to meet the recreational needs of millions of Americans. I believe that, in view of past experiences, the only way to adequately meet these needs is through passage of H. R. 1823.

Most people do not like detours. I do not like them; they usually are not as well designed as the main highways; they may not stand up well under long usage; they may take longer to arrive at the destination. But they do arrive there. And that has not been the case on the roadblocked main highway for forest recreation appropriations.

H. R. 1823 is a detour. But it is not the first detour that has been built. Other such detours in connection with the national forests are still standing up well after more than 40 years of use. The choice is clear. It is time to open this detour for the American public.

Golden Opportunity for the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Premier Bulganin of Soviet Russia has twice proposed a treaty of friendship with our Government in recent weeks. President Eisenhower wisely rejected the offers, pointing out that it is deeds and not words, which create international confidence and bespeak the true motives underlying national policies—deeds, for example, such as assisting to the status of nationhood some 600 million people—the record to which the West can point, since World War II.

Today, on the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, Premier Bulganin and his colleagues in the Kremlin have a golden opportunity to prove their good faith, by a comparable deed which could illuminate the pages of history for all time to come. All they need do is restore independence to Lithuania, as an initial step in a systematic program of freeing all of the subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Such a deed could lift men's spirits throughout the world. It would give substance to the Kremlin's protestations of noble motives, and dispel the specter of nuclear warfare that now haunts the world.

Will the Kremlin seize this golden opportunity? I am afraid not. And until it does, we shall do well to examine carefully any proffers of friendship.

Meanwhile, let us join in tribute to the unconquerable spirit of the peoples of Lithuania and their Baltic neighbors, whose will-to-resist has never been broken. Their courage in the face of tyranny, their inflexible determination to restore their lands to freedom and independence, will unquestionably be rewarded, one day, in the reemergence of sovereign, independent nations.

American Legion Auxiliary Observes Lincoln's Birthday in Springfield, Ill.—Address by Mrs. B. D. Ward, National President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the address of Mrs. B. D. Ward, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, at the annual Lincoln Day ceremonies on February 12 at Springfield, Ill. Mrs. Ward in her address pointed out the outstanding characteristic of the martyred President, namely, the gift of understanding. Would that the world in this generation could have the foresight of Mr. Lincoln.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY MESSAGE

To Mr. Lincoln's tomb, I bring the annual birthday remembrance of American Legion Auxiliary members around the globe. This wreath is but a symbol—that his name lives on with us, ever green; and that our gratitude for the Nation he preserved us continues, unbroken, from generation to generation. In every other respect, it is the least of the gifts we bring him on this 147th anniversary of his birth.

Perhaps the greatest of these gifts—and the one he would appreciate most—is the gift of understanding much about him that was obscured by the confusion of events, the prejudices, and the conflicts of his own times. Today we face many of the same problems that he faced in preserving the union, only on a larger scale. For these United States are now charged with providing leadership for liberty-loving nations in a world that is half free and half slave. And, as self-governing citizens of this Republic, each of us must make and support decisions of far-reaching consequence. As we fully awaken to the heavy responsibilities upon us, we can do worse than look back for guidance to the examples he made us.

He met the problems of a nation divided against itself with infinite patience and capacity for restraint, seeking only to reconcile those differences and make in whole again. Today we face a world that is in the same deplorable plight. Our problems are even heightened by the fact that we are without common language, customs, and culture to help bridge our differences. We have great use for his patient understanding, his forbearance, his compassion, his deep respect for the rights of others.

His unshakable faith in liberty as a God-given right, and in the power of men to govern themselves was not betrayed in his time, nor must we let it be in ours.

He accepted crushing responsibilities and, in the face of formidable opposition, stood for what he believed—not because it was universally popular, but because somebody had to do it. The tasks that lie ahead of us call for much of the same high dedication and stamina on the part of each individual citizen. We are not finding that lacking.

And so, if I could speak to Mr. Lincoln today, it would be to assure him that now, nearly 100 years after his lifetime, mothers in increasing numbers are recognizing their responsibility to sit down and teach their sons and daughters these fundamental truths that he somehow found for himself: The fact that freedom is not free. That it has to be worked for. The fact that right is not always the master of might. That each of us holds the power for self-determination, and that the right way for us can often be a hard path to follow. The fact that time is not automatically on the side of the good and the just, but rather, on the side of those who utilize it best. And, finally that if our heritage of liberty and idealism has been worth fighting for and dying for, it is equally worth living for and working for. As these truths go marching on, in the hearts and in the minds of your countrymen, may they always make for a happy birthday, Mr. Lincoln.

Big-City Congressman Discusses Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the November 1955 issue of Capper's Farmer there is published an article which I wrote for that well-known farm magazine, entitled "Why I Voted for High Price Supports." I believe that many of my colleagues will be interested in the views expressed there.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the article, which reads as follows:

A BIG-CITY CONGESSMAN TELLS "WHY I VOTED FOR HIGH PRICE SUPPORTS"

(By VICTOR L. ANFUSO)

(Brooklyn's "Farm" Congressman: Congressman ANFUSO, author of the accompanying article, is an influential member of the House Agriculture Committee, not because of his knowledge of farming but for what he knows about consumers' food problems. Consumers do not resent farm programs, Mr. ANFUSO declares. High supports for farm commodities assure them of plentiful food supplies at reasonable prices. Food surpluses are good, Mr. ANFUSO believes. But they are getting too much bad publicity. He thinks surpluses could be used to fight communism among hungry and discontented people. He is sponsoring legislation that will make it easier for foreign countries to buy our surpluses. He was in Europe this summer looking for possible ways to increase our farm exports. VICTOR L. ANFUSO came to this country in 1914 at the age of 9, son of an immigrant Sicilian shoemaker. He started his career as a shoeshine boy in Brooklyn streets. A lawyer by profession, he was a colonel in the super-secret OSS in World War II, where he gained some of his experience with Communists. He was responsible for a quarter million letters from American to Italian citizens urging them to vote against left-wing candidates in postwar elections. He is well known also for his fight against juvenile delinquency.)

I honestly can't tell a field of soybeans from clover, and you can sell me buckwheat for cottonseed. But talk about the price of a shirt, or loaf of bread, and I'm your man.

Make no mistake, I'm in Congress to look out for the downtown working man and his family. Three million of them in Brooklyn expect a lot.

As the first city member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I'm obligated to tell the consumer side of the food story. Our big New York metropolitan delegation demanded a spot for consumers on the committee, and I gladly accepted.

Simply, our story is that we need abundant food supplies—at reasonable prices. That's all. If we have that, we're not going to kick. It seems to me there isn't as much consumer resentment about farm programs—and their cost—as is generally supposed.

The attitude of Brooklyn people toward you, the farmers, I believe, is typical. It's this: the working man and his wife don't give much thought to where food comes from—unless prices are high. Then, you get it in the neck along with the middleman. On the other hand, when retail prices are down, they don't give you much credit either.

When a Brooklyn housewife complains to me about the high cost of food, I tell her four things:

Farmers get only a fraction of the total food price. She knows a loaf of bread costs between 16 and 18 cents. But she's surprised to learn the wheat in that loaf is worth only 2 cents to the farmer. Also, if farmers got all their feed grains free, it still would make only a difference of a penny in the price of a quart bottle of milk. The rest goes for transportation, processing, wholesaling, retailing, and to the union truck driver who delivers the goods. She can understand this, for 9 chances out of 10, her husband is a union man.

Farmer income is not high, relatively. She's surprised to learn an average farmer's wife must make ends meet on less spendable income than she does. Her husband probably earns more than $2,800—the average for factory workers.

Grocery and clothing prices would be higher if farmers didn't produce as much as they do. Food costs are not out of line with other things she buys.

Farmers don't have bargaining power to maintain income, like union members do. Nor can they shut down production to fit demand, like industries do. Price supports are the best substitutes for these things, so far.

For these same four reasons I voted for price supports at 90 percent of parity. I know of several "downtown" Congressmen who went along with me after I pointed these things out on the House floor. Frankly, it was these "city" votes which made the difference in the House 206 to 201 vote this year to restore 90 percent supports.

I tell my Brooklyn constituents—and Congressmen who expect me to guide them on farm legislation—it's a myth to believe reduced supports mean reduced consumer prices. High supports assure them of abundant supplies at reasonable prices. While I'm not wedded to straight-on 90 percent, I do think the principle is sound. Eventually, I'm sure we'll be able to develop an even better program.

But flexibles don't solve anything—and they don't help consumers either.

There are other things we can do to lower consumer prices—and still provide a fair return to farmers. For example, Agriculture Committee Chairman COOLEY and I have introduced the so-called terminal markets bill. This calls for modernizing marketing facilities for handling perishable commodities in cities. Building up-to-date markets would cut costs—lead to lower prices for vegetables, poultry, meats, eggs, and dairy products.

We could also spend more research dollars on the use of commodities you produce. A lot of money each year goes for researching farm production problems. While that's extremely important, we should put new emphasis on developing new and more efficient uses for farm commodities. We all benefit from that—and we all pay for it, too, through taxes.

High supports, to my way of thinking, can encourage you to produce needed abundance. On the other hand, they also assure you a living wage if you are forced to trim back production. This, flexibles don't do.

As for surpluses, I think they're a good thing—a sort of consumer insurance which is better than money in the bank. I sincerely believe that some of your own leaders are going overboard in saying surpluses are bad.

We all know how important surpluses are in event of drought, crop failure, or war. But we don't have to wait for a bomb to drop to make them pay off. I know from first-hand experience that lack of food causes discontent. Discontent is fertile soil for communism.

A bushel of wheat, a case of dried whole milk, or a case of macaroni often will do a lot more good in winning support of hungry people than a 6-inch shell or a machine gun.

I suggest two things. First, we should make it easier for foreign countries to get our surpluses. I am sponsoring a bill in Congress to let them get it on credit. Millions of people in countries tottering between East and West are hungry. But their governments often don't have the cash with which to buy our surpluses. My tour of Europe this summer pointed this up sharply. We should also pay at least part of the overseas freight cost of surpluses destined for welfare purposes abroad.

Second, I propose we offer free, and in good faith, our surpluses to the needy people in Iron Curtain countries. This should be done on a people-to-people basis—from American citizens to, say, Russian citizens. If the Soviet government permits it, fine. If they spurn the offer, we would reap favorably publicity throughout the world. I also think time is getting ripe for direct trade with Iron Curtain countries.

Those are some of your farm problems. But consumers have their problems, too. We are as anxious for you to know our prob-

lems as you are for consumers to understand you. Don't underestimate that. This is by no means a one-way street.

One of our biggest worries, and you can understand this, is that more farmers and farm workers might be forced off the land and onto city streets. I believe flexible price supports would speed this up to a dangerous exodus. This would mean more competition for city jobs, increased unemployment.

It could set up a chain reaction eventually reaching back to the farm—by reducing demand for farm products. That's against the best interests of those who produce food and those who consume it—and that includes all of us.

Those of us from industrial areas want to keep our factories humming and our workers working. But how can this be done if we let farm income decline? Unless Congress restores 90 percent supports, you are in for more farm income declines this year and in 1956.

I am alarmed by one of the biggest ironies of our day: Industry is going on to new record-high profits and workers are making more money this year than ever. Practically everybody is enjoying boom-times. Everybody, that is, but the farmer. If this isn't changed soon, agriculture may pull the rest of the economy down into a national depression. We fear the economic chain reaction of a farm depression.

You can see what city folks think of farm prosperity when you consider these facts:

A $1 billion decline in farm income results in a drop of $240 million in farm spending for machinery and equipment. American farmers normally use more steel a year than the amount used in production of automobiles. You use more petroleum than any other single industry. You use enough rubber each year to make 24 million tires. You use enough electricity to supply the combined needs of cities like Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston.

This means city jobs.

Farmers also must realize that expenses of city families have risen to a record high in recent years. And when wages fail to keep up with the cost of living city workers reduce their purchases of farm products.

A lot is being made about the fact that farmers now are in the minority, in Congress—and thus may not get a fair break. I don't think this is as dangerous as some people would have you believe. You are engaged in producing food, clothing, and raw materials. You comprise the Nation's No. 1 industry. As far as I can see, food will always come from our farms. We as consumers need to keep you producing.

"Old farm hands" on the Agriculture Committee, like Kansas' Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, keep me in close touch with your problems. In turn, they expect me to keep them abreast of the consumer side of things. This exchange of viewpoints is probably my biggest value on the committee—to you as farmers and to the consumers I represent. This balance is working smoothly—even though I'm 1 of 34 on the committee.

In Congress, I have appealed and will continue to appeal to my city colleagues to help provide the legislation you need. On the other hand, I expect to call upon the lawmakers from rural areas for their support of legislation needed by city people. This means things like increasing the minimum wage and more adequate housing.

When you talk about farmer-consumer relationships, you finally reach the inescapable conclusion that there is a definite interdependence between us. That's just as true as the fact that farm prosperity is essential to the prosperity of the Nation.

We in the cities are hearing a lot about a "consumer revolt" that's supposed to be coming along over farm programs. Frankly, I don't see any sign of one. Are we supposed to rebel? If we are, we don't know it.

I do think, however, that consumers don't know your story as well as they should. They're more confused than angry about price programs and surpluses. If they had access to the facts, I am sure they would understand. I am just as sure you would understand if you knew all the facts about consumer problems.

The machinery to build better understanding between farmers and consumers already is present. Your great farm organizations—whether they recognize the fact or not—have the responsibility of keeping you posted on consumer problems. By the same token, organized consumer groups—such as labor unions—must present your problems to their members. Business and civil organizations, as well as the chamber of commerce, also have a duty to perform in this regard.

Industries, such as agricultural chemicals and machinery makers, have a big stake in a strong agriculture, and should play their part.

When you get right down to it, the American economy is one great unit and all phases of it must be geared to the general welfare and prosperity of the Nation as a whole. Congress must recognize this and provide for it.

Destroying the farmer is no help to the city dweller. The fact is that prosperous farmers are essential to the prosperity of the industrial workers.

Often I'm asked: "How come you're on the Agriculture Committee with that bunch of farmers? What do you know about farming?"

My answer, simply, is this: You don't have to know how to milk a cow to recognize dairy trouble. Farm business is everybody's business. If the farmer is in trouble, we, as consumers, want to know about it. We're proud enough to think we can help.

United States Technical Cooperation and Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to say something about a small bomb that Ezra is about ready to set off that will materially affect the United States technical cooperation and assistance program abroad. It is nothing new or surprising to us for Mr. Benson has just about "slid" the dirt farmers of this country out of business and into bankruptcy by his agricultural policy so aptly described in the editorial in the December issue of Harper's, which called the American farmer a pampered tyrant and indicated that the farmer is a burden to the taxpayers, and that their dole is a permanent right.

At first I was surprised when I heard that Mr. Benson is carrying out a specific act which will pull the rug out from under our agricultural and technical-assistance program abroad.

Right now Mr. Benson has his movers actively engaged in moving the Foreign Training Division of USDA's Foreign Agriculture Service out of the South Agricultural Building into isolated, shabby, and unsuitable offices in a temporary building located at 900 Independence Avenue. What a shame.

It is this foreign training staff of about 40 trained men and women who serve as receptionists, liaisons, training specialists who plan training programs for agricultural diplomats, administrators, and agricultural technicians who come to the United States to find out what has made the farmers and agriculturists of the United States of America the greatest and most successful in the world. These people spearhead the agricultural training programs connected with the internationally-known program for which our great Oklahoman, Dr. Henry G. Bennett, gave his life in Iran while on duty supervising point 4 program activities.

This week, February 13–17, this all-important staff will set up headquarters in this temporary building known as the Escanaba Building, where unemployed people gather to seek work through the United States employment agency located there. A unit of CIA, formerly located in that shack, moved out to other quarters. Remember, this is the place foreign diplomats will gather when they come to this country to get information regarding agricultural training and information. It is also the concentration point where unemployed persons go to seek jobs. This is not the kind of environment to which we should subject important foreign people who we are trying to impress.

Some of our foreign visitors might want to buy some of our surplus farm products. Who knows.

Again I say it is a shame. It is this bad trait of Mr. Benson that keeps him forever tripping the farmers of our good country. He cannot blame this latest move on his letter writers. It appears now that he may be trying to destroy this international agricultural program which also reaches out into economic development, international friendship, international political fields.

Could it be that Benson's efforts to destroy or make ineffective the training for foreign agricultural dignitaries and technicians is a part of Mr. Dulles' "lead us to the brink policy," and so forth?

Fomenting Trouble in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., Friday, February 10, 1956:

FOMENTING TROUBLE IN THE SOUTH

As might have been expected, the northern press is in full cry over the disturbance at the University of Alabama. "Mob rule" and "disgraceful" are the epithets that frequently appear in editorials on rejection of a Negro student.

What example, ask northern editors in shocked tones, is the United States setting for the world in race relations?

The example, we agree, is disgraceful—but not for the reasons cited in the antisouthern press. The fact is that the United States Government, prodded by radical interests, has fomented race trouble where peace once reigned.

If the United States cannot keep its nose out of trouble within its own country, what chance has it to deal with huge native populations overseas?

Adlai Stevenson, speaking personally in favor of integrating the races, nevertheless has wisely said that this is a matter of the spirit, not of armed forces. He told a Negro audience that use of force to mix the races would amount to civil war.

President Eisenhower, in his press conference Wednesday, expressed the hope that "we could avoid any interference" as long as the State of Alabama will do its best to straighten the situation out.

Suppose Alabama cannot, or will not, "straighten out the situation" to the satisfaction of the Eisenhower administration and its radical allies. Will the Commander in Chief order out the troops to keep a Negro coed in classes at Tuscaloosa?

If so, by Mr. Stevenson's definition, civil war will have begun.

Will that not be the signal to Moscow to start world war III? Who will pull the trigger?

The incident at Sarajevo involved a minor colonial dispute. But it started World War I and set the stage for World War II.

Radicals, with false talk about equality and morals, are playing with powerful forces within the United States today. We believe the campaign of hatred against the South is part of a larger pattern. Whether inspired by Communists or only misguided politicians, it is wrecking the American Republic.

We do not wonder that foreigners fail to understand what is happening in the United States. Some of our own citizens cannot think clearly across the Mason-Dixon line.

A Danish society has offered a scholarship at the University of Copenhagen to Autherine Lucy, the colored student rejected by rioters in Alabama. The Danes, living in a white man's country, have missed the point. One colored student in a white college poses no threat to peace and harmony. But in Alabama, the forced entrance of one student is only a beginning. Southern white people look at a black sea flooding behind the small break in the dyke.

Would Denmark be willing to admit a majority or close to a majority of Negroes to its universities and schools? If so, perhaps a trade could be arranged. There are 15 million Negroes in the United States, and the population of Denmark is 4.3 million.

Ignorance may be in part to blame for race pressures in the South today. We happen to believe that more sinister forces are involved. Whether it is ignorance or evil, one fact stands out clearly in the United States. It is that our country is not prepared or qualified to take on the task of world policeman.

Two things are necessary to police the world. One is completely ruthless force. Russia has that. If the Kremlin wanted to put a Negro co-ed into the University of Alabama, she would go there though every white person in Alabama had to be machine gunned.

The other thing needed is patience—patience and diplomacy. Britain used it for nearly a century with colonial peoples, backed up occasionally by discreet use of troops.

The United States Government today lacks patience and diplomacy in dealing with the South. We hope it does not attempt to use armed force.

Adm. Harry E. Yarnell and Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller: Views About United States Intervention in World Wars I and II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, intervention on the part of the United States in World Wars I and II has long been subject to debate by historians, and probably always will be. The swelling ranks of informed critics of United States interventionist policy have now been joined by two more distinguished officers: Adm. Harry E. Yarnell of the United States Navy, and Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller of the British Army.

In an informative editorial in the January 14, 1956, edition of the well-known newspaper, the Tablet, of the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, N. Y., their views are summarized.

The editorial follows:

IT COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT

Adm. Harry E. Yarnell, former commandant at Pearl Harbor and onetime Commander of the United States Asiatic Fleet, gave an interview from retirement on his 80th birthday.

He said that the United States would be better off if it had not entered either the First or Second World Wars. The Spanish-American War, he said, was completely unnecessary.

The admiral, of course, will hear from all of the interventionists that he doesn't know what he is talking about. But, as the passions recede, it becomes more than ever troublesome for internationalists to justify these ventures.

The well-known British military authority, Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, has told us that, if Americans had kept their noses out of Europe in 1917, nothing worse could have happened than a compromise peace, probably less frightful than the peace settlement that followed defeat of the central powers.

General Fuller has further said that American intervention in the second European war was no service, either. If we had remained on the sidelines, he stated, the equally detestable dictatorships of Hitler and Stalin quite likely would have bled each other white. Any gains in territory Hitler might have foreseen at the expense of Russia, according to General Fuller, were bound to fade away.

It may be argued that these are merely attempts to read the crystal ball. But so are all of the arguments of American interventionists that the participation of the United States in these wars was necessary to national survival. They contend, without proof, that the Nazi colossus would have been astride the world if we had not fought, and they ask where we would be now if that had happened.

The answer to that is that the chances of their being right are no better than those of General Fuller in envisioning an opposite result. In either event, we would be here, with our manpower and economic potential unimpaired, a far smaller national debt, and with our dollar little impaired. Texas would not be so high.

But, all other things aside, the problems of "victory" have proved far more grave than those of tension or even of war. Ten years after the achievement of technical military victory, no problem has been solved, the expense is on the same order as in actual time of war, the military cannot relax, and our attempts to manage the world have been a colossal flop. Nothing has ever quite turned out the way it was intended to. Maybe the worst fate that could have been visited upon any nation considered a potential threat to America was to saddle it with the tasks arising from military "victory." We have not been able to master them. Who else could?

"And Joseph Opened All the Storehouses"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the February 15 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal. The editorial, written by Mr. Phil E. Zeigler, editor, the Railway Clerk, follows:

This country is approaching an age of plenty and it is time we learn how to distribute abundant production to those who could, and need to use it.

Surely, our civilization is not so stupid that, after producing enough for all, it has neither the will nor the brains to distribute it where it is needed most.

The current farm surpluses, which are depressing farm prices, is a problem in abundance on which we can bring to bear all our ingenuity to turn the present embarrassing farm surplus into consumer dividends. That makes it necessary to find families who could use more food and devise methods of getting it to them. We must ignore rules of a scarcity economy and make new rules to utilize our abundance.

If we must dump our farm surpluses, let us have consideration enough for our own people to dump them at home, instead of abroad, where it would disrupt world food production and force down farm prices among friendly nations who do not appreciate dumping practices.

Official figures indicate that 9½ million of our Nation's families are still living on incomes less than $2,000 a year. Apparently, in spite of our boasted prosperity, we have made little progress in reducing the "one-third of the Nation's ill-clothed, ill-housed, ill-fed." Among these people is the place to dump our food surplus.

E. W. Kleckhefer, farm editor of the Louisville Courier Journal, suggests that we must think first of our abundant farm production as inventories and reserves instead of surpluses; instead of thinking of getting rid of our bounty, we should think in terms of declaring dividends on our prosperity.

Editor Kieckhefer outlines a dividend plan to absorb our abundant farm production limited to taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year. This would apply to 70 percent of the Nation's families, or about 115 million people. Books of coupons would be issued on the basis of income-tax returns.

This is how the dividend plan would work. Suppose there was a large surplus of milk in springtime or summer. The Secretary of Agriculture would declare a dividend on dairy products stating that each coupon was worth 30 cents if used in the purchase of a pound

of butter or a pound of cheese each time the housewife bought a quart of milk.

"This would promote the sale of fluid milk," declared editor Kieckhefer, "which gives the farmer a good return on his investment, and at the same time stimulate consumption of dairy by-products. The two, working together, would reduce or even eliminate the necessity of a Government buy-and-store program for butter, cheese, and dry milk. A great number of combinations for the use of such dividends could be developed."

The dividend plan would not remove the necessity for a Government storage program for such commodities as wheat, corn, and cotton, but in the long run, such a farm dividend program would move into consumption a vast quantity of farm products and move them to the people who need them most.

Steps Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, persons living in the 10th Massachusetts District were leaders in sending to the President last November an open letter urging steps toward peace. Under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include such letter and also a memorandum on the subject.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the spirit of your repeated declaration that no stone should be left unturned in the quest for a durable peace, we wish respectfully to suggest that you appoint a commission of perhaps 20 men and women, preeminent in their fields, to make an exhaustive study of this vast and complex problem.

The problem, as we see it, encompasses far more than lies within the field of the Government, which is concerned, primarily, with its military, diplomatic, and political aspects. It reaches into the fields of religion, racial prejudice, nationalism, economics, mass psychology, and many other fields.

We all know that heretofore the search has been fruitless; that wars have persisted with cumulative and aggravated horrors. But we cannot admit that the futility of past attempts foreshadows failure for fresh efforts. We cannot concede that man is biologically and inherently a destructive, suicidal creature. The certainty that another major war would inflict on all mankind, on victors as well as vanquished, on civilians as well as combatants, on children and women, the most cruel calamity in history, impels us to plead for sympathetic consideration of this new approach.

We recommend that you muster the proposed commission from both the business world and the professions—industrial and financial leaders, clergymen, scientists, lawyers, farmers, labor leaders, educators, statesmen, philanthropists, historians, publicists, and others. We believe that the coordinated, matured judgments of the clearest minds might provide a program for the country at large, a program that would supplement and fortify the comprehensive efforts which the Government is making. Under your inspiring leadership, Mr. President, far more could be done in every community in the land—by study groups, debates, lectures, forums, and the like; far more in schools and colleges, far more by the radio and TV and the press. Millions could be spent with profit on such endeavors.

We recommend that this commission be asked to give serious consideration to the establishment of an agency, somewhat similar in structure to the American National Red Cross, which is a nongovernmental body yet closely associated with the Government. The Red Cross has its charter from the Congress of the United States; its honorary President is the President of the United States; eight of its board of directors are appointed by the President. But, at the same time, in its operations it is autonomous; it raises its funds from the people (in its fiscal year 1953–54 well over $85 million) and it carries on its multifarious activities largely by the work of its volunteers, in its 7,700 branches and chapters throughout the country. Furthermore, it has taken a leading part in the creation of similar institutions in 70 other countries, joined together in the League of Red Cross Societies.

Such steps would give further evidence to the world that our vast military machine must be maintained, only because we live in a world of international discord and anarchy, from which we have, so far, been unable to escape.

Such an undertaking, we submit, might have many far-reaching benefits:

It might stimulate to positive action many segments of our people who today, without leadership, participate only passively in the search for peace.

It might stimulate other countries to take similar action, as has the Red Cross.

It might lead the way for a spiritual and moral resurgence throughout the country and perhaps the world.

It might, in fact, prove the catalyst which would bring all these and many other forces together in such an overwhelming demand for peace that no government would dare ignore their mandate.

To be sure, many individuals and organizations are hard at work on this problem, but no one, to our knowledge, has proposed a definite, feasible plan so far-reaching and so likely to gain the cooperation and support of our countrymen.

Nearly a hundred years ago, an obscure Swiss businessman crossed the bloody battlefield of Solferino the day after the battle and, viewing the abandoned wounded, dying, and dead, vowed that such inhumanity must no longer be endured. From that day forth, Henri Dunant, renouncing all else, began sowing the seed which became the great far-flung humanitarian organization the Red Cross is today. Does not our proposal present to you, Mr. President, a similar opportunity for a great organized movement of our people, leading, under God, to a lasting peace?

Respectfully,

Prof. Edward L. Adams, Ann Arbor, Mich.; William H. Armstrong, Amherst, Mass.; Dr. Floyd G. Ballentine, Lewisburg, Pa.; Dr. J. Dellinger Barney, Boston, Mass.; W. Lee Beardsell, Belmont, Mass.; Dr. Conrad Bell, Waltham, Mass.; Alfred A. Benesch, Cleveland, Ohio; Carrol M. Bill, East Weymouth, Mass.; George W. Billings, Milford, Mass.; Earl D. Bond, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Henry C. Boynton, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. Thomas D. Brown, New York, N. Y.; Frank M. Buckland, West Hartford, Conn.; Freeman F. Burr, Wayne, Maine; Frank W. Buxton, Brookline, Mass.; Dunbar F. Carpenter,[1] Winchester, Mass.; Dr. George O. Clark, Newburyport, Mass.; Aubrey E. Landry, Washington, D. C.; Homer H. Smith, Gloucester, Mass.; Albert A. Cobb, Lakeland, Fla.; Harry F. R. Dolan, Cambridge, Mass.; Lewis M. Dougan, Middle Granville, N. Y.; Harold T. Dougherty, Westfield, Mass.; Walter Prichard Eaton, Sheffield, Mass.; William Edmunds, Wellesley Hills, Mass.; Dr. Robert H. Ellis, Portland, Oreg.; Owen David Evans, Prospect Park, Pa.; William P. Everts, Cambridge, Mass.; Dean Floyd Field, Atlanta, Ga.; Maj. Gerald F. Furlong, Hampton, New Brunswick, Canada; Arthur M. Goodridge, Cambridge, Mass.; George W. Harrington, Providence, R. I.; Duncan G. Harris, New York, N. Y.; Edmund Heard, Mathews, Va.; A. Stedman Hills, Washington, D. C.; Conrad Hobbs, Boston, Mass.; Arthur Drinkwater, Cambridge, Mass.; John F. Cole, Somerville, Mass.

Arthur L. Washburn, Sienna, Italy; Byam Hollings, Concord, N. H.; Llewellyn Howland, South Dartmouth, Mass.; Gardiner G. Hubbard, Barcelona, Spain; Herbert L. Hunt, Guethary, B. P., France; Frank L. Jewett, Austin, Tex.; William N. Johnson, Mattapoisett, Mass.; Walter D. Lambert, Canaan, Conn.; Frederic W. Lane, Tacoma, Wash.; Samuel W. Lewis, Lancaster, Mass.; Walter Lichtenstein, Cambridge, Mass.; Robert Livermore, Topsfield, Mass.; Edward F. Loughlin, West Concord, Mass.; Marklove Lowery, Utica, N. Y.; Albert G. Mason, Milton, Mass.; Wilbur Morse, Long Beach, Calif.; James H. Morss, North Abington, Mass.; Walter G. Mortland, New York, N. Y.; Clifford Norton, Chatham, N. J.; John H. Page, Phoenix, Ariz.; George W. Presby, Melrose, Mass.; Dr. Richard R. Price, Hutchinson, Kans.; C. Newton Prouty, West Brookfield, Mass.; Wynn M. Rainbolt, Pine Valley, Calif.; Montgomery Reed, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. James A. Richards, Winter Park, Fla.; Avery Robinson, New Lebanon, N. Y.; Herbert G. Robinson, Aurora, N. Y.; George F. Root, Concord, Mass.; Dr. Ernest Sachs, North Haven, Conn.; Robert A. Sanborn, Brookline, Mass.; William N. Seaver, Melrose, Mass.; T. Mott Shaw, Concord, Mass.; Frank H. Stevens, Marblehead Neck, Mass.; Ralph W. Stone, Harrisburg, Pa.; William B. Swinford, Norman, Okla.; Harold Tappin, Far Hills, N. J.; Cecil H. Taylor, New Milford, Conn.; Myron E. Terbush, Utica, N. Y.; George A. Towns, Atlanta, Ga.; Fred H. Train, Orange, Mass.; Ralph H. Watson, Greenwich, Conn.; Charles F. Wellington, Boston, Mass.; Ross K. Whiton, Springfield, Vt.; George A. Whittemore, East Orange, N. J.; Frederick M. Wilder, Port Hueneme, Calif.; Charles R. Woods, Southboro, Mass., members of the Harvard class of 1900.

[1] Deceased.

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY RELEASE OF ENCLOSED OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

GENTLEMEN: Eighty-three of my classmates of Harvard, 1900, living in 22 States and 3 foreign countries, have joined me in an open letter to President Eisenhower suggesting the appointment by him of a broadly representative, nonpolitical commission, with him as honorary president, to study the multifarious problems leading to a durable peace. The letter was intended for publication about a month ago but was withheld until we felt sure that its publication could in no way disturb the President.

We believe that the solution of the problem lies outside the usual scope of formal governmental action, and turn to the President because he has set himself above political partisanship in his search for peace. He is perhaps the only individual in the world who could animate such a movement as we propose. He above all others has moved boldly to do away with the causes and curses of war. We are appealing to him in the spirit of his intense desire for world peace.

We believe that the proposed plan will fortify and strengthen the various agencies set in motion already by the President, including atoms for peace and the activities of Mr. Stassen. We are convinced, however, that, pending the day when a durable peace is in sight, national defense must be maintained at the highest level.

We have suggested an organization on the lines of the Red Cross but do not feel sure that this would be the most workable and

effective arrangement. The Commission might well devise a better one. Our sole desire, in this respect, is that a large number of people of the United States, whose judgment will ultimately be decisive, should have an active part in the search for peace, without the restrictions unavoidable in purely governmental action.

We hope that the commission, if the President sees fit to name one, will be of such a character that its conclusions will command nationwide and even worldwide respect; that they will demonstrate the deep yearning of the President and the American people for a lasting peace, safe, protective, and honorable to all nations and all peoples.

CONRAD HOBBS,
Boston, Mass.

The Medical Aspects of Automotive Crash Injuries and Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Resolution 357 calling for an investigation of the causes of our constantly increasing traffic accidents, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the speech, the Medical Aspects of Automotive Crash Injuries and Death, delivered by Fletcher D. Woodward, M. D. Dr. Woodward is chairman of the American Medical Association's committee on medical aspects of automobile injuries and deaths.

Last year there were nearly 2½ million automobile casualties, 38,000 of whom were killed. Last year 1 out of every 12 automobiles was in a serious crash. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem, growing in magnitude each year, and I feel it should be given national attention.

The speech follows:

THE MEDICAL ASPECTS OF AUTOMOTIVE CRASH INJURIES AND DEATHS

(By Fletcher D. Woodward, M. D., Charlottesville, Va.)

Next to the victim and his family the physician is the most interested in the prevention of such crashes, for he is the one called upon day and night to pronounce death upon those beyond medical help and to treat those who have been injured.

His first duty is to see that adequate first aid is rendered and that proper transportation is furnished. To this end he, in collaboration with the American Red Cross, has developed through the years manuals for the education and guidance of his fellow physicians as well as the layman and the trained lay worker. This phase of medical care along with definitive care of the wounded is probably the only good that came out of our recent wars. To keep abreast of the rapid medical advances the committee on trauma of the American College of Surgeons, under the chairmanship of Dr. Arnold Griswold of Louisville, Ky., along with its other objective of fostering safetly design of the automobile itself, is preparing a new edition of such a manual and sponsors, along with the American Red Cross, the education of fellow physicians and lay workers in this important phase of care of the injured.

The physician's second duty is in the definitive care of the injured, and of these results he is justifiably proud. In his work with this problem his third responsibility soon manifested itself, which was the prevention of injuries and deaths by redesign of the machine itself. This aspect will be discussed later.

In the care of the injured statistics show that the recovery rate of the injured was much better in World War II than World War I. There was a further improvement during the Korean conflict. Prompt and efficient first aid, better and prompt transportation, the treatment of shock, more blood transfusions, better anesthesia, the use of antibiotics to control infection, along with improved surgical technics, were responsible for this gratifying improvement.

The medical profession, although not self-satisfied with its present-day accomplishments in the care of the wounded, is highly gratified with its results. However, if the problem of automobile crash injuries and deaths is viewed as a whole from the medical aspect, as it should be, it is obvious that there is much to be done. By study of how, where, and why these injuries occurred, it soon became apparent to the physician that prevention was possible in many instances and that he should direct his energies to this end. However, for many years his was literally a voice in the wilderness. The public accepted the grim statistical reports of the National Safety Council with indifference and complacency. The automobile manufacturers frankly stated that they were not only not interested but did not intend to call the attention of the public to the fact that an automobile was necessarily a dangerous or lethal machine. But by slow and methodical compilation of statistics by the individual physician, by universities and by public and governmental agencies, it became apparent that redesign of the machine itself could prevent many of these injuries and deaths. The use of safety belts and body harnesses would help to prevent the high percentage of injuries to the head, face, and legs of the guest passenger. Also, the use of crash padding on the dash, an ejectable windshield, collapsible steering wheel and column, the eradication of projecting knobs and buttons, the firm anchorage of seats, higher seat backs to prevent whiplash neck injury, safety locks on doors to prevent their popping open on impact, polarized headlight lenses and windshields, warning devices on the speedometer, dull paint to prevent glare, better shock absorbers, and many other simple and sensible suggestions were offered.

I am happy to report that now many of the manufacturers, led by Ford, are studying this problem and installing safety devices on their cars, and if the installation of such safety devices can be made competitive, then the many people and agencies responsible for this happy event can sit back and applaud; otherwise a Federal agency will be sought to establish and require of all manufacturers these minimum safety requirements.

The physician will then have more time to study his personal responsibility in prevention by study of the medical aspects of driver licensure and the medical reasons for crashes, although the purely medical reasons may not be over 2 to 3 percent of such crashes. Still, even 2 percent of a million is 20,000 injuries.

To this end the American Medical Association is directing a study of the Medical Aspects of Driver Licensure. This study includes a review of the visual and hearing and physical requirements, the incidence of Meniere's disease, petit and grand mal, as well as other diseases of the nervous system, the cardiovascular system, physical conditions, drugs, insulin shock, and alcohol.

We also feel that physicians should be included in an advisory board to study the physical and psychological factors in repeat offenders. To that end research funds should be made available to see if the chronic speeder and reckless driver conforms to a psychopathic personality pattern.

Among the things which we now know and can employ to reduce this carnage, in addition to safety features in the car itself, are the control and punishment of the drinking driver. It has been estimated that he was involved in 25 percent of the fatal accidents last year, but due to apathy on the part of the public, State legislators, and judges little has been accomplished.

I know of no more important project for your organization than to work for the enactment and impartial enforcement of a law to convict and punish the guilty drinking driver. A test to establish intoxication is available, is simple to conduct, and its results are conclusive—namely the drunkometer breath test. The Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs is sponsoring such legislation under the able guidance of its State safety chairman, Mrs. Randall Wade Everett, Jr., of Arlington. Many law and medical organizations are sponsoring similar legislation and I would like to commend to you for consideration a resolution passed last month by the Albemarle County Medical Society of Virginia.

Four-Motor Crocketts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the fullest utilization of modern jet aircraft by scheduled air carriers may be accomplished only by an efficient route pattern. Anything short of the most direct routes between major world centers will result in higher operating costs and an inevitable subsidy burden on the American taxpayers.

An even more serious result of uneconomical routing in our international air pattern would be a lack of demand for more modern equipment and the elimination of an incentive to produce bigger and faster aircraft.

The Washington Daily News deals with this important subject in an editorial which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time:

FOUR-MOTOR CROCKETTS

In our fair land, we glorify the pioneer in song, story, editorial, comic strip, movie, TV, and radio horse opera.

Yippee; it's them there boys with the long rifles, coonskin hats and the bold vision who're the backbone of the country, it says here. And they are richly rewarded by their sturdy fellow citizens, it also says, who are firm in the conviction that the intrepid, questing spirit of ol' Dan'l Boone, fostered by a generous sense of fair play, can press back our present-day frontiers of applied science, industrial enterprise, and international trade just as it conquered the Cheyenne and the coyote.

Yeh.

And when you put goggles on that coonskin helmet, and stick him in a cockpit, you've got Lindbergh and the Spirit of Free Enterprise, '76, the Alamo, Henry Ford, Kitty Hawk, and rugged individualism till hell won't hold it.

Yeh.

You also have commercial aviation, subsidies, politics, and high-priced lawyers and lobbyists spending the taxpayers' dough in

imaginative and remarkably unnecessary ways.

Today, down at the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Commerce Department, lawyers will start wrangling over why Pan American Airways, pioneer across the Pacific, should or should not fly that particular ocean efficiently.

When Pan-Am pioneered across the Pacific twenty-odd years ago, the most efficient way—in fact the only possible way by air—was by the islands—Hawaii, Wake, the Philippines, and so on, for fueling reasons. About 7,000 miles.

Today, with stratocruisers, DC 7-B's, and so on, the most efficient way is by the great circle route (a taut string on a globe gives you the great circle) between points. About 4,800 miles.

Pan American would like to stay efficient, and fly the great circle between Seattle and Tokyo, which it also pioneered, surveying it before anyone else.

Northwest Airlines claims it, too.

The Government (Civil Aeronautics Board) has the authority to say which, or both.

A lot of political potboiling went on a few years ago, with routes to Tokyo from California, Washington, and the Pacific islands on the CAB's stove; but, when dinner was finally served, a Democratic Party feast of pure reason, with President Truman and former Democratic Gov. Mon Wallgren helping to select the menu, had Northwest Airlines not only exclusively flying the great circle but also cut in on the island route from Seattle as well.

So, in effect, the Government said to Pan-Am: "No; you stay inefficient. If it costs you and the taxpayers money, why, nuts to it."

However, the whole thing has come up again; certification is up for renewal, and technical advances make such nonstop flights more and more promising, both as to cost and dependability. President Eisenhower has ordered the CAB to take another look.

This whole situation, historically, results from a basic difference between the way the United States and other nations fly international routes.

Other nations generally have a policy that one flag carrier each is enough for them to subsidize over international airways (SAS for Scandinavian countries, BOAC for the British, KLM for the Dutch, Air France, etc.). But the United States has a policy of subsidizing parallel United States lines. This costs the taxpayer more, of course. The theory has been that this subsidized "competition" improves service, and has been good for our country's international aviation position. Some critics say this is bunk; that foreign airlines equal ours in maintenance and many as superior to ours in service.

All we want to point out here is, that if it is necessary to subsidize a competitor to force the pioneer to keep on pioneering, it would seem to us that the way to do that would be not to tie flatirons on the pioneer's feet, but to make the competition truly competitive.

Let both lines fly both routes, even Stephen.

In that way, the taxpayer might have a way, through the subsidy he pays, to find out which line is doing the best job.

Aside from the passenger penalty which the longer route imposes on Pan-Am, one silly effect of the present Pacific arrangement is that Tokyo mail from the United States is hauled 7,000 miles by one line and 4,800 miles by the other, but both for the same price. This nutty arrangement is like pretending it takes no more gas or driving time for a truck to go from here to Miami via Chicago than by driving there direct.

The CAB cannot only unhook itself and the taxpayers from the evil effects of previous peanut politics by straightening this situation, but can also, it seems to us, give a little reality to the romantic notion described in our first paragraphs: that pioneers, in this country, reap the rewards of their pioneering; they aren't penalized for it.

Forestry Development in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I met a young man by the name of Robert N. Hoskins, who is industrial forester with the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. I have found since then that this young man is dedicated to promoting the forestry resources of our Nation. I have seen him in action several times at forestry programs in my own 8th District of Florida, which is in the very heart of the pine tree area of Florida. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and also as a member of our Subcommittee on Forestry, I have been inspired by the excellent work that Mr. Hoskins is doing in promoting an integrated utilization program of our forest resources. I am pleased to enclose an account of a recent forestry demonstration at Williston, Fla., in my district, which was attended by many of our citizens, and which was planned by Mr. Hoskins. I am also including an editorial which was in the Florida Times-Union in its issue on Friday, January 20, 1956, and titled "The South Rediscovers Its Woodland Wealth":

More than 600 persons attended an integrated utilization program which was sponsored by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., held Friday, January 20, on the old Williston airport property. The entire program was supervised by the railroad's industrial forester, Robert N. Hoskins.

Featured speakers on this occasion included Congressman D. R. "Billy" Matthews; Warren T. White, assistant vice president, Seaboard Air Line Railroad; Harry E. Wood, State supervisor of vocational agriculture; and J. Edwin Moore, assistant State forester, and W. S. Swingler, Assistant Chief of United States Forest Service. Speaker-Designate Doyole E. Connor, of Starke, delivered the address of welcome.

This program was billed as a 12-ring circus in the woods with the major accent being placed on wood utilization.

In charge of the discussions on production of crossties was Robert W. Cook, chief tie and timber agent, Seaboard Air Line Railroad at Jacksonville; pole production had as its discussion leader Sam Balser, Southern Wood Preserving Co., Atlanta, Ga. Production and treatment of fence posts was under the direction of Tony Jensen, Assistant Extension Forester, Gainesville, and Wilburn Farrell, county agent of Bronson. Production of pulpwood was under the direction of Harry D. Johnson, assistant manager, woodlands division, St. Regis Paper Co., Jacksonville. Discussions on forest insect damage were directed by E. P. Merkel, Forest Entomologist of the Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, N. C., while the timber stand improvement discussions were supervised by James E. Lavely, farm forester, Florida forest service, Ocala.

Ernest A. Clevenger, vice president of the Corley Manufacturing Co., Chattanooga, Tenn., served as discussion leader on sawmilling with George B. Williams, vice president of Turpentine & Rosin Factors, Jacksonville, and Ralph Clements, Lake City Branch, Southeast Forest Experiment Station, being in charge of the demonstration featuring new methods in the production of naval stores. George W. Mosely, president of the Florida Forest Equipment Co., from Jacksonville supervised the mechanical tree planting phase and Harold Mikell, district forester, Florida forest service, Ocala, supervised the fire-control equipment demonstration. Maintenance and operation of chain saws had as its group leader, Fred Mullino of the Florida Forestry Equipment Co., Jacksonville, and supervising the demonstration and actual discussion on the use of the Little Beaver Tree Girdler was Joe Beal, field assistant of the International Paper Co., Bronson, Fla.

This program was an all-day affair with sandwiches, coffee, and coca-cola served free, courtesy of the Seaboard Railroad. The Ocala F. F. A. string band provided music for this gathering.

The program was a cooperative one sponsored by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.; teachers of vocational agriculture from Marion, Levy, Citrus, Alachua, and Gilchrist Counties; the Florida forest service, Soil Conservation Service, and the Extension Service.

[From the Florida Times-Union of January 20, 1956]

THE SOUTH REDISCOVERS ITS WOODLAND WEALTH

Another step in the South's deepening realization that its forests are its greatest natural resource is being taken today in the forestry demonstration near Williston, sponsored by the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.

Experts from throughout the South will participate in the program in which all phases of wood production and utilization will be stressed. There could be no better contribution to regional development.

Latest demonstration of the key role of forests in the current southern industrial boom was last week's announcement by the Growers Container Corp. of plans to open a cardboard-box factory in connection with expansion of production by the local St. Regis Paper Co. plant. That announcement served to focus attention on how the South is becoming a national center for the many industries based on pulp and paper processing, because the region now supplies more than half the Nation's annual pulpwood production.

But that is only the beginning of the story of wealth from the forests. The Timber Resource Review of the United States Forest Service this fall forecast that eventually the bulk of United States lumber production will be concentrated in the South, basing its forecast on research showing that the region possesses far greater potential for expansion in timber growth and manufacture than any other. Already timber is a $2 billion a year industry in the region.

The Review cited the prospect of an amazing increase in demand for building materials, expected in the years to come because of population trends that are already manifest. This rising demand will bring a new golden age of lumbering in which the southern pine will be more valuable than ever before, the agency believes.

That the South is becoming aware of the opportunity is indicated in the growth of the Tree Farms Movement. During the first 9 months of 1955 alone, southern tree farm acres were increased by nearly 3 million.

With two-thirds of its land area in forests, Florida will be a leader in this new

era—if its capacity is scientifically developed. Such forestry demonstrations as the one scheduled today in Williston are calls to Floridians to awaken to the riches around them and to avail themselves of the knowledge without which those riches must remain untapped.

Dedication of Stoddard Reserve Center Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the brief address I made on the occasion of the dedication, last October 23, 1955, of the United States Army Reserve Training Center in Worcester, Mass., as a memorial to the late Lt. Col. Lincoln W. Stoddard, a World War II combat veteran with 44 months' service in the Pacific theater of operations.

Colonel Stoddard, who relinquished a commission to enlist as a private in the 180th Field Artillery Battalion of the Massachusetts National Guard's famous 26th—Yankee—Division, received five decorations and numerous citations for "performance beyond the ordinary call of duty."

Colonel Stoddard, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry G. Stoddard, of 7 Massachusetts Avenue, was associate editor of the Worcester Telegram and the Evening Gazette when he died suddenly while on Golden Rule campaign work.

The address follows:

SPEECH AT THE DEDICATION OF LINCOLN W. STODDARD ARMORY, WORCESTER, MASS, OCTOBER 26, 1955

It is a privilege to take part in these armory dedication exercises in tribute to and in memory of our late heroic friend and neighbor, Lt. Col. Lincoln W. Stoddard.

In the definition of the dictionary, an armory is a large building in which to store war instruments, containing a drill hall and related military facilities.

In a deeper Christian sense an armory is an arsenal of discipline. The discipline of mind and will that is here developed by military practices is founded upon the religious belief that man is a spiritual being created by the Almighty. Such a discipline achieved is the highest ingredient of a truly civilized society.

The unhappy necessity for this armory is our practical recognition that there are similar institutions in another land where the training discipline is based upon the atheistic principle that man is merely a material thing existing only for the service of the state, which is almighty. It is vital, therefore, that we remain constantly prepared to meet not only any sudden forceful acts, but even more, perhaps, the insidious pagan influence of the opposing atheistic power.

In this armory American youth is disciplined in military proficiency to fight, and die if necessary, in defense of the God-given blessings of life. In the atmosphere of the Christian discipline here, our American youth understand that the ultimate objective of their military skill is peace; a civilized peace, in which the Creator's gifts to mankind of individual liberty, justice, and freedom can be humanly enjoyed. So long as we commonly understand and are dedicated to military discipline for that purpose, America will prevail against any totalitarian state.

Lincoln W. Stoddard was a man of superior mind and will and talents. He loved his family, his fellow men, his country, and its freedoms with religious convictions. He thoroughly understood the discipline of man under God. In the spirit of that discipline, he was willing to give up his life for his country and his own principles. It is, then, supremely appropriate that we dedicate this armory in his memory. To all who enter and leave here, the name of Lincoln W. Stoddard will be an inspiration of reminder that the discipline they receive is to be consecrated only to the Christian objective of promoting peace on earth and good will among men. That is the inspiration which he has left to all of us.

The Moderate Position on Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Politics and Civil Rights" from the Washington Post and Times Herald; an editorial entitled "Bad Taste and Bad History" from the New York Times; column by Walter Lippmann entitled "Integration in Politics"; and a letter from Hamilton Basso entitled "Moderation as Solution."

Mr. Speaker, temperate voices on the school-integration issue are finally making themselves heard above the din of radical opinion. It is encouraging to know that Adlai Stevenson does not stand alone as an advocate of orderly transition by gradual adjustment and human understanding.

It is my conviction that we must foster this spirit of moderation if this problem is to be solved the democratic way. As our colleague from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] commented Tuesday, above all this is "a time for reason."

As evidence of the moderate point of view, I present forthright editorials which appeared this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald and the New York Times, a recent column by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and a penetrating letter to the New York Times by a native southern author, Hamilton Basso.

These articles follow in order:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 16, 1956]

POLITICS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Adlai Stevenson's plea that political leaders of both parties keep the public-school segregation issue out of the 1956 election campaign seems to have little hope of realization. With feelings so inflammable on either side, politicians can hardly forbear to ignite them. Yet they may touch off a disastrous explosion. The torch held aloft by Governor Harriman when he urged withholding Federal funds from States where school integration is not achieved forthwith may make a lovely light; but it will do nothing whatever to promote either integration or education. In its way it may be as dangerous as the cross burned on the altar of white supremacy by the rabid crew represented by Senator EASTLAND. And the bald attempt by Vice President NIXON to make political capital out of the fact that the Supreme Court happened to decide the school segregation cases during a Republican administration seems as shabby as it is mischievous.

We are at a climactic stage in the development of race relations in the United States. An historic pattern is being swept away. Ancient wrongs which find their only justification in a tradition based on bigotry are at long last being righted. It is only natural that Negroes who have suffered these wrongs should be impatient to inherit their full rights as citizens of the United States. Justice is so clearly on their side that it is almost an affront to ask them for moderation and continued patience. Nevertheless, moderation and continued patience are likely to bring them to their goals much more speedily than intransigeance and intemperance.

If the school segregation issue falls into the hands of the extremists and the political exploiters, an evolutionary process which came to maturity as a result of American economic and social growth—and which the Supreme Court merely recognized and ratified—will be frustrated and delayed. For it is plain that a harmonious integration of different races is one of the many matters that cannot be accomplished by the points of bayonets. This is by no means to say that justice and law and order ought not to be resolutely enforced by governmental authority. It is to say simply that kindliness, tolerance, mutual trust and good will are indispensable ingredients of every social adjustment.

"It is my conviction," Hamilton Basso wrote the other day in a distinguished letter to the New York Times, "that once the South is rid of its fear that it will be required to reorganize the whole of its society within a few months or years it will begin noticeably to obey those impulses of decency, kindness and honorable behavior which, because of the statements of its extremists, would now seem to be blocked off." The South's extremists respond to extremists from the North—and vice versa. No doubt it was this consideration that led the Supreme Court to order integration in flexible terms attuned to varying conditions; it ordered a "prompt beginnin," not an immedate completion. And it ordered compliance to be judged in the judicial atmosphere of Federal courts, not in an executive agency subject to political pressures. The firmness with which such action can be taken was demonstrated yesterday by a Federal court in New Orleans which declared Louisiana's 1954 segregation laws unconstitutional.

This is preeminently a time when the test of statesmanship is restraint. The change in customs and institutions demanded of the South involves the birth of a new era. Birth is never without birth pangs. It calls for compassion and understanding.

[From the New York Times of February 16, 1956]

BAD TASTE AND BAD HISTORY

Spokesmen for the Republican Party in the coming campaign are clearly going to make the most of the present administration's record in promoting the integration of Negro citizens into the normal life of America. They have much to be proud of in that record, and they are entitled to boast about some genuine advances.

But there is such a thing as carrying partisan claims in this area too far. Vice President NIXON did exactly that in talking

about the segregation decision of the Supreme Court in his Lincoln Day dinner speech before the National Republican Club in this city. Mr. NIXON listed some truly impressive gains for our Negro citizens. But then he said: "And, speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's schools." And, he added, "we did this, mind you, we did this all in just 3 years."

By thus directly linking the desegregation decision to the political campaign Mr. NIXON has done an immense disservice to the Chief Justice, to the Court and to the Nation. Statements such as his feed the fires of the die-hards; weaken the authority and the prestige of the Court; reinforce the will to resist; heighten emotions that are already dangerously high, and enhance the crudest kind of political partisanship.

Furthermore, the implications are not even accurate. Though the Chief Justice was, of course, appointed by President Eisenhower, only one other Justice of the Supreme Court was named during this administration. Each of the remaining seven is a Truman or a Roosevelt appointee. If anything could be bipartisan, the unanimous desegregation decision was; and it is as misleading to include it in the list of Republican accomplishments as it would be to claim it for the Democrats.

Let Mr. NIXON ponder the words of a well-know Republican when he was asked about the desegregation decision being "brought out under the Republican administration." He replied: "The Supreme Court, as I understand it, is not under any administration." That was the way President Eisenhower felt about it in May, 1954, and we have no doubt that that is the way he feels about it today.

INTEGRATION IN POLITICS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is mounting evidence of grave trouble ahead over integration in the public schools of the Southern States. For in recent weeks we have come nearer to the question which can divide the country dangerously. Is the decision of the Supreme Court to be put into effect gradually and with the eventual consent of the leaders of southern opinion or is the Federal Government to be called upon to enforce integration against the resistance of the South?

This question poses as fateful a dilemma as any internal American question that has arisen for several generations. It arouses great human passions which cannot be reconciled, which can only be assuaged and accommodated in this generation. They are passions which boil up quickly into violence, and they can be kept within bounds only when and only while there is great wisdom and resolution in the leaders of the country.

The temptation to play politics with these passions is almost overpowering. And it is the approach of the national election, the struggle between the two parties and also the struggle within the parties, particularly within the Democratic Party, which have brought the dilemma to the surface.

It is significant that the closer a public man is to the presidency, the more will he shrink from the idea of Federal enforcement, as distinguished from persuasion and accommodation. Governor Stevenson has been notably firm and decisive and the President, though his words were a bit cloudy, is certainly not considering intervention by the Federal executive power. It is the politicians, the men who have little or no prospect of themselves being in the White House and bearing the President's responsibility, who are heating up the issue.

There is no likelihood that the Republicans in Congress will agree to take the issue out of politics. For it is a most damaging issue to raise among the Democrats. Nor is there much likelihood that Governor Stevenson's rivals for the nomination will forbear to raise it. It is such an easy way to make things difficult for him.

The issue will have to be debated in the open. The fundamental question to be debated is whether integration is to be promoted by persuasian or by Federal enforcement. These are two different roads, and no one should think he can go down both of them at once.

Consider, for example, the Powell amendment which would withhold Federal aid from States or school districts that do not integrate their schools. Let no one suppose that the Southern States will give in and accept integrated schools because some Federal money is withheld from them. To suppose that they will give in is to mistake the temper of the South, particularly the temper of the deep South.

What, then, are Representative Joseph L. Martin and Governor Harriman going to propose next, once they find that withholding money does not induce the Southern States to yield? If they start on the path of coercion, the authority of the executive power will be engaged and new measures of coercion will be demanded to uphold that authority. For unless the Federal Government is going to confess that it is beaten, it must—taking the path of Federal enforcement—become more and more coercive.

No one should doubt that the attempt at Federal enforcement will intensify and harden the resistance of the South. Those who are disposed to try to work out integration gradually will resent the Federal Government's efforts to coerce them. The problem of integration will become progressively more insoluble in the South, the racial passions will become increasingly sharp, the sectional feeling increasingly disruptive.

Let us stop and think before we let irresponsible politicians push us into the whirlpool.

The way things are developing is a reason for asking ourselves whether the decision of the Supreme Court does not need to be supplemented. As it stands now, the question of what constitutes a "prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance" is left to the judgment of the Federal courts. Now what would be a prompt and reasonable start, say, in the District of Columbia might well be impossible, hasty in Mississippi. Success in putting into effect the principle of the decision requires a program which must vary with local conditions. It is, for example, an enormous step forward when universities in the South admit Negro students. And it would be the part of wisdom in a State like Alabama to regard admission to the university as being for present purposes "a prompt and reasonable start."

The question is whether through some sort of council of eminent citizens guiding principles might be agreed upon which would give to American opinion a standard around which it could rally.

MODERATION AS SOLUTION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Shameful and saddening as was the attack upon Autherine Lucy at the University of Alabama, it is not impossible that it can be productive of good.

As you said in your editorial of February 8 Mob Rule at Tuscaloosa, it is not surprising that there should have been this flare-up of violence. My point is that this very flare-up may be diverted to useful ends. What do we do now?

I should first like to suggest that the first thing we do is to realize that even a Supreme Court ruling cannot change a way of thinking that has persisted for generations. It is also my suggestion that we realize—and here the burden of realization falls on the South—that when a sovereign State yields to mob rule it no longer fits into the definition of a sovereign State.

ATMOSPHERE OF WARFARE

In a letter which you published on April 10, 1955, in commenting upon a visit to the South, I mentioned that the mood and temper of the section was one of secession. I have just returned from another visit to the South, and now I find that the atmosphere is one of open warfare.

The segregation issue has more than got out of hand. What has happened over the past 12 months is that it has got into the hands of extremists on both sides. In one set of trenches we find those represented by the mob, which at least for a time brought the State of Alabama to heel. In the opposite set of trenches we have those elements in the North who would almost seem anxious, judging from certain questions put to Adlai Stevenson, to compel the immediate end of segregation by returning the bayonets of reconstruction to the South.

It was Miss Lucy's misfortune to be caught in the crossfire. I find it impossible to believe that she would have been so maltreated a year ago. But just as the attack upon her must not be brushed aside as undergraduate irresponsibility, neither must the action of one mob be taken to represent the prevailing spirit of the South.

PREVENTING FEAR

I may be disagreed with, and even proved wrong, but it is my conviction that once the South is rid of its fear that it will be required to reorganize the whole of its society within a few months or years it will begin noticeably to obey those impulses of decency, kindness, and honorable behavior which, because of the statements of its extremists, would now seem to be blocked off.

Moderation admittedly has become almost a dirty word. However, if we examine the decision of the Supreme Court, what we find is that the Justices revealed a very clear preference for moderation. And here we would all of us, North and South, be well advised to follow the lead of the court.

Extremism will get us nowhere. The answer is neither mobs nor bayonets. There indeed can be no answer unless it is provided by the moderate leadership of both sides, supported by equally moderate men and women who are able to join together in patience, tolerance and mutual goodwill.

If what happened to Miss Lucy helps bring this about, she will deserve our thanks as she now requires our apologies.

HAMILTON BASSO.

Albert Einstein College of Medicine of the Yeshiva University

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of introducing an excerpt from the speech delivered by the Honorable James J. Lyons, president of the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, at a dinner in honor of the Honorable Hulan E. Jack, president of the Borough of Manhattan, New York City. The dinner was sponsored by the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of the Yeshiva University on February 7, 1956, at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City.

President Lyons stated:

Quite by accident I came across an incident which indicates the kind of institution we have. It so happens that a young lady who attained the second or third highest grades in Hunter College applied for admission. However, her financial situation was such that it was impossible for her to meet the total of $1,000 tuition plus other expenses that would be incurred. She was a brilliant and outstanding student and the admissions committee was of the opinion that she would make a very capable physician. However, being such a young school with heavy financial burdens, the admissions office did not want to take the responsibility to guarantee seeing her through school. Dr. Belkin heard of this and said it would be a tragedy in this young student were prevented from becoming a doctor because of lack of money. He asked the admissions committee to reconsider and accept her and said the college would find the money to give her a scholarship for her full 4 years. This, the admissions committee did, and it was only then that Dr. Belkin learned that this brilliant young lady was a Negro.

I think we can all be especially pleased that this medical student will have the opportunity through the Albert Einstein College of Medicine to serve her people and her country.

I am very proud to be the president of the Bronx, which is host to such an institution. This is a typical example of true democracy in action and should serve as a beacon and guide to all public officials and educators in every section of our great country to whom is entrusted the solemn duty of preserving and enhancing the American way of life.

Ninety-first Anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this year the Nation marks the 91st anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have printed in the RECORD the following letter to Mr. Luther Keith, of the Detroit, Mich., Catholic Interracial Council, who was the chairman of the council's program and dinner held on Sunday, February 12, 1956, commemorating this anniversary:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

Mr. LUTHER KEITH,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. KEITH: Please express to the members of the interracial council my sincere regret that I am unable to attend the anniversary program dinner this Sunday at St. Leo's Church.

This year, as the Nation marks the 91st anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation we would do well to pay tribute to the courage and the faith in American ideals of our Negro citizenry which is so dramatically demonstrated by the recorded history of the past 91 years.

In making such a tribute we may observe, in retrospect, that what has been characterized as "Negro progress" has been, in fact, American progress; for what has appeared to be a struggle by a segment of our people to rid themselves of second-class citizenship has been and is a struggle of the whole American community to realize our dream of true democracy.

Today Americans are becoming aware that the disease of prejudice and hatred affects the whole Nation, regardless of the immediate objects of such prejudice and hatred. It breeds lawlessness and violence and in recent months it has erupted into revolt against the supreme authority of the land. Such lawlessness and violence have served to characterize a national disgrace which has consumed the energies of large numbers of our people which might otherwise have been directed to bringing greater and more abundant benefits to the national community and to the local communities in which they live. Such lawlessness and violence have served to focus the floodlight of national and world scrutiny upon the advocates of 19th century social patterns in this, the 20th century. Under this scrutiny the course which our Nation must take becomes crystal clear. We cannot turn back the clock, even for a moment. We cannot cast aside 91 years of sacrifice. We cannot close, even slightly, a door that is not yet fully open, nor can we hesitate to open it all the way. We cannot deal indecisively with elements which place bias before decency and personal hate before law and order. We must face these matters now and we must act now to hold the Nation to the course it has taken 91 years to chart.

In commemorating this 91st anniversary, as we acknowledge the confidence of Negroes in America, let us as a national community resolve that our confidence in America and our faith in the future is no less than theirs, and let us do so by concrete legislative and social action.

With best wishes for a most successful and enjoyable affair.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL.

H. R. 3084

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, the attached editorial from the Indianapolis Star in regard to H. R. 3084, which would amend the so-called Hatch Act:

[From the Indianapolis Star of February 9, 1956]

IT'S ABOUT FREEDOM—REMEMBER?

The proponents of Federal meddling-in-everthing are setting out to fight Indiana Congressman BEAMER'S bill to take the Hatch Act hatchet out of the backs of the States. They are using the same strategy employed in the happily unsuccessful fight against the natural gas bill. They are attempting to hide the real issue under a smokescreen of emotional balderdash.

The Washington Daily News has set the tone in announcing its discovery that "one sleepy Capitol Hill day recently" the House passed the Beamer bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Hatch Act. It lives again through the knightly accomplishment of the Hatch Act enactment in 1939. It recalls "shameful abuse of official authority," "coercion of Federal jobholders for political purposes" and the plight of jobholders made "to kick in to campaign funds or knuckle under to party bosses." The recalling of all this does, to be sure, serve a good though extraneous purpose. We had almost forgotten what a vile place Washington was in 1939. But let's talk about the Beamer bill.

The Washington News examines the supposed reasons for the Beamer bill. It surmises these to be (1) that most States now have their own clean politics laws, (2) that the Federal Civil Service Commission "isn't equipped to enforce the law properly," a shortcoming which had escaped us, and (3) that "complaints of violations sometimes are motivated by personal antagonism."

We look in vain for a discussion of the issue.

Shades of Davy Crockett. Hasn't the Washington News heard about State sovereignty?

The issue of the Beamer bill is clear and simple. It is that the Federal Government has no bloody business telling a State Government whom to hire or whom to fire or why, or what shade to keep its domestic political linens. The Beamer bill is a measure to make this point clear to the Federal Civil Service Commission, which despite the supposed lack of equipment is doing a pretty effective job of harassing States under the authority of the Hatch Act. It was because the issue is so simple that the House passed the bill, to all practical purposes unanimously since, as the News noted, no member called for a record vote and none was taken.

How come the proponents of bureaucracy and meddling were sleepy that day we don't know. But now that they have been aroused they are going to do their best to befuddle the issue in the Senate, by prattling about purity in politics. We should not let them get away with it. We should make them discuss the issue.

Religious Persecution Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Communist war against religion and religious freedom continues unabated in the Iron Curtain countries. Despite occasional reports to the contrary, there has been no letup in the campaign of the godless against everything that is sacred and holy. All great faiths are menaced by this atheistic communism, which is seeking to destroy all religions and every trace of religious freedom.

A very tragic case in point is that of Archbishop Joseph Beran, of Prague, Czechoslovakia, who has been imprisoned by the Communists nearly 5 years ago and was forcibly removed from Prague and is being kept at an unknown place. To the people of Czechoslovakia yearning for true freedom, Achbishop Beran is to this day a symbol of their struggle for freedom. His suffering and the inhuman terror to which he is subjected during these 5 long years are inextricably bound with the suffering and the terror of the people of Czechoslovakia.

As these innocent men continue to suffer amidst the stony silence of the civilized world, I wonder at times whether we have become callous or insensible to the crimes being perpetrated against them. The free world must not forget

them in their lonely hours of agony and mental suffering. We must speak out anew in condemnation of this godless evil which has brought so much misery and suffering upon mankind. We must continue to demand the freedom of Archbishop Beran and others who are suffering a similar fate. We must continue to encourage these people so that they can be morally and mentally strengthened to survive the inhumanities to which they are subjected.

By our silence we seal their fate. By raising our voices in protest we give them hope and we bring to the attention of the world the true facts of religious persecution in the Communist-dominated lands. As long as innocent men like Archbishop Beran remain behind Communist bars, there is no freedom of religion behind the Iron Curtain.

Tune In and See the GOP as Guest Artist on the Liberal Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the administration's 1956 program is reprinted from the March 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest, entitled "Tune in and See the GOP as Guest Artist on the Liberal Hour." I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

YOU'LL LAUGH, YOU'LL CHILL, YOU'LL THRILL—TUNE IN AND SEE THE GOP AS GUEST ARTIST ON THE LIBERAL HOUR—WORLD-FAMED QUICK CHANGE ACT

"Each leap year, before the election
When their old slogans go sour,
Comes a pause in GOP occupations
That is known as the Liberal Hour."
—*Old American Ditty.*

President Eisenhower's 1956 series of messages to Congress heralds the formal opening of the Republican Liberal Hour, also known as GOP leap year, which runs from the Presidential campaign curtain raiser to election day.

Though it still is not definite that Mr. Eisenhower will be the GOP candidate again in 1956, his accent this year on the Republican forward theme is as politically polished as his Republican dynamic progressive presentation in 1952, if not more so. His proposals 4 years ago prompted his Democratic opponent, Adlai Stevenson, to comment on the election year phenomenon of modern times, wherein the Republicans quadrennially woo the people by borrowing phrases and ideas from Democratic platforms.

"Now, because of the timing of the conventions," Mr. Stevenson said, "this inevitably leaves them 4 years behind. But I suppose plagiarism must, nevertheless, be considered a form of progress.

"And this is open season for that kind of progress. This is the time when even the most obsolete Republican becomes momentarily reconciled to the machine age. * * *

"Now it's a misfortune—deserved, I fear—of the Republican leadership not just to be taken too seriously during these moments of imitation. This forward look sometimes seems to me like a costume taken out of the closet every 4 years for the big masquerade ball. It often looks nice after a dry cleaning, but the stuffed shirt still shows."

Under Mr. Eisenhower, the Republicans have made their most determined effort in more than 40 years to assume the guise of a "liberal conservative" or "progressive moderate" party. Though it didn't favorably impress the voters in 1954, the GOP strained mightily to look as if it had taken on the so-called "Eisenhower image" during that off-year election test. In fact, the Republican exertions along that line were so strenuous that some observers were moved to declare that President Eisenhower had stolen the Fair Deal-New Deal thunder, and had left the Democrats no issues on which to campaign in either 1954 or 1956.

Commenting on that extraordinary illusion a year ago this month, Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler said:

"We do not mind when President Eisenhower borrows Democratic policies, for he always returns them. But those of us who are genuinely devoted to those policies could wish that his attachment to Democratic ideas were a little less fleeting—as in the cases of his pledges on 90 percent parity prices for farmers, TVA, Civil Service protection, Federal aid to education, rural electrification, and a long list of other programs."

Sad to say, "the shadow and substance" contrast in the administration's programs has always been glaring, with the score for GOP lip service to important causes running consistently far ahead of the GOP's performance record. This feature of the Republican approach to national problems now attains its full flower as the President and his advisers shape up the Republican program for 1956.

From the state of the Union message, and from other administration pronouncements before and since the opening of the final session of the 84th Congress, it is clear that the Republicans are "proposing action in many fields where they have heretofore been content to hold the line and leave the initiative to the Democrats," as Columnist Doris Fleeson observes. Though many of the new administration gestures for progressive causes go against the traditional GOP grain, even the most conservative Republicans "can be expected to go along for victory's sake," Miss Fleeson also notes.

In short, we are now witnessing what seems to be a concerted Republican turnabout to new measures for farm aid for Federal aid to schools, highway building, public housing, aid to distressed communities, social-security expansion, more Federal health services, water resources development and other important projects pressing for nation attention. The Republican "get right for '56" movement even extends to a reversal on the administration's defense cuts and a stand for increased foreign aid.

Without exception, these are fields in which the Republican administration and the congressional Republicans together have managed to erect a massive blockade to progress over the last 3 years, while pursuing policies which have vastly speeded up the entrenchment and enrichment of special interests.

The leap year burst of liberalism in the White House has been brought about by election-year pressures combined with cold-war realities, reported Robert C. Albright in the Washington Post. Noting that the Democrats suddenly found themselves faced with a little competition in their plans for more liberal outlays for schools, health, social security, and other things, Mr. Albright added:

"How much of these budgetary increases were of a token nature, important as a talking point but not badly upsetting the administration's already laid fiscal plans, was still a subject for debate."

Considerations of that nature were responsible for the view, widely expressed among Capitol reporters, that the 1956 state of the Union message, in the phrase of one Washington pundit, was one of the best messages President Coolidge ever sent.

Good reasons for such journalistic skepticism are to be found in the GOP record on virtually every question before the Nation in 1956. One of the many cases in point is the new Benson 6-point program for agriculture, which President Eisenhower has endorsed 100 percent and expanded to 9 points.

Though carefully designed to make the farmers forget the GOP's empty 1952 promise of 100-percent parity for agriculture in the market place, the GOP's 1956 promise does not seem likely to ease concern among husbandmen and tillers of the soil over 3 straight years of declining income. Neither does it seem likely to lessen their disillusionment over the administration's failure to keep its pledge on 90-percent parity supports.

The new proposals include such promises as a vigorous purchase program to remove market gluts, an enlarged program of soil conservation, and incentive payments to farmers for diverting croplands to grass, trees, and forage (the soil-bank plan), an expanded rural-development program for low-income families, and stepped-up research.

The record, alas, shows that the administration has been headed in the opposite direction in all these fields. In practice, the Republican program has featured curtailed credit for farmers, budget cuts for REA, elimination of public-power preference clauses which are essential to continued expansion of rural electrification, higher interest rates on disaster relief loans and on Farmers' Home Administration loans, and a reorganization of the Soil Conservation Service, which has seriously impaired its usefulness.

In the matter of assisting low-income farm families. Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse and other Benson lieutenants have talked as if the best thing that could happen to the small farmer would be for him to get out of farming.

Still retained in the administration's program are the flexible or sliding-scale price supports despite the fact that the parity ratio in 3 years has dropped from 95 percent to 80 percent (as of mid-December 1955). Still guiding the administration is the Benson concept that price supports are merely insurance against "undue disaster." With farm prices down 18 percent, farm income down 17 percent, and the parity ratio down 15 percent since the GOP took office, and with a further decline for 1956 forecast, the question of where "undue disaster" begins grows more pressing.

Another feature of the GOP's 1956 reform in the farm area is that all the attractive Republican innovations are borrowed from their political opponents. The administration's soil-bank program, for instance, is similar to an acreage reserve plan which Democrats twice proposed in 1955, and which the administration opposed each time.

The new soil-bank proposals are actually a revival of a program conducted just before World War II under the 1936 Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended in 1938, in the Roosevelt administration. At that time, however, it was operated in conjunction with—and not as a substitute for—specific price supports to supplement the income of farmers, who agreed to use their diverted acreage for soil building, rather than soil-depleting cash crops.

At other important points in the state of the Union message, there are equally interesting and equally belated administration turnabouts.

The administration now is ready to abandon its banker's highway bill, which last year drew wide condemnation as a piece of extreme fiscal irresponsibility. Even Mr.

Eisenhower's own Comptroller General criticized the administration's proposal to issue $21 billion in highway bonds without counting that huge outlay as part of the Federal debt. Under that plan for every $1 spent for new roads, 55 cents would have gone to bankers and bondholders to pay debt costs. The administration's tardy shift from that scheme removes a major obstacle to action for badly needed highway improvements on a pay-as-you-go Federal-aid program which Democrats have pressed for all along.

The administration at last recognizes that something substantial should be done for public-school construction. It is ready to up Federal aid to $250 million a year, from the token $66 million it offered in last year's Eisenhower's program. However, the new proposal still suffers by comparison with the Democratic program it imitates. Meanwhile, another year has been lost in making a start toward meeting the Nation's critical classroom shortage.

The administration now is ready to increase Federal outlays for medical research and new medical research facilities. Meanwhile, the Nation feels the ill effects of 3 years of administration slashes in funds for medical research, and 3 years in which President Eisenhower recommended not one penny for research facilities construction.

The administration now makes another gesture for housing proposing 35,000 additional public housing units in each of the next 2 years. It still is far behind the modest goal of 135,000 units annually which Mr. Republican himself, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, set as a minimum back in 1949. Meanwhile, the Nation's substandard housing and slum blight problem grows apace, and the Federal agency in this field deteriorates steadily under the administration of the arch-foe of public housing whom Mr. Eisenhower appointed in 1953.

Mr. Eisenhower now calls for faster progress without delay in water-resources development. Why has his administration failed to request funds for a single new multipurpose project in its first 3 years in office? Why has it dragged its feet on 107 reclamation and resources development projects which Congress authorized in 1955?

The administration understandably is silent at this time about its partnership policy in the public utilities field, under which the Nation's public power development program has been brought to a complete halt while the administration engineered the Dixon-Yates deal and the Hells Canyon giveaway.

The administration now speaks reassuringly of efforts to aid small business and check monopoly. Its promise is vague, at best, but there is no uncertainty about the GOP record, which shows that since the last half of 1952 small-business profits are down 66 percent, while big-business profits are up 46 percent, small-business investors' returns are down 57 percent in contrast to a 36 percent gain in returns of big-business investors, business mergers in 1954 were triple the mergers in 1949, bank mergers are at an all-time high.

The administration now is coming forward with a program to aid distressed communities and a disaster-insurance program, both diluted versions of programs initiated by Democrats in Congress.

So it goes all along the line—amending the 1953 Refugee Relief Act, correcting inequities in the Taft-Hartley Act, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, liberalizing foreign trade, improving transportation. In almost every case, the administration's action comes 3 years late, the proposals copy Democratic programs.

This is, of course, the liberalism of Coolidge and Hoover, adapted to a later time. The fundamental Coolidge-Hoover philosophy shows through most clearly in the administration's tax stand. It now puts Federal debt reduction and a balanced budget before tax relief. Anything else it condemns as irresponsible. As Senator LYNDON JOHNSON observes, the administration acted exactly contrary to its proclaimed 1956 principles in 1954, when its tax program to help corporations and the larger income earners contributed several billions to an unbalanced budget and an enlarged Federal debt.

The 3-year Republican slowdown at home accounts in large measure for the decline of American leadership abroad, and for the worsening of the free world's prospects in the cold war. On the foreign front, the administration now moves to assume a less negative posture. For one thing, it has upped its defense budget for next year $1 billion over the current year. However, most authorities agree that this increased spending will not bring a military buildup. The extra billion will go to pay for last year's unbudgeted pay increases for the armed services, and for higher steel costs. What actually is happening, as Ernest K. Lindley observes in Newsweek, is that we are now getting less bang for a buck. Actually, it's a case of less defense for more money.

On foreign military and economic aid, the administration is trying to modify its 3-year deemphasis of international cooperation. Concerning this fourth quarter reverse play, the Nashville Tennessean comments:

"Even before the New Year dawned, White House and State Department experts were painfully reexamining the muddled foreign policy which left them groping after Geneva's depressing second meeting. All they have left, as Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, notes, is more and more expenditures abroad where Russia's mountebank salesmen have appeared, and that might bankrupt the country if carried on indefinitely.

"At the same time the Defense Department admits its pennypinching policies have handicapped the country in building for security, especially where the Air Force and guided missiles are concerned. After having brushed off repeated warnings, it now is frantically trying to catch up with the procession * * *.

"Republican alarm is shown in the sudden swing New Dealward, to the great displeasure of party conservatives in and out of Congress. But even this shift is no spur of confidence when it is realized that the same team is out there in the international bowl with the destinies of the Nation in its hands."

Such is the true picture of the state of the Union, which the President views through rose-colored glasses. In no case does he sound an adequate alert to the multitudinous problems which the Nation faces.

There is, of course, in the 1956 Eisenhower messages greater recognition of the Nation's needs than has ever before come from the Republicans. This is election year. "Which is why the administration is proposing greater liberality in various items," as Eric Sevareid observes in a CBS news analysis.

That is a form of progress, to be sure, but it should blind no one to the temporary nature of the Republican Liberal Hour.

As Washington columnist Thomas L. Stokes notes, Calvin Coolidge, if he were still living, "would be flabbergasted if he could pore through the pages of President Eisenhower's farm message and what he said in the annual message * * * and read how much is proposed that not even the most imaginative would have dreamed of in Calvin Coolidge's generation."

Mr. Stokes recalls Silent Cal's remark at one point in the farm depression of the 1920's: "Farmers never have made money. I don't think there's much we can do about it."

But something was done—in fact, a great deal—in two imaginative Democratic administrations, over the bitter opposition of the Republicans. That change has established the parity principle for agriculture as a permanent American goal—a goal which has been attained under Democratic government, and for which the American people will continue to fight until Coolidge's party also fully accepts a fair deal for our basic agricultural industry.

In the quarter century since Coolidge, the Republicans have been forced to modify their stand, resorting more and more to imitation of the Democrats. At the same time, they have opposed this change as hotly as their political strategists thought they dared. Right now, they are in deep trouble again for resisting the change more openly than was politically expedient.

The Late Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the terms statesman, legislator, lawyer, and American are used in their finest senses when they are applied to our beloved colleague, CHAUNCEY REED, of Illinois. It is with great sorrow that we face the loss of one whom we have loved as a man and respected as a Member of this House. It is with a sad heart that I pay tribute to CHAUNCEY REED.

Ever since I came to Congress I have regarded him as a close, personal friend—perhaps the closest among my colleagues. He entered Congress 2 years before I did; and in the 20 years of our association here, there has never been a time when I could not rely upon his good judgment.

The deeper I am touched the more difficult it is for me to give expression to my feelings. I know of no better words to express what I presently feel than the words of the following poem that I have committed to memory. The poem expresses both sympathy for the loss of a dear one, and the hope of immortality and reunion.

There is no death! the stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! the dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow tinted flowers.

There is no death! although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead! they have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet:
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

Close Mexican Border to Minors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation both in this Congress and the 83d Congress aimed at closing the Mexican border to United States minors who are not accompanied by their parents or cannot show legitimate reason for going to Mexican border towns.

These border towns are notorious sink-holes of vice and illegal narcotics. They are the last places that our impressionable youth should be allowed to visit unescorted. Southern California's juvenile delinquency problem has been exceedingly complicated because presently minors do have free access to these border towns.

In making these statements no offense is meant or should be inferred as to the Mexican Government and its officials. They recognize the problem and are doing all in their power to clean up these areas. The fact remains, however, that until they are cleaned up, they are no place for America's youth to roam.

An exceedingly unrealistic attitude has been taken by the State and Justice Departments in reporting unfavorably on my proposal. Particularly as respects to an assumption that passage of the legislation would give affront to our neighbors to the south. From what I can gather, they do not want American youngsters in these border towns complicating their policing problems any more than we want them down there. Rather than an affront, I believe we would gain the gratitude of Mexican officials for adopting the border-closing measure.

The following article carried by the February 7 issue of the Long Beach Press Telegram is just one of many examples why the Mexican border should be closed to minors:

LONG BEACH BOY, 16, ADMITS TRAFFIC IN MARIHUANA ACROSS BORDER

(By Fred Bolinger)

A 16-year-old former Jordan High School boy calmly admitted to detectives today that he hitchhiked to Tijuana recently and brought a "tin" of marihuana for resale in Long Beach.

The marihuana, which cost $8, can be rolled into 100 "joints," or cigarettes, and marketed at $50 to $100, Detective Inspector George E. Doyle reported.

The youth whistled to show his complacence as he was quizzed by Doyle and juvenile officer James A. Sprague.

He didn't reveal the slightest concern over the fact that by possessing marihuana, he had committed a felony, officers said. The boy has been "in and out" of the narcotics racket for more than a year, Doyle said.

When the boy went to Tijuana he was on probation for having been involved in narcotics crimes. Answering Doyle's questions, the youth revealed that he went "across the line in daylight, alone, hitchhiking both ways."

He couldn't recall how many trips he'd made to Mexico during the past year to buy narcotics, but Doyle said 10 or 12 trips probably would be "near right."

The "tin" of marihuana was found wrapped in a Mexican newspaper dated February 2.

It was uncovered in the boy's bedroom, in the home of a friend. The latter had befriended the boy, allowing him to live there while he taught him the plasterer's trade.

The friend told Inspector Doyle that he and his wife thought he "was a nice boy" and felt sorry for him and therefore took him into their home.

The boy was to be returned today to the juvenile court referee for investigation of probation violation. The local juvenile bureau will file a petition asking that the youth be made a ward of juvenile court.

If the court should consider the boy incorrigible, the lad would be tried as an adult and sent to the California Youth Authority if found guilty of the felony.

Police arrested the boy Sunday night after officers fired four shots into a car in which he and three adult narcotic suspects were fleeing in the vicinity of Long Beach Boulevard and Adams Street.

FHA Should Trust Local Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the Members of Congress to an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer under date of Wednesday, February 15, 1956, entitled "FHA Should Trust Local Agencies":

FHA SHOULD TRUST LOCAL AGENCIES

Two of the witnesses at Monday's 1-day congressional hearing on housing, Oscar H. Steiner and Upshur Evans, presented some hard facts on the difficulties of getting anywhere in low-cost housing with the Federal Housing Administration as a partner in the enterprise. Their testimony, based on practical experience, should receive special attention in Washington if Congress is going to do anything about removing some of the Federal roadblocks to urban redevelopment.

The position of Steiner, who is president of Community Development, Inc., was that the FHA is more of a hindrance than a help in getting such housing under way and built. He spoke as the builder of a project in Parma with FHA assistance, and of housing now abuilding at East 79th Street and Woodland Avenue without FHA. His experience with FHA soured him.

Director Evans of the civic-minded, nonprofit Cleveland Development Foundation, which helped financially in Steiner's 79th-Woodland homes, reviewed the many hurdles and long delays in the foundation's Garden Valley projects. After nearly 2 years, some bricks may be laid there beginning in April.

The urgency of getting low-cost housing for those in the slums, so unfit hovels can be wiped out, was stressed by other witnesses at the hearing. This is an old story, but it deserves frequent repeating. And it points up the dilemma that is continually being compounded by the built-in delays caused by Housing Act rules.

The answer for getting some momentum in doing the job, in the views of Steiner, Evans and others, is increased local autonomy. FHA's fixed extensive preliminaries not only don't help in getting started, they exasperate private businessmen and public officials who enter into prospective projects with good will and high hopes, then see them dashed. And the FHA regulations have had the effect of forcing higher building costs which tend to defeat the purpose of the projects.

If the city and the Federal Government cannot trust local institutions like the Development Foundation, reputable private builders and public bodies in arriving at sensible, adequate solutions for pressing problems, then it can trust no one.

We hope the lessons being learned here and in other large cities which have been reviewed by the congressional committee will bring the desired changes in legislation. As the queen observed of Wonderland, you have to keep moving quickly in slum elimination just to keep up with yourself, and you have to run twice as fast if you want to make any progress.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by C. L. Sulzberger, and appearing in the New York Times of January 13, 1956. This article is not a very optimistic one; its tenor is clearly nonoptimistic:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—BRINK OF WAR POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, February 12.—At present Soviet foreign policy is relatively static in Europe. To the west, where living standards contrast favorably with those of the U. S. S. R., Moscow concentrates on freezing positions and digesting previous gains. But to the south and east, in Asia, where endemic conditions are deplorable, policy remains dynamic. Bolshevik ideology and Russian power continue to push outward.

This Asian program has three facets. In the center it drives from the Oxus frontier over Afghanistan and toward India. To the east it adjusts to the new Communist behemoth, China, support for that massive state and inherent rivalries with it. And to the southwest it turns into the Levant. There, by pressure, by guile, by diplomacy, and by maneuver it seeks to extend its influence toward Suez and the Persian Gulf.

Convinced of communism's inevitable global triumph, Molotov is practicing his own "brink of war" strategy in the restless Middle East. All the inherent contradictions that Marxism sees in the capitalist world are unfortunately prevalent there: Anglo-American-French rivalries; psychopathic legacies of past colonial empires; dynastic strife and ugly religious fervor. The West insists this is its own Pandora's box.

WARM-WATER ASPIRATIONS

We may resent the Kremlin's intervention. But surely we should not be surprised. Since Czarist days Russia has looked eagerly to warm-water ports and oil. Molotov memorialized Hitler in 1940: "The area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf should be recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union." Moscow asked of the Allies bases in the Dardanelles and Bosporus, positions in the Red Sea and a voice in northern Africa. The Montreux Convention that governs the Turkish Straits expires next November. U. S. S. R. diplomacy is now lining up support for a new deal in that region.

The Russians previously have faltered in the Middle East. Even a weak Iran was able to eject them from its northern provinces.

Ankara's obstinacy frustrated the Soviets in Turkey. But the situation that developed in 1955 was too favorable for the Kremlin to neglect. An unnecessary crisis was permitted to develop in Cyprus creating a gap between the Greeks and Turks and opening the road for penetration. Simultaneously we challenged the U. S. S. R. by fostering the Baghdad Pact. Communist reaction was to leapfrog across this northern tier, already split at Turkey's western border, and peddle arms and influence among the Arab States.

This left us in a highly embarrassed position. Colonel Nasser, who aspires to Arab leadership, has used his new weapons to successfully blackmail the West. He confides great admiration for Tito, who showed him how to get help from both power blocs without joining either. Nasser is an apt pupil. The satellite arms deal with Cairo changed a strategic balance the Allies sought uneasily to preserve. By June, Egypt alone will have a military edge on Israel. The approach of this date therefore brings the world closer to the brink of war. Israeli jingoes urge their government to strike before then. Later, they fear, the Arabs will prepare an overall assault. Meanwhile the West, insisting Russia can have no say in Palestine, assumes responsibility for a peace it may be unable to keep.

COMMUNISM GAINS STRENGTH

Cairo is just as intent as Moscow on destroying the Baghdad Pact. Feudal Saudi Arabia presses its vendetta against the Hashemite dynasties in Jordan and Iraq. To obtain funds for subversion and propaganda King Saud has overdrawn his royalties with American petroleum companies by more than 2 years. From Cairo to Damascus underground communism gains strength. Three north Lebanese trade unions are now controlled by party agents. Syria's labor federation has succumbed. An agent of Britain's Iraq Petroleum Co. predicts that within 5 years communism may take over Syria.

Already it has penetrated the colonies of miserable Arab refugees who are not allowed to work in the states that harbor them. It has managed to make great headway among Moslem Nationalists. Nasser says: "We know there are underground Communists here. If they can convince the people that we are agents of the West they can gain control."

Even in Turkey new pressures are commencing. Unwise investment policies have brought that country to the verge of bankruptcy. Ankara has asked us for an emergency loan of $300 million. We have refused unless planning is revised. Now Moscow tells the Turks: Your economy sags because American pressure forces you to maintain a wartime footing.

For the first time the Soviets appear ready to gamble on an audacious Middle East policy. They have even cold-bloodedly encouraged the area to the brink of Palestine war. Why? Last summer in Geneva Moscow became convinced world conflict is excluded as too dangerous. A little holocaust is therefore worth the risk. For by its own insistence only the West could be involved.

Mr. Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief but warm letter which recognizes the efforts of Mr. Max Abelman in helping the 1955 fund drive of the United Hospital and Visiting Nurse Association of Brooklyn.

Mr. Abelman is a great humanitarian known throughout New York State for his charitable deeds. His heart and his energies know no bounds and his helping hand is everywhere. A community that has men of this type is indeed very fortunate.

The letter, addressed to Mr. Abelman, is written by Mr. J. William Stuart, chairman of the 1955 United Hospital campaign in Brooklyn. It reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: It is difficult for one volunteer to thank another. It is especially the case with thanking you because so much of your work is obviously done without the expectation of reward. Nevertheless, I do wish to express my appreciation for the efforts you have put forward in helping achieve the success enjoyed by the 1955 United Hospital Fund and Visiting Nurse Association of Brooklyn Campaign.

It is only through the work of community-minded individuals like yourself that our voluntary institutions continue to offer the high quality of service from which we all benefit. And I fully realize that your efforts on behalf of the Fund are only one aspect of your multifaceted interest in public service. This is well testified to by the recent honors awarded you.

Please accept my wholehearted thanks,

Very sincerely yours,

J. WILLIAM STUART,
Brooklyn Chairman, 1955 United Hospital Fund and Visiting Nurse Association of Brooklyn Campaign.

The 38th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians throughout the world will be observing the 38th anniversary of their homeland's independence. This observance offers us an opportunity to pause and reflect upon the suffering of the enslaved Lithuanians and to consider what we and the other free nations can do to encourage them during this time of oppression and to assist in making possible their eventual liberation.

The glorious history of this nation discloses the constant struggle for freedom which it has made against the tyrannical forces of aggression and proves that the liberty and freedom of any nation cannot be taken for granted, but preserved only by eternal vigilance and a strong national defense against enemies from within and without. During her period of independence, 1918–40, Lithuania made remarkable progress in every phase of life and received the recognition of the other free nations for her cultural, educational, and economic growth. All of these achievements were suspended and destroyed when this country became occupied for the second time by Russia in 1940; then by the Nazi forces, 1941–44; and then reoccupied and ruled by the Soviet forces up to the present day. Even though Lithuania's national status has been eradicated by Communist Russia, her people have not despaired and are fully united in their determination to reestablish their complete independence and to once more resume their tasks of development and progress.

On this anniversary day I wish to assert my own hope that in the not too distant future all obstacles in the way of peace will be hurdled and that the day of freedom will again come for these courageous people.

Coal Industry Sees Increased Demands on It To Meet the Nation's Energy Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am deeply interested in the entire subject of energy and the relationship of all our resources of energy. My district includes large coal reserves and important mining operations. Because of my interests in the atom, coal and energy generally, I am deeply impressed by the statement made by Mr. Tom Pickett, executive vice president of National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in which he discusses the importance of the coal industry to our national prosperity and defense, and the possible impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I think the statement is an enlightening, constructive, and fair contribution to our knowledge. It indicates some of the things that the coal industry is doing to develop new markets, as through the conversion of solid fuels to gas and oil. The enterprising coal industry in my State of Illinois is constantly alert to new markets and I can foresee a long period when the coal industry will be in an expanded era of production. I ask leave to print Mr. Pickett's statement in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF TOM PICKETT, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION, TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, FEBRUARY 15, 1956

The National Coal Association is the trade organization of the bituminous coal mine owners and operators whose total production is two-thirds of all the commercial bituminous coal produced in the United States.

The coal industry has a deep interest in the progress of atomic energy, both from the standpoint of its military potential and the peaceful applications. The association has reviewed the principles involved through a committee established for that purpose. The committee is composed of the following: Kenneth A. Spencer (chairman), president,

Pittsburg & Midway Coal Mining Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Joseph T. Berta, president, Pittston Clinchfield Coal Sales Corp., New York City; L. Russell Kelce, president, Sinclair Coal Co., Kansas City, Mo.; R. H. Knode, chairman of the board, Stonega Coke & Coal Co., Philadelphia; George H. Love, president, Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh; A. R. Matthews, president, Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc., Pocahontas, Va.; M. L. Patton, vice president, Truax-Traer Coal Co., Cincinnati; and R. E. Salvati, president, Island Creek Coal Co., Huntington, W. Va.

As a result of our committee's study, the board of directors of the National Coal Association on November 1, 1955, adopted a resolution setting forth the policy of the coal industry on atomic energy.

At the outset, it should be made clear the coal industry recognizes the need to continue the development of nuclear energy under Government sponsorship. We recognize that in the anticipated growth of the Nation and rising demand for energy, all sources have a very important part to play, including coal, oil, natural gas, and atomic energy if it is developed to the point of economic feasibility under our free enterprise system. There are many unsolved problems in the field of energy other than in the nuclear program. They should be given their proportionate share of consideration and research by the Government.

The resolution above referred to is as follows:

"Be it resolved by the Directors of the National Coal Association, That the following facts and principles should be considered by the executive branch of the Federal Government, the Members of Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the American people, in determining the role of the Federal Government in the development of atomic energy:

"I. In the progression of humanity, in furthering world trade, in advancing the cause of peace, and in maintaining the world leadership of the United States, there is a need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear energy. To this end, the National Coal Association recognizes the need for the Government to support the national laboratories and to carry out the basic as well as applied research in the field of atomic energy.

"II. Future development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide power for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The National Coal Association therefore recognizes the need for the Government to continue the power demonstration program to optimize the conditions under which atomic power is generated.

"III. The public interest requires that atomic energy be utilized principally in whatever ways or processes it will contribute efficiently to the energy requirements of the United States and the world. The conversion of solid fuels to gas and to liquid fuels through the utilization of atomic energy promises great benefits to the people of the United States. The national laboratory effort should be directed toward minimizing atomic energy fuel processing costs, increasing the safety of reactor systems against the public hazards, and developing high temperature materials of construction to the end that all sources of energy will receive their fair share of the total effort to achieve progress.

"IV. The United States is one of the few nations of the world blessed with sufficient reserves of fossil fuels to meet the Nation's power requirements at low cost for centuries to come. In the United States the most economic source of steam-generated electric power in the foreseeable future will be plants fueled by coal, oil, or natural gas. Under the competitive stimulus of our free enterprise system, the ingenuity of the American people will bring about the most beneficial results that can be obtained from all energy sources, including coal, oil, natural gas and atomic energy.

"V. The public interest demands dissemination of actual cost information with respect to nuclear fuels to the greatest extent compatible with national security. To the extent that Government subsidies are necessary in the development stages of the nuclear program, the public should be informed as to the magnitude thereof. There can be no reliable forecast of the comparative costs of power generation until nuclear fuel costs, and the cost of the safe disposal of radioactive wastes, are established.

"VI. The Nation's best interests are not served by unwarranted optimism about the early availability of low-cost nuclear power."

The reading of the resolution reveals in itself that the coal industry is in agreement with some of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. We have scrutinized the report of the panel and we believe it contributes a great deal to the public knowledge about present and prospective energy supplies and requirements.

One outstanding contribution to the public knowledge resulting from the report of the panel is the focusing of attention on the expected vast growth in energy demands and the part which the coal industry must play in meeting those demands. The public must also be made aware of the importance of coal and the capital outlay required for expansion to meet that vast growth in demand.

The report and its background material show that the Nation will rely on the coal industry for a large share of its increased energy supplies. They include figures furnished by the United States Bureau of Mines showing that by 1980 the Nation will need as a minimum 784 million tons of coal (nearly double the amount produced in 1955). The figures further show that in 1980 the Nation may need in excess of 1 billion tons of coal per year. These estimates are based on the assumption that synthetic liquid fuels will not be required during the period under discussion. When coal needs to be converted into synthetic liquid fuels to supply requirements for that type of energy, the demands on coal will be much greater.

The increasing demands for energy raise the question of whether there are adequate reserves of fossil fuels to meet the requirements. The facts furnished by the Bureau of Mines show the United States has nearly a trillion tons of economically recoverable bituminous coal. That is enough to last a thousand years, even if we are called upon to double the current rate of production. Further analysis of figures supplied by the Bureau of Mines shows that approximately one-fourth of those reserves are recoverable at or near present costs (enough to last nearly 500 years at the current rate of production). Again, the Bureau of Mines figures show nearly 300 billion tons more of those reserves (enough to last an additional 500 years at the current rate of production) could be recovered at from 1¼ to 1½ times present costs. There is, therefore, an ample supply of bituminous coal to furnish the energy demands on our industry not only for the quarter of a century within the purview of the panel report but for the next millenium.

We not only have the coal—we have the ability to produce it. The production record through two World Wars and that in Korea is evidence of that ability. The progress achieved in the last 15 years is further reassuring evidence that the Nation can rely upon the coal industry for its energy demands. In 1940 only 35 percent of underground coal production was mechanically loaded, and national productivity averaged slightly over 5 tons per man per day. At the present time more than 82 percent is mechanically loaded and national productivity averages 9 tons per man per day. The panel report recognizes that where mining conditions are favorable production reaches 20 tons per man per day for underground mines and 40 tons per man per day for strip mines. The Bureau of Mines estimates that national average productivity will increase to 15 tons per man per day by 1980. Mechanization in all phases of coal mining is increasing at a steady rate. The Bureau of Mines states that significant developments are expected in all phases of the coal economy, including mining, transportation, improvement in present utilization, and in new or expanded uses.

Kenneth A. Spencer, chairman of the National Coal Association's Atomic Energy Committee, in his statement before the panel on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, stated the following:

"The Bureau of Mines quite properly sees improved mining equipment for underground, strip and auger type mining, also improved methods of transportation, such as conveyor and pipeline systems, all of which will increase the economically recoverable reserves of coal. There are, however, other developments which will further enlarge recoverable reserves and reduce the delivered B. t. u. cost of coal. Substantially improved methods of preparation make possible the utilization of coal which was previously not commercially salable. The recent introduction of new low-cost explosives has substantially reduced that important cost of strip mining, thereby affecting both total mining costs and reserves which can be mined. The development of new processes in which coal is simultaneously used as a source of fuel and raw material, such as the low temperature char projects, make feasible integrated operations on previously unusable reserves of lignite.

"If we look down the road 25 or 50 years as we are doing in this atomic energy study, we will, no doubt, see the commercial development of coal gasification at the mine and perhaps the underground gasification of coal. All these factors will tend not only to increase recoverable reserves, but also reduce the delivered B. t. u. cost, particularly to utilities."

We concur in the panel's recommendation that "the Commission recognize that military requirements for uranium are the present reason for ore-price guaranties and that a free market should be the objective for the era of expanded peaceful uses without guaranties." We endorse the panel's recommendation that "the guaranteed price schedules for the production of special nuclear materials should be declassified to make possible public examination of this important financial device." We agree with the panel that "the inherent requirement for less secrecy and freer flow of significant information concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy is greater than the encouragements to this end contained in the 1954 act."

The panel deserves to be congratulated for its contribution to the public knowledge about the benefits to humanity which are possible of attainment from atomic energy in such fields as agriculture, food preservation, medicine and health, and industrial processing. Obviously research in those fields should be the subject of intense effort. We note that progress in these fields is not dependent upon progress in the power field—the panel report contains a statement that the practical limit of radioactive products which science, medicine, and industry can absorb "will probably be much less than the annual fission waste from a single power reactor, such as is now being constructed at Shippingport, Pa."

As set forth in our policy resolution, and as indicated in what has heretofore been said today, we agree with the panel in its conclusion that there is a need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear energy, for the progression of humanity, for furthering world trade, for advancing the cause of peace, and for maintaining the world leadership of the United States.

We do, however, find ourselves in disagreement with some of the overoptimistic and too-enthusiastic interpretations, implications, and conclusions drawn from language in the report, as well as some of the inferences deduced therefrom. For example, we cite those portions of the panel's report which imply that there is an "urgent" need for the development of nuclear power to meet the domestic energy demands. In this respect, portions of the panel's report are inconsistent with other portions. On the one hand, it leaves the impression that the development of nuclear power is necessary to maintain our expanding economy, and states that there is "urgency" associated with "the need for establishing atomic energy as a power resource available to assist in maintaining maximum expansion rates of our economy." On the other hand, the report recognizes that "there is no current urgent need for new sources of fuel for the production of electric energy."

Again, the panel report raises the question of the ability of the coal industry to increase production, while, at the same time, it recognizes the ever-increasing productivity of the industry which is predicted to continue. A resolution of that question may be achieved by reference to the facts as set forth on pages 4 and 5 of this statement.

The report points out that "the growth of electric power expresses in one simple index the American miracle of productivity and living standards," and it recognizes that growing energy demands must be fully met in order to sustain a dynamic and expanding economy. It contains a forecast that United States total electric-generating capability will grow from 103 million kilowatts in 1954 (it was in excess of 113 million in 1955) to somewhere between 358 and 600 million kilowatts in 1980.

We commend the panel for its selection of the growth of electric power as a simple index of the American miracle of productivity and living standards. The record of the electric utilities for uninterrupted low-cost power was made possible by the coal industry's ability to deliver B. t. u.'s on a dependable schedule where needed and at costs competitive with those of other fuels in the most populous areas of the United States. As to the future, I quote again from Mr. Spencer, who stated to the panel: "It is the considered judgment of the leaders of the coal industry that we will be in a position to supply fuel for the growing electric-energy needs of the United States at a reasonable cost for many, many years to come."

If the most optimistic hopes of the nuclear power enthusiasts are met, the Bureau of Mines figures show that in 1980 either 552 million or 938 million tons of coal will be required to meet the Nation's energy needs, depending upon whether the low or the high forecast of electric-generating capability materializes. It should be noted that the optimistic forecasts quoted by the panel would have nuclear power generating less than a quarter of the Nation's electricity in 1980. These statements emphasize the Nation's long-range dependence upon coal as the primary source of low-cost power. We believe some atomic generated electricity may help supplement coal in supplying the Nation's need for that energy. We believe atomic energy will neither destroy the coal industry nor reduce the Nation's need for a strong, healthy coal industry with a maintained capacity that can be expanded to supply enough fuel to sustain a dynamic and expanding economy.

The public should be informed as to the magnitude of government subsidies which are considered necessary in the development stages of the nuclear program. We do not object to these subsidies under the power demonstration program while atomic power is still in the development stages. However, we do wish to point out that vigilance on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission and your committee will be required to prevent abuse of the authority to subsidize the development phase of nuclear power. AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss illustrated this point in a speech delivered by him on November 9, 1955, when he said:

"The information paid for in this manner must, of course, be new information which will supplement existing knowledge, otherwise it cannot be said to contribute to the advancement of the art. This means that the Government, generally speaking, will not invest in projects which appear to duplicate each other. Under this philosophy the Commission could not justify giving financial assistance to research and development work on 2 or 3 reactors which are of the same type and size, and which, therefore, could be expected to produce the same or very similar data."

On February 9, 1956, Chairman Strauss announced that the AEC had accepted as a basis for negotiations, the Yankee Atomic Electric Co.'s proposal to construct, with Government subsidy, a pressurized water reactor plant. Mr. Strauss said, "Research and development work to be done for this plant would supplement work required in the development of the pressurized water reactor, a plant of the same general type, which is being built at Shippingport, Pa., in a project jointly sponsored by the Commission and the Duquesne Light Co."

We don't know whether the Yankee atomic plant is sufficiently different from the Shippingport plant to warrant Government subsidy. We do say, however, that your committee and the Atomic Energy Commission has an important task in seeing that a Government-subsidized plant does not essentially duplicate a previous plant. If this task is not adequately performed, the program to subsidize development of the nuclear program could be converted into a distortion of our free enterprise system.

In the coal industry's policy resolution, we take the position that "The Nation's best interests are not served by unwarranted optimism about the early availability of low-cost nuclear power." We are pleased to note that the panel report brings this matter into sharp focus. The panel feels that a better-informed public opinion, stabilized in the framework of sound public policy, is necessary to provide a balance to special-interest pressures. The report states that "The public attitude which now exists could result in the Commission's being charged with delaying accomplishment of the full benefit of peaceful uses of atomic energy"—a charge which the panel feels is completely unjustified. We concur with the report on this matter.

An informed public opinion with respect to atomic power is vital in many ways. For example, the report states that among the factors which may accelerate or retard the growth of nuclear power is the possibility of extensive programs for the construction of publicly subsidized or publicly owned nuclear power plants. If the public is given all possible factual information about the nuclear power program, including the full amount of those cost elements which can be determined at this time and the magnitude of the problems which must be overcome before nuclear power can compete with conventional fuels, the public will then decide if there is need for extensive programs for the construction of publicly subsidized or publicly owned nuclear power plants.

As set forth in the report, "Some highly publicized statements, however, do not take these facts into serious consideration. Announcements of plans are sometimes mistaken for accomplishment of objectives. This would be of no serious consequence in itself, if it did not tend to affect future conditions. Words sometimes outrun deeds. Some real facts, such as the use of the threat of development of low-cost atomic power as leverage over conventional fuel and transportation costs, may well be magnified out of proportion in the public mind. This overmagnification in the public mind might add up to real losses of potential atomic benefits and reduce the value of peaceful atomic development as an element of United States leadership."

There are other ways in which this "overmagnification" reacts to the detriment of the public interest. The Nation's dependence upon conventional fuels for the bulk of its energy requirements means that the coal industry must have available to it ever-increasing numbers of trained engineers. Individual companies and associations within the industry have through the years established scholarships for the education of mining engineers. More are in contemplation. We expect to be able to meet our need for trained technicians. However, if our young people are erroneously led to believe that nuclear power will soon supplant conventional fuels, difficulties may be encountered in attracting sufficient numbers to this important field.

If this "overmagnification in the public mind" continues to grow, the Nation may well suffer from curtailed research on improved efficiency in the generation of electricity from conventional fuels. The Bureau of Mines points out that electrical generating plants at present consume about 1 pound of coal per kilowatt-hour, and this is expected to be reduced, through continued progress, by at least 0.05 pounds per kilowatt-hour for each 5-year period. The Bureau also states that "Direct conversion of coal into electricity is a possible interesting development but one that will not come into fruition until beyond the period under discussion." "Overmagnification" of the prospects of nuclear power might cause some curtailment in efforts along these lines.

There is a way to correct the public's erroneous impression that low-cost nuclear power is on the verge of achievement. It can be done by the dissemination of facts. We believe the information contained in the panel report should help a great deal to bring about a "better informed public opinion." The panel suggests "the technical and economic realities of this stage of development of peaceful uses, especially in the field of atomic power, are not as yet entirely favorable, that present profitability is doubtful, and that future profitability is still not certain."

The panel points out that "An atomic-power reactor is a complex, expensive, and potentially hazardous machine. It is not a small black box in which one only has to put a lump of fissionable material. It cannot be transported in the luggage compartment of an automobile. It requires for its fabrication highly specialized techniques and materials. Its design demands a knowledge and ingenuity possessed today by relatively few people in the world. The task of bringing this source of power into reality is as great as is the challenge it offers to our society."

As set forth in the report, "Unless and until research and development demonstrate that atomic power can be economically feasible, there can be no substantial impact." The panel says that not until 1960 will we "have adequate technological information at hand on which to base judgment of the economic possibilities of atomic

energy as a power resource." The report recognizes that "If the nuclear energy industry is to become economically self-sufficient, more economical treatment methods of wastes must be devised," and that the insurance problem will have to be solved before privately owned reactors can be put into operation. At a recent press seminar on nuclear power, Mr. Kenneth Davis, head of the AEC Reactor Development Program, said: "In fact, we don't today know really how to do the chemical processing for as little cost—just for this part of the nuclear fuel cost alone—as we can probably afford to pay. So there are still many unsolved problems here since the fabrication and the chemical processing are both rather large."

We believe, as the Panel does, that proper dissemination of factual information of this type will contribute to a better informed public opinion with respect to nuclear power. Spectacular statements based on unwarranted optimism about the future availability of low-cost nuclear power have been all too common in the past. There is need to counteract the erroneous impression which has been communicated to the general public with facts—facts of the type contained in volume II of the report: "The fissionable material consumed by the nuclear plant represents but a small part of the nuclear fuel cost. When fabrication, reprocessing, and handling are included, nuclear fuel cost increases many times. The fuel cost computed in this manner for the *Nautilus* is about 50 times the cost of fuel oil for equal shaft power generation."

Instead of unfounded over-optimism, persons in a position to influence public opinion should disseminate information about the reasonable probabilities together with the known facts. It was recently revealed that power from the Shippingport reactor, which is the first full-scale power reactor which will be put into operation, is expected to cost in the neighborhood of 52 mills per kilowatt-hour in the early years of operation. This figure compares with a 3 to 8 mill range for power from conventional fuels. With proper publicity of the known facts, we will have a better informed public opinion.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize the following facts: The coal industry does not ask curtailment of basic and applied research in the field of atomic energy. We do seek a better informed public opinion through the dissemination of the known facts which bear upon the possibility of achieving low-cost nuclear power. On the basis of the known facts, we believe that in most sections of the United States the most economic source of steam-generated electric power in the foreseeable future will be plants fueled by fossil fuels. We believe that for the foreseeable future the maintenance of a dynamic and expanding economy will depend upon the availability of ever-increasing amounts of low-cost energy from coal. We have the coal reserves necessary to meet the Nation's needs. We have the know-how and the manpower to produce that coal. We confidently expect to meet the Nation's expanding energy demands within the framework of the free-enterprise system, without subsidy, and we believe the Nation's dependence upon coal warrants close congressional scrutiny to the end that legislative inequities against the coal industry shall be eliminated. We do not fear inroads upon our market by nuclear power—we believe that for many years to come the atomic-energy program will consume far more coal than is displaced by nuclear power.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today on behalf of the bituminous-coal industry.

Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is comforting to know that our young people are interested in prayer. One of the most interesting articles that I have seen lately is that by Miss Dorothy Carolyn Putnam, who is a freshman at the University of Arkansas. Her home is in Fort Smith, Ark.

She is a lovely person, and it is with much pleasure that I insert her article, which appeared in the Arkansas Methodist in the issue of December 1, 1955:

PRAYER—EXPOSURE TO GOD

(By Dorothy Carolyn Putnam [1])

It is interesting to speculate what would make the deepest impression on a visitor from the planet of Mars to our Earth. It might be the Empire State Building, towering above the other mighty skyscrapers of New York City. Or it might be our coal mines and oil wells, assuming that there are no such things on Mars. Or he might be astounded at our airplanes, as they landed and took off from a major airport. Perhaps such an ordinary thing as a field of green grass would impress him most, if he had never seen one before.

But there is a good chance that the most mysterious sight of all would be that of human beings at prayer. We have witnessed it so often that we tend to overlook the wonder of it. What would we think if we were viewing for the first time a person or a group of persons, with their eyes closed, their lips framing words, but the One to whom they were speaking not visible in any direction? To whom are they talking? Where is He? Does He hear? Does He answer? Does their talking do any good?

These and many other questions might enter the mind of our imaginary visitor. As a matter of fact, they often enter our minds also.

WHAT PRAYER IS NOT

Before we try to work out an understanding of what prayer is, it may be useful to dispose of a couple of false notions.

Prayer is not primarily asking God for something. Some people seem to think that it is. The very question so often heard, "Does God answer prayer?" implies that asking is the chief thing about praying. But that is not the case at all. In order to be sure of this point, all we have to do is to go through the Lord's Prayer, which Jesus gave His disciples as a model for them to follow, and see how much asking it contains. In the Lord's Prayer we begin by speaking to God, and about Him. We say that His name is to be held in reverence. We express the great hope of the coming of His kingdom, and the doing of His will on earth as in heaven. Not until we are half-way through do we express any petitions at all, and these are of a most general sort. We ask for our daily bread, which means not merely a loaf of bread but all that we need for our day-to-day existence. We ask that God will forgive us our sins, as we forgive those who sin against us. And we ask that we be not led into any more temptation than we can stand. That is all. Then our thoughts turn back to God once more, and we acknowledge that the kingdom and the power, and the glory belong to Him forever.

There is nothing here in the way of a request that tomorrow may be a nice day for the Sunday school picnic; or that we may get a job we are hoping for very much; or even that such and such a sick person may be made well. Certain phrases of this sort we would hesitate to insert into the Lord's Prayer. They don't seem to belong to it. The Lord's Prayer is not primarily about us at all; it is chiefly about God.

This is not to say that God is necessarily displeased if we ask Him for this or that occasionally.

The main point of prayer does not lie in asking.

Let us go a step further. Prayer is not primarily saying words. It may take the form of words spoken aloud, or words shaped silently by the lips, or meditation that is virtually wordless. When a group of people worship together, they almost have to say words in order to keep together in their approach to God. But in private prayer, the saying of words is strictly secondary. What is primary is the content and direction of a person's thoughts, what they are about, and in which way they are heading.

In particular, praying is not necessarily the same as saying prayers. We may do the former, and not mean much by it.

Real prayer is a matter of the "bent" of our souls. If what we say we want, and what we actually want, coincide, well and good. But if they are different, it is the latter that really counts.

WHAT PRAYER IS

A good definition of prayer is that it consists of a time exposure of the soul to God.

A good example of prayer is Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane during the agonizing hours just before the soldiers came to lead him away to be crucified. In this crisis he withdrew from his friends, to be alone with God. The words which he said have come down to us, or at least some of them: "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matthew 26: 39). Three times He prayed, using these same words. He was opening His soul wide to God. He was facing toward God, so that God's goodness, love, and purpose might register fully within His own life. He was making sure that God's will would be His will in this emergency, and that is prayer, at its highest.

A good analogy of prayer is Nathaniel Hawthorne's story of the Great Stone Face. The man in the story had lived in the presence of Him. That is what we mean by prayer.

What, then, shall we do when we come to pray? First of all, think about God. Turn our faces toward Him. Turn our thoughts toward Him. Turn our lives toward Him. At bedtime, we can run over in our minds the many evidences of God's goodness which we have seen that day.

When we pray in the morning, we turn Godward in the same way. This new day speaks to us of God. We see Him in it. We think about Him. Then our thoughts quite naturally get around to ourselves during this new day. What does He want us to do and be today? What would our lives be like if they resembled Him?

Wherever and whenever we pray, this is the basic pattern: opening our souls to God, and giving Him a chance at our own lives; thinking first about Him and then

[1] Miss Dorothy Carolyn Putnam is a member of the Midland Heights Methodist Church, Fort Smith. This article was a meditation given at the concluding service of the Midland Heights Youth Activities Week in August. Miss Putnam is a member of the Midland Heights MYF.

about ourselves. Prayer of this sort can take place in church, on a hike, in the course of a drive along country lanes or through city streets, during an examination in high school, or washing dishes at home. It may take a half hour, or a split second. If it follows this pattern it is true prayer. In the nature of things, we often come to God with some particular problem or burden on our minds.

We can and should come to God also with other people on our minds.

Having done and thought these things, we rest back finally in a sense of peace, like a good swimmer relaxing in the water, knowing that the water will support him if he doesn't struggle too much. We have been face to face with the Eternal. We see our own lives and life about us in a clearer light. We are reminded that around us and beneath us are the everlasting arms. Everything is all right with us, with those we love, and with the things in which we are interested. This is not guarantee against misfortune. It is rather the confidence that, whatever happens, nothing can really harm us. Nor is this the easy peace of dodging hard decisions. Rather it is the contentment of facing them squarely with God's help. And so we rest or work, in quietness and confidence. In His will is our peace.

DOES GOD HEAR PRAYER?

If radio's slim fingers can pluck a melody
From night and toss it over a continent or sea;
If the petaled white notes of a violin
Are blown across a mountain or a city's din;
If songs like crimson roses are culled from thin, blue air,
Why should mortals wonder if God hears prayer?

DOES HE ANSWER?

If we no longer think of prayer primarily in terms of asking for something, then this question takes an entirely different turn.

The highest answer we can hope for in our prayers is God Himself. If we pray long and hard, if we expose our souls consistently to God, His likeness will be stamped upon our lives more and more. We shall resemble Him increasingly. We shall enter into closer and closer fellowship with Him. Our lives will become more orderly and purposeful. Bewilderment and anxiety will decrease. We shall live as though we were seeing the invisible—which indeed we are.

What more can we want than this? This is the Christian life at its fullest. This is the secret of life itself.

Adventures in Interfaith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in which there is located one of the finest of modern hospitals, the Jewish Memorial Hospital. Recently, a local publication, the Interfaith Observer, published a story about the Jewish Memorial Hospital which deserves to be more widely read. I am pleased to introduce it herewith:

ADVENTURES IN INTERFAITH: JEWISH MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, WHERE THE ONLY CREED IS AID FOR THE ILL

Right in the heart of Washington Heights in a building located on Broadway and 196th Street, there is an institution that symbolizes, in its own distinctive way, the varied character of the communities of Washington Heights, Inwood, Riverdale, and West Bronx. It is the Jewish Memorial Hospital, an eight-storied structure set behind a well-kept lawn, which is now entering upon its 51st year of service.

A recent news story about the hospital further attests the interfaith character of the institution. Shortly after President Eisenhower had his heart attack, the children of the arts and crafts' division of the hospital's outpatient department decided to send him a get-well message. They did so in the form of a hammered-out copper plaque on which they wrote "get well." The signatures are revealing. The children who joined in this action were: Terry Kruska, Teddy Vlassopulos, Carolyn King, Adibah Salim, Theresa Claus, Carol Urban, Rose Overbeck, Michael Pappa, Chris Potter, Mamie Simmons, Lucy Flores, Roslyn Hirsch and Juliet Diaconis. In this variety of names there is the clearest indication of the universal character of Jewish Memorial Hospital.

This is not an accident. Jewish Memorial Hospital has, from the beginning, set out to be a community institution serving all of the people who need it without regard to race, color, creed or origin. It is no wonder that tributes to this striking quality were paid to the hospital on the occasion last year of the opening of its new Research Laboratory Building.

The event itself was a heartening demonstration of cooperation and good will. Among those who spoke and who sent messages of greeting were Dr. Ralph Bunche, the distinguished American who won the Nobel peace prize several years ago; Father James J. McNally, of the Church of Our Lady Queen of Martyrs, one of the best-known religious centers in the area; Mayor Robert F. Wagner; Rabbi Israel Goldstein; and the president of the board of trustees of Jewish Memorial Hospital, David Schwartz. Their words on that occasion are worth remembering.

Dr. Bunche said: "This dedication signals a new advance in the development of a distinguished institution which for nearly half a century has rendered invaluable service to the community. Its portals welcome the needy. Its staff and facilities are open to all races and creeds."

Mayor Wagner greeted the institution with the following tribute: "The addition of this important new facility for the expansion of the many noteworthy services provided by the Jewish Memorial Hospital is in keeping with the magnificent tradition of progress and contribution to our community's welfare that has been continuous since the Hospital's founding."

Mr. Schwartz speaking for the hospital trustees said: "We are also proud of the fact that no one seeking treatment in this hospital is asked about his race, or religion, or origin. A disease germ does not recognize those distinctions. Neither do we. A glance at our staffs and at our patients will show the nonsectarian universal character of our hospital services."

And Rabbi Goldstein noted this interfaith quality when he said: "It is a source of special pleasure to me that my participation in these ceremonies today is an encore to my participation in the ceremonies at the dedication of your main building some years ago. The participation of clergy of several denominations then as now is no doubt a tripleclad guaranty of your success. Actually, it is a tribute to the broad character of your ministry of healing which does not ask whether a person is Christian or Jew; black or white; but only whether he is in need of the service you have to offer."

A notable instance of this pioneering program was in the institution's Know Your Hospital Program, whereby groups of children from the neighborhood schools (and of adults too, for that matter), have been invited to our building and to see for themselves just how the institution carries on. This has been particularly effective in reducing among children a fear of hospitals.

A year ago, the New York Times devoted a full feature to this program of acquainting children with a hospital, and in that way, bringing them closer to that community institution in terms of understanding and knowledge.

Last year, the hospital celebrated its Golden Jubilee; the completion of 50 years of its existence and services to the city.

Like every institution that serves the community, the hospital in the last analysis, must thrive on the understanding, knowledge and support of the people in its area. It invites groups of citizens; fraternal groups, parents' and teachers' associations, churches and synagogues, youth organizations and schools to arrange for association with its many activities. Above all, it invites and hopes for the understanding of the people of the community to whose well-being it is dedicated.

Obstruction Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an Oregon Journal editorial relative to "the blockaders"—some of the Federal power or nothing advocates. The following editorial from the La Grande (Oreg.) Observer points up the continuing obstructionist tactics of "the blockaders":

OBSTRUCTION TACTICS

The Northwest Public Power Association has launched an attack against the applications of the Pacific Northwest Power Co. to build two dams on the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites on the lower Snake River.

This opposition was not unexpected but there seems to be very little in their argument to justify the opposition.

The Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites are below the Hells Canyon site and are not a part of that controversy.

About a year ago, the Northwest Power Co. announced that they were interested in exploring these sites and were granted a preliminary permit to carry on the testing.

The two dams will develop about a million kilowatts at a cost of about $200 million * * * first power would be available in about 4 years.

But now that application to begin construction has been made, the public power group has suddenly decided there should be a federally built dam at this location.

Heretofore, the Nez Perce site, which is below the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites, has never been seriously considered as a Federal site. The main reason for this is because of the great damage that a dam at this location would do to the fish runs.

The Mountain Sheep site, which is the furthest downstream of the two sites, is just above the mouth of the Imnaha River. This leaves both the Imnaha and the Salmon open for fish runs. These are recognized as the two most important tributaries on the Snake for spawning.

A dam at the Nez Perce site, which would be over 600 feet high, would place an insurmountable barrier against the spawning runs and would do great damage to the fishing in the future.

The main objection which the public power group gives to the application of the Northwest Power Co. is that it would aid the creation of a power octupus.

It is not clear just what is meant by this term, or what sins they are attributing to the octupus.

It is significant to note that they do not offer any alternative plan for building the Federal dam at Nez Perce. It is the same old story: "We don't know when, if ever, we will build a dam, but we don't want anyone else to build one either."

The figures presented during the COON-NEUBERGER debate here recently indicated that the presently authorized Federal dams would require 27 years to complete at the present rate. Since the Nez Perce site is not one of these it is safe to assume that we would have to wait at least 30 years before we could expect power from this stretch of the river under Federal development.

It seems clear to us that this Northwest Public Power Association is interested in only one thing—socialized power.

They do not seem in the least concerned about the present need for additional power, or for working out any solution to the financial problems facing the Northwest in getting additional generating facilities under construction.

There's a dog-in-the-manger approach. They are saying, in effect, that they would prefer to see a power shortage develop with all of the loss of growth and employment that would go with it, rather than to have any new power made available to the region by private development.

It is time that we realized all this talk about John Day, Hells Canyon, Nez Perce, and others is only serving one purpose. To delay the construction of dams that will provide the badly needed power.

We will very soon begin paying the price for this delay, and it is a price that will come very high to all the people of the area.

Health and Welfare Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. MURRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, considerable newspaper publicity has been given in recent years to the welfare trust funds of labor organizations. Much of the publicity has been critical of such funds.

I have been privileged, in recent weeks, to have received the statement of Michael J. Kennedy, business representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 134, in Chicago, Ill., relative to that union's health and welfare fund, given at an apprenticeship graduation exercise.

This report discloses that health and welfare funds freely negotiated between management and labor, and fairly administered, furnish a complete answer to two erroneous views often expressed by extremists on the opposite sides of the political forum, first, that a combination of workers in a labor organization is detrimental to the welfare of the individual, and, second, that the Government is the sole proper administrator of funds devoted to the health and welfare of individuals. This report gives real evidence that such political contentions are destitute of substantive merit. It proves that the fund to which it relates is in the best interest of employer, employee, and the public.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the following address by Michael J. Kennedy disclosing the benefits provided by the health and welfare fund of such union, the number of participants in the fund, and the payments made by the union:

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVE OF INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL 134, RELATIVE TO UNION'S HEALTH AND WELFARE FUND

The electrical insurance trustees established its first benefit in the year of 1932 and that benefit provided each member with a $1,000 life and total disability insurance policy.

During the 12-month period from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955, 34 of our members passed away and their beneficiaries received a total sum of $34,000.

SECOND BENEFIT

The second benefit was established in 1937 and provided for a system of unemployment assistance in the form of $10 and $15 certificates, depending upon the number of hours worked by the member in each quarter and these certificates can only be applied to pay the $12.60 cost of his $3,000 insurance policy on his quarterly card.

During the 12-month period ending last July 1 our members received a total of 593 of these $15 unemployment certificates and 243 of the $10 certificates, for a total number of 836 certificates representing a total sum of $11,325.

THE THIRD BENEFIT IN 1942 AND PROVIDES FOR LOANS

The policy of the insurance trustees has been to make loans only to our members who are past 65 years of age and who are on pension.

And to qualify for these loans, when a member takes his pension at the age of 65 he then receives a pension of $50 per month from our international office and that same member also carries a $3,000 life-insurance policy in the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of local 134.

According to our bylaws, if the member's income from other sources does not exceed $2,500 per year, he has the privilege, if he wishes to, of borrowing $35 per month on his $3,000 life-insurance policy which he must deposit with the financial secretary, $17.50 from the local and $17.50 from trustees.

Two hundred and sixty-five members on pension, 185 receiving these loans.

FOURTH BENEFIT

The fourth benefit was adopted also in the year of 1942. It provided benefits only for our members in the Armed Forces of our country and their families.

These benefits provide that the electrical insurance trustees pay out of our insurance fund the $12.60 premium per quarter on each member's $3,000 life insurance policy, and also pay the premium on hospitalization benefits for his wife and children.

During the 12-month period ending July 1 we had 79 members still in the service and those benefits amounted to a total sum of $6,571.48 for that 1-year period.

It might be interesting to know that since 1942 up to the present time a total number of 773 of our members have been in the service and the premiums paid on their insurance has totaled $98,905.14.

FIFTH BENEFIT: HOSPITAL BENEFIT FOR MEMBERS

This fifth benefit was established in July of 1944 and it provides that our members be eligible to receive hospitalization benefits and surgical expenses.

During the 12-month period ending last June 1, 921 of our members have received a total sum of $156,789 in hospitalization benefits.

The sixth benefit was also established in the year of 1944 and it provided pension benefits of $1 per day for certain of our pension members who must qualify in a rather unusual manner.

Those pension members whom I spoke of and who are receiving loans of $35 per month on their $3,000 life-insurance policy are the only pension members who are eligible to receive this $1 per day benefit.

Those pension members will, after 6¼ years, have borrowed a total sum of $2,625 on their $3,000 insurance policy and at that time after 6¼ years they can borrow no more, as the balance of $375 is held in reserve to pay the $12.60 premium on his $3,000 insurance policy.

When that time comes, the pension member finds himself with only the $50 monthly pension from our international office and then he is eligible to receive these $1 per day pension benefits.

During 12 months, 78 members at $1 per day, total $28,470.

SEVENTH BENEFIT: HOSPITALIZATION BENEFITS FOR WIVES

The seventh benefit was established in March of 1947 and it provides for the wives of our members to receive hospitalization and surgical benefits.

During this 12-month period ending last July 1, 1,370 wives of our members received a total sum of $227,751 in hospitalization and surgical benefits.

EIGHTH BENEFIT: HOSPITALIZATION BENEFITS FOR PENSION MEMBERS

This benefit was established in 1948 and was only for the benefit of our pension members who had borrowed the full amount of $2,625 on their $3,000 life insurance policy, and who were receiving the $1 per day pension benefits.

This group are all past 71 years of age.

This benefit provided that those pension members and their wives receive full hospitalization benefits at the low cost of $23.80 per quarter.

At the last meeting of the electrical insurance trustees on last June 15, we eliminated entirely this cost of $23.80 per quarter to pension member for hospitalization benefits for himself and his wife, effective October 1 and in the future, these pension members will receive these hospital benefits at no cost whatsoever.

NINTH BENEFIT: HOSPITALIZATION FOR CHILDREN

Our ninth benefit was established in 1950 and provided hospitalization and surgical benefits for the children of our members.

During this 12-month period, from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955, the children of our members have received a total amount of $64,951 in hospital benefits.

TENTH BENEFIT: ACCIDENT AND SICK BENEFIT

The 10th benefit was adopted in 1952 and provides for all members working for electrical contractors, what is known as the accident and sick benefit.

This benefit pays to the member $30 per week for a period of 26 weeks while he is laid up because of sickness or because of an accident which he has suffered off of the job and while he was not working.

We've had an average of about 45 members per month who have received this benefit during this 12-month period ending last July 1 for a total sum of $73,160.

XI

1. The total amount of all benefits received by our members and their families during the 12-month period from July 1, 1954 to July 1, 1955 was $603,017.48, or an average of over $50,000 per month.

2. It might be interesting to know that out of a total number of 5,500 of our members who are working for electrical contractors during the 12-month period that I have just covered there was a total of 1,958 different members and their families who received sick and hospital benefits. This averages almost 2 out of 5.

XII

In conclusion I want to say a few words regarding the electrical insurance trustees and their responsibilities.

The board of trustees is made up of 5 members, 4 trustees representing the Electrical Contractors Association and I have been the fifth trustee representing our local union.

This 4-to-1 ratio is not important because any changes or amendments to the insurance agreement can only be made by the unanimous approval of all 5 trustees and also by the approval of local 134 and the Electrical Contractors Association.

Mr. Kennedy and the board of trustees of which he is a member are to be commended for their able administration of the funds intrusted to their custody, and for their voluntary and public accounting of stewardship.

Pollie Anner Myers Hudson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, recently two Negro women were ordered by a Federal district court in Birmingham, Ala., to be admitted to the University of Alabama. The decision of the Federal district court was in compliance with the Supreme Court school case of May 1954, which in my opinion was a political decision.

I would like for the Members of the House to know something about one of the Negro women, and I include in my remarks the following excerpt from a story in the February 13, 1956, issue of South magazine. This excerpt has to do with Pollie Anner Myers Hudson:

Complying with a Federal court order, University of Alabama trustees admitted the first Negro in its 136-year history—Autherine J. Lucy, 26, of Birmingham. In denying her room and board, they hurled back at the Supreme Court some of its own language: applicants were studied with respect to welfare, safety, and other effects upon them and other students, and on sociological grounds.

Rejected because her conduct and marital record did not meet admission standards was another Negro, Pollie Anner Myers Hudson, also of Birmingham. No details were given in the board's terse statment. South went to official records, found these facts:

"Pollie Anner Myers, unmarried and pregnant, applied for admission the third week in September 1952. Two months later, November 14, 1952, she married Edward Hudson, whose 3-year sentence for burglary had been revoked in Jefferson County in 1948. Six months and four days after the marriage Pollie Anner Myers Hudson gave birth on May 18, 1953, to a male child. It was a normal birth, length of pregnancy was 40 weeks.

"Henry Myers, the woman's father, was sentenced from Elmore County on September 26, 1938, for 1 year and a day for possession of still and manufacture of whisky. Edward Hudson, from whom the Associated Press reported she was separated and seeking a divorce, was sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary February 14, 1947, for daytime burglary of an uninhabited dwelling in Jefferson County. Probation was revoked October 8, 1948, and sentence was imposed. He was sentenced for a year and a day on August 28, 1948, on another charge of burglary on an uninhabited dwelling."

I wish each Member of this House and each member of the Supreme Court of the United States would ask himself this soul-searching question: "Would you want your teen-age sons and daughters to go to school with a person like Pollie Anner Myers Hudson?" Her attorneys, aided by NAACP attorneys, are continuing their efforts to force her admittance.

Echo Park Deletion—Cleverest Stunt Since P. T. Barnum Invented the "Egress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the palmiest days of his great career as a showman, the incomparable P. T. Barnum discovered the profits of his animal shows were dwindling. The kind of naive folk in his tent became so intrigued with the strange and wonderous animals on display they stayed on and on to view them lingeringly.

This, of course, produced long lines waiting outside for room to get in. It vastly discouraged additional cash customers, anxious, but for the long wait, to pour more admissions into the great entrepreneur's coffers.

In a stroke of wizardry, P. T. solved the problem. He had a large sign painted with a giant directional arrow pointing in an appropriate direction with the bold legend: "To the Egress."

Trusting spectators unhesitantly followed the arrow to view what they believed would be another exotic animal, possibly even a cross between an emu and a tigress. They soon found themselves on the cold side of the exit.

The temporary deletion of Echo Park dam and power facilities from the proposed upper Colorado River storage project is the cleverest stunt since P. T. Barnum invented the "egress."

The supporters of the gigantic upper Colorado River project admit that in its present form it is "an engine without pistons."

Yet they are asking Congress to pass this incredible bill, and force the Nation's taxpayers to suffer a loss of more than $4 billion.

The "pistons" of the upper Colorado project was Echo Park Dam. Conservationists throughout the country fought Echo Park Dam because it would flood a part of Dinosaur National Monument.

Facing certain defeat, the bill's supporters finally informed the conservationists that Echo Park Dam would be taken out. The conservationists accepted this promise and withdrew their opposition.

It is apparent from the record that the conservationists have walked into a trap.

Although Echo Park may have been deleted temporarily from the bill at hand, it can no more be taken from the project than can history be abolished by destroying the pages on which it is written. If this Congress passes any bill, it simply means that Echo Park must be authorized later to help salvage the taxpayers' investment.

The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, and numerous individuals have testified repeatedly that Echo Park Dam is absolutely vital to the feasibility of the upper Colorado River project.

For instance, on January 18, 1954, Under Secretary of Interior Ralph A. Tudor testified before the House Interior Committee as follows:

Mr. TUDOR. We think Echo Park is a necessary part of the project, yes, sir.

Mr. ENGLE. You think it would be like taking the engine out of the automobile, then?

Mr. TUDOR. I might say it might be like taking the pistons out. We feel definitely that the feasibility of the entire project would be placed in hazard if Echo Park were left out and some alternative substituted.

There is nothing in the world to prevent Congress from returning Echo Park Dam to the bill. If the bill can be passed without its "pistons," obviously it will not work, and the "pistons" will have to be put into the engine.

By withdrawing their opposition to the bill, the conservationists are racing toward the egress. They are being lulled to sleep, and they will wake up some morning to find that Echo Park Dam is to be built in Dinosaur National Monument.

The record before Congress is replete with unqualified statements by Reclamation Bureau officials and others that Echo Park must be in the project or the project will not work, cannot pay out, and would fail to provide the development desired.

Here are excerpts from that record:

Mr. AANDAHL, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.[1] With respect to the need for the Echo Park Reservoir, our recommendations remain unchanged. We still recommend the construction of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir.

Mrs. PFOST.[2] In your opinion, are there other sites that would be as beneficial to the project as Echo Park?

Mr. AANDAHL. No; I think Echo Park is way out ahead——

Mrs. PFOST. There is no other substitute?

Mr. AANDAHL. It is way out ahead of alternates that might be proposed.

Mr. W. A. DEXHEIMER, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.[3] The proposed use of

Footnotes at end of speech.

the canyon sections of the Dinosaur National Monument for water and power developments was contemplated long before the original 80-acre area was enlarged to its present size of over 200,000 acres in 1938. A number of power-site withdrawals prior to that year are evidence of this fact. Recognition of the importance of these potential power developments was given in the President's proclamation enlarging the 80-acre monument. The supervision of the area by the National Park Service under this proclamation was not to affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and administration of the monument was subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

The plan before you for coordinating the development of the water and power resources of Green and Yampa River Canyons along with their scenic and recreation values is therefore consistent with the language and spirit of the proclamation. The Department has no doubts as to the appropriateness of creating an artificial lake and adjoining facilities within the bounds of this particular national monument. It would not create a precedent for invasion of other parks. The precedent, if any, was created in 1938 when the boundaries were extended to the canyon areas with a clear understanding that water conservation and power development had prior right to the use of those areas.

Mrs. PFOST.[4] Mr. Commissioner, is Echo Park essential to the economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes. Although, by elimination of parts of the project, the economic feasibility might be established for something less. But it would not be, we think, the proper way to meet the ultimate or even the present needs of the upper basin.

Mr. DEXHEIMER.[5] It (Echo Park) is essential in the upper reaches of the area, and without it we would be unable to make the full development anticipated and would probably have to leave out even some of the participating projects which are recommended at the present time, or some of the units in participating projects, and it would greatly decrease the financial feasibility of the overall plan.

Mr. E. O. LARSON, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation.[6] Here are the principal advantages of including Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado storage project plan:

1. With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

2. Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored in Echo Park would be less than any other major storage site in the upper basin.

3. Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 200,000 acre-feet of evaporation losses annually, a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

4. Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and the Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating the flows of the rivers, that is, when they are constructed. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at Split Mountain and Grey Canyon sites downstream on the Green River. This is why Under Secretary Tudor mentioned that Echo Park was the wheelhorse in the upper basin.

5. The use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economical development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to upstream power markets of the proposed system of dams and powerplants and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer, chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many other important minerals.

Mr. SISK. Could I ask you this question, Mr. Merriell: Do you feel that Echo Park represents a more important feature of this project, let us say, than Glen Canyon, assuming that only a portion of the project could be built?

Mr. FRANK C. MERRIELL, Chief Engineer of the Colorado River Water Conservation District.[7] In some ways it does. In the first place, where this project will sell power, the first places are in the vicinity of Salt Lake and of Denver, and the most direct transmission that can be devised in the project is from Echo Park to each of those places. Now, that is the principal reason, and there are other collateral reasons. There is a possibility of a very great industrial use right close to Echo Park in the phosphate beds of the Uinta Mountains, and other possibilities in the Uinta Mountains, in the Grand Valley, in industrial use, whereas Glen Canyon is a long ways from there.

BRIANT H. STRINGHAM, Vernal, Utah.[8] Opponents of the project, most of whom are well-intentioned citizens, base their chief argument on the false premise that the building of Echo Park dam within the Dinosaur National Monument will set a precedent for the commercial invasion of all parks and monuments. This argument is not based on facts as the following official documents will show. These instruments also prove that it was definitely understood by officials and the people at the time the monument was enlarged that power and reclamation projects were to be constructed inside the monument at some future time, and that the area would be subject to several other existing rights.

On June 10, 1920, the Federal Water Power Act was passed creating the Federal Power Commission. This Commission was given authority to grant licenses to construct dams in national monuments according to the opinion given by Councilor Abbott representing the House Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation. However, on March 3, 1921, the Congress amended the Federal Water Power Act taking from the Power Commission and giving to the Congress authority to grant licenses to construct dams within parks and monuments, but in doing so, the Congress added these significant amendments: "As now constituted or existing." Thus leaving the authority in the Federal Power Commission to grant licenses for construction of power dams in newly created monuments such as Dinosaur. President Roosevelt recognized this fact in his proclamation enlarging the monument.

Mr. GEORGE D. CLYDE, commissioner of interstate streams for Utah.[9] Mr. Chairman, I think the Echo Park Dam is absolutely necessary to this project. The Echo Park Dam, in my opinion, occupies the same position that I would, for example. I am pretty good with both arms and both legs. You can cut one arm off and I can still live, and you can cut two arms off and I can still live, and you can cut both legs off and I can still live, but I am not much good. And Echo Park dam is an essential unit in this thing because it is a basinwide project, and it must be considered in terms of the series of storage dams, their operation to provide for water for consumptive use, provide the water to meet the obligation to the lower basin, and to provide for power generation. All of those three are inextricably tied together.

Mr. DIXON.[10] You concur in his testimony that there is no substitute equal to Echo Park as a dam site.

Mr. CLYDE. Yes, sir; I am convinced in my independent analysis as well as review of many, many reports, that there is no substitute for Echo Park.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a United States Senator from the State of Wyoming.[11] So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States.

MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Governor of Wyoming.[12] Echo and Glen Canyon Dams are vital elements in the development of the upper basin States.

H. T. PERSON, dean of engineering, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Woy.[13] In regard to Echo Park Reservoir—this unit is one of the very important units in the team of storage units necessary for the fullest development of the water resources of the upper basin. Its strategic location below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, its low-evaporation losses and its contribution to maximum power production makes it an essential unit in the upper basin development. The grandeur, the spiritual and esthetic values of the canyons of the Echo Dam site are acknowledged. The Echo Park Reservoir will not destroy these values. Echo Park will eliminate some sections of river rapids—but there are hundreds of miles of river rapids in the vast areas of the upper Colorado River Basin. Echo Park Reservoir will make the recreational values of this vast area available to hundreds of thousands of people every year—rather than to just those few hundred daredevil river runners who now have that opportunity. Echo Park Reservoir is in the Dinosaur National Monument. However, the evidence is documented and clear, that the people of the area were given assurance in 1938 when Dinosaur Monument was extended to include the Echo Park area, that establishment of the extensive monument would not interfere with the use of the area for grazing, or with the development of the water resources of the area.

G. E. UNTERMANN, director, Utah Field House of Natural History, Vernal, Utah.[14] Much of the opposition of rabid conservation groups to a proposed dam in Dinosaur National Monument is baseless and unrealistic.

HERBERT F. SMART, Salt Lake City, Utah.[15] Conservationists opposed to the construction of this dam say there is a principle involved. Yet actually the only principle involved is one of the integrity of the Government and the people, including conservationists, in keeping promises and assurances, and abiding by conditions incident to the enlargement of the Dinosaur National Monument. The question of the inviolability of a national monument is not at issue here. The question of the inviolability of promises incident to the enlargement of the boundaries is involved. The integrity of our national pary system is predicated upon good faith, and conservationists interested in preserving the inviolability of our national park system should be the first to recognize and, in good faith, insist upon compliance with the conditions under which the Dinosaur Mounment boundaries were extended, namely, subject to power and reclamation withdrawals.

To many of us who have been a part of the conservation movement in the West, we are at a loss to understand the motives of conservationists opposing a project which will result in such a material gain to conservation objectives and principles. In the best tradition of Gifford Pinchot, the passage

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

of the Colorado River storage project will mean the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest period of time.

ANGUS MCDONALD, legislative assistant, National Farmers Union.[16] Sites other than those recommended by the Department of Interior have been suggested because it was contended that the building of a dam at the Echo Park site would be an invasion of the national park system and would forever mar the natural beauty of the area. The record will show that the original monument created by President Wilson consisted of 80 acres which would not include Echo Park and when President Roosevelt expanded the monument by Executive order in 1938, that he provided that expansion of the monument should not bar the building of power projects. In other words, the Echo Park site has never been part of the national park system. The mere fact that it was called a park did not make it a national park. It is also contended that development of the water resources of the upper Colorado and the Echo Park site would impair it as a recreational center and that in some way it would disrupt the Dinosaur Monument. Geography indicates that the bones of the dinosaurs, if any, would not be disturbed because the dinosaur graveyard is down the river from the Echo Park site. Impounding water behind the Echo Park would not submerge a single dinosaur bone. On the contrary the proponents of the project tell us that the creation of a huge lake behind the Echo Park would enhance the recreational opportunities and that roads would be built into the area so that many more thousands of people could enjoy recreational activities, whereas at the present time, the area is relatively inaccessible.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, a United States Senator from the State of Utah.[17] This puts the shoe on the other foot. It is not a national monument that is being invaded—it is a matter of some misled or misinformed conservationists who are trying to urge that Uncle Sam violate his integrity and treat as mere scraps of paper solemn reservations in the public interest in the Dinosaur Monument area that precede the limited monument proclamation by 17 to 34 years. It illbehooves honest conservationists to take such an untenable position, because we who love our parks and monuments should strive to preserve as honorable and legal commitments the reservations of public lands for such a noble and worthy use as parks and monuments. Therefore, how can we, in the same breath, ask that equally binding and legal reservations for water development, be invaded, especially when the monument proclamation itself recognizes and exempts from the Dinosaur Monument land reservation these previous withdrawals for water resource development?

INDEX TO QUOTED STATEMENTS

Colorado River storage project: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3383, H. R. 3384, and H. R. 4488 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Part I

[1] Aandahl, Hon. Fred G., March 9, 1955, p. 32.
[2] Aandahl, Hon. Fred G., March 9, 1955, p. 38.
[3] Dexheimer, W. A., March 9, 1955, p. 51.
[4] Dexheimer, W. A., March 9, 1955, p. 174.
[5] Dexheimer, W. A., March 10, 1955, p. 193.
[6] Larson, E. O., March 10, 1955, pp. 193–194.

Part II

[7] Merriell, Frank C., March 11, 1955, p. 471.
[8] Stringham, Briant H., March 14, 1955, pp. 551–552.
[9] Clyde, George D., March 14, 1955, p. 559.
[10] Clyde, George D., March 14, 1955, p. 571.
[11] O'MAHONEY, Hon. JOSEPH C., March 16, 1955, p. 615.
[12] Simpson, Milward L., March 16, 1955, p. 619.
[13] Person, H. T., March 16, 1955, p. 623.
[14] Untermann, G. E., March 16, 1955, p. 650.
[15] Smart, Herbert F., March 16, 1955, pp. 683–684.
[16] McDonald, Angus, March 16, 1955, p. 703.
[17] WATKINS, Hon. ARTHUR V., March 16, 1955, p. 706.

Lithuania Must Be Free and Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to join with other Members of the House of Representatives in presenting my thoughts on the independence of Lithuania, as we observe its 38th anniversary of that event.

The people of the free world and especially the people of the United States have been shocked at the utter ruthlessness of Communist Russia in seizing a free nation such as Lithuania. It has suffered the fate of Latvia and Esthonia, but by the will of God and eternal vigilance on the part of the people of these three Baltic free states, liberty and independence will surely come. Russian aggression will be eliminated when the world realizes that there is no longer any room for ruthless aggression among civilized nations. The present Communist conspiracy will fall of its own weight when the Russian people realize they are but slaves of a totalitarianism that is a blight upon the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, the very great need at the moment is for free Lithuanians, such as the hundreds of groups which we have in this country, to keep alight the fires of freedom in high hope and in confidence that Lithuania will once again be independent and assume its proper place in the family of nations.

The history of events since Russia has occupied Lithuania is clear to all the world. Upon the pretext that Germany was about to occupy Lithuania, Soviet Russia moved in and occupied that country. When Communist army garrisons had been established in Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia the red armies were moved from the Baltic States and placed along the Finnish frontier in preparation of an assault on Finland. This was in late November 1939. Soviet Russia at that time was merely looking for a pretext to move its armies of occupation into those unfortunate countries.

After occupation was well established the Communists spread false accusations against the Lithuanian government and in 1944 deputized one of its commissars to make sure that a pretext for occupation had been established. One of the false charges was that Lithuanians had been kidnaping and killing Russian soldiers and when the Lithuanian government demanded the right to be heard on these charges the Soviet government refused to honor the requests. The Lithuanian Commission on the other hand found the charges had been absolutely false but that made no difference to the Russian terrorists.

Attempts were made to negotiate a peaceful understanding between Russia and Lithuania, but these attempts were ignored and to this day, Mr. Speaker, the United States Government has refused to recognize the occupation of the three Baltic countries.

Mr. Speaker, this is to the credit of the United States and we must forever insist and maintain that under no circumstances will we be parties to the bargaining away of the right of independence for Lithuania and her sister Republics.

The challenge to Americans of Lithuanian descent is to continue to battle for a free Lithuania and the slogan at all times must be to carry on for freedom and liberty in a Christian country until the fight is won and recognition is achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate those Americans of Lithuanian descent who are carrying on this fight and may God sustain them in their efforts.

Peace Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial, Peace Policies, appearing in one of the leading newspapers of New Hampshire, in the January 30, 1956 issue of the Laconia Evening Citizen of Laconia, N. H.:

PEACE POLICIES

General Ridgway's articles appearing in the Saturday Evening Post emphasize his belief that the way to peace is to maintain a strong Army, Navy and Air Force and in this the general's position is identical with that of Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Boston, known to many persons in Laconia, Tilton and Gilford because of his vacationing here, with Mrs. McCormack during the past 25 years. In December we wrote an editorial commending the congressman for his views as expressed on this point to a Boston interviewer.

And now comes an Associated Press dispatch from Washington which quotes Congressman MCCORMACK as contradicting the quotation attributed to Secretary of State Dulles in Life magazine that "strong action" by Dulles had prevented United States involvement in Indochina and in two other crises.

Mr. MCCORMACK, according to the report, said the United States "would have been over the brink and into war" if congressional leaders had not applied the brakes.

The caption on the front cover of Life read: "Three Times at Brink of War: How Dulles Gambled and Won." That was an

allusion to a quotation which Life attributed to Mr. Dulles: "Of course we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. . . . If you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost."

Congressman McCORMACK as a leader of his party attended a meeting in Mr. Dulles' office in April 1954 where there was talk of a "mass air attack upon the Communists who were besieging Dien Bien Phu," the French fortress whose subsequent fall presaged the end of the war in Indochina. Congressman McCORMACK told a reporter Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, favored United States intervention on the side of the French. He said congressional leaders advised Messrs. Dulles and Radford to "come up with a ful package" including agreement with Great Britain and France on what course to take. He said the leaders didn't say "Yes" or "No," but advised against going in alone which makes the Dulles article more of a political document than anything else.

One of the statements made by General Ridgway is that he was told Army cuts had to be made by the businessmen's administration at Washington. This subject is to come in for an airing, as well it should, if the weakness in our defenses alleged by General Ridgway is corect. A report of the Government Operations Committee of the House is coming out, we are informed, which declares that businessmen like Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson are not the panacea for problems of a nation hard hit by a cold war. After reading General Ridgway's disclosures we would sleep better nights if someone other than Mr. Wilson was settling questions of national security, and deciding how much of an Army, Navy, and Air Force constitutes an adequate defense. We admire Mr. Wilson as a business genius, but the indictment of his peace program by such an authority as Ridgway is too devastating to be ignored.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch expresses a belief that President Eisenhower missed an opportunity to reaffirm the peaceful policies of his administration when he discussed at a press conference "the damage done by John Foster Dulles in the latest of that confused diplomat's international indiscretions."

"Whatever else this press conference should tell Mr. Eisenhower," asserts the St. Louis newspaper, "it should tell him he must again find the way to speak effectively to the millions of people who were so moved by him at Geneva."

We would say the President regained those noble heights, as an apostle of peace with honor, in his letter to Premier Bulganin, exposing the latest Soviet propaganda maneuver.

The Lesson at Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
February 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune for February 12, 1956, contains an intelligent discussion by Mr. Roscoe Drummond on the University of Alabama incident. I direct the attention of our colleagues to the article, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON
(By Roscoe Drummond)
THE LESSON AT ALABAMA

It is not fully appreciated, I think, that if the University of Alabama fails to permit Miss Autherine Lucy, its first Negro student, to continue in her classes, this action will be a violation of the gathering practice and tradition of colleges throughout the 17 Southern and Border States. By 1953, well before the Supreme Court's unanimous decision requiring ultimate desegregation of the entire public school system, state-owned universities in 12 of 17 Southern and Border States had opened their classrooms to Negro students. This transition of the publicly-owned higher institutions of learning throughout the South—private Southern colleges and universities similarly have been admitting Negroes—from total segregation to a mounting degree of integration has been accomplished with little stir and with relatively little fanfare. It has been largely accomplished by southern leadership at southern initiative to reflect the changing traditions of the South itself. These facts help to put the University of Alabama incident into clearer perspective. These facts show:

That in accepting Miss Lucy as a student, the university was acting in observance of the widespread and now nearly unanimous policy of the Southern and Border States with respect to higher education.

That in permitting a small mob of some students and some outsiders to drive Miss Lucy from the campus, the local and State law-enforcement authorities are denying to the president and faculty of the University of Alabama the lawful protection they need to carry out their decision and to bring the university into line with the policies of other southern colleges.

The interview which president Oliver C. Carmichael gave to the New York Herald Tribune last week demonstrates that the head of the university and the faculty are faithfully trying to keep this young Negro girl as a student.

Thus it seems to me that the Governor of Alabama, James Folsom, and the law enforcement officials subordinate to him are doing Alabama and the whole South a grievous disservice.

Their tolerance of violence means that they are permitting mob rule to prevent their own university from carrying out its decision to allow a Negro student to study on the campus.

Their inaction means that thus far they are conniving at the most indefensible kind of "interposition." That is, they are permitting mob violence to interpose itself in front of the slow but steady and persevering approach to educational desegregation at those very points where the South itself believes it can most wisely be carried forward—at the levels of higher education.

The Supreme Court has itself advised patience and caution. It is not calling at any point for simultaneous, instantaneous desegregation. It recognizes the complexity of the problem and directs the district courts to allow the decision to be carried out at different speeds in differing localities and at different educational levels.

But when the Governor of Alabama permits mob violence to keep a southern university from a desegration decision of the greatest moderation in line with the policies of other southern universities, he is doing violence to the South's own practices and is disserving the cause of moderation in every phase of the problem.

Desegregation in higher education has been a firm southern trend for the last dozen years. From 1944 to 1954, 26 State-financed colleges (previously all white) in 12 Southern and Border States began to accept Negro students, and the private colleges and universities followed about the same pattern.

By July 1954 the number of southern medical schools open to Negroes jumped from 2 to 10; by 1953 more southern law schools were admitting Negroes than refusing them; between 1950 and 1952, the number of southern nursing schools admitting Negroes increased from 18 to 30.

State universities of 3 (Alabama, Florida, and Georgia) of the 5 Southern States which have kept total segregation seem at the point of accepting Negro students.

This whole gradual trend has been free of violence. If the State of Alabama now permits violence to obstruct its university from embracing the policy of other southern universities, it will be undermining the very concept of moderation which the South has long been building.

American Legion Commander's Tribute at Lincoln's Tomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, for more than a score of years it has been the custom of the American Legion to make an annual pilgrimage to the tomb of Abraham Lincoln on the anniversary of his birth.

In keeping with that custom, my fellow townsman, National Commander J. Addington Wagner this year delivered an eloquent tribute to Lincoln during the annual ceremonies at Springfield, Ill.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the address given by Commander Wagner:

For 22 years we of the American Legion have come as pilgrims to the tomb of Abraham Lincoln on the anniversary of his birth. This is a pilgrimage in which all our countrymen are joined in spirit. Long after the American Legion is no more, representative Americans will stand where we stand now, reverently and humbly seeking inspiration and knowledge.

Why is this so? I think it must be because Lincoln, perhaps more than any other American, succeeded in defining and expressing the deepest meaning of the American philosophy.

He translated the great documents of our Government into simple, understandable terms. By word and deed, he illuminated the spirit and the power that account for the greatness of America.

So today, here at Springfield and throughout the land, we pause to honor the memory of the man and to find new strength in his example.

Abraham Lincoln did not live to hear the praise and homage now given him by free men everywhere. At the summit of his service, he was called both pacifist and warmonger. Some ridiculed him as being too weak while others denounced him as a tyrant.

But Lincoln looked beyond his day. He possessed a sure and unshakeable faith in people—free and united people. From a position in the very center of the fiercest storm which ever raged in America, he was able to ask:

"Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

Today, we are a stronger and a more mature nation. We have achieved and endured much since 1865. The nearly 3 million Legionnaires whom I am privileged to serve have fought to preserve that ultimate justice of the people of which Lincoln spoke. And it seems to me that our whole experience as a reunited Nation these past 91 years has proved two very significant things:

First, the principle of government by the governed is as practical as it is ethical;

And, secondly, looking at the world around us, self-government based upon the equality of men under God will endure as a system only if the United States of America endures and prospers.

Think of it. In less than one century a nation divided and at war with itself has emerged as the keeper of human liberty for all nations.

Such has been the shift of power and responsibility from the old world to the new.

Other nations now free might collapse * * * we pray to God that they will not—and the cause of freedom would still go forward. But if we fail—if America should falter in leadership or influence—there would be left no nation strong enough to sustain the free cause.

In view of this tremendous responsibility, there are those who say we are not as united as we should be—that we differ and argue too much among ourselves. I feel that the question is worth considering, particularly on this day and in Lincoln's light.

We are a proud people. North, South, East and West, we place great value on the personal independence that is part of our heritage. It is not our way to think or do alike, or to see things exactly as our neighbor does just for the sake of agreement.

Today, we have problems which seem to call for one solution in one area and a different solution in another. We are approaching the time for deciding who will lead us during the next 4 years and who will represent us in the Congress. We have varying opinions, as individual citizens, on foreign and domestic policies. All of this makes for vigorous debate and discussion.

However, let no one exaggerate the depth of these differences. The American Legion firmly believes that there is no issue big enough or precious enough to endanger our unity as Americans. So long as we keep our tempers down and our sights up on the goal of a free America capable of defending its freedom, we have nothing to fear.

Lincoln said it this way: "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

That is what very nearly happened a century ago. Men disagreed and the disagreement was allowed to proceed from reasonable discussion to personal bitterness and, finally, to bloodshed. Extremists on both sides brought on circumstances in which honorable men could turn only to the battlefield.

Let us never repeat that mistake. The "justice of the people" will prevail, whatever the issue, provided we retain our common belief in the destiny and goodness of the land we love.

What concerns me far more than signs of healthy disagreement is the evidence of a declining public appreciation of patriotism itself.

More often than not, we hear the very word, patriotism, spoken with a note of apology. Too many of our best people spend their best efforts mocking those who desire to recognize and glorify our great American heritage.

This is a dangerous, irresponsible game. It could make the kind of mischief that would invite attack by those outside our country who seek to destroy us. Equally important, it tends to sow in the minds of our young people doubts and indifference about the system of government they will one day lead.

My friends, we need patriots. We need believers in America—men and women who understand and are proud of the blessed opportunities that come with American citizenship.

Our free institutions have survived assault from without and within. They can survive anything except a lack of interest and confidence on the part of the people.

Encouraging the development of that interest is one of the important works which the American Legion has undertaken. We shall carry it forward just as vigorously as we can. Because it directly involves the future security of America—because it helps to insure the enlightened patriotism which Lincoln dramatized in his own life—we earnestly hope you will join with us.

Keep Murphy Army Hospital Opened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following cogent statement of Anthony D. Tieso, past State commander, Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, which he delivered at the mass meeting held at Hovey Hall, Waltham, Mass., protesting the proposed closing of the Murphy Army Hospital:

STATEMENT BY ANTHONY D. TIESO, OF MATTAPAN, MASS., PAST STATE COMMANDER, DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT HOVEY HALL, WALTHAM, MASS.

National Commander Kenneth T. Lyons, members of the Federal Employees Veterans Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am representing the Disabled American Veterans, the Department of Massachusetts, upon the authority of State Commander, Judge David B. Williams. Commander Williams cannot be present due to the monthly meeting of our department executive committee.

The proposed closing of the Murphy Army Hospital is needless. The Federal Government wishes to deprive dependents of servicemen of Massachusetts of medical care and hospitalization on the grounds of economy. This, may I assure, is false ecenomy and will bring untold hardships and great expense to mothers, sons, and daughters of many a Bay State soldier.

For example, the nearest Army Hospital to Boston is at Fort Devens, a distance of over 45 miles from the capital of Massachusetts.

An expectant mother, receiving prenatal treatment, is forced to travel long distances for medical examinations and will not receive any reimbursement for her expenses. This will occur if Murphy Hospital is closed, though the Federal Government, by law, is supposed to give full medical care to the dependents of our soldiers.

They are not receiving anything free from the Federal Government. When a man enlists in the Army of the United States, he automatically receives the benefits of a serviceman.

When the United States takes away these benefits, it affects the morale of every man in the uniform of this country. Secretary of the Air Force, Harold E. Talbott, while speaking in Massachusetts some time ago, disclosed that enlistments are dropping at an alarming rate. This, according to Secretary Talbott, was due to lowering of morale because benefits are being stripped from the serviceman.

Massachusetts sent over 500,000 men and women into World War II. During the Korean conflict, over 100,000 Bay Staters served their country. Today many of them still wear the uniform of this country. They have distinguished themselves on the field of battle.

Now the Federal Government rewards them by attempting to close the Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham, an institution that is needed by the soldiers from Massachusetts.

Thousands of mothers, sons, and daughters, miles away from their loved ones in uniform, are to be the victims of economy. Economy will not keep this country strong against aggression. Only our fighting men, possessed with courage, strength, and a high morale, can keep this country strong.

But the Federal Government can cause untold damage to our Armed Forces. A soldier from Massachusetts will suffer immeasurable harm if the Murphy Army Hospital is closed.

The Disabled American Veterans requested President Eisenhower, the Members of the House and the Senate, to convert Framingham VA Hospital into a Federal soldiers' home. This request was denied by the Federal Government.

Today, the Disabled American Veterans of Massachusetts strongly protest the closing of Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham and urge you to do everything in your power to help the mothers, sons, and daughters of every soldier from Massachusetts by writing your Congressmen and Senators in Washington and protesting this move.

To me it is inconceivable that the Army should attempt to abandon the Murphy Army Hospital. I simply cannot understand why Senator SALTONSTALL sits idly by each year when these attempts are made to close this hospital which would affect thousands of servicemen and their dependents in this area.

Thank you.

"Liberals" Should Quit Being Soft on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following address by President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, which was delivered before the National Religion and Labor Foundation in New York on December 14, 1955. The address is published in the December 23, 1955, issue of U. S. News & World Report:

LIBERALS SHOULD QUIT BEING SOFT ON COMMUNISM

Too many in the free world fail to see the real nature of communism as the mortal foe of everything that we hold dear, of every moral and spiritual value. Too many in the free world are still prisoners of the illusion that communism is, historically speaking, a progressive system—extreme liberalism temporarily making bad mistakes.

Actually, communism represents darkest reaction. It is an antisocial system in which there are imbedded some of the worst features of savagery, slavery, fuedalism, and life-sapping exploitation manifested in the industrial revolution of early-day capitalism.

Too many in the free world seem to have lost their capacity for moral indignation against the most brutal inhumanities when they are perpetrated by Communists. It is painful, but we must face the cruel facts of life.

We of the democratic camp must develop a far more vigorous moral attitude.

We must rekindle our capacity to cry out against, to protest against, the Godless dogmas and savage crimes being perpetrated by Moscow.

Such struggles and such protests are not negative actions. They are positive. They are morally and politically constructive. I know of nothing more positive and constructive than a total struggle against the totalitarian cancer in the body politic of modern society.

It is rather disturbing to me that many people in our country who call themselves liberals are stone silent about the Soviet concentration camps. They never find the time to utter a word of condemnation against the Communist-imperialist destruction of the national independence and democratic rights of hundreds of millions of people in Europe and Asia.

It is shocking to see the studied attempts being made by Western diplomacy to tear to shreds the Charter of the United Nations under the guise of the so-called package deal with Moscow and Peiping. Can it be that the free world is so weak in its moral spirit that it does not recognize this deal as appeasement of the worst kind?

I am all for a fight to the finish against racialism in our own midst. Racialism is damnable and detestable in any form. But racialism in reverse—as now propagated in India and Burma by Khrushchev and Bulganin—is just as reprehensible.

And the Communist imprisonment of hundreds of thousands of hostages—so-called war prisoners—10 years after the close of the war, in violation of every human right and international agreement—is morally reprehensible. One would expect the true liberal to cry out in protest against human beings being carted, tagged and shuttled about for weeks in rail yards of Russia, as if they were carloads of coal or bags of potatoes.

Not until we of the free world can give rebirth to a vibrant moral attitude, to a burning indignation against such frightful bestialities, can the freedom-loving people be sufficiently stirred to gather the moral strength for resisting and defeating the totally antimoral dogmas and deeds of communism at home and abroad. Yes, this means above all a moral struggle against communism.

Communism is the very opposite of liberalism. Communism is the deadliest enemy of liberalism. Liberals should be the most consistent and energetic fighters against communism. Liberals must also be on guard against developing a certain type of McCarthyism of their own. They must shun like a plague the role of being anti-anti-Communist.

Only by refusing to be thus entrapped, can liberals shed every vestige of subconscious and conscious regard for comunism as a movement with which they have something in common.

Much more regard must be shown by the democracies for principles—for the principles of human rights and human freedom. We must never sacrifice principles to expediency. This means being rigid in support of our principles.

Moscow is sure it has history's timetable in its pocket. Hitler once thought so, too. We have nothing to fear from peaceful competition. They need our help. We do not need theirs. They have nothing that can help us. What they have can only hurt us. But what we have they want from us in order to help and save them from the follies of Communism and Soviet imperialism.

We must avoid the suicidal self-deception of the popular front and united front.

No country, no people, no movement can stand aloof and be neutral in this struggle. Nehru and Tito are not neutral. They are aides and allies in fact and in effect, if not in diplomatic verbiage.

In conclusion, I cannot emphasize too strongly to you: The conflict between communism and freedom is the problem of our time. It overshadows all other problems. This conflict mirrors our age, its toils, its tensions, its troubles and its tasks. On the outcome of this conflict depends the future of all mankind. I pray that, on the threshhold of the atomic age, we—all of the free world—can muster the moral courage and total strength to preserve the peace and promote the freedom of the men and women of every continent, color and creed.

Birthday of Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marked a very special day in the hearts of lovers of freedom everywhere. All over the world it was celebrated as the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. In America and Poland at least it was celebrated as the birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko as well.

The parallels between these two men are striking. Both men fought courageously, in their own ways and in their own times, for the liberty of man and for the right of each nation to determine its own way of rule. Both believed in the dignity of man. Both dedicated their lives to free man from oppression. Both contributed richly to make this Nation great. Their nobility of character, devotion to principle, and love of justice for all men continue to inspire us today.

Thaddeus Kosciusko was born on February 12, 1746. He came to this country in 1776 as one of hundreds of Polish patriots who won undying glory by aiding us in winning the Revolutionary War. These men were not soldiers of fortune or adventure seekers. They were true believers in the freedom of man. Most of them had fought for Poland for that ideal before crossing the seas to aid us in our cause.

Immediately upon arriving in this country Kosciusko applied for military service. He was accepted and charged with drawing up plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The success of this project earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

The remainder of his work in the War of Independence is a matter of history. How he directed the construction of fortifications at West Point. How he erected defenses at Saratoga which played such a vital role in our victory there. How he engaged in the Battle of Charleston and was among the first of the Continental Army to enter the city after the British evacuated. By the close of the war he was a brigadier general.

For a time after the war he remained in his adopted land, but when it became apparent that there was hope for a resurgence of freedom in his native Poland, he returned to join the fray. There he led a tiny but inspired army of patriots in its resistance to the Russian tyrant. The odds against him were great and the outcome inevitable, but he fought bravely on. Imprisoned once for 2 years, he was eventually exiled to Switzerland, where he died in 1817.

We honor General Kosciusko today, not only because he fought for our independence but because he was a vigorous champion of the universal cause of human freedom as long as he lived. His name, indeed, is enshrined in the hearts and minds of the American people. I am proud to state that a street in my home city of Rochester bears his name.

But let us bear in mind that while we here in this country enjoy the blessings of freedom, the native land of Thaddeus Kosciusko, who fought to make our land free, still suffers under the cruel yoke of tyranny. We have neglected the plight of Poland too long. She is too good a friend for us to treat in this fashion. Though we are engaged in cold but mortal combat with the forces of communism the world over, we cannot allow ourselves to forget others who have sacrificed for freedom and fought the common enemy. We should do all in our power to bolster up the spirit of our friends in Poland.

To that end, let us extend and expand the Voice of America and United States Information Agency programs, so that the voice of the free world will continue to penetrate the Iron Curtain.

Above all, let us protest to the United Nations concerning the many injustices going on today in Poland. In the past conquerors and exploiters of Poland have always permitted the Poles to retain intact their cultural traditions and their sense of national history, as well as their native language. Now, however, the heel of Moscow grinds deep. Reports from behind the Iron Curtain indicate that not only Poland's culture and history, but her language as well, are being systematically destroyed by the Russians. We must not let the names of titans such as Mickiewicz, Sienkiewicz, Padarewski, and Kosciusko die out. We must not let the flame of freedom they helped feed die out. We must protest to the United Nations the injustices in Poland.

The finest way in which we can honor the memory of that gallant Pole who came to our aid in 1776 is to dedicate ourselves to assist in every possible way to gain freedom for Poland and for all men everywhere. Let us reiterate our faith in freedom and reaffirm our determination to work to make the world safe for the democracy for which Lincoln and Kosciusko fought so bravely.

The Late Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the first helping hands extended to me when I came to Congress in 1953 was the firm, friendly hand of CHAUNCEY REED.

Not in an attitude of noblesse oblige and not in the manner of an all-wise statesman to an uninitiated freshman Congressman, but in a true spirit of human brotherhood he offered to guide me along the tortuous and sometimes frightening path which the new Member of Congress must follow. From that first meeting until the last my respect, admiration and love for him constantly increased. He was a man without moral fault and with many outstanding virtues. He was a man without an enemy and with many friends among his colleagues of the House. His passing leaves a void which cannot easily be filled in the ranks of the Committee on the Judiciary which he loved so dearly and indeed in the citizenship of this country which he served so faithfully.

I was privileged to attend his funeral last Tuesday in West Chicago, Ill., where he was born, raised, and schooled. One could not help but be impressed by the universal admiration in which he was held by those who knew him best and longest. The services were plain and simple, as I am sure he would have wished them to be, but dignified in their simplicity. As he lay in State in the auditorium of the local American Legion chapter of which he was a member, hundreds of his old comrades in arms and fellow citizens of the little community which he called home all of his life filed by in respectful silence and, with a salute, or a bowing of the head, or a falling of a tear, rendered tribute to this great man whose constituency was the world.

Truly, he left footprints on the sands of time, footprints which all who aspire to serve the people might pridefully follow.

The Armenian Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on the 35th anniversary of the historic February 18 revolt, freedom-loving Armenians worldwide pray for another uprising in Armenia and to the four corners of the Soviet Union by the various groups who like the Armenians live in a reign of terror. And this uprising must come before the whole of Armenia's youth are done away with, as reported in a recent series of articles by Mr. V. Valadian, an analyst of Soviet affairs and well-known Armenian writer. Valadian said:

Soviet papers reported that 4,000 Armenian youth had been sent to forced labor in the Kazakh steppes. The dispatch of Armenian young people to Kazakhhistan has continued without pause, that the total has reached $10,000 or thereabouts. Most of the young men and women are students. Others are construction workers.

This in itself is an example of how the Soviet maintains its iron rule on its subjects, by steadily draining the country of its freshest, most promising youth. The youth who the Soviet fears may be the leaders of another February 18, 1921.

There are many significant events in recent and contemporary history which are not well known. Some important events which took place more than three decades ago, events in which freedom-loving men fought valiantly against the then growing power which today threatens the very basis of our way of life, are not as familiar to us as they should be. The revolt which the Armenian people staged against the Communist tyranny of the Kremlin 35 years ago is one of those little known but important events.

The Armenian people had lost their national political independence more than 500 years ago, but throughout that long period they had contrived to maintain their national entity and had firmly clung to the idea of national independence. Toward the end of World War I, they saw their chance, seized upon it and declared their independence in May of 1918. At that time Russian communism, as an international force, was in its infancy, though a definite threat to the newly born Armenian Republic. Even so, the new state managed to stave off both Turkish nationalist and Russian Communist threats for more than 2 years. But toward the end of 1920, it was clear that, unless the Armenians were aided by the West, their independence as well as their freedom was doomed. Unfortunately that gloomy prediction was fulfilled. In the fall of that year, when nationalist Turks and Communist Russians launched their simultaneous attack against the Armenians, their country was overrun and their independence destroyed. By the end of December, Communist Russians succeeded in bringing most of Caucasian Armenia under the Soviet hegemony.

In the course of the next 2 months the Aremenian people learned the brutal nature of Soviet tyranny, which in its train produced intolerable oppression and caused endless misery. In mid-February of 1921 the Armenians, under the inspiration of their fearless leaders, revolted against their Communist oppressors. They acted in complete unison and with such determination and resolve that in a few days they expelled their unwelcome overlords from the country, and on February 18 they again asserted their national independence. This revival, however, proved to be of short duration. In the course of less than 2 months, Russian Communists gathered strength and again attacked Armenia, this time with a larger force. By early April, Armenia was once more engulfed in the massive blood-bath of Communist tyranny.

For almost 35 years, Soviet tyranny has been maintained over Armenia with an iron hand, and its oppressive yoke weighs heavily upon the people there. The helpless Armenians, however, even when subjected to inhuman treatment by the ruthless minions of the Kremlin, have not relinquished their claim to freedom and their right to national independence. Theirs was one of the first successful attempts to overthrow Communist tyranny. And today nothing would please us more than to see them freed from the clutches of deadly communism and once more regain their national political independence. In commemorating that revolt, we not only pay tribute to the memory of those who gave their lives for a noble cause, but we also express our profound admiration for those who still steadfastly cling to the ideals held in common by all free men.

Selfish Power Interests Oppose the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, many people are puzzled by the hostile attitude of southern California toward the Colorado River storage project, particularly when it can be clearly seen that the project would be of substantial benefit to southern California by prolonging the effective life of Hoover Dam and in many other ways.

I believe the truth of the matter is that a majority of the people of California, at least those who are well informed, are not opposed to the Colorado River storage project. The opposition is coming from a small, selfish group who are growing rich by using the upper basin States' share of Colorado River water to generate low-cost hydroelectric power and who are frantically fighting anything that will bring an end to this situation.

With the tremendous power subsidy they are receiving from use of our water, they have plenty of money to spend on propaganda. As a result, most of the people in their own area and many of those in other parts of the country have been sold a completely fallacious story on the effect of upper basin development on both upper and lower basins of the Colorado River.

The facts of the situation I have outlined are set forth in an editorial which appeared in the Denver Post, and which I now insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

HERE ARE THE STAKES ON THE COLORADO

Do you know how much the power consumers of California have gained from the upper Colorado River Basin States' failure to provide upstream water storage for their own use? Well, we've given our California friends $12 million since 1938.

If we don't get some water storage projects by 1988 (which is the 50-year contract period covering payout of Hoover Dam) our total charity to California will have been $115 million. Who are the beneficiaries of our largess? The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the city of Los Angeles, the Southern California Edison Co., and the California Electric Power Co.

No wonder California is willing and can afford to dump dough into congressional sabotage of our storage project. Here's the story:

When the Government, under the Boulder Canyon Act of 1940, negotiated hydroelectric power sales contracts for Hoover Dam kilo-

watts with the California customers, it was necessary to consider annual depletions from Lake Mead resulting from upstream diversions. (The river had been "divided" theoretically by compact of the States and Federal Government some years before.) Those depletions were estimated from hydrologic studies covering the period 1938–88, which were the initial and termination dates under the power contracts.

It was assumed that the average annual decrease in water supply available to Lake Mead, because of increased upstream uses, would amount to 79,000 acre-feet. But, as things worked out, there has been no significant upstream depletion between 1938 and 1954. That means that there have been, in that 16-year period, about 111 million acre-feet more water available at Hoover Dam for power production than would have been available had progress been made in upstream projects. That additional water is equivalent to some 4.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam powerplant.

Now, that has been secondary energy, sold to the California interests at something like 1.30 mills per kilowatt-hour. Had that same power been generated by fuel in the Los Angeles area it would have cost about 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. Thus the municipal consumers of southern California and two private electric utilities have saved close to 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour, without additional investment on their part and with only minor transmission losses.

Under the Hoover Dam power contracts all secondary energy is reserved to the California allottees; and the savings to them since 1938 have amounted to $12 million.

Every year that the lower California Representatives in Congress, the lobbyists for the city of Los Angeles, and the trained seals on the payroll of Southern California Edison and California Electric can block the upper Colorado storage project, it means money in the bank for them. And if they can hold it up for just about 30 years more, they will have won a prize of 43 billion kilowatt-hours of secondary energy at a total savings of $115 million.

Their bonus is not a result of any contractual right, understand. It simply represents a premium that they would realize from the presence of water physically reaching Lake Mead as a result of the Upper Basin States' failure to use even part of the water allocated to them under the Colorado River Interstate Compact of 1922.

In view of the foregoing is it any wonder that lower California would (or could) raise a rich lobbying fund to persuade Members of Congress and the people of the United States that the upper basin project is a "boondoggle"?

Behind the Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It is a date that the freedom-loving people of the world will note. The feeling of Americans on this occasion is well expressed in the following editorial which appeared this morning in the New York Times:

BEHIND THE CURTAIN

The Soviet campaign against both meteorological and the Free Europe balloons has had the ironic result of calling increased attention to the Iron Curtain and the fate of the subjugated nations behind it. That fate is illustrated in the case of Lithuania, which in bitter silence at home but with appropriate ceremonies among its exiled sons and daughters observes today the 38th anniversary of its independence, still acknowledged by most of the free world.

Together with its Baltic sister states of Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania presents a prime example of Soviet perfidy. Lithuania was among the first nations with which the Soviets concluded a nonaggression pact similar to that now being offered by Premier Bulganin to the United States. But at the first opportunity the Soviets tore up the pact, seized the country, and converted it into a colony which they are colonizing with Russian Communists, who often assume the Lithuanian names of the victims they displace. The Lithuanians, however, like other subjugated nations, continue both passive and active resistance and take new hope from the espousal of the cause of freedom by their own exiled leaders organized in the Assembly of Captive Nations and by leading free world statesmen, including President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden.

The Soviets have tried to kill off the native surge for freedom by offers of amnesty to the "forest brothers" conducting active resistance and by their "Operation snow," designed to lure the exiles back into their power. But the cause of freedom has always proved itself to be stronger than slavery, and on the basis of that experience there is reason to hope that the Soviets will not succeed in reversing the course of history.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we Americans who are cognizant of the benefits of a free Nation happily proclaim the achievement of that independence every Fourth of July. Lithuania normally celebrates their declaration of independence on February 16. Unfortunately, for 16 years Independence Day has not been an occasion for celebration in Lithuania. The freedom which Lithuania had gained on February 16, 1918 was lost when Hitler and Stalin signed their nonaggression pact and spelled the doom of Lithuania's independence. During the course of World War II, the Soviets subjugated the powerless Baltic nations and have kept them under bondage ever since. In the process of complete Sovietization many of the courageous Lithuanian people were executed and deported. However, it is encouraging to note that despite the totalitarian techniques of terror the Lithuanians to this day have steadfastly opposed the Soviet tyrant. The mere fact that the Soviets have found it expedient to use these terror tactics is tangible evidence that the struggle for freedom still exists in this captive country. Moreover, this heroic fight for liberation is a symbol for suppressed nations everywhere and has won the gratitude of all the free nations of the world.

On this 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the American people, ever mindful of the blessings of their own Declaration of Independence, join with all Lithuanians in hoping for the day when this enslaved nation will be released from its bondage and will once more be welcomed in the family of free nations. We are positive that their struggle will not be in vain.

Murphy Army Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following illuminating account of the status of the Murphy Army Hospital, at Waltham, Mass., which appeared in the Boston Post, on February 13, 1956.

The article follows:

PLOTTERS OF THE PENTAGON

The United States Defense Department has on its staff some first rate military strategists; this was demonstrated in World War II and, again, in Korea. The Department can boast, too—and probably does—of a number of political plotters, whose object is to thwart the public will as expressed by the people or their representatives in Congress whenever it seems convenient or advantageous to do so.

These plotters of the Pentagon have nothing but contempt for the people of Massachusetts. When Bay Staters indicate what is best for this area, the plotters sweep the suggestions and the fact under some large steel desk, and then proceed as coolly as so many potential dictators to do what they please.

Despite a congressional edict forbidding it, they have been working for 4 years to close down the Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham—and they partly succeeded. Despite protests of almost all the Massachusetts Representatives in Congress, they have already begun the cold-blooded liquidation of the Watertown Arsenal.

A congressional act prevented the closing of Murphy Hospital. To circumvent this, the Pentagon plotters began last fall moving an Air Force unit into the Murphy property. By way of showing just what able strategists they really are, they made the move a "secret," or "classified" project; that prevented ordinary citizens of Massachusetts from prying into the procedure.

Then they decided to convert a little more of the hospital to their own use to make it that much more unavailable to service men and their dependents. The plan was to get the Corps of Engineers installed there, too.

Then, with the Air Force in one section and the Corps of Engineers in another, how could the poor benighted public—the poor lowly civilians—possibly complain when the last bed was pushed out, the last patient

ejected or transferred, and the last ward closed down?

It was a plot worthy of schemers in a totalitarian country—or in an operetta. It might have worked, too, because the Pentagon schemers have stooges even on Capitol Hill, in Washington.

They managed to get—excuse us, to "sneak"—a rider onto a Senate appropriation bill which would have permitted the engineers to move in with the Air Force detachment. Between them, they would have taken over all the hospital space.

If Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK hadn't got word of the plot and got permission to go into the Senate and expose it, the hospital might well have been closed next March. The plotters were that close to having their way.

Why do they do it? We don't know. But we do know that their ultimate aim is to impose their will on the people, and we think it is long past time that they be reminded that this is a democracy at peace and not a military encampment at war.

The people, not the Pentagon, are still the source of power and policy in the United States.

Air Traffic Control Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transport Association of America concerning my remarks in the RECORD of January 24, 1956, as to the inadequacy of the Nation's air traffic control facilities.

Mr. Tipton states that "the requirement for this improved air traffic control system is considered by the scheduled airlines as the most important single factor needful of attention in the operational field for both military and civil aviation."

Respecting recent proposals of highly qualified authorities that the military SAGE system may be used for both civil-military aviation control purposes, Mr. Tipton feels that such a multi-billion-dollar project is too expensive for purely control purposes, that it might be discontinued with improved world conditions but that it may be adapted to serve dual civil-military purposes. He further is of the opinion that the CAA Act of 1938 provides for a complete traffic control system which would serve all segments of aviation.

I include this letter without additional comment for the information of Members of Congress as I consider the views of Mr. Tipton and his association as worthy of deep consideration:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: We were very pleased to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—House, of January 24, 1956, your comments concerning the need for a vastly improved air traffic control system to cope with the accelerated development of the air industry in the United States. The requirement for this improved air traffic control system is considered by the scheduled airlines as the most important single factor needful of attention in the operational field for both military and civil aviation. We appreciate your recognition of this requirement, and trust that your contnued efforts will have the needed impact upon the Congress and the public. It occurs to us that the following comments might be somewhat helpful to you in future discussions of this subject.

The immediate improvements which will result from implementation of the CAA 5-year plan should receive the endorsement and backing of the Congress, as well as the administrative branch. The item of $40 million for 1957, as submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for establishment of new navigation and traffic control aids, will result in considerable improvement in the flexibility and capacity of our present system, which we realize must be utilized for several years.

It should be recognized that, while these expenditures will go a long way increasing the capacity for the handling of air traffic, these are interim improvements, and that a new system of traffic control, specifically designed to meet the present high volume increases in operation and for the significantly increased speeds which are now and will be experienced in the future, must be undertaken.

This latter program must be started simultaneously with the interim improvement program for which the $40 million is under consideration. I am sure you realize the important relationship between the requrements of our military in the interests of defense of the country and the requirements of all other segments of aviation involved with civil enterprise and commerce. In spite of the difference in purpose of the military and civil operations, there is, nevertheless, a complete requirement for integration and common handling of all flight traffic insofar as air navigation and traffic control is concerned. This was the basis on which the common system concept was developed by Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics in the Collier Award-winning report of Special Committee No. 31, entitled "Air Traffic Control." This concept embraces the recognition, as expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, that the Civil Aeronautics in the Collier award-winning report sponsible for the control of all traffic, both civil and military. While it is true that the Air Force, Navy, and other military components have certain air traffic activities operated by them and intended to augment the existing CAA air traffic control system, insofar as the continental United States is concerned this is due only to CAA deficiencies in rendering service which the miltary require.

In your comments before the House on January 24 you commented on one phase of this problem, under the heading "Civil-military issue." This comment was concerned with the President's recommendation for appropriations to permit the CAA to take over from the Department of Defense the cost of operating certain radar installations. These installations, known as RAPCON's (radar approach control facilities) in most instances should be operated by the CAA, except at a relatively few isolated locations where there is practically no civil traffic, if we are to have a common system. They were established by the Air Force and Navy to augment the CAA traffic-control program, as mentioned above. They were designed specifically to meet military requirements in designated areas. A number of civil airports and airways lie within the boundaries of these areas. The military requested the CAA to budget for the operations as early as 1951, in the interest of maintaining a common air traffic control system. The CAA has budgeted to operate only approximately 18 of the 56 RAPCON's.

In connection with the military SAGE project, we have supported a program advocated by the Air Coordinating Committee, wherein the Air Navigation Development Board, as the coordinating agency for the Departments of Defense and Commerce, was to explore the possibility of using this system as an interim air traffic control system in addition to its primary mission for military defense. It is our opinon, subject to confirmaton after further study, that the SAGE system—or certain components thereof—could be advantageously utilized for traffic control as an early aid in improving the total air traffic control system capacity.

On the other hand, we are very doubtful—and certainly do not recommend at this time—that the SAGE system should become the ultimate traffic control system. This position stems primarily from the fact that the SAGE system is one of such cost magnitude that it can be justified only by defense requirements under a highly troublesome world situation. It is entirely possible that, with an improvement in the future of relationships between nations, this high cost would not be justified from a defense standpoint—at least as a fully operational activity. We feel confident that this cost could not be supported purely for a traffic-control purpose. The SAGE system, involving a multi-billion-dollar budget, is far too complex and expensive for traffic control alone. On the other hand, it is possible to develop a system which uses many of the SAGE techniques in more simple application, which could be compatible with the SAGE system while it is in being and yet perform its traffic-control function independently should the SAGE activity be discontinued. Accordingly, we recommend the development of this more simple and less expensive pure traffic-control system, using the advanced automatic techniques commensurate with the problem at hand. This system could be supported by governmental budgets specifically assigned to the accomplishment of the traffic-control mission for both military and civil aviation.

Under the heading Who Will Operate System, and in connection with your comments on Senator MONRONEY's bill, S. 2828, you raise the point as to whether or not a new committee, board, or counsel divorced from either the Department of Commerce or the Department of Defense might be necessary. It is our belief that the creation of such an organization is unnecessary. As stated earlier, there is agreement that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has made provision for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to supply a complete traffic control system which would serve all segments of aviation, both civil and military. It is only necessary that this concept be supported by ample funds for the purpose, that there be a clear understanding by all concerned that this was the intent of the legislation, and that even though the term "civil aeronutics" suggests that the activity would embrace only civil operations, in reality, aircraft of all agencies would be handled in a common and coordinated manner. Along the line of your suggestion, we believe that the organizational structure of the top air navigation development board should be augmented by the appointment of a third member (non-government) who would act as full-time chairman.

The air navigational development board is responsible for systems enginering and planning and developing new and improved traffic control facilities. At the present time, the top ANDB consists of two voting members, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Defense or their appointees. Under the present structure of the ANDB there is

no manner of resolving differences arising between the two voting members. The appointment of this third member should assure aviation an effective traffic control development program.

Once again we would like to commend you for your foresight in recognizing this serious situation, and your expression that its resolution should be given early and thorough consideration by appropriate committees of the Congress. We would suggest that the program can be effectively advanced by support of the recommendation of the nonpartisan Harding Committee report (Aviation Facilities Study Group of the Budget Bureau) pertaining to the appointment of an individual of national reputation and broad understanding of civil and military aviation, to provide full-time, high-level leadership in bringing our aviation facilities in line with air traffic growth and progress.

We will gladly make any information we have and our services available to you on this most important subject, or on any other aviation matters.

Cordially yours,

STUART G. TIPTON, *President.*

Nations Mark World Day of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to pay tribute to the church women of the world, who tomorrow are marking the annual World Day of Prayer, in this Nation and in 134 foreign lands across the world.

The church women have chosen for the theme of this year's observance "Thy will be done," words taken from that most perfect of all prayers. Beginning at dawn over the Fiji Islands and sweeping across the world in a great chain of prayer, man's innermost longings for world peace and understanding will be sent heavenward tomorrow in every dialect, every tongue.

A day that brings together all nations in a great fellowship of prayer cannot help but have an uplifting effect on all of mankind and who knows what great and wonderful things may be achieved through it? It was Tennyson who said, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of," and we in this country have recently had a demonstration of the power of this great and limitless resource. A few months ago the President of this great Nation was stricken and the hearts of the whole world were moved to pray for his recovery. A few days ago the President's physicians were able to report him well and sound and again prayers of thanksgiving rose from the lips of men and women in this and every nation on the globe.

I cannot help but feel that this tremendous outpouring of sincere prayer, plus the President's own deep and abiding faith, were able to bring about this happy circumstance.

When men and women lift minds and hearts to God in unselfish, sincere prayer, then lives can be changed, miracles wrought, hatred transformed into love and bitterness and conflict and peace.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 11, 1956, the Worcester, Mass., Lithuanian organizations celebrated Lithuanian Independence Day with an appropriate program held at the Lithuanian Naturalization Hall at 12 Vernon Street.

The program was sponsored by the Lithuanian Aid Association. Among the other societies taking part in the ceremony were the Lithuanian Community of America, Worcester branch; the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club; Lithuanian National League of America; Lithuanian Women's Club, Lithuanian Alliance of America, Branch 57; St. Casimir's; St. George's; St. Ludwig's and Birute societies; Lithuanian Aged Aid Society and the Lithuanian National Society of America.

Mr. Vincent Macys was general chairman, assisted by Michael Zemaitaitis, vice chairman; Leonard Kacinskas, secretary; John Dvareckas, treasurer; John Pipiras, financial secretary; Miss Anna Taraila, assistant secretary; and John Palubeckas, master of ceremonies.

In connection with the celebration, I have been asked to include the addresses delivered by myself and a most prominent Lithuanian American, Anthony J. Miller, Esq., over radio station WNEB in Worcester, Mass.

The addresses follow:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ANTHONY J. MILLER, ESQ.

As an American citizen of Lithuanian descent, I am proud and privileged to join in this program commemorating the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

This annual ceremony is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanian-Americans because it is held to recollect that day of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule. Lithuania, on that day, stood forth as an independent, democratic republic. There was cause for rejoicing and the future was faced with confidence.

This is the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. What did the Lithuanians accomplish during the brief period in which they were their own masters and the Government of Lithuania was of, for, and by the people of Lithuania?

Let me give you a few figures: In 2 decades when Lithuania was free the number of primary schools was increased from 677 to 2,696. There were constructed over 100 secondary schools, including 2 years of college, and 4,000 advanced students were enrolled at the great university at Kaunas. Every city in Lithuania of more than 5,000 population supported opera seasons with the world's great operas, many of them translated into Lithuanian, given under conditions making it possible for all who so desired to attend.

Everywhere there were special schools for music, art, and ballet. Industry and commerce reached peaks never before attained in a country of a population of not many more than 3 million. Practically everyone owned his own home or his own farm. This is the record made in 22 years when the people of Lithuania were free and the Government of Lithuania was of, for, and by the people of Lithuania. No people in all the history of the world ever made a record surpassing that of the people of Lithuania when Lithuania was free.

There is something in the Lithuanian blood that will not tolerate injustice and that can withstand the most savage inroads of tyranny. The source of the spirit of freedom that is in the Lithuanian people goes back many, many years. It was 1,500 years before the birth of Christ that the Lithuanians came to settle themselves in Europe. It is said that the origin of the Lithuanian race is lost in the mists of time. Probably it came from the Himalayan Mountains of north India, one of the tribes belonging to the Aryan group of thousands of years ago.

The settlement of Lithuanians in Europe was on the rolling plains along the shores of the Baltic Sea, a land of rich and fertile earth, heavily forested, and with wide rivers and many lakes. In modern times, it is described as a heart-shaped land of 33,000 square miles, lying between Russia and Germany, like a walnut in the jaws of a nutcracker.

From 1500 B. C. to this year of A. D. 1956 the Lithuanians have been a vital force for freedom in Europe and their descendants now numbering over a million who came to the United States of America have in this land of ours been a vital force for freedom.

When Tatar hordes swept out of the East, their objective being the overwhelming of Europe, the Lithuanians rallied to beat back the invaders. When to the West the Huns and other Germanic tribes came with fresh threats, again the Lithuanian people rallied and beat back the invading hordes.

In the first centuries after the birth of Christ the worship of the Lithuanians was that of a pagan mythology. Perkunas was the god of thunder and lightning, Zemininkas the god of earth, and Viehpate the god of life. Then came Christianity. One of the first of a long line of powerful Lithuanian leaders was King Mindaugas, who succeeded in gathering the other Lithuanian dukes under his banner and who 700 years ago was crowned King of Lithuania. For three centuries the unconquerable legions of Lithuania held the balance of power in Eastern Europe. The word of the Lithuanian was law through much of what is now Poland and Germany and beyond Moscow in Russia.

In 1572 the Polish throne was given up and in 1795 the country was overwhelmed by the legions of Russia. There followed the tide of diplomatic intrigue, the Napoleonic wars, and the oppression of the czars. Always did the Lithuanians refuse to accept their conquerors.

Three times in the 19th century they rose and revolted against overwhelming odds. Again at the dawning of the 20th century they revolted, their spirit still beyond the power of tyranny to crush. Loyal freedom-loving Lithuanians were torn from their homes and thrown in the hellholes of Siberia, but no power, no torture could quench their spirit.

Then in 1918 freedom came again to Lithuania. Again she was free to form her own government and take her place in the family of nations. In the 22 years of Lithuanian independence a record was written in successful self-government of which any people could be proud.

Today again Lithuania is in the enslavement of a brutal tyrant but the spirit of freedom, which centuries of oppression have never succeeded in crushing, lives on among the people of Lithuania.

On this anniversary day, then, I ask you to join with me in sending across the seas to our beloved but still enslaved people of Lithuania this message:

"Be not discouraged, be not downhearted. The night may be long and dark but the sun of the morning is soon to break upon you, your homes, and your land. Each day that passes brings your blessed country closer to inevitable independence. We shall not fail you and will work and pray together with you until your liberty is accomplished."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

As your Representative in the United States Congress, I am honored to take part in these exercises commemorating the 38th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

As you are all aware, 38 years ago Lithuania made known to the world that it was an independent nation, exercising the right of self-government and self-determination. This declaration of Lithuanian independence was one of the great milestones in the history of a liberty-loving people whose struggle for self-government continued over centuries.

From the 16th century on, Lithuania was almost in a constant battle against aggressive neighbors, but never gave up hope to preserve the Lithuaian tradition for freedom. During 120 years of Russian domination, no less than five distinct major revolts took place in Lithuania. Back in the early 1800's, Czar Nicholas the First invoked a sweeping policy to Russify Lithuania. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, literature, language, schools, religion, and governmental offices.

In 1863 and 1864, another revolt took place which failed after a struggle of 18 months. Another revolution in 1905 brought fresh hopes for independence, but failed.

During World War I, the German armies overran the country and remained there until the end of the war. During this time, uprising, negotiations, and minor rebellions did not cease.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously adopted a declaration calling for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as the capital and the severance of all political ties which linked it with other nations. This declaration became Lithuania's proclamation of independence.

After the evacuation of Lithuania by Germany in November and December 1918, Russian troops arrived at the border of Lithuania and again made an effort to subjugate the nation. The last battle with the Red army was fought late in 1919 which culminated in a peace treaty signed July 12, 1920.

On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, thus Lithuania became a full member of the international powers. The permanent constitution was adopted August 1, 1922. It was an instrument which followed the blueprint of western democracy. The state of Lithuania was an independent democratic republic; the people were accorded the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly; the constitution guaranteed freedom of religion; the independent Lithuanian Government instituted land reforms; industrial production proceeded to ascend; neglected railroads were rebuilt and transportation improvement was inaugurated throughout the land; social legislation and education were expanded and it did not take long before the new independent democracy was functioning with the precision of nations much older.

The Lithuanian people proved, during the period of time from their declaration of independence up until the Hitler-Stalin menace devastated Europe, that its people could give the world a practical example of true democracy in action.

During the period from 1920 to 1939, the Lithuanian Government entered into peace treaties, nonaggression pacts and mutual assistance agreements with the Soviet Union. By reason of typical and well-known Communist duplicity and treachery, every one of these agreements was discarded and nullified by Russia when they saw the opportunity was ripe to enslave the Lithuanian people.

The long and dismal record of the mass liquidations, prison incarcerations and tortures brutally inflicted by the Soviets upon the brave and liberty-loving people of Lithuania would take hours to recite. It is a black page of world history vividly revealing the barbaric tyranny that godless Communist dictators imposed upon innocent human beings.

This terrible and frightening record is accurately drawn up in the final summary report of the Congressional Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression published on December 31, 1954. The basic findings, conclusions, and recommendations outlined in that report should awaken the consciousness of all still free peoples throughout the world to the danger and intent of the Communist conspiracy.

It is, indeed, a solemn warning of the cruel treatment any nation and people falling under the domination of the Kremlin iron heel will receive.

That is why we as your fellow Americans and this Government, in our own interest, cannot and should not relax our efforts of assistance to Lithuania, and all other enslaved nations under Communist domination, in regaining their rightful freedom.

The attitude of the United States Government in regard to the present status of Lithuania is, of course, universally known. The United States has never sanctioned the forced incorporation of Lithuania, with Latvia and Estonia, into the Soviet Union and still continues to recognize them as sovereign states. Many other free democracies also regard the Baltic nations as being deprived of their independence by an act of aggression having neither legal nor moral justification.

However, nonsanction is not enough. We must be increasingly insistent in demanding that the Soviet leaders restore the liberty of Lithuania and the other oppressed countries as proof of their declared intention to cooperate for peace in the world. There can never be any true and lasting peace in a world that is half slave and half free. The conscience of the still free world will never be clear until Lithuania has regained her freedom and let us rededicate ourselves tonight to that objective, praying that it be God's will to occur in the near future.

Hon. Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow the Members of the House heard the sad news of the untimely passing of our beloved colleague CHAUNCEY REED. In his passing, the State of Illinois has lost a true statesman and we in this House have lost a treasured personal friend. His life should be an inspiration for others to emulate.

CHAUNCEY REED left his own monument. It is a dedicated Christian life founded on character, integrity, loyalty, and ability. It is a dedicated life of distinguished service to his constituents, to our great State of Illinois, and to all America. The State of Illinois and our country have lost a great man, but we are all better for having known him.

His friendliness penetrated rugged partisan barriers, especially in his legislative work with fellow Members, and radiated throughout this Chamber I treasured his friendship, advice and counsel and fond memories of CHAUNCEY REED will be inseparable from my service in the House of Representatives.

His loved ones should find solace in the fact that he left them a rich heritage of love and affection and devoted service to his country.

Bob Sikes: A Great Friend of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the development of the forestry industry; in the State of Florida, and in particular in the Eighth District of Florida which I have the honor to represent. One of the most devoted friends of our great forestry program is the dean of of our Florida delegation, the Honorable BOB SIKES, who so capably represents the Third District of Florida. This last year Congressman SIKES made a number talks on forestry throughout our State. He made a splendid address at a meeting at the research station at Olustee in my district. I am pleased to include for the record another great address he made for the annual meeting of the American Forestry Association at Jacksonville, last October. Congressman SIKES' address follows:

A REPORT ON FORESTRY PROGRESS IN THE SOUTH

(By Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida)

Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to welcome you to Jacksonville, Fla., and to the South. I hope you will enjoy and profit by every minute of your stay here. I hope you will see the South and its forestry opportunities and problems not as a casual visitor but as a careful observer and that you will take back with you an understanding of what the South is achieving.

A few years ago one of our great pulp and paper corporations, the International Paper Co., issued a remarkable annual report called A Report to the People of the South. It illustrated how the prosperity of the people was dependent upon forestry progress being made on the company's lands. I'm sure that company would not object if I copied their expression of good public relations and expanded their idea in a report to you. So, I would like to give you who have come here from all over the Nation a report on forestry progress in the South.

I come from northwest Florida where many of the counties are more than three-fourths forested. It is a real piney-woods

country. Years ago I saw the great virgin pine cleared by the steam skidders, and the remains of logging railroads scattered like bones from a skeleton on a barren, wasted country. I have seen the annual fires set by men on horseback as far as they could ride. More recently I have seen the change to protection and a start toward proper management under which the great green regrowth of pine will reclothe our plains and hills with a new wealth. I have seen the development of the pulp and paper industry—there are three of these wonderful industries in my district alone—the International Paper Co., the St. Joe Paper Co., and the St. Regis Paper Co.—all with great well-managed land holdings.

I have lived with forestry in the South and therefore I must ask you to forgive the seemingly too frequent use of the personal pronoun. Forestry is a personal matter to me and a personal matter to the people of my district. Forestry must be a personal matter to you, too, as indicated by your presence and active interest in this meeting. Forestry is important not only regionally but also nationally. What the South does affects the Nation. Our success or failure in producing the forest products needed in war or peace will have a lot to do with the welfare and prosperity of everyone be he a Kansas farmer or a Brooklyn shoe clerk.

Through protection and development of its forest regrowth the South has become the great forest factory of the Nation. With 222 million acres of commercial forest land the South is producing and can be counted upon to continue to produce a great wealth of forest products. Incidentally, when I speak of the South I am including not only the Deep South but also Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri. I need not remind you of the great many uses of our forests, but a moment might be well spent in considering new uses as well as old. Let me give you an example: Two centuries ago in this area longleaf pine was cut and charred slowly to make pitch. The pitch was collected by the crude method of draining it into a pit dug in the earth. Fifty years ago longleaf pine was chipped or hacked and the gum collected in a box chopped into the base of the tree. Then, in addition to tar, we produced turpentine and rosin. Now with modern conservation methods of working the trees, using bark chipping, acid and spiral gutters and removable double-headed nails which do not damage the tree, we are producing high quality gum or oleoresin which is being used in a great number of products—medicines, paints, linoleum, paper and even as lubricants needed by jet airplanes.

Certainly we are making great strides in our forest products industries. Since World War II the South has experienced an industrial expansion never dreamed possible. Industrial capacity for paper making has doubled. I know that some people in the South and the Nation had their misgivings about this great paper company expansion. For example, when one big company wanted to expand its plant in my district 3 years ago, I was consulted and I deliberated for a long time due to the high timber drain estimates. I checked with company officials and foresters. We studied forest survey reports. Based largely upon the company's plans for sustained forestry my advice was to encourage the expansion. The forestry plans are being carried out and I feel that I can report that my decision has been fully justified as the wisest course of action.

We are in reality enjoying a cellulose age when you think of our multiwall paper bags and cartons which package almost everything from milk to concrete, the hardboard, insulating board, and newsprint, and hundreds of cellulose products. I hope you will visit one of our great pulpmills while you are here. I have also mentioned naval stores. You are in the heart of the colorful naval stores belt here and I hope you'll get out of your cars to examine some working trees and perhaps a central steam still. Our lumber industry is booming any many of our big lumber companies like the Neal Lumber Co. of Blountstown, Fla., and the Alger-Sullivan Lumber Co., of Cantonment, Fla., for example, are doing a splendid forestry job.

Last year the South planted 516,477 acres, three-fourths of the Nation's total planting. May I brag a little bit by saying that in tree planting the South leads the Nation? Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi lead all the States in tree planting. The State of Georgia is now producing more than 100 million trees per year. The State of Florida is increasing the capacity of its State nurseries to about 80 million. In addition to this, many of the paper companies have tree nurseries or are in process of establishing them. Their combined production will exceed 50 million trees this year. In this field we are making great progress but before we become complacent let's remember that the South still has 26 million acres of idle forest lands in need of planting and probably an equal area in poorly stocked woods where interplanting is needed to obtain full production. We need to produce 1 billion trees per year if we are to get on with the job.

As most of you know the tree-planting program is a cooperative State-Federal-private landowner venture began in 1924 under the Clarke-McNary Act. I am proud of the partnership relationships which have been time tested under this act and the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 in which I had a part. These acts show what can be done by working together in true partnerships. Federal money and technical assistance are needed in all States, particularly the lagging States, and to provide uniformity of programs and to guarantee that the national interest is protected.

In the field of private forest management I am sure the South is leading the Nation and that in no other part of this Nation will you see as much timber marked for selective cutting, as much thinning and timber stand improvement work, and as much general private forest management activity anywhere as in the South. The only dark cloud in this bright picture is that most of this fine forestry is on the large holdings while the small landowner isn't keeping up. In fact, I believe the small woodlands are deteriorating. The small woodland owner rarely is getting the technical help he needs to put his woods under good management. All of the large timber companies have staffs of able foresters working on company lands and most of them will help the neighboring small woodland owners. In fact, I am told that some 150 conservation foresters employed by industry are helping small woodland owners and coordinating their services with the 112 farm foresters that are on the States' payrolls working under the State-Federal partnership set up by the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950. But that's a mere advance cadre of what is needed if we are within a reasonable length of time to help the 2 million small woodland owners of the South who own 157 million acres.

In research we are moving ahead slowly and painstakingly. Scientists are working diligently to find new uses for forest products and new ways to grow more and better trees. Some land which once grew majestic longleaf pines is now covered with worthless brush. How to remove this brush and reforest in an economical way is one of our biggest problems. Research will lead the way. Within 50 miles of Jacksonville are two Federal research facilities: The United States Forest Service Research Center at Lake City, Fla., and the Naval Stores Laboratory of the United States Agricultural Research Service at Olustee, Fla. In my district the Chipola Forest Station at Marianna is studying important production problems. In addition, the Union Bag & Paper Co. has a research center at Savannah and the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. has one at Charleston, S. C.

In the field of protection, I wish I could report to you tonight as I might have done a year ago that the South is making great progress. Here my optimism gives way to grave concern. We had about 86 percent of all the fires in the country, 95 percent of the area burned and about 90 percent of the area still unprotected. In the past year the South has really taken a terrible licking from wild fires. Let me tell you of only four cases which have been reported to me recently:

1. In one of our States an incendiarist, just for meanness, set 20 fires in one night. While thousands of acres of valuable timber were burning up, the State caught the incendiarist, hauled him before the local judge and he admitted his guilt. The judge sentenced him for 2 years and immediately suspended the sentence. The same judge the same day sentenced a man caught stealing a small quantity of food to 6 months at hard labor.

2. In the great Commonwealth of Georgia they had very disastrous fires in the Okefenokee Swamp area. The swamp was extremely dry and the area is very remote and inaccessible. Many fires in that swamp were caused by lightning but many of the large fires around the swamp were of incendiary origin. They entered the swamp where they could not be controlled. Later the wind blew them out of the swamp onto the high-valued pine areas where they destroyed millions of dollars' worth of timber. One man-caused fire near Fargo, Ga., burned about 90,000 acres of some of the best pine timber in the South. The effect of the fires in southeast Georgia during 1955 will be felt by the forest products industries in the Southeast for many years to come.

3. In my own State, Florida, there were many damaging fires last spring. Some of the most disastrous fires were in the Madison-Taylor County area. March 7, firebugs or incendiarists strung fires for about 6 miles. This fire soon roared out of control and was joined by the Foley fire that started March 10. These 2 fires were finally controlled on Sunday, March 13, but not until 57,000 acres were ravished. Eight thousand additional acres in the same general area were destroyed by numerous small fires during the same period. These were not ordinary surface fires; they were roaring, terrifying crown fires that destroyed everything in their path.

4. In North Carolina in May a fire swept across 200,000 acres before it was controlled. So hot was this fire that it rolled right over the coastal waterway. At a meeting held June 20 at New Bern it was brought out that the personally able State forester was not equipped and did not have the organization and reserves to handle a blowup situation. Why didn't he have an adequate setup? It was brought out in the hearings that the State forester was doing the best he could but he just couldn't finance the setup needed. Why didn't he have the money? As a Member of Congress I must take part of the blame but each one of you must also accept a share of the blame for this failure in protection. Here's why. The State forester of North Carolina received for protection under the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 only $295,466 of Federal money. The State, counties, and private sources put in over 3 times as much—$988,105—giving him a total of $1,283,571, which was inadequate. Why doesn't he get adequate funds? In the past 10 years Federal expenditures for fire protection in this partnership have increased 50 percent, but this is less than the estimated

cost-of-living increase. During the same period State expenditures have jumped 335 percent. I can speak only from the Federal side. He doesn't get more simply because the Federal Government, which originally intended in 1924 to match the State funds, has failed to redeem its responsibility. This is the case with all of our States. I mention North Carolina because of the public interest in this case.

Why doesn't the Federal Government meet a full 50–50 share of the cost of protection from forest fires? Congress has tried hard to provide the appropriation which would do this. In doing so, of course, it is anxious to listen to advice of all of the people. You would think that everyone would advise Congress to appropriate adequate sums for its just share of protection, wouldn't you? I thought so too, until I found that our efforts were being hamstrung. For example, let me read you a resolution which was given wide circulation by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association: National Lumber Manufacturers Association Release NL–92–55 Sea Island, Ga., May 21:

"The industry leaders also recommended a gradual reduction in Federal forest fire protection payments to the States and urged development of multiple land use programs for the national forests."

The spokesmen of the lumber industry will tell you that their interests lie in economy and in the reduction of Federal taxes. But let us consider this point more fully—from the standpoint of the whole picture rather than of the tiny facet labeled forest fire protection and management.

Let me give you a few figures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. According to the Handbook on Federal Grants-in-Aid published by the American Parents Committee, Inc.: The Empire State, New York, received $286,076,374 of Federal aid of which one-tenth of 1 percent, $284,079, was for all forestry cooperation, including protection. Ohio received $137,944,138 of Federal aid, of which only $77,220 was for forestry. Florida received a total of $86,973,619 of Federal aid of which forestry, including protection, amounted to six-tenths of 1 percent, $565,748. The total amount of Federal payments to States amounted to $4,041,215,778. Forestry, including cooperation with the States for forest fire fighting was two-tenths of 1 percent, $9,950,612. February assistance has never been adequately financed by the Federal Government. But every time we try to increase the appropriation for forest protection there are some who say that this is unnecessary, and the increase is not appropriate. The costly fires of last spring provide their own answer to this question.

I am hopeful that in the future forestry appropriations for Federal-State cooperation will be given more favorable consideration. You must make certain, however, that your Representatives in Washington actually represent you and carry out your wishes. If you want more Federal assistance in fire protection, go after it. Don't let lobbyists persuade the administration and Congress that Federal assistance isn't needed and that the States and counties will pick up the check. The States are already way head of the Federal Government now in protection expenditures and just haven't been able to do the entire job. It is time that the Federal Government met its responsibilities to share 50–50 in fire prevention costs as intended under the Clarke-McNary law of 1924.

I am sure you believe as I do that wildfire is no respecter of State lines and that the disastrous uncontrolled fire is an enemy—the enemy not only of Florida and the South but also of the entire Nation. Within the next decade how many board feet of lumber for boxes will be grown on the burned areas? How many units of naval stores so vitally needed in times of war will be produced from the scarred blackened trees of burned-over areas? Can the Nation, confronted with the threat of a world war III, afford to neglect such wastefulness? Let's not kid ourselves that because we have atom bombs we can win easily. The struggle may be a long one and victory may ultimately be won by the side which has best developed its long-term resources. All acres would be needed in full productivity not as idle or burned-over wastelands. Thrifty, well-managed forests could be essential for victory.

War is not inevitable. In the event we are favored with a peaceful future we will still need our forest resources. We will need forest products not only for domestic consumption but also to maintain our position in world trade. Economists tell me that there is a shortage of many types of woods in the world's markets. With its favorable location, its climate and soils the South can produce abundant forest crops. The South can be a strong factor in the Nation's domestic and international prosperity.

I'd like to sum up by saying in my report to you that the South is making forestry progress. We are proud of our forestry achievements of the last 50 years. We are proud of our area planted to trees, of the establishment of our great forest industries, of our large well-managed private forest holdings, of our publicly owned National and State forests, and particularly we are proud of the results of our forest research. In general, we are proud of our protection work too. Although we have just experienced a terrible setback in our forest protection, I would like to think that the terrible fires of this Spring won't occur again. But we all know that they will if the fire-fighting organizations aren't manned and equipped to stop them. They happened once and they can happen again if something is not done about it. I am deeply concerned and I know you must be too. We must do something to overcome this setback and to insure full progress ahead. We must stand up and be counted as to whether or not we will go forward in favor of adequate protection. Our forests are growing and our population is growing—therefore our problems are growing. We must go forward, changing methods with changing times, but steadfastly striving to achieve our goal. Let us ever keep in mind that our goal is the well managed and protected forest resource serving factories, with work and money for the people who live here and providing products for the Nation. We will neither accept nor compromise with anything else.

Five Hundred Negroes Attending White Colleges in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a news report headlined "Five Hundred Negroes Attending White Colleges in Dixie," which was published in the February 13, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. As all of us are aware, many of those persons who oppose altogether the implementation of the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation of public schools and the gradualists who oppose forthright action to comply with this order have seized upon the deplorable incidents which recently occurred at University of Alabama to say that this type of lawlessness is the typical response to be expected of citizens of the South in general. I submit this article as clear evidence that such a position is not based in fact.

In a quiet and orderly manner, integration in schools has begun in at least seven Southern States. There has been no such reaction among the citizens in these States as attended Miss Lucy's admission to University of Alabama. You will note that the acceptance of Negro students by the student body has been in the democratic spirit—as a matter of course.

It is significant also to note that despite the fact that Louisiana School Board's president has announced that the board will appeal the new Federal district court decision banning as unconstitutional laws devised to keep segregation, that school has enrolled more Negroes students in former all-white colleges and universities than any other State in Dixie. Its total is 116.

While commendation cannot go to any State for its resistance to the spirit of democracy in fighting against enforcement of constitutional guaranties for all American citizens, these facts point up that peaceful compliance can be had through forceful legislative, executive, and judicial mandates.

The article follows:

FIVE HUNDRED NEGROES ATTENDING WHITE COLLEGES IN DIXIE

ATLANTA, February 12.—More than 500 Negroes have enrolled in formerly all-white, State-supported colleges and universities from Texas to Virginia—with the marked exception of the deep South stretching from the Mississippi River to the Atlantic coast.

It was in this 4-State section of Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina, that violent demonstrations accompanied the first attempts by a Negro student to attend classes at a State institution of higher learning.

And it was in this section that the first organized opposition arose to the United States Supreme Court's ban on public-school segregation.

Seven States bordering the one-time Cradle of the Confederacy have accepted Negroes in State-supported colleges with little fanfare. An eighth State, Florida, has never accepted Negroes but opposition has not been as outspoken.

The Florida Board of Control has sent out 62,000 questionnaires in an effort to learn how students, faculty, alumni, and perents would respond to mixed college classes.

A survey showed today that Louisiana has enrolled more Negroes in white colleges and universities than any other State in Dixie. More than 350 there are taking graduate and undergraduate courses.

Texas has more than 100 enrolled. Negroes are well represented in both Kentucky and Arkansas schools. Ten have entered the University of North Carolina, 17 in several Virginia colleges, and two (part-time) in Austin Peay State College in Tennessee.

In those States there has been none of the racial rioting which marked the entrance of Autherine Lucy into the University of Alabama.

Womack Rucker, one of 116 Negro graduate students at Louisiana State University, said, "I'm just another person in the class, and I receive fair treatment."

Mrs. I. E. I. Sephas, a student at North Texas State, said that "everybody has been wonderful to me. In every class, I have been fully accepted as another student."

Six graduate students attend classes at Southern Methodist, where Dean of Students

Mayne Longnecker said they appear to be "carefully chosen, well accepted and assimilated, and the relationship between them and their classmates is a pleasant one."

All State-supported colleges in Virginia, with the exception of three teacher schools for girls, have accepted Negroes at one time or another and Lester Banks, executive secretary of the Virginia NAACP, said "things have been so quiet, I haven't checked since October."

The University of North Carolina admitted its first three Negro undergraduates last fall, bowing to a Federal court order.

The undergraduates, brothers Leroy and Ralph Frasier and John Brandon, agreed that white students "act if we were of any other race. They are very friendly. We like it."

National Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall for my distinguished colleagues some remarks which I made last year at just about this time. We were then, as now, observing National Negro History Week. At that time international strife had centered our national concern upon the necessity for developing strong unity between ourselves and other peoples of the world who share a basic faith in democratic principles. We were using every means at our disposal to present the American case to the world in an effort to assure all people that American belief and practices upholds the concept of equality of men in matters of justice and opportunity. I felt impelled at that time to point out the significance of the program of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History of the Cultural Heritage and the Contributions of the Negro Race to Society. It was pointed out that through the daily continuation of its program, the Association's purpose is to give America the opportunity to combat the evils of prejudice and fear which are the results of miseducation and noneducation that this country might better its own national human relations and retain its stature in word opinion. Its yearly observance of Negro History Week is a reminder to American people who rightly do say that education is an aid in the solution of racial problems, that such information is and has been available over the years. It has been produced by 31 years of research, documenting of information from legislative records, newspapers, our Nation's archives, and from numerous other accepted, legitimate sources of historical fact. This was a purpose which the association assumed because the facts, although always a matter of historical record, remained unassembled and undisseminated.

During the year since the last observation, progress in human relations has been gravely jeopardized in certain areas of our Nation and this state of affairs has resulted in severe internal conflict. In view of this situation, National Negro History Week ought to have a special concern to every Member of the liberal bloc of Congress as we face issues which concern principles of democracy as they are applied to American minority groups. The theme of the national observance for 1956, Negro History in an Era of Changing Human Relations, describes with accurateness the major issue which faces the legislators, political aspirants, the present administration and the citizens of this Nation—changing human relations. When, by way of example, the New York Times newspaper includes in 1 issue at least 9 news reports or articles upon issues of civil rights, we are forced to concede that human relations are of serious national concern, that changes are in demand and cannot be ignored or deflected until some undetermined time. Yet in reading our current daily news accounts, we know that too many legislators and leaders in government try to convince themselves and hide from the rest of the world the fact that in this country, designated the land of freedom and opportunity, discrimination, segregation, and injustices are inflicted against a large, even though minority, portion of the American citizenry and have no other reason for their imposition except race or creed. Although there are attempts not to admit these injustices or to minimize them, modern means of communication makes these efforts futile and ridiculous. Undoubtedly to ease the conscience and justify these imbalances between declared concepts and practice of democracy, as a long established custom the history of the contributions of the Negro to the welfare and progress of this Nation has been painstakingly omitted from the ordinary textbooks and other educational tools with which our school and university students, interest groups, and interested individuals of all age groups are familiar.

Negro citizens have no wish to be set aside and designated as a special group, even in their contributions to the society to which they belong, but until an honorable and democratic victory has been won in human rights and the history of the Negro is admitted and given its factual place in world history, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History must pursue its course as one role in the minority group battle for life, liberty, and opportunity to pursue happiness. The objective is, as stated, "not merely to emphasize Negro history but rather the history of the world void of national bias, race hate, and religious prejudice." In view of the pronouncements on the role that truthful education can play in the solution to internal conflict, it is time that our legislators, educators, and citizens questioned the reason for almost complete silence in the textbooks used in schools and universities of this Nation on the subject of the role of Negro citizens in the development of America to its present position of world leadership in cultural and material aspects. Outside of the fact that there was an era of slavery of Negro people within this Nation, there is an appalling lack of information concerning the participation of Negroes in the life of our Nation and how they served the Nation in the Halls of Congress as far back as the 1860's, and in the halls of justice, in education, medicine, arts, and every other field of endeavor, and given their lives in this country's battles throughout the centuries of its progress.

National Negro History Week is not a weak gesture for short-lived acclaim, but a reminder to Americans as the association itself points out in the following quotation by Dr. John Hope Franklin, world historian, that "The strength of this Nation lies in the diversity of its cultural heritage as well as in its political unity and military might. No other nation can boast of such remarkable assimilation of peoples of differing cultural and ethnic backgrounds, all contributing to the richness and the strength of the whole. The dramatic and significant story of the Negro is one of the prime examples of what the strength of this Nation is and what it may become as it moves into a new era in human relations."

I would add only that it is these contributions by the various racial groups of Americans which gained for our Nation its place of respect. A judgment is not unchanging and the world which made the judgment of America watches us in our human relations. Our world status, if it is to remain unchanged, calls for our meeting the problems in human relations which do exist and taking forceful, effective action to erase them. Use of the means to proper education regarding the Negro is one step in the right direction.

Inaction on Jefferson Memorial Saddles Downtown St. Louis With Barren Wasteland — Globe-Democrat Series Urges Fulfillment of Long-Delayed Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the third in a series of excellent articles in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, St. Louis Gave Up $8 Million for Riverfront Wasteland, details the contributions which the people of St. Louis have already made in behalf of the long-delayed project.

This article, like the preceding ones in the series, is by Ted Schafers and Ray Noonon, Globe-Democrat staff writers. Marsh Clark, who is on the Globe-Democrat's Washington staff, has also been working on this excellent series of articles, and I know of the extensive research he has been doing on this series.

Under unanimous consent to insert this series of articles in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where I know they will impress the Members of Congress with the need for a $5 million

appropriation to begin work on the great project commemorating the Louisiana Purchase, I include the third article in the series, as follows:

ST. LOUIS GAVE UP $8 MILLION FOR RIVERFRONT WASTELAND

(By Ted Schafers and Ray Noonan)

(Third of a series)

St. Louis has given up more than $8 million in cash, property, and lost taxes because the Federal Government made a promise that was never kept.

More than 20 years ago the Government agreed to develop the Jefferson National Memorial on the downtown riverfront, but hasn't done it.

Besides making its financial contribution to the project St. Louis has been saddled for many years with a barren wasteland on the edge of its downtown district.

Buildings in the 40-block riverfront were razed to make way for a national shrine, to the West, which the city expected would have been completed many years ago.

There is little doubt that this desolate strip—has been a factor in the decay of downtown St. Louis.

St. Louis has thus far lived up to its part of the agreement, and has $5,250,000 of authorized bonds left to match additional Federal funds when they once again are made available.

Release of these bonds would make the total city contribution more than $13 million. Here is what St. Louis has anted, based on figures supplied by City Comptroller Milton Carpenter:

In 1935, St. Louis citizens voted a $7,500,000 bond issue as the city's share of the estimated cost of the $30 million memorial. The Federal Government was supposed to furnish the other $22,500,000. (In other words for every $1 from non-Federal sources the Government was to put up $3.)

An allocation of $6,750,000 of Federal funds was made in December 1935, for acquiring the site. These funds, granted 20 years ago, are the only Federal money made available to date for the memorial.

Out of the $7,500,000 bond issue, the city sold $2,250,000 of bonds for its share of acquiring and clearing the site. Interest on these bonds, the last of which will be retired in a few months, amounted to $871,875.

It is estimated the city has lost about $3 million in taxes on this riverfront property through its removal from the taxrolls. This includes $250,000 of taxes, which were delinquent when the buildings were razed, and the land turned over to the Government.

The value of streets and alleys in the area, which were vacated by the city and given to the Government, are estimated at $1,300,000. In addition, the city deeded to the Government the old courthouse, valued at $1 million, to be part of the memorial.

All added together—bonds spent, interest, taxes lost, and property donated—the city has given an estimated $8,421,875 toward the memorial, which still is only a parking lot.

And still, on tap is the $5,250,000 unspent portion of the original $7,500,000 bond issue.

Citizens of many States, regardless of their party affiliation, have worked hard for the memorial, and have dug into their own pockets to help. For example, in 1935 a public fund of $125,000 was raised to meet the expenses of holding meetings and formulating plans. Again, in 1945 through 1947, the people and business firms in St. Louis and other States raised another $225,000 to hold the nationwide architectural competition, which resulted in the Saarinen design being unanimously accepted.

This is not Federal money, but voluntary contributions from citizens.

During the long wait for the Federal Government to do its part the struggle to keep alive the dream of a magnificent Jefferson memorial has been carried on.

Some of those who have battled the hardest and hoped to see their inspiration come true, have died.

Two St. Louis civic leaders who sparked the project in the early 1930's, Luther Ely Smith and William C. D'arcy, died years later without seeing anything but a parking lot for all their efforts.

Mr. D'Arcy, an advertising executive, died in 1948, and Mr. Smith, an attorney, in 1951.

Elsewhere in the Nation there were enthusiastic supporters who did not live to see their dreams accomplished.

One was William Allen White, famed Emporia, Kans., editor, who died in 1944, and Amon G. Carter, Fort Worth, Tex., publisher, who died last year.

Congressman John B. Sullivan, of St. Louis, who tried to push an appropriation measure through Congress, died in 1951. His widow, Congresswomen LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, now is continuing the battle, supported on a bipartisan basis by other St. Louis area Members of Congress.

Disappointment after disappointment confronted those who sought completion of the memorial.

At a congressional hearing in 1950, supporters, including the late Mayor Joseph M. Darst, spoke hopefully of it being completed by 1953 for the sequicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase. That hope faded and died.

Too many years have passed since the Federal Government promised to build the memorial. Even though new hope has been aroused recently that at long last, the Government may do its part, the project may pass before it is finished.

This is the 200th anniversary of the founding of St. Louis which will come in 1964. This would be nearly 30 years after the memorial was first promised.

Completion before then certainly should not be too much to expect.

Globe-Democrat Reports Affront to City in Failure of Administration to Seek Adequate Funds for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat's series of articles on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial has reported the background of this great project for the commemoration of the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the West, and the work which has gone into the project—including a great deal of effort and expense on the part of St. Louis.

In this, the fourth article in the series, the Globe-Democrat reports the indignation voiced by St. Louis civic leaders over the "affront to our city" represented by the mere $150,000 suggested for the project in a supplemental budget request. We have asked for—and we need $5 million for the Federal share of this project as presently authorized. It is a project in which St. Louis has already invested much more than that.

This article in the series is by Ted Schafers, who collaborated with a fellow Globe-Democrat staff writer, Ray Noonan, in writing the preceding articles in the series. Under unanimous consent to include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the fourth article, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS RIVER FRONT GESTURE CRITICIZED AS AFFRONT TO CITY

(By Ted Schafers)

(Fourth of a series)

The Government's recent $150,000 gesture in contrast to its $5 million promise toward a start on St. Louis' riverfront memorial is "an affront to our city," William R. Crowdus said yesterday.

Crowdus, an attorney, is president of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, an organization of prominent St. Louisans who have led the fight the past 20 years for this historic national shrine.

His criticism was directed at the action of the National Park Service last week in asking only $150,000 to cover cost of fencing and landscaping of the old courthouse here, which is part of the memorial.

The agency took no action toward getting the $5 million authorized by Congress in 1949. The only restriction Congress put on the $5 million was that no appropriation could be made until the budget was balanced, a condition that has now been met.

Announcing that a meeting of the executive committee of the memorial association will be held tomorrow, Crowdus said:

"St. Louis should no longer be discriminated against. There is no further legal or moral excuse for the Federal Government to delay its obligation to appropriate funds for the St. Louis memorial—at least to the extent of the $5 million authorized by the 83d Congress.

"The time has come for strong united action on the part of all St. Louisans," Crowdus continued. "Many millions have been appropriated by the Federal Government for national memorials elsewhere in our country.

"It is inconceivable that cities like Houston, Dallas, or Los Angeles or many other progressive cities in our country would have been as patient as we have been," he declared.

The fight for the memorial over the years has had the strong support of 5 St. Louis mayors, 2 Republican and 3 Democratic. Two are dead—William Dee Becker and Joseph M. Darst.

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker and former Mayors Aloys P. Kaufmann and Bernard F. Dickmann reiterated yesterday they are continuing the fight until the battle is won. Kaufmann is now president of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce; Dickmann is Postmaster of St. Louis.

Said Mayor Tucker:

"When I appeared before Congress in 1953 I said then and my feelings have not changed, that I believe there is a strong moral and legal commitment on the part of the Federal Government and the city government to complete this project.

"Actually a contract has been signed, sealed, and delivered, but the work has never been done. The people of our Nation have been assured since 1935 that this memorial will be completed. However, all we have to show for a 20-year-old contract is a vacant lot.

"I will give the memorial my fullest support. Much of the revival of St. Louis is dependent on what is done with our riverfront."

Kaufmann stated, "It is my firm belief that development of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial will be of incalculable benefit in our efforts to spur the economic and cultural development of Metropolitan St. Louis.

"The Mid-America Jubilee, to be held on the historic riverfront next September, will help tell the story of St. Louis' role in developing the Louisiana Territory and the West. Now is the time to proceed with the

permanent national memorial for which we have so patiently waited."

Dickmann pointed out he has lived with the memorial project since it was first started in 1933.

"I would like to stress that this memorial does not just belong to St. Louis," Dickmann said. "It is a memorial for all America. It deserves the support of all the States of the Louisiana Purchase, which it commemorates."

Morton D. May, president of May Department Stores Co. and Famous-Barr here, has been one of the many prominent St. Louisans who have worked hard for the memorial.

May said yesterday that the Government's failure to complete the project has been in a good measure responsible for the decay of downtown St. Louis and for the falling value of real estate in the downtown area.

"It is vital to the future prosperity of our whole city for the Federal Government to appropriate the necessary funds to get this project underway," he said.

"I believe it will be an inspiring monument, worth more than all the gold in Fort Knox, in uniting the people of this country and directing their thoughts to the ideals of the founders of our Republic. There could be no better site—the St. Louis river front—since here is where the Lewis and Clark Expedition started, and where the Santa Fe, the Oregon, and other famous trails began."

Edwin M. Clark, president of Civic Progress, Inc., disclosed that some months ago this group of civic and business leaders had pledged to strongly support plans to develop the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial area.

"From the St. Louis standpoint, a developed memorial area on the river front would serve as a cultural and recreational center for the entire city. But the memorial is important to a much wider audience. Its major purpose would be to serve as a national shrine."

Charles Nagel, director of the City Art Museum of St. Louis, was a member of the board of nationally prominent judges who unanimously selected the "Saarinen Plan" for development of the memorial.

Said Nagel:

"In 1948 Eero Saarinen emerged the winner in one of the greatest competitions ever organized in the country, thanks to funds contributed by St. Louis businessmen of large vision.

"Saarinen's design at once preserves the monuments of the past; fulfills the present need for parking, provides restaurant facilities, recreational and cultural activities, and provides a compelling and beautiful symbol of St. Louis' historic position as the 'Gateway to the West' and of its promise for the future as well."

Nagel pointed out 1964 will be the 200th anniversary of the founding of St. Louis and added, "We should press now for all appropriations and legislation needed for the completion of this great memorial in time for this important anniversary date."

Federal Aid: Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Long Island is unusually blessed with a number of good weekly newspapers. Their editorial policies accurately reflect the thinking on the major issues of the day. The Suffolk County News touches on one of these important questions: Federal Aid to Education. I am pleased to submit an editorial from the issue of February 3d.

FEDERAL AID: FEDERAL CONTROL

If you favor the Federal-aid-to-education program now before the Congress we suggest you read the arguments on the other side of the fence as submitted by the Empire State Chamber of Commerce, excerpts from which we publish herewith:

Every Federal-aid program involves control, and the Federal Government has the power to enforce control by cutting off payments to the States.

Federal control starts in Washington. It spreads down through the regional and State offices of Federal agencies. It takes innumerable forms—rules and regulations, approvals, disapprovals, audits, inspections, prohibitions, reviews, standards, policies, procedures.

All of it represents still another layer of bureaucratic supervision. Federal control means added overhead and handling charges for sending State and local tax dollars through Washington. Yet control is a necessary part of the Federal-aid system.

How could anyone in the State of New York seriously advocate Federal aid without strings? There is too much at stake in the tax dollars which are sent to Washington—too much risk of turning such assistance into a giveaway program.

Federal aid is supposed to provide a money incentive for the States to take action. How can the Federal Government expect to know whether incentive is supplied unless it lays down the rules? Federal aid is supposed to raise State standards. How can the Federal Government avoid dictating State standards?

New York should have a direct interest that Federal aid dollars are not spent in other States merely to lower somebody else's taxes, to set up artificial lures for New York industry, to fritter away on inferior public services, to spend on vote-catching projects.

A congressional act extending Federal aid may be fairly simple, containing a few basic conditions for observance by the States. But this is just the beginning. Then the Federal official enters the picture. What follows is a stream of directives controlling State and local action, always backed up by Washington, regional offices, and agents in the field.

The Federal law, for example, says that States must have a welfare plan and that State plans must be cleared through Washington. In New York State this innocent-looking requirement turned into something formidable.

The New York State department of social welfare was compelled to submit a plan satisfying Federal requirements which ended in a fat file 2 feet, 4 inches in thickness. According to a 1955 State commission which looked into the matter, the State plan was no mere outline of a program but in fact the totality of all laws, regulations, bulletins, policies, and procedures which, even remotely, are related to public assistance. For good measure the Federal agency itself issued a 600-page manual of requirements and recommendations for administration of State welfare programs.

Recent congressional proposals for Federal aid to school construction carry a provision which goes like this: "Except as specifically provided * * * no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, any State agency, school agency, or school to which any funds have been or may be paid."

But elsewhere will be found familiar provisions for Federal control—in this instance covering State plans for school construction, financing, determination of need, State and local contributions, standards for locating, planning, and constructing schools; and numerous other matters.

The United States Commissioner of Education was to be given power of approval over State actions; and if in his judgment he felt a State was not proceeding according to plan, he could withhold the payment of Federal funds. Such provisions would put the Federal Government in the business of school administration. New York State officials will recognize at once what is entailed in a Federal requirement for State plans.

Possibly that is why so little is heard from the State education department about Federal aid for New York.

Tax on Average Taxable Income: Explanation of Proposed Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today for appropriate reference a bill designed to mitigate the existing harsh and inequitable effects of the impact of high surtax rates on persons with fluctuating incomes. As proposed, the bill is made limited in scope in order to take into account the revenue cost.

Under the present statute, each taxable year is treated as a completely independent tax-producing unit. Accordingly, if an individual earns a greater amount in one year than in the next, he must pay tax in the first year upon the higher bracket rate in effect for such year without opportunity to offset against this amount—or the taxes paid with respect to it—the lower income of the succeeding or preceding years. The necessity to compute taxes on a year-by-year basis, while a necessary administrative expedient, is based upon the concept of a relatively constant income level. This bill seeks to even out the income on an annual basis for a limited number of years, even though it in fact may have been received in irregular amounts for these years.

As applied, the proposed legislation would permit an individual to treat the current year and the first or the first and second year preceding as one economic unit. Such individual would total his taxable income for the 2- or 3-year period involved—whichever produces the lesser averaged amount—and would be liable for tax as if he had received the averaged taxable income for each of the 2 or 3 years in question.

Thus, if an individual has taxable income for 1955 of $10,000, for 1956 of $20,000, and for 1957 of $30,000, the average taxable income for 1955 and 1956 is $15,000. If 1955, 1956, and 1957 are taken into account such average is $20,000. The taxpayer has an opportunity to utilize the first, or the first 2 preceding taxable years, whichever produces the most favorable result. In any event, since the averaging period permitted is

limited to 3 years including the taxable year, no problem of adjustment of returns or of computations made for a period beyond the statute of limitations is presented.

In order to prevent the application of the averaging principle where minor changes in income are present, the bill—subsection (b)—provides that the rule of averaging is not available unless the tax rates without application of the legislation differ by 5 percentage points or more. This would mean that the rate applicable to the income for the taxable year as compared with the first or second preceding taxable year must change brackets by 5 points. For example, an income of $10,000—taxed at 38 percent—would not be available for averaging unless the income in a later or preceding year was taxed at 43 percent—$14,000—rate. Such a rule will limit the revenue cost and confine application to true fluctuating income situations.

In order to prevent doubling up of benefits averaging is not available where the taxpayer switches from a joint return to a separate status or from a separate return to a joint return status during the period covered by the averaging; that is, the taxable year, the first preceding taxable year or the second preceding taxable year. The benefits of averaging are available, however, if the taxpayer's return, whether or not on a separate or joint basis, is consistently filed, either on a joint or separate basis.

The proposed legislation would not operate unless an election in form prescribed by the Secretary was filed. This will permit administrative control over the provision.

In the event that the averaging principle produces a decrease in tax for the taxable year, the taxpayer may apply such decrease against unpaid installments for the taxable year. If, in addition, it appears that a refund is also likely, then at the taxpayers' request the return for the taxable year and the preceding taxable year or years will be examined by the Revenue Service within 90 days from the filing of the return and a refund at the expiration of such period will be automatically granted. This will enable the legislation to provide practical, monetary relief for people whose incomes have dropped sharply. This may be obtained by offset against installment payments due or through actual cash refund.

Behind the Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include and call attention to an editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled "Behind the Curtain." The comments are most timely and appropriate and completely in point with remarks I intend to make on the floor later in the day during the time set aside for commemoration of the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

The article follows:

BEHIND THE CURTAIN

The Soviet campaign against both meteorological and the "Free Europe" balloons has had the ironic result of calling increased attention to the Iron Curtain and the fate of the subjugated nations behind it. That fate is illustrated in the case of Lithuania, which in bitter silence at home but with appropriate ceremonies among its exiled sons and daughters observes today the 38th anniversary of its independence, still acknowledged by most of the free world.

Together with its Baltic sister states of Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania presents a prime example of Soviet perfidy. Lithuania was among the first nations with which the Soviets concluded a nonaggression pact similar to that now being offered by Premier Bulganin to the United States. But at the first opportunity the Soviets tore up the pact, seized the country and converted it into a colony which they are colonizing with Russian Communists, who often assume the Lithuanian names of the victims they displace. The Lithuanians, however, like other subjugated nations, continue both passive and active resistance and take new hope from the espousal of the cause of freedom by their own exiled leaders organized in the Assembly of Captive Nations and by leading free world statesmen, including President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden.

The Soviets have tried to kill off the native surge for freedom by offers of "amnesty" to the "forest brothers" conducting active resistance, and by their "Operation Snow," designed to lure the exiles back into their power. But the cause of freedom has always proved itself to be stronger than slavery, and on the basis of that experience there is reason to hope that the Soviets will not succeed in reversing the course of history.

Highland Park, Mich., Cleanest Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, permission is requested to place in the RECORD the following article from the February 9, 1956, edition of the Highland Parker, Highland Park, Mich. For the fourth consecutive year, the city of Highland Park has been the winner of a national contest sponsored by the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau and designated the cleanest town in the 25,000 to 50,000 population class.

I am proud to pay tribute to the active, cooperative, and progressive community spirit which exists in this city, which is a part of my congressional district, and point it out as a splendid example of what can be done to arouse the citizenry to assume their civic responsibility for building and maintaining better communities. May other localities emulate Highland Park's course.

HIGHLAND PARK WINS CLEAN TOWN AWARD—WINS HONORS FOURTH TIME IN 4 YEARS

For the fourth consecutive year, Highland Park is the winner of the national "Cleanest Town" contest, placing first in its population class.

Joseph F. Battle, president of the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau, announced the award yesterday and said an engraved trophy is being forwarded.

Highland Park was the winner for the fourth time in the 25,000 to 50,000 population class, which drew a record number of entries in the national contest.

The award was based on the report of the activities and results of the annual "Glamouree" campaign, which was directed by the Mayor's Civic Improvement Committee (MCIC).

Mrs. Jack Pickering was chairman of the MCIC "Glamouree' subcommittee. Dr. W. Mason Matthews is MCIC chairman.

Highland Park's "Glamouree" activities were a part of the national urban renewal program.

Plans for an area-by-area program for this year are being developed now by Richard B. Fernbach, city planner. The Board of Commerce also is planning a program beginning in April.

Mayor Paul V. Winkler yesterday congratulated all Highland Parkers who took part in the "Glamouree" and urged that increased efforts be made this year to expand the annual campaign.

"Highland Park's fourth consecutive award is a fine tribute and honor for the many persons who have contributed their share to making our city a winner in this national contest," he said.

"This award will serve as further incentive, I am sure, to this year's campaign. I am certain that Highland Parkers again will join wholeheartedly in making the 'Glamouree' a bigger success than ever before.

"Last year's 'Rainbow Alley' was a fine example of the projects we can undertake in our city. I hope that this program can be expanded and others developed so the 'Glamouree' campaign can receive further recognition.

"Every Highland Parker can take pride in the latest award. It is added recognition that Highland Park's community spirit continues from year to year."

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Once again it is my pleasure and honor to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

This small Baltic nation only dated its modern independence from February 16, 1918, the date we are commemorating today. But the Lithuania people have a long and glorious history behind them. Their traditions, their culture, their language, their fierce desire for freedom, all are reasons why foreign occupation of their homeland since 1940 has not been able to quench the spirit of independence in their hearts.

During my work with the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, I was able to learn much of the details of the Soviet takeover and domination of Lithuania. Based upon

the information we received, it is my conviction that none of the Communist-enslaved peoples desire liberty more, that none of these peoples are prepared to sacrifice more for freedom than are the people of Lithuania.

This Government has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and, I am confident, has no intention of doing so. I know that all friends of freedom for the captive peoples were greatly encouraged by President Eisenhower's Christmas message in which he stated that the people and the Government hoped and believed in freedom for the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain and intended to work through every peaceful means to bring about this freedom. This is, and will remain, a keynote of American foreign policy.

It is our hope that the recognition of occasions such as this and the sending of our expressions to the people to whom they refer will clearly demonstrate to the entire world that the American Congress and the American people whom we represent here are fully behind the President in his belief and determination. May the day come soon when all peoples who are now enslaved by colonialism, of the Soviet version as well as other kinds, will have the God-given right of self-determination and freedom to choose the political, economic, and social structures under which they wish to live.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people are justly proud of their long and glorious history. For centuries the Lithuanian Kingdom was a powerful force in the whole of eastern Europe. The Lithuanians not only succeeded in repelling at least some of the incursions of barbarian invaders coming from the East into northeastern Europe, but they also were champions and an advance guard of Christianity in that part of Europe. Late in the 16th century the Lithuanians united with the Poles, and formed a dual monarchy. However, a great deal of independence was retained by both countries. The union lasted for 200 years. During that time the destiny of Lithuania was wedded to that of Poland, and in the late 18th century when Poland was partitioned, a part of Poland and all of Lithuania were incorporated into the Russian Empire.

The loss of national independence by Lithuania did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of independence. Throughout their trying years under tsarist domination the Lithuanians learned that individual or group well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the benefits of their labor, they should have complete freedom in their homeland. Consequently, for more than 100 years, until the day whose 37th anniversary we are now celebrating, they worked ceaselessly for the realization of their most cherished ideal, for the independence of Lithuania. None of the restrictive and repressive measures of the Russian regime, none of its harshness, nor its proscription of the Lithuanian language and culture, none of these could prevent the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians from striving for the realization of their national dream. They fought for it openly as well as clandestinely. They staged open rebellion against their oppressors more than once, but they had to wait until World War I for the actual achievement of their national independence.

When Lithuania became a democratic republic, the war was still raging, and most of Lithuania was still under enemy occupation. Soon, however, the war ended and all Lithuanians joined hands, not only in the fullness of joy to celebrate their victory, but also for the rebuilding of their now liberated country. In this task they were remarkably successful. In a few years normalcy was restored, and Lithuania was blessed with prosperity and progress and peace.

For more than two decades the Lithuanians lived in the happiness of freedom. But then came rude shocks from the sudden unleashing of evil international forces. Hemmed in between the vast military machines of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, little Lithuania could not hope to cope with either. When World War II came, its independence was lost as the Russian Communists took over the country in 1940. During the course of the war the Lithuanians had to exchange one oppressive alien regime for another; they experienced the horrors of both communism and nazism. In the end it was the Red Army which held the country in its iron grip.

For more than 10 years now the Red regime has been there with its commissars and spy rings, with its informers and executioners, and it has literally changed the life of Lithuania to one of regimented horror. Of course, no Lithuanian under the Red Government is allowed to celebrate his national independence day. We of the free world, fortunately, do not share his lot. We do share, however, his feelings and his hopes. And on his behalf we solemnly celebrate this independence day. We ardently hope that soon he will be free to celebrate that day as we do it here.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, mindful of the turbulent conditions of world affairs today, we join our prayers with those of the patient, brave, and persevering Lithuanian people in commemorating the 37th anniversay of their independence, an independence that was short lived and wrested from them by cruel tyrants.

Like all subjugated peoples, the Lithuanians, and their leaders in exile, realize that liberation will not come overnight, and that until it does come resistance will exact a terrible price in death and mass deportations.

They also realize that the time for small nations as self-contained entities is over and that they must seek salvation in a wider all-European organization. But for the present the fight for liberation must invoke all the values that go with the building of a nation, and independence.

In her never-ending valiant effort to gain this independence, Lithuania, like the other eastern European nations, led a precarious political life between the two powerful police states of Soviet Russia to the east and Nazi Germany to the west.

The infamous pact between Hitler and Stalin in 1939 brought about her conquest. In 1940 Russia moved in, while the Nazis in 1941 and 1942 took over the country. Terror was practiced by both regimes. Toward the end of the war the Russian armies again occupied Lithuania and once again initiated a reign of terror. Thousands of Lithuanians were executed and hundreds of thousands were deported to Siberia. At the same time an equal number of Russians were settled inside Lithuania and the attempt was made to obliterate the national sentiment and free spirit of the people.

Things have not changed in the past few years, all the terrible methods of the modern police state are still being practiced by the Russians.

Because of this domination over body and soul, there are no public demonstrations in that unfortunate country on what would otherwise be a joyous national holiday. Any such display or attempted demonstrations would be immediately halted with force and violence resulting in additional harsh punitive measures on the suffering populace by the Red tyrants. No matter how gallant the spirit of a people may be, it would be suicidal today to take isue with firing squads. In their stead we, here in the United States House of Representatives, will carry their feelings to all by raising our voices in their behalf.

We in America, and I am sure all other freedom-loving people, have not forgotten the unfortunate plight of the Lithuanian people.

We want them to know that we support them in their fight for freedom. We are not unmindful of the fact that under present circumstances they can do little for themselves; that the present government of their country is not one of the will of the people but rather one that has been imposed upon them by force.

We have not forgotten their valiant fights of the past against tyranny and dictatorship and we entertain a fervent hope that the day will soon come, as it did in 1918, when the great people of Lithuania will rise in their wrath and again break the Soviet yoke that they have carried around their necks, but not in their hearts.

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government has been a member of the ILO, the International Labor Organization, ever since its formation. This organization had a unique conception and is composed of representatives from industry, labor, and Government. The United States delegation, for example, consists of a labor representative selected by the AFL-CIO, an industry representative nominated by industrial groups including the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, and two representatives from the Government itself.

For many years the Russians did not participate in the work of the ILO. The Russians and other satellites decided to join this organization in 1954. Participation by Communist countries presents a serious problem inasmuch as there is no way for these delegations to include representatives either from free labor unions or from private employer groups. Marxism has no place for either free labor or free enterprise capital. The inclusion of Soviet countries in the ILO will completely destroy the tripartite character of the organization.

Congress is presently considering raising the ceiling on the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 to $3 million annually. The board of directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce at their meeting on January 27 adopted a resolution condemning Russian participation in the ILO and proposing a congressional investigation of the activities and structure of the International Labor Organization to determine whether the United States should continue its support of and membership in this organization. I believe this resolution by the United States Chamber is of great importance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 27, 1956

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States reaffirms its belief in the fundamental objectives of the original constitution of the International Labor Organization which were:

"Universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice.

"Conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled."

Whereas since 1934 we have cooperated and participated in the efforts of the International Labor Organization to effectuate these principles;

Whereas our participation has convinced us that the Internatinal Labor Organization is not accomplishing these objectives, but instead has shown that:

1. The activities of the International Labor Organization have gone far afield from the original concept of the achievement of social justice within the field of labor-management relations;

2. There has been undue interference with the internal affairs of nations, beyond the proper scope of international agreement;

3. The International Labor Organization is being used as a propaganda forum for statism and socialism;

4. The technical-assistance program has been subverted to the distribution of statist and Socialist ideologies and propaganda;

5. The tripartite system of representation by Government, employer, and worker delegates is a failure;

6. The entry of the Soviet Union and its satellites into the International Labor Organization has made a mockery of free and independent employer and worker representation;

7. By and large the staff of the International Labor Organization is nonobjective and dangerously devoted to the accomplishment of statist and Socialist ideologies;

8. The proper functions of the International Labor Organization are now being or could be performed by various other agencies now in existence;

Therefore the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is convinced that continued support of the International Labor Organization by the taxpayers and by the Government of the United States should be questioned seriously at this time, and recommends:

1. That the executive department should reexamine the activities of the International Labor Organization;

2. That there should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the activities and structure of the International Labor Organization, to determine whether the United States should continue its support of and participation in this organization;

3. That, pending such investigation and subsequent decision, the United States should not increase its financial support or participation; and

4. Pending this investigation and decision, at the request of representatives of the United States Government, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will again participate in the nomination of employer delegations to the International Labor Organization for the year 1956.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, in these days when our hearts and minds are attuned to the unceasing entreaties for help and understanding for the oppressed over the world, no plea to our conscience and for our sympathy is more appealing than that of the people of Lithuania for national liberation. Although a tiny nation geographically and subjected to repeated foreign incursions and influence historically, Lithuania has never surrendered her ideals or permitted her longings for ultimate political independence to be crushed.

Over six centuries ago the principalities, which were to be the nucleus of present-day Lithuania, were united for the first time, and in the succeeding years the Lithuanians strived for political unity and the assertion of their own desires in the formation of a national state. Even with the steadily growing pressures of neighboring powers to force her to deviate from the course she had set for herself, she fought to preserve her national traditions and aspirations. Her efforts to destroy the bonds imposed by outsiders and to remain true to the principles of democracy, demonstrated the survival strength of her consciousness as a nation. Today we see that she has remained faithful to the memories of her glorious historical past and that she has never allowed the terrible wrongs she has suffered at the hands of invaders to stifle her undying passion for freedom and independence.

With humility and compassion we, the people of the United States, applaud this courageous Nation of Lithuania for her unending attempts to free herself from the Soviet yoke of avarice and oppression and reassure her again that the United States stands firm in her policy of self-determination for all the Baltic States. Following the First World War the Americans of Lithuanian descent handed a declaration to the President of the United States whose resounding words are still as true and meaningful today as they were then. In part this declaration read:

At this critical moment, when the world is called upon to solve a very important problem, namely, that of establishing a humane and assuring a lasting peace, we, the empowered representatives of the Lithuanian Nation, assume the privilege and duty of declaring that it is our sincere belief that lasting peace can be established only if every living nation be given the right to determine her own destiny.

It seems especially fitting, therefore, that we Americans, fellow sympathizers of the Lithuanian people in their fight for the cause of democracy and of freedom, should give our tenderest and strongest support to Lithuania on the 38th anniversary of her independence.

Safeguarding Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Congress to legislation pending before the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Ways and Means which I consider vital to the future welfare of the automobile dealers of America and to the Nation in general.

On February 14 I introduced H. R. 9251, H. R. 9247, H. R. 9248, and H. R. 9249, bills which strike directly at the heart of the problems with which the automobile dealers of this Nation are faced. They are designed specifically to safeguard legitimate and reputable dealers from the unethical practices of so-called fly-by-night operators in the trade. In general, they are similar to bills introduced previously for this group of businessmen.

I am convinced the problems which face the automobile dealers today are a menace to the economy of the entire Nation. I have introduced the aforementioned bills to emphasize the seriousness of the situation and as a means of stating my firm support of corrective legislation.

I have long held the belief that the preservation of this great Nation is coupled directly to economic considerations which have always been a traditional part of our culture and customs. Foremost among these considerations is the spirit of free enterprise, the right of an individual to progress independently through competitive endeavor. Our standard of living, the highest in the world, is testimonial to the virtues of this form of economic policy.

However, during the course of growth under the free enterprise system, there crop up periodically a parasitical group of irresponsible firms which threaten the livelihood of the entire trade. Such is the case now in the automobile sales industry. Unethical firms are operating on a shoestring, so to speak, with low sales prices resulting from the fact they offer no service on merchandise sold, little or no warranty of merchandise performance, and no intention to maintain business operations permanently in the same locality. These irresponsible operators are bilking the public of tremendous sums of money each year at the direct expense of reputable and legitimate automobile dealers, whose sales, warranties, and service result in an overhead too high to allow them to compete on the open market with the fly-by-night operators.

I am particularly troubled by any threats to small-business operations in this Nation. I consider small business, both in industry and agriculture, as the economic foundation not only of this country but of the world. And I also consider the thousands of American automobile dealers an integral part of this firm economic base upon which our Nation was founded and has prospered to the point of world leadership.

I have made specific reference to the automobile dealers of America, but my views also can and should be applied to include small-business operations of all types and forms. Proprietors of these business concerns are the backbone of community life in this country. They have spent much time and effort in establishing reputable firms which conscientiously serve the best interests of the community. These men and women are civic leaders as well as business leaders and their lives have been devoted to this dual role.

However, the service they offer to the community is costly to maintain and many are faced with the prospect of financial failure unless something positive is done to safeguard their economic lives from unscrupulous competition. Their loss would be an immeasurable blow to the economic and social welfare of this country. All they ask is the right to serve the Nation in a spirit of free enterprise, unhampered by unfair trade practices.

The Congress should not sanction any legislative devices which will tend to stifle free enterprise. Nor should it hesitate in removing parasitical growths which stand in the path of healthy economic growth. It must safeguard free enterprise. The bills which I have introduced serve that objective.

Lithuania: A Tribute on the 38th Anniversary of Her Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, nothing warms the heart of an American more than to witness the triumph of freedom over slavery and tyranny. For many years we Americans have been warmly sympathizing with the tragic plight of the peoples of Lithuania and feeling a rising surge of resentment against the appalling events of suppression and brutality to which the Soviet Union has persisted in subjecting them. Today, on the 38th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, we pause, therefore, to give a resounding salute to the heroic Lithuanians who continue to fight to free themselves from Russian domination.

Over six centuries ago the ethnic groups that were to form the future state of Lithuania began the struggle for unification and sovereignty. During those same centuries the Lithuanians suffered repeated defeats and mistreatment by foreign armies. With her more powerful neighbors constantly pressing in on her and eventually partitioning or absorbing her, one might think her will to survive would have been crushed or her aspirations for national liberation diverted. But such was not the case with Lithuania, because underneath her factual incorporation into the political jurisdiction of other powers there remained the undying devotion to her ideals of national self-determination and a belief in the dignity of man and the right to determine her own political destinies.

Lithuania was one of the first of the victims of Soviet expansion to the west. Using the innocent-sounding phrase "peaceful coexistence" to blanket her real intentions in regard to Lithuania and the other Baltic nations, Soviet Russia progressively and systematically blotted out the slightest semblance to liberty and justice and by devious processes annihilated the political independence of the Baltic States. Lithuanians, however, deeply believe in the rule of reason, of justice, and of law and have never let their spirit be conquered. Recently the Moscow regime admitted its dissatisfaction with the economic and political situation within Lithuania and openly berated the Lithuanians for their "bourgeois nationalism." This term, it must be explained, means the natural Lithuanian aspiration for independence and opposition to Soviet rule. What an inspiration to the free world is this spectacle of indomitable national pride and of courage in the face of the most oppressive dictatorship of modern times.

We Americans cannot afford the luxury of complacency or escape our responsibilities to the peoples of Lithuania. The very existence of the Soviet tyranny is a threat to all democratic people in the world. May we take a page from the heroic history of Lithuania and proclaim today, as we have in the past, that we stand at the side of the true representatives of Lithuania and will always recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of free Lithuania, giving unceasing support to her cause. Several years before she declared her independence, a small group of her delegates accredited to an international conference enunciated her desires for national independence. One section of that proclamation read:

> The Lithuanian nation with its own traditions, culture, national ideals, and its individuality, believes that the only way a nation can survive is to acquire its own rights in all domains of life, and that the nation should direct its own destiny.

No more sincere declaration of intent to be free can be found than this one, and it will act as a guide to us in our struggles against the forces of evil and tyranny.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the seventh in a fine series of articles on mental illness prepared by Miss Louise Evans and Miss Mary Tom Rasco, reporters for the Amarillo Globe-Times in my district:

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED
(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)
THE MENNINGERS: APOSTLES OF MODERN PSYCHIATRY

When Kansas citizens decided to move their State hospital out of the Middle Ages into modern times, they found they had one unique asset—Topeka.

Here in one small city of less than 100,000 was concentrated 1 of the finest training programs in the Nation for workers in mental health. Concentrated here, too, was the material to work with—the 1,800 patients in the Topeka State hospital and the approximate 1,250 patients in the psychiatric and neuro-

logical wards of the VA Winter Hospital, and other hundreds in several other public and private clinics and training centers.

And, of course, in Topeka were the Menningers.

There are many other psychiatric clinics in the United States, and there are some schools of psychiatric thought at odds with the Menninger theories. But no one denies that the Menningers, by book, lecture, training of young psychiatrists, and sheer physical energy, as well as undeniable talent, have influenced the entire picture of American psychiatry.

THE DOCTOR HAD A THEORY

The first of the Menningers (the "g" is almost silent, but somewhat pronounced as in "singer") was Dr. C. F., who died in 1953 after 92 years of enthusiastic living. Dr. C. F. was an Indianan who started a practice of general medicine in Topeka in 1889. He had arrived in Kansas in the eighties to teach natural sciences, botany and biology. (Topeka, especially the grounds of the Menninger Foundation and the various Menninger homes within the city, reflects in landscapes of rare trees and shrubs, the old doctor's undying love for growing things.)

Dr. C. F. had a theory: He believed that the wide scope of human illnesses demanded that a group of doctors, preferably each with a specialty, should practice together. After a visit in 1908 to the Rochester, Minn., clinic of the Mayos, he announced to his sons, Dr. Karl and Dr. William, and a third, Edwin, that they were to grow up quickly, study medicine and form the Menninger Clinic.

At medical school, both Karl and William chose psychiatry, then a new specialized branch of medicine. In 1919, when Karl graduated from Harvard Medical School, he joined his father in Topeka, and Bill followed in 1925 with an M. D. from Cornell University Medical School. Edwin, because of an accident in which he lost an eye and an arm, did not study medicine. He is publisher of the Stuarat, Fla., newspaper.

MODIFIED FREUD TECHNIQUE

Town ordinance prohibited a mental institution within the city limits of Topeka, so the Menningers bought an old yellow frame farmhouse a short distance from the city. Now it is 3718 West Sixth on one of the most heavily trafficked streets in Topeka.

The farmhouse was remodeled into a 13-bed psychiatric hospital—the first in America to use Freudian psychoanalytic principles for treating hospitalized mental patients. But even Sigmund Freud, the Viennese who discovered the "unconscious" and who first opined that psychoanalysis could be used as a treatment method in hospitals, believed that the technique would have to be modified. The Menningers are the men who modified it through the experience gained from work with thousands of mentally ill adults and children.

The Menningers have been the apostles of modern psychiatry. Karl is the author of three books—"The Human Mind," "Man Against Himself," "Love Against Hate"—that are written in language any layman can understand. Bill is the preacher—if Ohio wants a multi-million-dollar program to renovate its mental health program, Dr. Bill can be relied upon to carry the word to the organizations in Ohio that can establish the program, be they medical societies or State legislatures. He talks the language of both. He has written "Psychialtry for a Troubled World," which grew out of his war experiences.

MODERN BUILDING CAME LATER

The Menningers believe State hospital systems should spend their money for skilled men to treat the mentally ill, not for fancy buildings that become virtual prisons. They have lived by that principle. The office building, across Sixth Street, was once a barn, a hamburger stand, and a gas station. A two-car garage grew into a headquarters for the nursing staff. Recently, however, they added to the hospital unit a modern stone building, the entire unit named the C. F. Menninger Hospital to memorialize the patriarch of the clan. But the famed Southard School for Children still is contained in two one-time houses.

The Southard School was named in the honor of Dr. Ernest Southard, one of the first great leaders in American psychiatry and Dr. Karl's mentor at Harvard. The Southard School and the children's unit at Topeka State Hospital, as well as the thousands of children's guidance centers that dot the American landscape, may all be traced back to the advice Southard gave his students. In fact, his final instruction to Dr. Karl was: "Go back to Kansas and establish a psychiatric clinic but don't forget the children. It is from them that we are going to learn most about the human mind and, therefore, about mental health."

For many years Arthur G. Hopkins, of Sherman, Tex., served as a trustee and vice president of the foundation. Hopkins, chairman of the board of directors for the Ma Tucker Enterprises in Sherman, died in 1952. A new building which houses recreational facilities on the Meninger Foundation land is a memorial to him, but until that time recreational facilities were housed in an old stable.

OUTPATIENT SERVICE

Included on the foundation grounds are two psychiatric centers offering at economical cost, treatment that can head off the complete mental breakdown with its subsequent costly hospital care.

One is the outpatient clinic, which, like the outpatient clinic of a general hospital for physical illnesses, offers diagnosis and treatment for those who can remain in their homes. The other is a day hospital, which is for the man who needs more care and attention than the outpatient clinic can furnish but who does not need hospitalization care at night. These patients stay in town, perhaps at boarding houses, and enter into the activity of the hospital routine during the day.

Sometimes the day hospital is used to furnish the gradual return into community life that a hospitalized patient may need.

The step from full hospitalization to outpatient status may be a hard one for a man to make. He often can resume his responsibilities and take part in community living only gradually. The day hospital helps him make this transition with the minimum of anxiety.

TEXANS ON BOARD

In 1941 the Menningers decided to broaden the base of their activities. They formed the Menninger Foundation and transferred to it all of their properties. The foundation has a board of trustees and governors consisting of more than 80 outstanding American citizens. Dr. Bill serves as general secretary, and Dr. Karl is the foundation's chief of staff and director of professional education. The foundation has approximately $400,000 each year in contributions to support its programs of research training and prevention of mental illness, but its annual budget for treatment and training is $2,500,000.

Four Texans are on the Board of Governors for the Menninger Foundation: Jerome K. Crossman, J. Rutledge Hill (first chairman of the Board of Texas State Hospitals and Special Schools) and John Rauscher of Dallas and Mrs. Arthur G. Hopkins, Sr., of Sherman, Richard W. Robbins of Guymon, Okla., is also a trustee. The governors represent varied fields of interest. They include Jane Froman, radio and screen star; Marshall Field III, philanthropist; Alf M. Landon, one-time Republican presidential nominee; Dr. Lillian Gilbreth, scientist and mother of the family about whom "Cheaper by the Dozen," was written; Floyd Odlum, financier and husband of the famed aviatrix, Jacqueline Cochran.

TRAINING PUSHED

The Menningers had trained a score or more psychiatrists in earlier years, but in 1946 they determined to found a school of psychiatry. In that year in all of the medical schools of this country, there were places for only 92 physicians to be trained in psychiatry.

Perhaps the Menningers were always teachers. They instituted a formal course in psychiatric nursing in 1931 and by 1933 were approved by the American Medical Association for a program in training resident physicians seeking to specialize in psychiatry. Also in 1933 occupational therapy field work at the clinic was approved. Postgraduate work in psychiatry and neurology were offered to physicians from 1935 to 1939. A psychology division was established in 1937 to provide internship for university graduates seeking field training. A like program was started for social-work students in 1938.

Therefore, they had a fine basis on which to start a school of psychiatry. They hoped to be able to train possibly as many as 25 psychiatrists at a time in the foundation's school.

But within a year they were to be handed what they considered an impossible assignment—although somehow they have managed to almost meet the goal.

DRAFTED BY ARMY

Dr. Bill had been Brig. Gen. William C. Menninger, M. D., throughout the war years. As chief consultant in neuropsychiatry to the Army Surgeon General from 1943 to 1946, he had been in charge of the mental health programs for some 10 million Americans in the armed services.

The Army had good reason to attempt a program of mental health among its inductees in World War II. Almost one-fourth of all rejections at induction carried the NP label.

Between World War I and World War II, the Veterans' Administration had spent well over a billion dollars in care of the "shell-shocked" soldiers left over from World War I and for those who broke down in civilian life afterward.

In April 1945, there were almost 50,000 neuropsychiatric patients in Army hospitals. Therefore, the armed services and the Veterans' Administration knew exactly what they faced in the toll of sick minds. The VA also knew that it would cost from $50,000 to $150,000 to care for each of these men, depending upon the type of custodial care given him if he developed a chronic illness.

Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the Veterans' Administration, took a long look at the 500 patients to be admitted to one VA hospital alone. Maybe 100 would be able to get along some way without treatment and another 100 would become chronic custodial cases regardless of effort. But the other 300 offered the general a choice: treated and restored by good psychiatric care, the cost might be $3,000 each—that is, about a million dollars; untreated, or unsuccessfully treated, they would become permanently disabled custodial cases, costing the Government $25 million, based on an average life span of 70 years.

The general made his choice. He flew to Topeka and asked the Menningers to start a training program that would help produce the estimated 2,000 psychiatrists needed for VA staff positions.

The Veterans' Administration took over Winter General Hospital on the outskirts of Topeka which was soon to be vacated by the Army, and turned it into a training hospital. Today Winter has 900 psychiatric beds plus 100 neurological beds. (Neurology is the medical science of disease of the nervous system. In neurological cases of irreparable

physical damage, psychiatric guidance helps the patient to live with a physical handicap.)

From January 1946, when the first veteran entered Winter Hospital, 13,500 patients have been treated and discharged from the psychiatric service alone. With the help of the Menninger Foundation and the medical school faculty of Kansas University, the hospital is outstanding in medical research, education, and treatment.

The general had asked the Menningers to train 100 psychiatrists a year, as well as many of the other psychiatric workers that would be needed at Winter. They have almost managed. The 500th fellow was named not quite 10 years after the first class of 27 physicians were enrolled. The annual rate has reached 100.

Among the current enrollees are 3 Texans, as well as men from 27 other States and 8 foreign countries. The alumni list of the Menninger School of Psychiatry shows 11 residing in Texas.

Winter, Menninger, and Topeka State Hospitals feel that any addition they make to the pool of skilled workers in the case of mentally ill will somehow reflect back in lessened work for their own institutions. They are willing to add to the national pool as they train sufficient numbers for their own busy wards.

Gabriel G. Kajeckas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, winning essay, and an article from the Washington Daily News regarding 1 of the 4 national winners of the Voice of Democracy Contest:

I was 1 of 4 equal national winners in the ninth annual I Speak for Democracy contest, sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, and the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

During the 9 years of the contest, over 9 million students have spoken in it. This year, about 1.5 million students participated.

I am a senior at Gonzaga High School in Washington, D. C., where I am an honor student and active in debating, dramatics, elocution work, the Sodality, cheerleading, am on the school paper's staff, and am treasurer of the Student Council.

I feel that it is a wonderful thing that the adult generation, through opportunities such as contests of this type, is providing American youth—the citizens of tomorrow—with an excellent background knowledge of the American heritage that we all prize so dearly.

I intend to go on to college next September, and after graduation from college, into some field of journalism, radio-TV, or public relations.

(My father is the counselor of the Free Lithuanian Legation in Washington.)

GABRIEL G. KAJECKAS.

N. B.—I was coached for the contest by Mr. Ronald Redmond, S. J., and Mr. Francis McDermott, both instructors at Gonzaga High.

THE ETERNAL ENGRAVING

(Winning Voice of Democracy contest script by Gabriel G. Kajeckas, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.)

"Democracy cannot be defined." How many times have we heard this statement, and how many times have we agreed? Yet, we find that such is not the case, for democracy can be defined—here in my hand I hold its definition. It is small and insignificant, and yet it represents America, it symbolizes our way of life, it speaks for democracy.

What is it, you ask, that can be held in my hand, and yet represent the unlimitedness of America? The answer is simple, but so often overlooked. The answer is—a mere coin, a penny.

But how can a penny define democracy? How can something we take so much for granted, how can it speak for democracy? Because engraved on this little copper coin is the definition of democracy. Look at it, and you will understand.

On it, the first thing we see is the strong, determined profile of a great man, the man who made all men in this country free and equal, and without whom we would never have been one and indivisible—Abraham Lincoln.

Then we see the word "Liberty" engraved on the metallic surface. Liberty that gives my father the right to operate a restaurant if he so chooses; that gives your brother the right to be a printer; that gives each and every one of us the right to worship as we please, vote as we choose, and live as we wish. Indeed, this is more than just the word "Liberty" engraved on a small coin—this is a way of life for the American people.

Next, we turn our gaze to the words "E Pluribus Unum"—an ancient phrase, brought to life in our lives, meaning "one from many"—existing as a country of diverse interests, and yet a country of one in unity. But how can a country be unified in which there is a fruit stand next to a jewelry store, where a 160 million people of different nationalities, races, and creeds are intermingled—where 9 million of these people can exist in a concrete maze of tall buildings and winding streets—where a general and a rail-splitter can become President—where a youth can address an adult audience with his own thoughts and can be heard with attention?—This is a gigantic dream come true, a living miracle. And this, my friends, is the miracle of America. And the reason for this miracle—why we are the United States—is also stamped on this small copper coin. The reason for this miracle is—God. Therefore, "In God We Trust"—and it is in this trust that we are one, that we are free, that we have life, that we have the miracle that is America. These are the ideas generated by a small coin—a coin that we pass through our hands daily.—These are the ideas that add up to our definition of democracy—our democracy of freedom, equality, unity, and trust in God.

Democracy, my friends, is an old idea. But having been betrayed by so many ancient lands, it was brought to a new land—a land of red men and virgin forests, a land of peaceful rivers and fruitful plains inhabited only by the buffalo. And in this land, through the tearful sufferings of Valley Forge and the sweat and blood of Bunker Hill, this spirit was fanned into a roaring fire of freedom which became our democracy.

This spirit that has made our country the greatest Nation on earth is as old as the human race. But the forces of hate, lust, and greed are also as old as the human race, and from time immemorial have opposed all justice, honor, and law in the world.

And so, my friends, these representations of justice, honor, and law on this small coin are not enough to preserve our way of life—we, as the inheritors of this coin and its defined freedom—we must take these words from the coin and inscribe them on our hearts, and in our spirit—and then, through the common usage of a small coin, realizing its value as representative of our way of life—we can continue this flaming spirit of democracy.

And then, this little coin alone won't speak for democracy—then, we will speak for democracy, and if we speak for democracy, then the eternal engraving of the American people will read: "There will always be a democracy—and there will always be an America."

[From the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1956]

THE SON OF AN EXILE IS ONE OF THE VOICES OF DEMOCRACY

Gabriel Kajeckas is a tall, slim, mild-mannered high-school senior with a voice that can rage like thunder or whisper like a cat's footsteps.

His resonant voice and a subject he used it on won him first place in the Washington branch of the National Voice of Democracy contest.

ONE OF TWELVE

And yesterday at a junior chamber of commerce meeting it was disclosed that he has placed among 12 semifinalists in the contest, which originally involved more than 1 million high-school contestants.

Gabriel, 16, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kajeckas, of 1756 Euclid Street NW. His father is counselor at the Lithuanian Embassy—an embassy of exiles since the Russians overran Lithuania.

He repeated his contest speech at yesterday's luncheon.

SYMBOL

Using the penny as a symbol of democracy, Gabriel suggested Americans "inscribe the spirit of the penny on our hearts."

He said he "chose the penny because it is a tangible symbol of freedom which everyone is familiar with and because it and the phrase 'In God we trust' are always taken for granted."

Gabriel is a member of the debating team and dramatic society at Gonzaga High School. He has ambitions in journalism, and this year is editor of publications for the City Catholic Student Mission Crusade.

FOUR FINALISTS

Four finalists in the Voice of Democracy contest will be picked by 12 judges, including television's Dave Garroway, who listen to tape recordings of the speeches. The finalists will be announced late this month.

The contest is sponsored jointly by junior chambers of commerce, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, and the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers' Association.

If Gabriel is one of the four winners, he won't have far to go to collect his prizes, including a $500 scholarship check. They'll be presented February 22 at the Shoreham.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Oliver 2-3263

Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — North 7-8109

David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Emerson 2-0544

Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Emerson 3-6267

George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — Adams 2-6327

John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700 — District 7-4704

Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700

Vacancy

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge—Robert E. Quinn
Judge—George W. Latimer
Judge—Vacancy
Commissioner—Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk—Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*-------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*---------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*-------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*--------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*---2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*--------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*-------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*-------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*-------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*

Quigley, James M., *Pa*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*

Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Proposed Lowering of Women's Eligibility Age for Pensions, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on February 12, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver an address over Radio Station WGN, in Chicago, Ill., relating to the proposed lowering of women's eligibility age for pensions, and other steps to liberalize the social-security system. This address is in the form of questions and answers. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES LOWERING WOMEN'S ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR PENSIONS AND OTHER STEPS TO LIBERALIZE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

I would like to report to you tonight on a subject which is of concern to every single American.

Yes, through the courtesy of WGN I should like to report in some detail on a subject on which perhaps more of my Wisconsin constituents write to me than any other single subject.

That subject is social security.

During the coming weeks, all of us are going to hear a lot more about H. R. 7225. This is a bill which was passed by the House of Representatives last July. This legislation would amend the Social Security Act in a number of important ways. As the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate consider this legislation, we are all going to hear a lot more about extended coverage; about waiting periods, and about disability freeze. It is a subject on which all of us should be informed. I am now going to answer some of the basic questions on this problem.

PRESENT COVERAGE

Question. First off, Senator WILEY, just how many people are now reached by social security in the United States, and how much money do they receive in benefits?

Answer. Eight million out of our 165 million people now draw social security benefits. These 8 million receive about $5 billion a year. That adds up, of course, to an important contribution to the overall stability of our economy.

PROPOSED COVERAGE

Question. If the social security legislation now pending before the Senate Finance Committee is reported out and passed, Senator WILEY, how many more Americans would be added to the 8 million now receiving Government pension checks, and how much more would they draw from the pension fund?

Answer. Over 1 million more Americans would be eligible for social-security benefits. They would receive another $600 million in benefits immediately. Within a few years, the increased benefits would total more than $2 billion.

PROTECTION AGAINST SLUMP

Question. Senator, before you tell us some more about the exact coverage that this bill proposes, I wonder if you would share your own views on the extension of social security to so many Americans over the past 20 years?

Answer. I have always felt that the development of social security has been one of the most important reasons why our economy is protected against a serious slump.

Back in depression days—and I have gone through several of them—our penniless old folks went hungry. But today, for example, through social security we have developed economic insurance for the 14 million Americans who are now over the age of 65.

Question. What has private industry done along this line?

Answer. A great deal fortunately. I have been very favorably impressed with the development of private industry pension plans. They now cover more than 12 million citizens. Social security itself, covers nearly all these 12 million, plus about 50 million more.

And then there are other public plans—for example, for Federal, State, and local workers which account for about 7½ million additional people.

Not many folks realize that besides providing for pensions, we have developed a tremendous reservoir of pension funds—more than $65 billion.

That vast sum in turn is invested in part in corporate stocks and bonds. And that investment provides American business with needed capital for expansion.

NEW GROUPS ELIGIBLE

Question. Well, Senator, specifically, to whom will pension benefits be extended if this legislation passes the Senate?

Answer. Well, in the first place, I would like to say something to couples in this audience, who are looking forward to retirement. Under the present law, the man in the family can retire at 65.

Generally, men marry women younger than themselves. So, the men become eligible for old-age pensions several years before their wives. Under the present social-security law, a man may wish to retire at 65. But he often finds that he and his wife are not able to make ends meet on his pension alone.

So, the proposed legislation would make the wife eligible for her pension—which is about half the size of her husband's—when she is 62. This means that a retiring couple who have reached 65 and 62 would be able to get pensions totaling as much as $162.80 per month.

It is estimated that about 300,000 wives—300,000 couples—would receive this benefit if the legislation is approved.

Question. Do you favor this proposed provision, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Absolutely. It represents a commonsense, fair-minded answer to an important social problem.

Question. What about unmarried women workers at 62 under the proposed legislation, Senator WILEY?

Answer. The single woman worker at 62 will be able to retire immediately on a pension up to $108.50 a month.

AID TO WIDOWS

Question. Senator, turning to the problem of widows, I know that you have long been a champion of improved social security for them. What about benefits for them under the pending legislation?

Answer. Fortunately, quite a few benefits.

Statistics now show that there are 7½ million widows in the United States. In fact, 1 woman in every 10 between the ages of 45 and 54 is a widow. Between the ages of 55 and 64, 1 woman in every 4 is a widow.

Statistics also reveal the fact that 1 woman out of every 2 who becomes a widow has more than 20 years of life ahead of her. Furthermore, many of these women have dependent children still in their care. So, we are all glad to see that this legislation provides survivor benefits up to $81.40 a month for widows. This could bring under social security about 200,000 women at the present time.

MORE COVERAGE

Question. To what other groups would social security be extended under this proposed legislation?

Answer. Over 200,000 self-employed lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors and optometrists would be newly covered by the proposed legislation. It would also bring benefits to some farmers who are not now covered. And it would extend the legislation to some owners or tenants on lands who have some self-employment income from their work as farmers.

DISABILITY ISSUE

Question. Let's turn now, Senator, to the controversial features of the proposed legislation. What phases will be debated most strongly in the Senate?

Answer. The disability clauses are probably the most controversial clauses of this legislation.

The main question revolves around the issue of determining the extent to which a person is totally and permanently disabled.

As currently written, the new plan would permit disabled workers to draw full pensions starting at 50. Wives and children of disabled workers however, would not get benefits until the workers reach 65.

The legislation also provides that such workers retired for disability would have to save long records of coverage under the pensions system in order to draw their benefits. Moreover, restrictions which are provided in the current legislation would limit the number who would get benefits up to around $100 a month, under this section of the legislation to about 250,000 disabled workers.

HANDICAPPED YOUNGSTERS

Question. How about disabled children?

Answer. The bill definitely extends benefits to disabled children. That means youngsters, who, for physical or mental reasons, are totally incapable of looking after themselves, unfortunately even after they reach the age of 18. Under the present law, the children of a retired worker or of a worker who was insured at the time of his death, receive benefits only until they are 18. But I have had many letters from parents who call attention to the fact that when these benefits stop at age 18, it imposed tremendous burdens. The bill would correct this situation. And I, for one, am 100 percent in favor of remedying the problem and not leaving these youngsters out in the cold, so to speak. It is estimated that only about 1,000 disabled children would receive benefits.

COST PROBLEM

Question. Senator WILEY, turning to still another phase, I know that your listeners would like to know how much this overall new legislation will cost them.

Answer. That is a very pertinent question. In the first place, if you receive $4,200 or more per year, you would have to pay a payroll tax of $105, instead of the $84 which you are now currently paying.

If you have $3,600 of earnings, you would pay $90 instead of the $72 that you are now paying.

Employers will be called on to match these tax payments. For example, a company with 100 employees would be subject to an added tax of about $2,000 a year. In other words, a total of $1.4 billion would have to be contributed by over 53 million workers and 4.4 million employers.

CHANCES EXCELLENT

Question. What are the chances of approval of this legislation during this session, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Chances are excellent, although there probably will be some changes made. The thing that everybody, legislators and citizens alike, will have to decide at this time is this: Do the higher payroll taxes which this legislation would require offset the value of easing the financial hardship facing a very important segment of our population? That is the $64 question. If our people are willing to pay the price, then benefits can be expanded.

SENATOR WILEY'S BILLS

Question. Your own record would indicate that you feel our people are willing to pay the price for liberalizing benefits, Senator WILEY.

Answer. Yes; I have introduced a good deal of social-security legislation for this very purpose of liberalizing benefits. Thus, I introduced in the present 84th Congress S. 591, which would reduce to 62 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors benefits. I believe that it will be best if ultimately the age will be reduced to 60 years. I have also introduced S. 1779, which would provide for voluntary coverage under Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers. Both of these bills have met with very fine response, not only in my own State of Wisconsin but from all over the country.

Also, in order to meet this problem of the increasing number of people who are over the age of 65, I have introduced S. 2279. It would authorize grants to States for the development and improvement of programs and services for the aged and aging.

CONCLUSION

I am anticipating early action on this new social-security legislation by the Senate Finance Committee. I will, of course, urge early Senate passage.

We must do a lot of planning and thinking in this field if we are to adequately meet the needs of our people. Social-security legislation is only one part of the story. Health, housing, recreation, constructive leisure-time pursuit—these are all other aspects of the needs of America's older citizens which perhaps we can discuss at another time.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you this evening.

Disaster Insurance and Adequate Building Codes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the January 30, 1956, edition of the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat, entitled "Flood Damage Shows Need for Building Code." This editorial emphasizes that the lack of adequate building codes contributed to the extensive flood damage to both residential and business structures during the recent flood disaster in California.

Had a code been in effect that required such structures to be bolted to their foundations, there is no question but what the number of homes lost could have been reduced considerably.

The Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress are considering a plan for putting disaster insurance into effect. I believe this editorial to be apropos, and submit it to the attention of the Members of Congress. I favor the enactment of disaster insurance, but submit that to be effective it must be augmented by building codes requiring that buildings be secured to their foundations, and that other structural improvements be required.

The editorial follows:

FLOOD DAMAGE SHOWS NEED FOR BUILDING CODE

Among the lessons learned from this season's Russian River floods is the need of a building code in Sonoma County, Paul Nichols, county flood engineer, said in a recent talk before the Santa Rosa Rotary Club.

Three hundred structures were destroyed in the Russian River Basin by the flood. That's not counting the hundreds more that were damaged but can be salvaged or repaired.

By the dozens, homes were lost because there is no code in Sonoma County requiring that there be proper foundations, or that homes must be secured to those foundations in a sensible manner.

People who had bought or built homes in good faith and under the assumption that they were properly built found themselves ruined because there is no code, and no protection.

Some of the structures were on pilings instead of solid concrete foundations. They simply floated to destruction.

Some were on solid foundations, but not bolted.

"In a few cases, the only thing that held a building to its foundation was the pipes in the plumbing," Mr. Nichols reported.

While this is the most drastic lesson yet provided in Sonoma County as to the importance of a building code, it is far from the first one.

People have died in their homes from the poisonous fumes of improperly vented gas-burning heating devices.

Others have been burned to death in fires caused by overloaded or improper electric wiring.

Only the good faith and inherent honesty of commercial builders has kept the loss of both life and property from becoming monstrous. As long as there is no county building code, there can be no regulations or inspections to make certain that both safety and durability are built into new homes constructed for sale.

For many months, there has been before the Board of Supervisors a recommendation for a minimum-regulation building code exempting agricultural areas.

Had it been enacted, it would not have prevented the losses on the Russian River because it affects only construction done after its passage.

But construction is going on all over Sonoma County at the greatest pace in history. Its enactment would assure that all future construction is sound. It would guarantee against future losses such as the heavy ones which have taken place.

The President's Ordeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the great timeliness of the subject matter in the article and because of its importance to all, I wish to call the attention of the American people to the contents of an article appearing in the February 16 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald under the byline of that distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE PRESIDENT'S ORDEAL

It is reasonably plain that the President knew in advance of his latest checkup that the signs of his recovery would be favorable. Thus at his press conference a few days before he said that he would probably trust his own feelings rather than the doctors' report. This could only have meant that the favorable report of the doctors would not decide the matter.

Moreover, it stands to reason that he has heard considerably more from his doctors than the public has heard, or could have expected to hear, about what limitations he must expect to live under.

The decision whether to run again has not been clarified for him by the doctors. They could have told him that he must not run again. They could not, and did not, tell him that he could take his health for granted in making his decision. The President has made it clear that he himself is not taking his health for granted, and that—should he decide to run again—the question of his physical fitness to bear the burden of the office will be not only a legitimate but a necessary subject of public discussion. No one, in fact, has discussed the question of his fitness so frankly as has the President himself.

The decision which he must now make is whether he himself feels within himself that he is equal to the burden of his office, is equal to it not as he has known it during the past month but in its great periods of strain and stress and crisis. At Dr. White's press conference Mrs. May Craig, of the Portland Press Herald made a remark which, despite Mr. Hagerty's comment, everybody in Washington knows to be true—that the President has not recently had to bear the full load of the office. No doubt he has had a reasonably full schedule. But January was a comparatively quiet period both at home and abroad, a lull before the storms that are brewing in Congress, in the election campaign, and from the gathering momentum of the Soviet challenge in Asia and Africa.

The hardest question that the President has to resolve is not whether he might die in office. The doctors have given him as good an assurance on that point as they could have. Nor is it a question of his being incapacitated, though that eventually is, as he himself has said in one of his press conferences, a weak link in our constitutional system. The doctors' report is adequately reassuring on that point. The real question is not death or disability but inadequacy, not being at his best, being able to carry on the routine of the office but not to supply the kind of energetic leadership which the world situation is certain to demand.

This, it is quite plain, is the crucial point which the President is now wresting with.

There is another point, second only to this, which would become of critical importance if he resolved all the other questions in favor of running. It turns on the Vice Presidency. There can be no doubt at all that the President would have a very special personal obligation to consider without fear or favor, impersonally and objectively, the choice of the man who would succeed him in case of death or disability. He will be required, if he runs again, to give the country his personal guarantee that the vice presidential candidate does in fact believe in, does not merely support politically, the principles that he himself stands for.

He can give no such guarantee for Mr. NIXON. It is not a question of whether Mr. NIXON supports the Eisenhower legislative program or whether he speaks up in defense of the Eisenhower policy. Of course he does. The question is whether he represents the central thing which Eisenhower represents, the thing which has given Eisenhower such a hold on the American people.

This central thing is that Eisenhower unites the country and heals its divisions. This precisely is what NIXON does not do. Instead of being a national leader, he is a ruthless partisan. He is a politician who divides and embitters the people. The country has just had a spectacular demonstration of this characteristic in his speech at the Lincoln Day dinner in New York. "Speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court," said the Vice President, "a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools." A man who will exploit for partisan purposes such a decision of the Supreme Court does not have within his conscience those scruples which the country has the right to expect in the President of the United States.

The question of who would run with Eisenhower is clearly bound up with, is for all practical purposes inseparable from, the question of whether he himself will run again.

Professor of Economic Geography Declares Upper Colorado Project Gigantic Highway Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, J. Russell Smith, emeritus professor of economic geography, Columbia University, is one of the Nation's leading experts on the interrelation of economics and geography. As such, his opinions should carry great weight, even with Members of the Congress of the United States.

When such a man as Professor Smith is moved to characterize the upper Colorado project proposal as "that gigantic scheme of highway robbery," it is time for Congress to take a sober view of its responsibility to safeguard the people's money.

I have received the following communication from Professor Smith concerning the proposal:

SWARTHMORE, PA., *February 8, 1956.*

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: Thank you for your letter of the 6th concerning that gigantic scheme of highway robbery, the Glen Canyon Dam.

As an economic geographer it seems to me to be a shocking waste of national resources to use that water for irrigating plateau land, of which we have a lot, that will not grow anything that cannot be grown on 250,000 square miles of land further east. Whereas it could if it were allowed, go down into the subtropical climate where it could produce commodities that could not be produced in any similar quantity elsewhere in the country.

As to that money waster, the Reclamation Service: I have great faith in facts and while I follow these matters from a very long distance, it seems to me that a paralyzing case can be made if we get the facts of 15 or 20 enterprises that the Reclamation Service has recommended with the amount that they recommended for it and then the amount that they later did spend.

This would show them up as experts at baiting us on, like the classic case of the carrot in front of the ox.

Sincerely yours,

J. RUSSELL SMITH.

In accordance with Professor Smith's suggestion to reveal just how far wrong the Bureau of Reclamation has been in its cost estimates on projects authorized in the past, I submit the entire available record between 1903 and 1952 as compiled by the Second Hoover Commission. It is a sorry record, indeed:

Project	Date of authorization	Estimated total cost at time of authorization	Estimated total cost, June 30, 1952
Hondo, N. Mex.	1903	[1] $359,000	$371,788
Milk River, Mont.	1903	1,000,000	9,881,774
Newlands, Nev.	1903	1,250,000	7,899,479
North Platte, Nebr.	1903	2,516,000	27,939,501
Salt River, Ariz.	1903	2,800,000	26,244,688
Uncompahgre, Colo.	1903	1,300,000	8,965,959
Belle Fourche, S. Dak.	1904	2,100,000	5,288,236
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak. (old)	1904	(2)	223,423
Lower Yellowstone, Mont.-N. Dak.	1904	1,200,000	3,633,219
Minidoka, Idaho-Wyo.	1904	2,600,000	43,706,054
Shoshone, Wyo.-Mont.	1904	[1] 7,828,000	23,673,962
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif.	1904	3,000,000	5,806,743
Boise, Idaho	1905	[1] 10,852,000	66,371,938
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	1905	[1] 605,000	5,800,683
Garden City, Kans.	1905	[1] 419,000	334,475
Huntley, Mont.	1905	900,000	1,552,159
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.	1905	[1] 4,470,000	18,871,222
Okanogan, Wash.	1905	444,000	1,633,973
Rio Grande, N. Mex.-Tex.	1905	2,317,113	27,337,078
Strawberry Valley, Utah	1905	1,250,000	3,498,994
Umatilla, Oreg.	1905	1,000,000	5,324,457
Yakima, Wash.	1905	10,000,000	60,359,928
Sun River, Mont.	1906	7,372,000	10,059,013
Williston, N. Dak.	1906	(3)	409,095
Orland, Calif.	1907	[1] 607,000	2,564,519
Grand Valley, Colo.	1911	[1] 3,621,663	6,765,733
King Hill, Idaho	1917	527,230	1,987,854
Yuma auxiliary, Arizona	1917	(3)	2,266,487
Riverton, Wyo.	1920	9,465,000	26,626,000
Owyhee, Oreg.-Idaho	1926	17,715,000	18,998,744
Vale, Oreg.	1926	3,590,000	4,962,697
Weber River, Utah	1927	3,000,000	2,725,885
All American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.	1928	38,500,000	67,614,755
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev. (Hoover Dam and powerplant)	1928	126,500,000	172,070,000
Bitter Root, Mont.	1930	750,000	1,037,087
Baker, Oreg.	1931	200,000	281,589
Burnt River, Oreg.	1935	550,000	601,026
Central Valley, Calif.	1935	170,000,000	737,774,000
Colorado Basin, Wash.	1935	487,030,228	754,476,000
Frenchtown, Mont.	1935	220,000	290,797
Humboldt, Nev.	1935	2,000,000	1,214,321
Hyrum, Utah	1935	930,000	953,854
Kendrick, Wyo.	1935	20,004,000	37,738,385
Moon Lake, Utah	1935	1,500,000	1,599,359
Ogden River, Utah	1935	3,500,000	4,735,284
Parker Dam, Ariz.-Calif. (power)	1935	21,767,000	24,201,808
Provo River, Utah	1935	9,974,000	33,452,199
Sanpete, Utah	1935	375,000	374,540
Truckee storage, Nevada-California	1935	1,000,000	1,092,423
Buffalo Rapids, Mont.	1937	3,055,000	5,669,336
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo.	1937	$31,702,772	$164,131,000
Colorado River, Tex.	1937	20,000,000	23,961,794
Deschutes, Oreg.	1937	8,000,000	12,943,000
Gila, Ariz.	1937	19,474,000	[4] 50,083,860
Pine River, Colo.	1937	3,240,000	3,471,437
Tucumcari, N. Mex.	1937	8,278,000	[5] 15,540,011
Austin, W. C., Okla.	1938	5,600,000	12,295,102
Fort Peck, Mont.-N. Dak. (exclusive of powerplant and dam)	1938		$25,400,000
Fruitgrowers Dam, Colo.	1938	$200,000	200,309
Buford-Trenton, N. Dak. (WCU)	1939	1,500,000	1,238,546
Paonia, Colo.	1939	3,030,000	6,723,308
Rapid Valley, S. Dak.	1939	1,118,000	927,412
Colorado River, Ariz.-Calif.-Nev. (front work-levees)	1940	(6)	[6] 12,190,000
Eden, Wyo.	1940	2,445,000	6,152,000
Mancos, Colo.	1940	1,475,000	3,926,000
Mirage Flats, Nebr.	1940	2,560,000	3,282,588
Newton, Utah	1940	595,000	712,591
San Luis Valley, Colo. (1st unit)	1940	17,465,000	56,230,577
Davis Dam, Nev.-Ariz.-Calif.	1941	41,200,000	118,902,056
Palisades, Idaho-Wyo.	1941	24,092,000	76,601,000
Scofield, Utah	1943	640,000	943,889
Balmorhea, Tex.	1944	347,000	429,554
Hungry Horse, Mont. (power)	1944	48,319,000	102,900,000
Intake, Mont.	1944	62,000	90,530
Missoula Valley, Mont.	1944	250,000	278,762
Rathdrum Prairie, Idaho	1944	300,000	482,360
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	1946	1,466,000	2,488,000
Arnold, Oreg.	1947	220,000	205,535
Cachuma, Calif.	1948	32,310,000	36,967,000
Ochoco, Oreg.	1948	1,500,000	849,830
Preston Bench, Idaho	1948	453,000	449,554
Solano, Calif.	1948	45,577,000	47,111,000
Fort Sumner, N. Mex.	1949	1,798,000	2,434,257
Grants Pass, Oreg.	1949	100,000	100,000
Weber Basin, Utah	1949	69,534,000	70,385,000
Canadian River, Tex.	1950		96,079,100
Eklutna, Alaska	1950	20,365,400	33,800,000
Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex.	1950	30,179,000	29,606,000
Vermejo, N. Mex.	1950	2,679,000	2,919,000
Collbran, Colo.	1952		17,236,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN			
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	1944	$8,104,000	[7] $52,795,000
Canyon Ferry unit, Montana	1944	11,025,000	28,844,000
Crow Creek pump unit, Montana	1944	1,525,000	1,766,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1944	26,894,500	[8] 73,943,000
Kirwin, Kans.	1944	10,000,000	20,474,000
Marias, Mont. (lower unit)	1944	19,700,000	67,878,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	1944	2,470,000	9,630,000
Webster unit, Kansas	1944	7,800,000	24,636,000
Angostura unit, South Dakota	1944	3,300,000	14,163,000
Boysen unit, Wyoming	1944	8,202,000	34,254,000
Dickinson unit, North Dakota	1944	354,630	1,824,000
Fort Clark unit, North Dakota	1944		774,000
Keyhole unit, Wyoming-South Dakota	1944	750,000	4,820,000
Savage unit, Montana	1944		564,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas	1944	7,611,000	18,286,000
Heart Butte unit, North Dakota	1944	2,497,280	6,223,000
Shadehill unit, South Dakota	1944	2,327,000	11,445,000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	1944	13,311,600	15,589,000
Missouri diversion unit, Montana	1944	23,831,000	61,993,000
Jamestown unit, North Dakota	1944	6,984,000	8,576,000

Footnotes at end of table.

[1] Estimated in H. Doc. 1262, 61st Cong., 3d sess., Fund for Reclamation of Arid Lands, 1911.

[2] Combined cost of Williston and Buford-Trenton estimated in 1911 at $1,195,000.

[3] Included in estimate of Yuma project.

[4] Exclusive of contemplated allocation of $1,553,565 of cost of Imperial Dam herein included in All American Canal project.

[5] Exclusive of cost of storage works (Conchas Dam) constructed by Corps of Engineers.

[6] $100,000 per year.

[7] Except for total estimated cost, figures include $3,467,000 of the cost of Corps of Engineers Harlan County Dam allocated to irrigation.

[8] Except for total estimated cost, figures include $6 million of the cost of Corps of Engineers Red Willow Dam allocated to irrigation.

A Dam on the Feather River Is Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial entitled "Start the Oroville Dam This Year," which appeared in the February 9, 1956, edition of the San Francisco Examiner.

In 1950 I introduced legislation to authorize construction of a dam on the Feather River in the vicinity of Oroville, along with an irrigation canal system and hydroelectric facilities to generate 300,000 kilowatts of power, and to store over 3 million acre-feet of water.

Since then, reapportionment has taken this area out of my congressional district, and a move was started to have the dam built by the State rather than the Federal Government. Without a doubt, both State and Federal funds will be required to develop this project.

The Feather River is the major flood threat in northern California. It behooves State officials to get the ball rolling and, as the following editorial states, a start should be ordered during the March legislative session.

START THE OROVILLE DAM THIS YEAR

The Governor and the legislature should push aside California's welter of water quarrels long enough to order a start on the Oroville Dam during the March legislative session.

This winter's flood tragedies have crystallized the thinking of the public and the experts to the point where it is clear this dam on the Feather River deserves the highest priority of the many water storage projects the State must build.

It is 1 of the 2 basic units of the enormous Feather River project. Unfortunately it has come to be thought of as inseparable from that vast and controversial plan, though as a matter of fact it was first proposed by the people of the Marysville-Yuba City area as primarily a flood-control project.

It can and should be divorced from the Feather River project for the purposes of making a start.

Many necessary dam preliminaries—land acquisition, part of the engineering, highway rerouting, etc.—can be accomplished over the next 3 years.

These time-consuming preliminaries are necessary whether the dam ultimately is to be one of the world's largest, as proposed in the Feather River project, or simply another dam.

The Feather River project is at least a $1,500,000,000 scheme that will require 25 years to realize if it is to carry water to southern California. A firm decision to build all of it cannot be made until several basic controversies are settled.

These include the fight over creation of a single State water department, the intricate counties-of-origin water ownership dispute, the issue of State against Federal control of the San Luis holding reservoir, the financing method, and several lesser controversies.

Years will be required to hammer out agreements on these questions.

Meanwhile Yuba City and Marysville and rich farm areas along the Feather must live under the threat of engulfment by another great wall of floodwaters.

No man can say when nature will visit upon California another disaster like that of this winter. The 3 years of time that can be gained by starting the Oroville Dam this year may be the margin that will prevent a greater catastrophe.

In Memoriam, My Friend and Colleague, Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH
OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and highly grieved to learn of the passing of our colleague, CHAUNCEY W. REED. While we all had been advised during the last days of his illness that the black angel of death would soon come for him, nevertheless one is never quite prepared for the passing of a friend or loved one.

Having served in Congress with CHAUNCEY REED for more than 7 years, I can truthfully say that there is no other Member of this great body who was more respected by me. As a freshman Member of the House, I always considered CHAUNCEY REED as one of my finest tutors and friend. His legal ability, honesty, and integrity was always above question. His loyalty and patriotism to his country was exhibited through his fine work with the American Legion and other patriotic organizations. His deep religious feelings were exhibited by his work in Masonry and in the church. CHAUNCEY REED's death is a great loss to this body, to his country, to his friends, and to his family.

I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow, his fine children, and all his close friends.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Before the Decalogue Society of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made before the Decalogue Society, in Chicago, on February 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I accept your award and thank you for it. It means a great deal to me to receive this evidence that the struggles some of us have been waging in Washington are approved and supported here in the heartland of America.

I have long known of this distinguished society, with its noble name enshrining in a word the basic rules of goodness and godliness.

I have the high privilege of knowing almost all the eminent persons who have received this award before me, and I am proud, indeed, to be included in that great company.

At least one of your Members is an old friend, or rather a young friend of mine. I am glad to greet him here in his hometown as a rising star in the public firmament, a man in whom brilliance of intellect is aptly joined with integrity of character—Congressman SIDNEY YATES. It has been a privilege to know and to cherish this dedicated young man. The Decalogue Society and the community should be proud of him.

Tonight I propose to discuss with you a subject in which many of you, I am sure, share a great interest with me—our immigration and citizenship laws.

I am going to assume that there are none present whom I need to convince that these laws require amendment and modification tonight. I want to give you my judgment as to the kind of modification that is needed and the effort it will take to secure that kind of modification.

It should be unnecessary for me to point out that this is not a partisan matter. The support for the McCarran-Walter Act was and is bipartisan. The opposition to it was and is bipartisan.

Any successful effort to modify the present law in a significant and meaningful manner can only be a bipartisan effort. Indeed, this issue is one of those which clearly cuts across party lines and disregards political affiliations.

But this is not to say that political considerations do not enter into the question at all. There are political considerations involved, in a very healthy and democratic way. Today, unlike the situation 4 years ago, there is an aroused and vigilant citizenry in some parts of the country, demanding changes in the law. So it becomes necessary for the President and Members of Congress to take cognizance of the question, and to take a position on it. It now becomes politically impossible to ignore the question. That is the way democracy functions—thank God for that.

I anticipate that reform of our immigration and citizensihp laws will be an important issue in the national elections of 1956, but not because all the members of one party are clearly for, and the others clearly against. No, nationally it will be a question of which party has contributed and can contribute most to the substantial revision of present law. It will also be a question, nationally, of what kind of revision will be pledged by each party.

In many districts of the country, there will be lively and intensive discussion of this issue by candidates for Congress, and even for local office. There will be some districts, of course, where this will not be an issue, where no candidate will espouse a change in the law, and where there will be little interest in the subject. But the number of such districts will be far fewer in 1956 than in 1952.

And by this we will be able to measure the great progress that has been made on this front in the past 4 years.

Yes, we have made great progress in stimulating public interest in this question compared to the situation exactly 4 years ago, when this act was before the Congress. At that time there was no general public interest whatever in this subject.

I remember the vain efforts some of us made in the Senate to engage in debate with the proponents of the McCarran-Walter bill. For days we spoke to a chamber empty of all Senators except the handful of us opposed to the bill. The sponsors of the bill gave us the silent treatment. The late Senator Pat McCarran made only 2 or 3 appearances on the floor in behalf of his bill. And on those occasions, he spent most of his time quoting excerpts from the pages of the Daily Worker to show that the Communist Party was opposed to the legislation, and to suggest that we who fought the McCarran-Walter Act were dupes of the Communist Party.

Today, that is still the main line of supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act—the same tired, threadbare arguments.

Well, those arguments do not attract as much support as they did a few years ago. It is no longer possible for any but the fanatic and the blind to charge that the chief inspiration for the reform of our immigration and citizenship laws comes from the Communist Party.

President Eisenhower has officially recommended to the Congress a series of amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act. Attorney General Brownell and the Justice Department drafted the President's recommendations. It will be interesting to see if the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act now undertake to show that Mr. Brownell is a dupe of the Communist Party.

Let us get down to specifics. What do we mean by substantial revision of the McCarran-Walter Act? What is wrong with the act? Do the recommendations made by President Eisenhower cure those defects?

The worst thing about the present law is its spirit—the spirit of fear and suspicion directed against every alien and even against naturalized citizens. It is hard to dig this spirit out of the law by a few amendments. It is a spirit which shows through every title and chapter of the law.

Now, I don't want to leave the impression that I think there was nothing good in the McCarran-Walter Act. It had some good provisions, by which I mean that some few improvements over preexisting law were made in the 1952 act. But for every constructive change made in 1952, a score or more of new restrictions were added. The preexisting law was already cruel and vicious consisting of a long succession of antialien measures adopted by Congress from 1872 to 1952. Some of the worst of these provisions were added in 1950 as part of the blunderbuss McCarran Internal Security Act.

It is sometimes forgotten that the Internal Security Act was originally introduced in Congress as the Mundt-Nixon bill. In 1950 it was taken over by the late Senator McCarran who proceeded to use it as the vehicle for a comprehensive set of drastic antialien proposals, all of which became law in the summer of 1950, over President Truman's veto.

The bad provisions of present law are beyond listing in a single speech. They number in the hundreds. There are so many that they can only be covered by category.

There is the national origins quota system, and the invidious racial and national discrimination which it bespeaks.

There are the impossible and endless requirements for admission. There are over 700 separate grounds for refusing admission to an alien. Some requirements are literally impossible to fulfill. Some are purely mystical, depending on the clairvoyance of the Consular Officer or the Immigration Inspector.

Then there are the many cruel, heartless and unjust provisions for deportation, retroactive in most cases, post facto law in some. There are today 125 separate grounds for deportation.

There are scores of harsh and unreasonable punishments for relatively minor misdemeanors. The dread penalty of banishment for resident aliens is provided as casualty as a $5 fine.

There is no review or appeals procedure for aliens who are denied visas. A consul's decision is final and nonreviewable by any higher officer, board, or court.

These are just some of the categories of evils in the immigration provisions of the law.

There is also the nationality title of the act. That title, too, is a Pandora's Box.

There are the distinctions between naturalized and native-born citizens.

There are the encroachments on the status of citizenship acquired even by birth.

There are the provisions for revocation of citizenship by judgment, without even the requirement of personal service.

This listing is but a rough and almost random selection.

You who are lawyers know that it takes cases and court decisions to give life to the law. Well, I wonder if you know that large sections of the McCarran-Walter Act were drafted after a careful study of every court decision which the Immigration and Naturalization Service had lost over a 20-year period.

In every case in which a court had given life to the law, the McCarran-Walter Act applied an axe to remove every legal handrail to which an alien might possibly cling if the Immigration Service wanted to deport him; and to close every crack and crevice in the law through which an alien might possibly enter, if the Consular Service and the Immigration Service, for whatever reason, didn't want him to enter.

This is the kind of law we now have on our statute books, and have had for the past 4 years.

This law is one of the greatest talking points against America which the Communist International has. We are held up to ridicule because of this law—a powerful country like ours—sound, prosperous, and stable—but afraid to admit a Polish violinist because he once signed a peace petition, or an Italian shoemaker, because he once belonged to a Communist-dominated labor union.

We have lost more prestige abroad than we can compensate for with the Voice of America. This law, which the Daily Worker criticizes for its own purposes here, is priceless grist for the Communist propaganda mill abroad.

In this law we sacrifice our international dignity. We gain nothing. We lose much.

But what are we to do about it? What amendments do we seek?

I have had a bill pending in Congress for 3 years, proposing a wholesale revision of the law, eliminating the national origins quota system, wiping out the distinctions between native-born and naturalzed citizens, restoring citizenship status to what the Founding Fathers conceived it to be, and establishing standards of justice and equity for the treatment of all aliens, those seeking admission here, and those already resident here. I have 12 cosponsors on my bill in the Senate. The same bill has been introduced in the House by Congressman CELLER, and by 20 or 30 other Members of Congress.

I must tell you frankly that it may be very difficult to get my comprehensive bill enacted at this session of Congress. What about President Eisenhower's proposals?

I was greatly gratified by the President's recommendations. They came a long way in the direction I have been pointing for 4 years. They were better than I had expected.

But the President's proposals were expressed in general terms. They were fine words, as far as they went. The specific bills which have been introduced to carry out the President's general proposals, the Watkins-Keating bills, fall rather short of the mark set by the President's message.

The President sharply criticized the national origins quota system. But the Watkins-Keating bills retain the national origins quota system. The Watkins-Keating bills still discriminate against Asians, against Jamaicans, and against natives of Trinidad and other islands in the Caribbean. The administration proposals discriminate against Africans. This discrimination is on the basis of race and national origin.

I cannot, for the life of me, see why we should hold back, why the Watkins-Keating bills hold back, from repealing outright the national origins quota system.

Those who oppose the elimination of the national origins quota system will similarly oppose, with all their might, the limited pooling of unused quotas as provided in the Watkins-Keating bills. These bills will be characterized as an attack on the national origins quota system. If they are going to have the name, why not the game?

The Watkins-Keating bills make no change in the second-class status now forced on naturalized citizens. Except for a partial exemption from automatic denaturalization on accident of residence abroad, provided for certain veterans of war-time military service, the unjustifiable distinctions between naturalized and native-born citizens are left intact in the law. To this continued acceptance by President Eisenhower of the concept of second-class citizenship I cannot and will not agree.

The same type of limited advance characterizes other aspects of the Watkins-Keating proposals. They do not go far enough. They do not remedy some of the major evils in the present law. Some are of questionable merit.

But I shall not discuss them in detail tonight. I have just begun my own intensive study of them. I commend the President again, and the Attorney General, too, for the forward strides they do make in this field. It is a pity that the administration isn't yet ready to recognize, publicly, the chief evils in the law.

Speaking for myself, I will go along with the President as far as his recommendations go but at the same time press for further advance.

I will not cease to fight for the complete elimination of the racist and bigoted national origins quota system.

I will not cease to fight for the elimination of all distinctions between native and naturalized American citizens.

I will not cease my efforts to remove the unnecessary harshness and injustice from all sections of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The opposition is going to be overwhelmingly strong. The fight is not going to be over at the end of this session. It is just going to get under way. As a great President said of other legislation, "We have only just begun to fight."

But we can look forward to a joining of the issues. There will be public debate and discussion. I hope that we can get some action in Congress. We must try our hardest, but temporary failure must not discourage us.

Here in Illinois, the home State of Abraham Lincoln, with the echoes of Lincoln Day speeches still resounding, I would like to read an excerpt from a letter which Abraham Lincoln wrote to a friend of his, Joshua Speed more than a hundred years ago.

"As a Nation," wrote Abraham Lincoln, "we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.'

"We now practically read it, 'all men are created equal except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' "

That was what Abraham Lincoln wrote, more than a century ago. The know-nothings were only a passing political threat in those days—a lunatic fringe. But their modern-day successors are more than a threat today. They have made their mark upon our statute books. They have written some of their philosophy into our laws. What Abraham Lincoln conceived as the worst that could happen has actually happened.

But today we are on the road back. We are moving forward. We are no longer on the defensive. We are the ones who are attacking, laying siege to the strongholds of fear and prejudice.

We face a long and hard struggle—a stubborn and entrenched enemy. They will not easily surrender. They are not the kind that compromise.

We must not rest nor relax until the McCarran-Walter Act is completely overhauled and until the hostile and suspicious spirit of that law is replaced with one consistent with the spirit of America. As I understand that spirit, it is the same as that described ages ago to the Prophet Moses by Him who gave Moses the Tablet. As written, in Leviticus, the Lord said:

"And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

Yes, to win the fight to humanize and liberalize our immigration and citizenship laws will be a victory to reward all efforts. It will be a victory in the cause of freedom, justice, and humanity. We will all be able to lift our heads higher, when once more we will be able to say:

"Here in America is the home of justice, of asylum for the oppressed, of refuge for the persecuted, of opportunity and challenge for the worthy seeking life and freedom in the new world. This is the America we know and love."

We lift up the lamp again beside the Golden Door.

Charles F. Kettering Receives Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at Hotel Statler in Washington, D. C., on February 10, at which L. L. "Tex" Colbert, president, Chrysler Corp., presented the 1955 silver quill award of NBP—highest tribute of the business press—to Charles K. Kettering, of General Motors Corp. for most distinguished services to business and industry through research. In keeping with silver quill tradition, former President Herbert Hoover, who was last year's recipient, served as chairman of the selection committee which unanimously named Mr. Kettering to receive the 1955 award. This annual Washington dinner features a question-and-answer period in which Cabinet officers, captains of industry and other Government leaders gage the state of the Nation, by pointing up prospects in their respective areas of the economy:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES RUFUS CHOATE, PRESIDENT, SCOTT-CHOATE PUBLICATIONS, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

Permit me, please, just a few words about NBP and its purpose.

National Business Publications is an association of publishers of 170 technical, professional, industrial, scientific, merchandising, and marketing magazines.

Business publications perform a unique service to the economy. They facilitate the exchange of business education and industrial know-how. They stimulate our enterprise. They power the progress of our technology.

Business magazines are designed to serve the needs of the specialist who must keep abreast of the newest developments in his highly specialized field.

The history of business publishing parallels the growth of business and industry in America. The result is that there are today fields of vital activity never dreamed of only a few years ago that are served by technical

periodicals specializing in electronics, antibiotics, synthetics, atomics and the like, keeping technically trained men and women in touch with quick-changing know-how in such areas as virus vaccines, supersonic flight, merchandising and marketing, automation and nuclear propulsion. This they do almost exclusively through the Business Press.

Among NBP's principles of practice, which are found on the back cover of your program, there is one that pledges active allegiance to the American system of free competition, and therein lies our real reason for being here tonight.

Sound business decisions are essential to the continued prosperity of our enlightened economy. Business magazines are dedicated to the enduring service of providing the knowledge that is necessary for those sound decisions.

That is why we seek each year to present our Silver Quill Award to that person who has best demonstrated those things for which we stand and in which we serve. The Silver Quill of NBP, like the organization that awards it, is synonymous with consecrated service to business and industry and to the Government that guarantees our freedom of enterprise.

As in past years, it is our hope that this state of the Nation dinner may serve as a fair-weather forecast of things to come. These leaders from Government and industry have graciously consented to briefly answer one specific question that is related to our future welfare. Now, then, Mr. Secretary Folsom, will you please set the stage for us by answering the first question.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PORTION OF THE STATE OF THE NATION DINNER

MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Question. Mr. Secretary Folsom—You are, no doubt, gravely concerned over the health of the Nation. Business, of course, is concerned over health in relation to productivity and the efficient operation of all elements of the economy. Will you tell us something of your plans which are designed to institute improvement in this area?

Answer. Our first concern, of course, is the contribution good health makes to a better life for individuals. At the same time, good health is vital to the productive capacity of our Nation. The health and vitality of the American people have been essential in building our shining record of productivity and well-being as a country.

One of the best hopes for continued advancement of the health of the people lies in medical research. In recent years medical research has produced great benefits for mankind. But much remains to be done. And so we are seeking an increase of 28 percent in funds to expand and improve research in cancer, mental illness, heart disease, and other major killing and crippling diseases of our time.

In addition, we are asking Congress to authorize $250 million for a new, 5-year program of matching grants to medical colleges and other institutions. These grants would help build urgently needed facilities—facilities for carrying on research, and for training more of the scientists and doctors we need.

As business editors, you might be interested in an investment in which the rewards are far greater than the costs. Such an investment is vocational rehabilitation, our program of restoring disabled persons to useful and productive lives. For 3 years there had been a downtrend in the number of persons rehabilitated. But, under an improved program the number now is expected to increase from about 56,000 in 1954 to about 80,000 next year. Past studies show the rehabilitated person will return to the Government in taxes many times the cost of his rehabilitation. But the greatest satisfaction is the humanitarian reward as thousands more human beings learn to lead fuller lives.

One of our major healh problems, of course, is the cost of medical care. In meeting this burden, voluntary health insurance has made remarkable progress over recent years. I am convinced that even more rapid progress should and can be achieved in this same field—especially in protection for older people, for those in rural areas, for the handicapped and against catastrophic illness. We in the Federal Government are now working toward practicable and effective means of encouraging expansion and improvement of voluntary health insurance.

These are just a few examples of our programs and plans. As President Eisenhower said in his special message to Congress: "As a nation we must now take further steps to improve the health of the people. This further effort * * * should be a characteristic American partnership—a partnership in which private and Government enterprise are joined to advance the national welfare."

T. M. EVANS, PRESIDENT, H. K. PORTER CO., INC.

Question. Mr. Evans, the word "merger" is very much in the forefront these days. Congress is considering legislation which may have a great effect on future corporate mergers. As head of a concern which has grown at rapid paces during the past few years, what comments do you have concerning legislative action on mergers and the size of corporations?

Answer. It seems to me the problem of mergers and the size of corporations divides itself into two parts: First, as it affects the giant corporations, and by that I mean the very largest industrial concerns in this country; and second, as it affects the small or medium-sized concerns. For instance, I think everyone will agree that the merger of two small or medium-sized, relatively weak concerns into one stronger concern is a constructive step, particularly since such a combination would often reduce selling costs and make for more effective competition. However, it seems to me that the various bills now being considered by Congress do not get to the real source of the problem of mergers and size of industrial concerns.

We all know that banks and public utilities are already closely regulated and supervised by the Government, but to insure competition and avoid socialism something must be done to control or curb the concentration of economic power in our extremely large corporations.

To set an effective limit on the size of an industrial concern through a graduated corporate income tax would not only be practical but simple to carry out. Once a concern reaches the highest rate of a graduated corporate income tax, there would be no incentive for it to merge or become larger, thus automatically eliminating the major problem in the very large corporations. An individual's income is taxed on a graduated basis according to his earnings, presumably to control economic power. Why shouldn't a corporation have this very same principle applied to it, and for the very same reasons.

It is my feeling that it is both significant and dangerous to the economy of our country that of the 500 largest industrial corporations (as reported by Fortune magazine) 10 of the very largest represent nearly 30 percent of the sales and assets of the 500. In other words, 2 percent of the companies account for 30 percent of the sales and assets.

It takes an extremely powerful union to deal with such gigantic corporations, while smaller competing companies are bound to follow their lead in such matters as wages, union contracts, pricing policies, etc.

Any corporation that would fall into the high brackets of a graduated income tax could use the present spin-off provision of the tax law to protect its stockholders and thus avoid the tax. As we all know, the present spin-off provision of the law allows a corporation to divest itself of a part of its business without involving any income tax on its stockholders. If the present spin-off provision were to become effective in this way, it would give men in the very large corporations an opportunity to run their own companies rather than merely head up divisions.

To preserve the capitalistic system for our children's or grandchildren's time, it seems to me that one of the most important things Congress can do is to make it possible for more individuals to become capitalists. This cannot be done if the larger corporations are allowed to grow without restraint.

C. H. GREENEWALT, PRESIDENT, E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO.

Question. It is claimed that the chemical and chemical processing industries expect to reach a sales volume of some $70 billion, coupled with enormous plant expansion and unprecedented research that promises to open up even greater economic frontiers than we now visualize. In the words of your own great slogan, shouldn't this mean much better living through chemistry and shouldn't it also provide fabulous opportunities for young people who have been technically trained?

Answer. The words "enormous," "unprecedented" and "fabulous" seem more appropriate to the moving picture industry than to the chemical industry. When our industry will have aggregate sales of 70 billion dollars, or some reasonable fraction thereof, I do not know. The chemical industry has traditionally been research-minded and has spent perhaps 3 percent of its annual sales in its research laboratories. Here, of course, is the lever that produces progress. If research on that large scale is even moderately successful, there can be no doubt at all that the industry will show progress, not only in its sales volume, but in its service to its sister industries throughout the Nation. As to opportunities for the young, there has never been a time when these did not exist. If we can assume that there will be adequate incentives to promote high performance, I see no reason why the future should not offer even greater opportunities to our youth than the past.

CHARLES S. THOMAS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Question. Mr. Secretary Thomas, we are hearing and reading a great deal these days about our new Navy. Yould you tell us something about it, please?

Answer. The Navy is presently undergoing the greatest transformation it has ever known. All at the same time, it is passing from steam to nuclear power, from gun powder to nuclear weapons, from guns to missiles, and in the air from subsonic speeds to supersonic speeds. The advent of the atomic age has made the Navy even more important than it has ever been in the past.

The seas are still our cushions of defense; the seas are still our communication lines to our allies and friends; the seas are still our lifelines to overseas sources of raw materials; the seas are still the avenues of carrying the attack back into any aggressor's home territory. The day of the atom, therefore, has increased our dependence upon the sea.

The modern developments and weapons of our age are peculiarly adaptable to our fighting fleets. The Navy is making bold and imaginative efforts to adapt these new weapons and techniques for the further protection and security of our country.

This is the new Navy: New in the sense that it is progressive in its weapons and advanced in its thinking. In terms of fighting spirit, morale, and dedication, it is still the old Navy.

H. E. HUMPHREYS, JR., PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.

Question. Mr. Humphreys, we hear that 1956 is to be the greatest year yet in the history of rubber, with overall sales approaching $6 billion. It is said that the gain will be due largely to demand for replacement tires for cars, trucks, and off-the-road vehicles. But, we also hear disturbing comment about severe cutbacks in the automotive industry which could have direct bearing on your future market. Would you care to assure us in that regard, indicating how much of a stimulus you anticipate from the new highway program?

Answer. The rubber industry set a new sales record of $5¼ billion in 1955. We should beat that record in 1956. I think we may do a half-billion more. That would make a total of $5¾ billion.

In making this forecast, I am aware that car production is expected to be somewhat lower this year. And I well know that the automotive industry is of tremendous importance to the rubber industry. But increases in other lines should more than make up the difference.

There is a record number of automobiles on the road 2 years old or older, which will require new tires this year. The use of foam rubber in furniture and bedding is growing rapidly. We can also expect further increase in demand for casual footwear, for synthetic rubber, for plastics and many other products.

The general price level for rubber products increased slightly in 1955 due to higher raw material and labor costs. These higher prices, which will be reflected through all of 1956, will contribute to the expected dollar sales increase. Rubber consumption this year will remain at about the same figure of 1½ million tons.

Regarding the new highway program, I cannot see that it will provide any sales stimulus for the rubber industry this year. I doubt it could move that fast. But the program is much too important to think of in terms of one product, such as tires or one industry such as rubber.

Our 59 million motor vehicles—cars, trucks, and buses—sustain the life of our country. The roads and highways they travel are no less than America's arteries and veins. As we produce, distribute, and consume more and more goods, we need more highways, safer highways. I hope the program will move forward with the greatest possible speed.

DONALD A. QUARLES, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Question. Mr. Secretary Quarles, in January, in Korea, you made a statement to the effect that Uncle Sam is determined to build up its own and allied air forces in the Far East by introducing modern weapons, including guided missiles. In your estimation of events to come, do you conceive of that action as carrying with it the possibility of pushing the Nation closer to the brink of war?

Answer. I do not. It is generally known that the Communists are building up their air power opposite our Far East positions at an impressive rate. They now have, and would be expected to continue to have, numerically superior air forces in the area.

Any buildup in the strength of United States or other free world air forces in the area could certainly not be considered provocative as long as it is faced by numerically superior Communist forces.

Moreover, it has been made abundantly clear to the Communists by President Eisenhower that we will not be aggressors and that our military forces are designed and deployed to discourage Communist aggression.

It seems clear to me, under these circumstances, that the proposed build-up of the free world air strength in the Far East would not have the effect of pushing the Nation closer to war, but would instead have the effect of emphasizing and reinforcing our deterrent position, and therefore the effect of improving the chances for peace.

L. RUSSELL KELCE, PRESIDENT, SINCLAIR COAL CO.

Question. Mr. Kelce, we are told that—according to best-informed authorities—the annual requirements for coal will increase during the next 10 years to approximately 800 million tons. What will be the nature of those requirements and, in your opinion, is the industry prepared to meet the annual requirement base with its present production facilities? If not, what must it do to meet such heavily increased demands?

Answer. It is not only my opinion but almost the unanimous opinion of all persons associated with the coal industry that we turned the corner in the summer of 1954, the year we produced less than 400 million tons. In 1955 we produced 465 million tons or an increase of approximately 17 percent.

There have been many estimates made as to our probable production 10 years from now, and it seems probable that our production would reach approximately 800 million tons. This is due to the tremendous increase in production of electric power, aluminum, steel and industrial growth, also the requirements of export coal from overseas.

If this demand is met by our industry it will require the expenditure of 5 or 6 billion dollars during this period for new mines, new techniques, new equipment and more efficient methods.

In this 10-year period 500 million or 600 millions tons of new production will be needed due to the depletion of older mines and the obsolescence of many. The industry must and will increase its average daily output per man day from the present less than 10 tons per man day to at least the figure used in our popular song "16 tons."

The coal industry has new life, with a great future ahead of it, and I can assure you that whatever demands are made upon us for increased production—we will be ready, whether it be for peaceful use or a case of emergency.

MAURICE H. STANS, DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL

Question. Mr. Deputy Postmaster General, in President Eisenhower's recent state of the Union message, he said:

"Recommendations on postal facilities and on additional postal revenues will be submitted to the Congress."

What are the Department's proposals in these two interrelated matters?

Answer. In 1953 when we took over a postal system that was, by all standards, obsolete and antiquated, we set three goals:

1. To improve the mail service.
2. To reduce costs.
3. To make the postal system financially self-supporting.

The two recommendations for improved postal facilities and realistic postal rates are the last major steps we need to achieve these objectives.

We have improved the service. We have made many changes that are gradually coming to the attention of the public. We have added 7,000 new city delivery routes to serve 3½ million families. We have initiated later post office window hours and later pickup hours. We have provided new services such as combination mail and certified mail, and 75 other improvements for the benefit of the mailer. And we have been experimenting for some time with the carrying of regular mail by air, whereby millions of three-cent letters every day are reaching their destinations a day or more earlier than ever before.

We have reduced costs. Our gains can be proved with one statistical fact. In 1955, we delivered 8½ percent more mail than in 1953 and spent comparatively less money to do so. This was the result of a massive program of reorganization—the largest ever undertaken in any business—including thousands of projects to streamline, modernize and mechanize our handling of the mail.

Now for our present proposals. We have recommended a 5-year building and equipment program that will cost $780 million. We are proposing modest postage increases on first, second, and third-class mail, roughly 30 percent on each, to bring in about $400 million a year.

We occupy 25,000 postal buildings, some leased and some owned by the Government. Many of these are rundown, overcrowded, and poorly lighted, monumental structures that were built 50 or more years ago. No post office has been built with Government money since 1938, but since then our volume has doubled.

In several major cities, postal facilities are so inadequate that, rain or shine, mail must be handled on the sidewalk. Indoors the work of thousands of postal employees is hampered by inadequate space, poor ventilation, old-fashioned equipment, and obsolete lighting. These conditions slow service, breed inefficiency and impair employee morale. Most of these buildings badly need modernizing or enlargement. Some need replacement.

That is our facilities problem. Our deficit problem is equally serious. In 1952, the Department lost $727 million. In 1955, our program had reduced this to less than half. But then Congress voted increased wages and other benefits to our employees, so our deficit this year will be back up to nearly one-half billion dollars, despite everything we have done.

In the past 10 years the post office has lost $5 billion. That $5 billion would have purchased 5,000 new million-dollar schools, or a four-lane super highway from New York to Los Angeles and back to New Orleans.

The trouble is that we are still charging 1932 postage rates and paying 1956 costs. Our rate proposals would stop this financial irresponsibility. They would give us the money to fix up our buildings and buy automatic equipment—and enable us to do the rest of the job in providing the American people with the best possible mail service at the lowest possible cost.

Isn't it time that we have the courage, as citizens, to face up to this unpleasant task? Isn't it time that we stop passing on our unpaid postage bills to our children and grandchildren?

DR. CHARLES ALLEN THOMAS, PRESIDENT, MONSANTO CHEMICAL CO.

Question. Dr. Thomas, we are told that prospective developments in chemical agriculture place the agricultural frontiers of America in the chemical laboratories and experiment stations, promising a food supply adequate, for the first time, to feed the world's population, of which the vast majority is still engaged in food production by manual processes. What effect will new discoveries in agricultural chemistry have on future man-hour requirements and farm output?

Answer. Farm output has doubled in the United States since 1900 while the acreage in farmland has remained almost constant and the number of farm workers has declined almost by half.

Three major revolutions in agriculture have contributed to this progress: The biological, the mechanical, and now the chemical revolution.

The biological revolution, dating from 1850, brought control over nature through genetic selection, disease-resistant crop strains, and, later, selective animal breeding and hybrid corn.

Then, in 1910, came the mechanical revolution led by the farm tractor, 4¾ million of which are now in use on American farms,

along with a wide variety of other labor-saving machines. The 22.5 million man-hours of farm work in 1910 has been reduced to about 14 million man-hours today.

The chemical revolution dates from the early 1940's with the start of widespread chemical fertilization and the development of organic pest controls, notably DDT insecticide and 2,4–D weed killer. Two million tons of fertilizer were used in 1940, compared to 6 million tons in 1954.

Consider, too, the fact that more than 3,000 species of insects and twice that many diseases prey on our farm livestock and crops. The annual farm loss to insects, weeds, and diseases in the United States is estimated currently at $12 billion each year. That is roughly one-third the dollar value of our total farm output.

Since 1945, 25 major new organic pesticides have been developed by the chemical industry. Despite the fact that farmers are using at present rates more than 1 billion pounds of these pesticides years, Government statistics show that more than 80 percent of our Nation's cropland still goes untreated chemically each year.

If, through wider use of available farm chemicals, the farmers were to succeed in cutting their present losses to insects, weeds, and other pests in half, this would represent more than a 16-percent increase in farm output. In addition, it is estimated that the full use of fertilizers would increase corn production over present levels by 81 percent, wheat by 95 percent, soybeans by 58 percent, and cotton by 124 percent.

Meanwhile, chemical companies are investing heavily in research programs which should yield a variety of new chemical hired hands; systemic insecticides which render the hides of livestock and the tissues of plants toxic to their insect pests while harmless to humans; growth regulators which delay blossoming, prevent dropping of fruit, and speed ripening of crops; controls for the tiny, wormlike nematodes which feed on plant roots, highly selective weed killers, such as one we have now which kills grasstype weeds in grass crops without injury to the crops.

How incongruous all this seems, with today's problem of overproduction on our farms. But bear in mind that our population of 160 million is almost double the figure of 1900, and a 25-percent increase to 200 million is predicted by 1975; and it may be 250 million by the year 2006. After the turn of the century the world's population could conceivably double, so to disprove the Malthusian theory in the coming years there will have to be a decided emphasis throughout the world on the effort to make 2 blades of grass grow where 1 grew before.

CLARENCE DAVIS, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Question. Mr. Secretary Davis, some experts are predicting that, within 15 years, the Nation's fresh-water supply will be dangerously short for meeting the needs of our expanding population and greatly increased industrial and agricultural demands. Will you tell us, please, what plans are under way in your Department to avert the possibility of such a future economic and/or military disaster?

Answer. It is very true that we face a tremendous water problem in the United States. We must recognize that we cannot take our water supplies for granted. By 1975 our water needs for domestic and industrial use can be expected to increase 145 billion gallons. This is a lot of water. Just how much, you can visualize best, perhaps, by noting that it is equivalent to the flow of 11 Colorado Rivers. While it is certain that we face a water problem of extraordinary proportions, it is equally certain that there is an answer.

I am convinced that a large part of this answer is to implement the Water Resources Policy Report recently approved and sent to Congress by President Eisenhower. This report provides a blueprint for the necessary action to ease this country's existing water shortage and to meet the water needs for a population of 200 million people by 1975.

Your question asked what plans are under way in my Department to avert the possibility of future economic and/or military disaster caused by a shortage of water. The Department of the Interior has many important responsibilities for our water resources.

We are carrying forward a stepped-up program for the collection of the basic data on rainfall, streamflow, and so forth, which the Nation needs to plan our water-resource programs soundly. We are conducting a research program to develop an economic means of desalting saline water. We are working closely with the Department of Agriculture to give increased emphasis to the upstream-watershed program. We are continuing to build multipurpose water projects which contribute in so many ways to the advance of wide areas of our country. We intend to carry out these assigned responsibilities vigorously in keeping with the scope of the problem the Nation faces.

The main point which I want to emphasize in dealing with this water problem, however, is that it is not a job for the Department of Interior alone. Or for the Department of Agriculture, or the Corps of Engineers alone. The many necessary programs which are a part of a sound-water program must be carried out on a cooperative basis, with all Federal, State, and local agencies participating actively.

By working together on this vast problem we can best assure that our future needs for water will be met and that water shortages will not hinder the continued expansion of our economy.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Question: Admiral Strauss, now that Russia has the necessary know-how for atomic and hydrogen warfare, is there any real reason left for withholding so-called secret information from industry and the public? If not, can we now look ahead to an earlier atomic energy future for heat, power, and other commercial uses?

Answer: Because of the manner in which your question is phrased, a really comprehensive answer would require considerably more than 3 minutes allotted. However, I shall try and respond to it, as best I can, within the time limitation.

First of all, the fact that the Soviets have learned how to build nuclear weapons does not mean that a static point or a point of equality in such weapons has been reached. Technology in the field of nuclear weapons, as indeed in all kinds of weapons, is constantly changing. Refinements and improvements occur in design, application, and effectiveness. We are always at work on new weapons, intended for specific tasks of the Armed Forces in particular situations; we are developing, manufacturing, testing, and stockpiling a variety of nuclear weapons to assist in defense against attack.

What your question refers to as "so-called secret information" is, in the main, data bearing upon the design or the components of nucelar weapons. The very survival of our Nation may well depend upon the effectiveness of the secrecy of such information.

I should also point out that the need for such security is not impeding the expansion of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. There is no information of use to the peaceful application of the atom which is not already freely circulated or readily available to responsible American industries and individuals under our system of access permits.

We now have the beginnings of a substantial atomic energy industry. It is making use of this access arrangement effectively.

The first full-scale atomic powerplant will be in operation in the United States next year, others are in negotiation and design. The limiting factor on the growth of this new industry will not be Government security regulations, but only the time required to improve technology to the point where atomic power is economically competitive with power produced by conventional means.

WALTER WILLIAMS, UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Question. Mr. Secretary Williams, no one in this audience is more cognizant than you are of the basic values of advertising to the distributive processes of the economy and we know that you keep yourself fully informed concerning the functions of business publications as specialized spokesmen for business and industry. If 1956 is to be more competitive than 1955, do you visualize a greater need for adequate advertisting, as a positive market stimulus, and do you consider the business press a definite economic asset in that respect?

Answer. Your question is directed toward an evaluation of the need for more advertising in our economy, and the contribution of the business press to advertising. Since one can hardly speak of advertising apart from merchandising and selling—nor of the business press apart from the many other media used to keep our people informed about the increasing volume and variety of goods and services we produce, I would like to address my remarks within this larger framework.

Through merchandising and selling we move the products of our economy toward the people—through advertising we pull our people toward the products. By means of all of the activities in merchandising, selling and advertising, and the many other functions in distribution we utilize a market mechanism which is indispensable to our highly developed industrial economy in which we are so rapidly exploiting the fruits of scientific research, technology and automation.

We measure our gross national product in the volume of goods and services produced. But our standard of living is measured in terms of personal consumption. A sustained and expanding production and a rising standard of living are dependent on the expansion of markets and increased consumer expenditures irrespective of our capacity to produce. Production, distribution, and consumption are interdependent. Moreover, an increasingly high level of employment can be continued only by sustaining and increasing the level of both production and distribution.

Last year it took about $4 billion of consumer expenditures, along with $2 billion of investment and Government purchases, to provide employment to 1 million persons. While these proportions change from year to year, if personal consumption continues in the future to absorb about two-thirds of the gross national product, then in the long run we are going to have to sell $4 billion more to consumers for each rise of 1 million persons in the labor force.

In addition, our productivity is steadily rising with advancing technology, continuous improvement in the quantity and quality of our capital assets and constant advances in the education and skills of the working population. It requires additional sales of perhaps $5 billion a year to consumers, with proportional changes in other types of spending, merely to absorb the additional products which a constant labor force can turn out. And this amount will grow as our economy expands. Of course, some of this increase in productivity can be absorbed by reducing the average length of the workweek, and increasing leisure as we have done in the past.

But, however, we view the future with its improved technological development and population expansion—greater emphasis must be placed on sales and selling.

Every business in America has something to sell—and the security of its investment,

its opportunities for employment and its success and profitability, all are dependent on a successful sales job. Consequently, distribution is one of the most vital parts of our economic system, and advertising is a vital part of distribution.

This is my answer to the first part of your question.

Critics of advertising point to alleged waste in the promotion of competing products and brands; to excesses in advertising appeals; and to high-pressure sales methods. As in all other fields of human endeavor, there exists a minority whose methods or motives are subject to question. But I have found that the great majority of advertisers, and advertising media, conscientiously establish, accept and adhere to high standards of ethical practice.

The importance of the basic function of advertising is often overlooked by its critics. In a mass production economy characterized by variety, constant change and improvement, successful distribution demands adequate information on availability quality, and performance. It also requires a dynamic stimulation to consumers motivating them to buy new, better, and more products in order to live better—and to earn more in order to do so.

In addition, there are many byproduct values from which we benefit through the function of advertising. Not least among these are the trade, technical, industrial, and business press of our country which disseminate information on current developments in science, engineering and technology on new products and processes, methods of goods handling and other aspects of improved production or distribution. Without this exchange of information through the business press, the broad application of the fruits of discovery, invention and progress could never be fully realized. If it were not for the support of advertising our business press with its widespread exchange of scientific and technical information could not exist.

This is my answer to the second part of your question.

The Advertising Council's film and booklet Miracle of America dramatized the significance of production to our economy—Challenge to America, produced by the Joint ANA-AAAA Committee on Understanding of Our Economic System dramatizes in a similar manner the importance of marketing and distribution.

Advertising, selling, merchandising, and all of the other functions and institutions involved in distribution, constitute a major segment of our economy—one which is destined to assume increasing burdens and greater responsibilities.

As our economy and our population continue to grow and expand, and as the level of total consumer income and the proportion of disposable income continue to rise, we must redouble our efforts to improve, expand, and make more effective all of our techniques of advertising as well as all other activities directed toward the expansion of markets.

You of the business press have a major responsibility in this respect, not only for your own success, but also the continuing success of many others dependent upon your efforts. I am confident that you will meet this challenge as you have met many others in the past.

WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Question. Mr. Secretary Brucker, as the advent of long-range guided missiles as major weapons of future warfare rendered artillery and the foot soldier obsolete? If so, why do we continue the Army, per se, as a branch of the Defense Establishment?

Answer. I am most happy to have the opportunity to answer this question.

The advent of long-range guided missiles has not rendered either artillery or the foot soldier obsolete. If there has ever been any uncertainty about the mission of the Army in modern warfare, and how it fits into the overall defense picture—especially in relation to airpower and our nuclear capabilities—let any such doubt be now dispelled. As long as man lives on the land and depends upon the land for his sustenance we will always need an Army.

The strength of the Army is fundamentally the strength of men—of trained soldiers. The mission of the Army is to conduct prompt, sustained, and successful combat operations on land, to defeat enemy forces, to seize and hold ground and to dominate the enemy and his means of waging war. There is nothing that has occurred so far which has made the accomplishment of this mission less important than it has been in the past.

We need an Army—a strong Army today because of the threat facing the free world. That threat—the international Communist movement has many faces. It shows itself in the guise of political and economic warfare, propaganda, subversion, and armed force. The military part of the threat included not only atomic weapons, but also large and effective armies. It takes men on the ground—soldiers—to make aggression finally succeed. And the only way to deter aggression of this kind is to have enough land forces to make any would-be aggressor think twice.

The United States Army, and the armies of our free world Allies, and supported by strong Naval and Air Forces, is a major deterrent to aggression and war.

The Korean and Indochinese wars have indicated that an air-atomic capability alone cannot deter all forms of aggression. The Army is necessary to counter the conventional capabilities of our potential enemy as military parity in atomic weapons is approached.

We live in an era in which we may be headed toward atomic stalemate. A potential enemy, may well increase his attempts toward expansion in the vulnerable areas of the world, using the land armies of the Communist bloc. Our Army is needed to deter or defeat local aggression without necessarily broadening the local war into the atomic war we all seek to avoid, if mankind is to survive.

The Army is essential to the support of America's collective security policies—with its means that can be easily recognized on the ground. The American soldier stationed in an overseas area is there for a purpose the potential enemy understands.

The Army provide the Nation great military versatility. It can apply force with discrimination; it can apply force in the right amount at the right time, in all types of weather and in all types of terrain.

The Army is vitally interested in all weapons that will extend its capabilities. It is not welded to any existing weapons or any weapon now under consideration. It will not discard its traditional weapons in favor of any single "best" weapon, since no one can predict the precise weaponry that would be required in any future war nor can we forecast the exact nature of any future war.

What I have said, I believe answers the question. I repeat no weapon that has appeared on the military horizon has made artillery, the foot soldier, or the Army obsolete.

The Army is and will remain a decisive factor in warfare.

J. H. CARMINE, PRESIDENT, PHILCO CORP.

Question. Mr. Carmine, we note with interest the recent consent decree entered into between A. T. & T. and its subsidiary, Western Electric, through which over 8,000 patents will be released and licensed without charge. In your estimation, what economic effect will such action have on the future of the radio-electronics-television industry, which is presently forecasting a $500 million sales gain, $250 million of which is to come from purchases of color receivers?

Answer. I think this question is almost as loaded as "Will Eisenhower run?" and "How do we stand on atomic energy and guided missiles." To say the least, I certainly wouldn't want to hold myself up as the outstanding authority on patent situations and antitrust suits.

In the electronics industry, the A. T. & T. has been most liberal in working out cross-licensing and patent arrangements with those who requested them in the industry. And they have, of course, through the Bell Labs, contributed tremendously to the growth of our country and to great new patents and developments of patents from which great developments have benefited all of us in this Nation.

So they should be tremendously encouraged to carry on all of their great research work. The effect, however, should certainly be the lowering of prices in the electronics industry and the greater encouragement of other smaller electronics companies and laboratories to develop new and greater things from this magic electronics world. Many new patents or many developments come from the smallest laboratories in our country. And we certainly hope that this will be an encouragement to the electronics industry. I think that it will have that effect.

From the standpoint of color television, which is on the minds of everyone, it's pretty hard to predict whether this sales estimate, Mr. Chairman, will come true. There's been so many false starts and so many estimates as to when color television would get started it's pretty hard to predict. One thing I can tell you is that the industry has learned today, for the first time, how to build a good, stable, sound, workable television receiver. And they will get started this fall in fair quantity. In 1957 it should be one of our major industries and 1958 will blossom into one of the countries most gigantic and promising industries which will be most beneficial to all. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES RUFUS CHOATE

We come now to a proud moment for the business press—the presentation of its silver quill award. You may be sure that numerous candidates of high caliber were recommended to the selection committee. But, in the fabulous area of research, there was a name that stood out above all others and it belonged to a man whose deeds are even more fabulous than all the rest. As has been underscored by many messages of commendation to this dinner, it is we who are honored, beyond measure, in having the privilege of honoring so grat an American. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, we are doubly honored and twice privileged in having with us tonight to make the presentation of our silver quill the president of the Chrysler Corp., Mr. L. L. "Tex" Colbert, whose company was the first in the United States to design a working gas-turbine engine that could be installed in a passenger car of normal size and which could be driven in city streets. I ask you—where else but in America could you find such a situation as this—two highly competitive giants of industry, General Motors and Chrysler, sharing the same spotlight and saluting the economic freedom that guarantees their right to compete.

Mr. Colbert, the business press is honored to have you here to make the presentation of its silver quill award at this time.

REMARKS OF L. L. COLBERT, PRESIDENT, CHRYSLER CORP., IN PRESENTING THE 1955 SILVER QUILL AWARD TO CHARLES F. KETTERING, GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, my role this evening is one in which I find deep personal pleasure, particularly because it involves a well-earned presentation to a warm friend and a most respected competitor.

All of you who are members of this association which represents the business press of the country are to be congratulated for selecting Charles Kettering as the recipient of your silver quill award this year. He is a great man and a great American.

I am sure you were fully aware when you decided to honor him that you were also honoring one of our best-established and most popular national traditions. People like to honor Mr. Kettering, and they have been doing it for more than a third of a century. If my arithmetic is correct, this is the 87th time that he has had honors bestowed upon him. He has received 18 honorary degrees as doctor of science, and 5 as doctor of engineering. He has been made an honorary doctor of laws by five different institutions. And he has received 58 additional honors, including medals, special awards, citations, and honorary life memberships in professional societies. He has been honored by our greatest universities, by business associations, by foreign governments, by his friends in his own home town, and by groups representing American youth.

In a very literal sense Charles Kettering is one of the very most highly honored Americans. And we don't have to look very far to find the reason why he holds this place in the Nation's esteem.

In part it is because of the concrete contributions he has made to our comfort and pleasure and to our national wealth through his own inventions and those he has inspired in the minds and imaginations of others. In part, it is because of his own character and personality—his friendliness, his unswerving honesty, his idealism—qualities which we would all like to think are typically American.

But, in addition to these things, we honor him because by his example he has taught us to tackle the future as a great adventure. He has given momentum to the job of building a civilization and has taught us to look upon that job as one we have just begun. He has reminded us constantly that our automobiles, the factories that produce them, and all of the other technological wonders of the modern world are only a good start—and that we can do a lot better. He has never settled back and looked upon past accomplishments with complacency. He gets his fun and his satisfaction out of new problems. As he once said, "The minute you get satisfied with what you've got, the concrete has begun to set in your head."

It is this quality in Charles Kettering—this zest for the future, this appetite for change—that makes him a symbol of the American drive to improve an imperfect world. And it is this drive, after all, which underlies the productivity of American business and the strength of our economy and our national defense. It is also the unique contribution of our American civilization to the rest of the world.

Now, in presenting the fifth annual Silver Quill award of National Business Publications, may I read you the inscription on the plaque: "To Charles F. Kettering for most distinguished services to business and industry through research."

Boss Ket, it gives me great pleasure to hand to you the silver quill and please accept my heartiest congratulations.

REMARKS OF CHARLES F. KETTERING, GENERAL MOTORS CORP., IN RECEIVING THE 1955 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS

Tex, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I haven't the words to express my appreciation for this, but I still have some doubt as to how I go classed as a businessman.

You see, there are two kinds of people. That's the reason I want this (the award) to face toward you, so that you can see this pen. There are two kinds of people in the world. Those who work at desks with pens and paper and those who work at benches with screwdrivers and pliers. I'm a screwdriver and plier man.

I'm in no wise evaluating the relative importances of the two things. This (the award) represents management, planning, and all that sort of thing—even advertising. And I'd like to point out that neither Tex nor myself is the kind of person that our advertising agents have led you to believe.

I've been an inventor all my life and inventors, as you know, are known as longhairs or screwballs. Well, nature has taken me out of one of these categories. But the reason why we're called screwballs is a very simple thing.

The Honorable Governor Brucker here (Secretary of the Army) comes from a State which advertises for tourists. And, in some of the fine cities, just at the outskirts, as you enter the city there'll be a big billboardd and a map of the city or the county, with a little arrow running down to a sign saying "You are here." But the difference between the inventor and people—and, remember, we're a disappearing race, for the reason I am going to give you. Now, the only difference between people and screwballs is that people are only interested in where they came from. Screwballs are inteterested in where they are going.

Now, whenever you get in doubt as to where you are going, you turn around and study where you have been. You won't find out anything there that will help you at all. But it is a nice subterfuge for facing up to the problem. You know, problems come to us by nature, I mean, in the business we are in. And we've been very clever to have programs and projects which are means of detouring the problem and making it possible to write nice reports to our bosses. The problem must sit back, then, and feel like this because you never touch it.

You know, thinking about this state of the Nation dinner, I think you might be interested in seeing how the state of the Nation looks through an inventor's eyes. You see, you're mostly worried about the seething of current effects. Now you can't do anything to fix anything today, today. You had to fix it 10 or 15 years ago. So all of this is just turbulence.

Now the great problem we have to see through is how far in the future do you have to know your business to have it safe today.

Most people are so afraid of going through the iron curtain of tomorrow that we come up and hit it and turn right around and go back the other way. We read a little more history. I have been trying to get a word for years that means the exact opposite of history, because I am interested in the future, very much interested, because, that's where I expect to spend all the rest of my life.

The only suggestion that I have had for that word yet has been hysterics. And I know that's not the right word. But, about looking forward, you know nature has been very good to me. I have always had very poor eyes. I have not been able to read too much.

Because I always thought that this was a wonderful country that we live in. We've done a lot of things. Charlie Thomas sitting over here spoke about the great surplus of agricultural products which I understand we have. He mentioned the farm tractor. But, one part of that farm tractor is very important, one of the great inventions of all times. And, as you know, you don't have to have a universal bunch of inventors, if you have just a few of them. And, so, that percentage of 5 percent of them doing 80 percent of the things—well, there's nothing new about that.

There's only 2 percent of the people who ever composed any music at all. And you daren't play some of that. The little tricycle tractor that lets you come up so that you can cultivate a row, then turn around, lock the wheel, go back the other way and cultivate another—that's what took the horses off the farm. And, in the last 25 years, we have taken 20 million horses off the American farms.

Now, that's important for this reason, because every time you don't feed a horse you can feed 4½ people. Now, it's a little hard on the horses, but nevertheless that's given us a tremendous surplus of food. A hundred million more people we can feed, without farming anymore land. When you took the horses off the farm, you lost your market.

Now, the great problem that I have found and, this is true, I think, every place, is that it's so difficult to do anything new. I don't care what it is. And the reason for that, and I think, I know the reason for it, is simply this—we can be residents in space, but you can't be a resident in time. You are going to transient. The only time that you'll ever become a resident in time is in the undertaker's office.

You are going to be a transient, tomorrow's going to be different. The next day is going to be different. But we want to arrive, whether it's that desire for security, I don't know, but you are never going to arrive any place, because the world won't stand still. The next thing is we know so little about anything that it's all yet to be done. So, it's important for these great business publications which you represent here to keep the thing going—pointing out where we're going. Let us remember we don't care where you came from. We'd like to know where you are going. Thank you so much for your applause and thanks to the business publications again for the award.

Nineteenth District Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the tabulated results of a poll of opinion I have conducted in the congression district which I represent.

Late in December I mailed questionnaires to every 10th name appearing on the voting lists in the 3 counties of the 19th district. The response has been most excellent, running about 12 percent. I think it reflects well the intelligence and interest of the voters of this area. Those who responded had to furnish their own envelope and stamp. The comments which accompanied so many of the returns are indicative of the careful thinking with which the respondents approached their answers.

Members may read some significance in the results of this particular poll insofar as they reflect the thinking of President Eisenhower's new neighbors. The President and Mrs. Eisenhower recently became official, voting residents of the 19th district when they registered at the Adams County Court House in Gettysburg.

Questions	19th district		Adams		Cumberland		York	
	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent yes	Percent no
1. Do you favor, at this time, a reduction in Federal taxes?	58	42	54	46	55	45	60	40
If your answer was "yes" indicate which of the following methods would be fairest:								
(a) Increase in personal exemptions	72		58		80		81	
(b) Eliminate excise taxes	6				3		9	
(c) Curtail excise taxes	5		5		4		7	
(d) Decrease corporate tax rate only	2				3		2	
(e) Across-the-board rate reduction	24		5		24		30	
2. Does the present farm crisis require Federal action?	56	44	53	47	62	38	68	32
If your answer was "yes" indicate the proposals which appear to offer the best solution:								
(a) Fixed price supports	22		8		18		30	
1. 90 percent of parity	17		8		17		23	
2. 100 percent of parity	5				1		7	
(b) So-called soil fertility bank	17		15		25		15	
(c) Direct farm subsidies on all crops, similar to present program for wool	8				6		9	
(d) Increased market research	34		19		35		36	
(e) Use of present surpluses to feed world needy	71		53		68		75	
(f) Combination of all above	17		10		26		41	
If your answer was "no" indicate whether we should:								
(a) Abolish all farm aid programs	37		39		43		35	
(b) Continue with present flexible price support program	63		32		57		53	
3. Do you favor a program of Federal aid to education?	75	25	80	20	73	27	78	22
If your answer was "yes" indicate the programs you believe most justifiable:								
(a) Grants to States for school construction	35		42		29		45	
(b) Aid to teacher-training institutions	14		13		10		16	
(c) Grants to help defray teacher salary costs	24		25		32		22	
(d) Grants to help defray administrative costs	6		4		3		7	
(e) Federal guaranties of local school bonds	13		2		10		16	
(f) Combination of all above	48		33		31		54	
4. Should the Federal Government concern itself with the problem of rising costs of medical services and care?	64	36	57	43	54	46	67	33
If your answer was "yes" indicate your preference of the following suggested programs:								
(a) Health insurance modeled along lines of social security	58		42		45		63	
(b) Increase funds available for hospital construction	14		19		14		16	
(c) Provide grants to operate hospitals	13		14		16		14	
(d) Grants to medical and nursing schools	17		16		19		17	
(e) Medical and nursing scholarships	23		22		33		21	
(f) Federal guaranties against losses to private health insurance and hospitalization plans	11		12		11		11	
(g) Combination of all of the above	24		17		22		25	
5. Should we continue to have Federal housing programs?	65	35	67	33	70	30	64	36
If your answer was "yes" are you satisfied that present policy is providing an adequate program?	49	51	31	69	60	40	48	52
If not, indicate whether any of the following moves are necessary for improvement:								
(a) Permitting FHA to insure cooperative projects	21		42		16		21	
(b) Increasing direct loans to veterans	31		68		34		26	
(c) Expanding public housing programs	40		100		60		28	
(d) Combination of all above	59		20		55		65	
6. Are you satisfied with present foreign policy programs?	39	61	53	47	46	54	36	64
If your answer was "no" indicate whether you favor the following:								
(a) Continue to support United Nations	57		74		46		58	
(b) Withdraw from United Nations	7		15		5		6	
(c) Withdraw from all overseas commitments	11		15		11		12	
(d) Strive to strengthen United Nations	63		95		46		63	
(e) Continue foreign economic aid programs as is	10		27		9		8	
(f) Increase tempo of foreign economic aid	14		15		11		15	
(g) Further emphasize point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas	44		73		34		43	
7. In the light of existing world tensions, should we:								
(a) Increase our military strength	44		42		54		43	
(b) Continue military establishment at present levels	50		54		45		50	
(c) Make further national defense cuts	6		4		1		7	
(d) If you checked (a) above, do you then believe we should adopt universal military training?	73	27	63	37	84	16	72	28
8. Do you feel that the Taft-Hartley Act provides the fairest basis for Federal supervision of labor-management relations?	49	51	58	42	52	48	47	53
If your answer was "no" indicate whether it should be:								
(a) Repealed with no replacement	8		7		10		8	
(b) Repealed and replaced with a perfected version of the Wagner Act	56		47		55		57	
(c) Amended to meet the objections of labor	36		32		24		40	
(d) Amended to meet the objections of management	22		20		20		23	
9. Both major political parties have recommended amendments to McCarran-Walter immigration law. Do you agree?	75	25	71	29	80	20	74	26
If you answered "yes" indicate whether:								
(a) Quota system should be abandoned	8		17		4		8	
(b) Unused quotas should be transferred to countries where they are oversubscribed	35		28		36		35	
(c) Temporary adjustments should be made by extension of and amendments to Refugee Relief Act	62		63		60		62	

Ridiculous Stand on Farm Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very timely editorial from the Racine (Wis.) Journal Times on the subject of pending agricultural legislation. I agree with the sentiments expressed in this editorial and prayerfully hope that the committee may have a Federal farm program based upon its merits and not upon political pressures:

RIDICULOUS STAND ON FARM PROPOSALS

The Senate Agriculture Committee, confronted with a choice of two measures to subsidize the American farmer, "happily" chose both of them. It didn't seem to bother a majority of Senators on the committee that the two plans submitted to them—the soil bank and high rigid price supports—are mutually contradictory.

The high price support plan, which Congress kicked in the slats last year when it had built farm surpluses to a point perilously close to a national scandal, is a repudiated policy and one of the major causes for the predicament the farmer is presently in. The Eisenhower-Benson soil bank program, while continuing present flexible price supports, would continue to hand the farmer cash for land he doesn't farm and work he doesn't do, but it would at least have the virtue of reducing surpluses.

The plans are certainly at odds. The high price support program would actually encourage more production on the part of the farmer by assuring him that he could continue to grow surplus crops and sell them to the Government. The aim of the soil bank program is to take land out of production and thus reduce surpluses.

Adopting both of them would be legislative insanity. Yet that is exactly what the Senate farm committee asks Congress to do.

Two Secretaries of Agriculture, one an incumbent Republican and the other a former Democratic Secretary, have been revolted at this frivolous, politically motivated action of the committee. Secretary Benson and former Secretary Anderson, now a Senator and a member of the committee, both blasted the committee action over the weekend, and said they hoped President Eisenhower would veto this strangely mismated plan if it clears Congress, Anderson called the bill "atrocious," and Benson said it was "a step backward."

The country is still waiting for someone to make sense on matters of Federal agricultural policy this year. The only plans and programs submitted so far have been warmed-over versions of past mistakes, gilded and embellished to make them look politically attractive. Congress is showing an apparent desire to pass any and all of them, in a hope that all the past mistakes will add up to some wonderful program that will buy the farm vote. The fact that all these past mistakes have played an important part in causing the very problem they are trying to solve has not occurred to the vote-buyers.

Third Anniversary of the Farmer's Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago on January 20, 1953, the Eisenhower big-business-Benson administration was inaugurated. The ensuing 3 years have witnessed a steady downward drift of farm prices and purchasing power. The decline in net incomes of farmers have been even more severe because farmers' operating and living costs have not decreased; in fact, the cost of many items have increased.

The total net incomes of farmers in 1952, the year Mr. Eisenhower was elected President, was $15 billion. By the third quarter of 1955, the total annual net income was reduced to $10 billion. This represents a decrease of 33⅓ percent or a one-third cut in the net income of the farmers of America and their families since the year 1952, and during the past 6 months the farm income picture has grown much worse.

Although the total farm production for the year of 1955 was 12 percent greater than in 1947, gross farm income was 9.4 percent below 1947 and net farm income was down 38 percent. During the same period national income from nonagriculture sources increased about 68 percent and farm production expenses increased 11.4 percent. The parity ratio, which measures the relationship between prices received by the farmers and prices paid by farmers, dropped from 115 in 1947 to 80 in January of this year.

The farmers are the victims of a cost-price squeeze, and while the farmers' income has steadily declined, big business corporation profits have gone up higher and higher. Big business manufacturers, processors, commodity markets, packers, stock markets, transportation carriers, et cetera, have more than doubled and redoubled their net profits. General Motors Corp. reported a net income of more than a billion dollars for last year.

Mr. Speaker I say that the Republican publicized Eisenhower "prosperity and peace program" is a gross misrepresentation, and a grave danger to our national economy when it is revealed in the light of the fact that one of many big profiteering corporations—General Motors—reaped a profit last year equal to one-tenth of the total combined annual net income of 22 million loyal American farm people.

Another example of the Eisenhower "boom-prosperity and peace" program is the profits of Armour Packing Co. Profits of this company increased 600 percent in the year 1955. All other packing companies and processors report the greatest profits ever known in their operations.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America do not object to big business profits—we favor such profits if not unreasonable. The farmers do not wish to injure or prevent anyone's prosperity but they are entitled to their rightful share of the profits from our national resources and prosperity.

During this phony boom period, the Eisenhower administration has consistently followed a course of action designed to force farm prices down. On every occasion when the so-called flexible price support law permitted, the administration has reduced the support price when and it was above the free market level.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed and voted against the flexible or sliding scale farm price support bill when presented by the Republican leadership and passed here by the Eisenhower administration and Republican Congress 2 years ago. Instead I favored a 100-percent parity price for all farm products, and I supported and voted for a continuation of 90-percent parity price support program as was presented for a vote on the floor of the House at that time.

The Eisenhower administration of our agriculture programs has opposed and continues to oppose 100-percent parity protection for the farmers. The farmers are not willing to accept and must not be compelled to accept the controls of the soil-bank program without rigid 100-percent parity price support protection. The main opposition presented by opponents to parity price support protection for the farming industry is an exaggerated complaint against accumulated farm surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, for all of the 8 years from 1947—the first year after demobilization—through 1954 the average annual surplus of this type, for all farm products dumped together, has been only 1.6 percent of annual production, with an excess production in 5 years and a deficiency in the other 3.

According to the official figures from the Commodity Credit Corporation, December 31, 1955, we have a surplus supply of corn which would last 3 months and 19 days; present supply of wheat would last 13 months and 10 days; butter, 1 month and 14 days; milk, 1 month and 27 days; barley, 4 months and 14 days; oats, 24 days; and soybeans, 29 days.

Quite aside from the fact that accumulated farm surpluses could be used advantageously both at home and abroad, they are not in the aggregate excessively large as an emergency reserve. If war should break out or a national catastrophe occur, a total accumulation of farm products amounting to less than one-third of 1 year's normal production would be a minimum safeguard. Indeed, we would be more safe if we had more surplus farm products in reserve storage. We now have an inventory of over $100 billion worth of military equipment and supplies. How large, in comparison, is the $8 billion our Government has invested in surplus stores of food and fiber, and which could at any time be liquidated for sale at world markets outside the United States?

Mr. Speaker, there would be no farm surpluses if home consumption was expanded and exports of farm products enlarged. But unfortunately for the farmers of America, the Republican administration now in power protects foreign agriculture from American farm exports in order to increase the exports of the manufacturing industries.

Big business and big industry are protected by the Eisenhower administration by Government subsidies and special tax privileges to enable them to maintain certain price charges and limit output. Farmers are compelled to buy in a protected administered price market asking, "What is your price I am compelled to pay?" Farmers must sell in competition with millions of other farmer sellers to a monopolistic-type market, taking what they are offered as set by the monopolistic market price.

Mr. Speaker, big business corporation profits, after taxes, have increased by more than 36 percent since 1952. During this same period farmers' net income has decreased by more than 30 percent. The consumers of food and farm products are not deriving any benefits from falling farm prices. The average prices received by farmers for all products are now 26 percent lower than in 1951, but the food prices paid by consumers are about the same as in the year 1951. For example, prices received by producers of beef cattle in mid-December 1955 were equivalent to only 67.1 percent of the 1947–49 average, but the cost of beef to the consumer has not decreased.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad state of affairs when farmers are becoming worse off while others are prospering. It shocks human instincts and commonsense to see cutbacks in production and hear talks of surpluses while millions of American families lack adequate diets and hundreds of millions of people elsewhere in the world fear starvation. We all know enough of our economic history to be worried when agriculture is rolling downhill, because all general depressions have started on the farms, and conditions on the farms today threaten the lasting prosperity of all.

Mr. Speaker, the farm situation demands immediate adjustment and emergency action by the Eisenhower administration in order to prevent a complete collapse and bankruptcy of the farmers of America. Laws now in effect permit and authorize such action by the executive branch of the Government to protect and improve farm income, and the failure and refusal of the Eisenhower administration to effectively administer the farm laws now in effect makes it even more necessary for the Congress of the United States to enact

mandatory farm income protection legislation. The practices of monopolistic market manipulations which are circumventing the operations of free markets and enriching the few to the end of destroying the producer must be stopped. An immediate investigation should be conducted along the line provided for in my resolution, House Resolution 371, which I introduced January 12 of this year.

What agriculture needs at this time is a blood transfusion, such as a production payment plan, as advocated by Fred Heinkel, president of Missouri Farmers Association. A production payment plan could be put into effect in a very short time, and would not disrupt normal channels of trade. Such a plan should be made retroactive through and for the year of 1955 as well as for 1956 and subsequent years or until the farm surplus problem is worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I favor and will vigorously support and vote for farm legislation as outlined and proposed by the national farmers' organization. The Department of Agriculture should immediately establish a price floor of not less than $20 per hundredweight on butcher hogs and approximately $30 per hundredweight on Good to Choice cattle. He has existing authority by law to do so; however, if we need more specific mandatory legislation, then we must enact such legislation, and also provide mandatory income protection for family production of all commodities at 100 percent of fair parity, by means of production payments in workable combinations with price support loans, purchase agreements and purchases. We must revitalize and expand Federal crop insurance, expand use and demand for farm commodities, through domestic consumption expansion, such as milk for school lunch programs, and we must vigorously increase export of farm products.

Mr. Speaker, the only action that will solve the problem is legislation that will stop the fall in farm family income and raise it to a level commensurate with a fair opportunity for farmers in an otherwise expanding and prosperous national economy. Existing law permits and authorizes in general, but does not compel the executive branch to take the necessary actions required to protect and improve farm income. However, the executive branch has not used this authority. On the record, there is no reason to believe or hope that the Eisenhower-Benson executive branch of our Government will extend or administer adequate farm income protection programs as now authorized by laws in effect. Passage of mandatory farm income protection legislation will make the intent of Congress crystal clear; the absence of such mandatory legislation may give the executive branch some further excuse for its timidity and failure to act.

Mr. Speaker, our great United States has survived the tests of time, economic depressions and wars. From obscurity and small beginnings four centuries ago, America has emerged into history as the most powerful and resourceful free nation in the world. A nation only 400 years old, against the 5,000 years of India; 400 years against the days of Egypt that dates back centuries before the birth of Christ; 400 years against the life of China known by records to date back as far as 2205 B. C. The 400 most enlightened and liberty-laden years of mankind, which we have achieved by and through a philosophy of government that the welfare of all the people is paramount to that of a privileged few.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America were the founders and pioneers of our great Nation. It was indeed their lives and epochs that laid the convenient stepping stones which led to the industrial development, and the high standard of living and security the people of America enjoy. And the farmers of America are not only entitled to share in our national prosperity, their income, standard of living and opportunities must be equalized with other segments of our economy or a national economic depression with bankruptcy and bread lines will surely be upon us again.

You Can't Face Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Henry Hazlitt in Newsweek for February 13 in his column Business Tides points out that the President in his economic report says that lasting prosperity of the Nation depends far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does or can do for them.

Mr. Hazlitt then points out that in the next breath, the President says:

But we have also come to believe that progress need not proceed as irregularly as in the past, and that the Federal Government has the capacity to moderate economic fluctuations without becoming a dominant factor in our economy.

Truly, this is facing both ways. What do we want? The article follows:

FACING BOTH WAYS

Like his budget message, President Eisenhower's economic report seems to preach two mutually contradictory philosophies at the same time. It pays lipservice to Government economy and free enterprise, and ends with scores of recommendations for increased spending and more governmental controls.

It is perhaps forgivable, especially in an election year, that the administration should congratulate itself on the astonishing economic record of 1955, and imply that the result came about because, as Franklin Roosevelt once boasted, "we planned it that way." "Full employment, rising incomes, and a stable dollar have been cherished goals of our society. The practical attainment of these ideals during 1955 was the year's great economic achievement."

But what caused this result? The report begins, modestly enough, by admitting that "lasting prosperity of the Nation depends far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does or can do for them." It adds: "Today, we believe as strongly in economic progress through free and competitive enterprise as our fathers did, and we resent as they did any unnecessary intrusion of Government into private affairs." Then a qualification is added which, as it turns out, practically nullifies this statement. "But we have also come to believe that progress need not proceed as irregularly as in the past, and that the Federal Government has the capacity to moderate economic fluctuations without becoming a dominant factor in our economy."

Under the multitude of measures the report proposes, however, the Federal Government would obviously become the dominant factor in our economy. For the President and his economic advisers are now apparently convinced that wise and timely actions by the Government and soundly conceived and well-timed governmental policies can smooth everything out, give us exactly the right rate of growth, and prevent a minor contraction from turning into a spiraling depression. In order to do this, it seems that some 53 new laws or policies on the part of the Federal Government would be required. Most of these would greatly increase Federal powers. They imply interventions in the private economy at a thousand points and a constant stream of Government subsidies and handouts.

Moreover, even the specific governmental policies proposed contradict each other. This is most clearly brought out in the recommendations for credit controls. The Federal Government should be empowered to set minimum downpayments and maximum maturities on installment credit because installment credit sometimes accentuates swings in the buying of automobiles, furniture, televisions sets, and other consumer durables, thereby exposing the rest of the economy to the hazards of widened fluctuations.

But the same Government that fears the too-rapid growth of installment credit, even when financed by private lenders at their own risk, has promoted an enormous housing boom by itself guaranteeing mortgages on shoestring margins that make the installment-credit terms on automobiles or television sets look like the acme of conservatism. It has forced Americans who want to invest in American corporations to pay down 70 percent of the purchase price, while it uses the taxpayers' resources to encourage other Americans to buy houses for 7, 5, 2, or 0 percent of the purchase price.

The Federal Reserve authorities, bluntly, have not had the courage to exercise a sufficiently firm control over the total volume of bank credit. They have kept down interest rates below the levels to which they would otherwise have gone. It is this that has encouraged and made possible the huge growth in consumer credit. It is futile economically, and dangerous politically to give governmental authorities the right to increase the total supply of credit to make it cheaper and easier, and then to ration the oversupply by stepping in to say who shall and shall not have credit and on what terms. This substitutes bureaucratic judgment and favoritism for the judgment of the market place.

Annual Awards by Sports Lodge of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 26 carried a most interesting article, written by Mr. Bob Addie, con-

cerning the annual awards which are made by the sports lodge of B'nai B'rith. The story of the recipients of these awards is truly the story of America. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOB ADDIE'S COLUMN

Just a few days ago the Sports Lodge of B'nai B'rith gave out its annual awards. The list of honorees was impressive. Included were George Monaghan, New York State harness racing boss; Babe Zaharias, probably the greatest woman athlete of all time; Jesse Owens, hero of the 1936 Olympics; Terry Brennan, Notre Dame football coach; Jackie Robinson, of the Brooklyn Dodgers; teammate, Johnny Podres, hero of the 1955 world series, and Washington's Shelley Mann, the lovely swimming champion.

One glance at the award winners for 1956 (based on 1955 performances) reveals how widespread is the influence of sports. We have two Negroes, a Catholic, and assorted other typical Americans being honored by a Jewish organization.

It's been that way since the start, too. The previous award winners could make up a Who's Who of sports with such fields as boxing, swimming, racing, baseball, and football represented. Last year, the militant priest from Chicago, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, was honored for his tremendous work in founding and fostering the Catholic Young Organization.

Every man and woman honored is a standout in his particular field and again it is to the credit of sports that only performance counted.

Each winner honored at this latest banquet had a typically American story to tell. Podres, for instance, is the grandson of a Lithuanian immigrant who worked in the mines. Johnny's father worked in the mines, too. Now, to the new generation comes the pot of gold.

In every story there is a moral, deep and abiding, of unshaken faith which makes a champion. For instance, when Podres signed with the class D Hazard, Ky., club in the Mountain States League, the beginning looked like the end. The young lefthander let in seven runs in the opening inning. He pleaded with his manager, Max Macon, ex-Dodger, to be allowed to continue. Class D clubs aren't blessed with too many reserves and, besides, Macon had faith in Podres. Johnny bore down and shut out the opposition for the rest of the game as his team won, 10-7.

Then in 1954 Podres was sidelined by an attack of appendicitis. When he came back he had a sore arm and looked ready for the scrap heap. It must be remembered that when Podres beat the Yanks in the first game he faced them, he hadn't completed a game since June 6, 1955. He completed that game for an 8-3 victory over the Yanks and then crowned his performance with the dramatic, 2-0 shutout in the final game of the World Series.

Appropriately, Johnny was given his B'nai B'rith award by Gwen Verdon, star of the baseball musical, "Damn Yankees." Perhaps you remember the hit song of the show: "You Gotta Have Heart." That was the theme for Podres and appropriate it was, too.

Take the case of Babe Zaharias. She couldn't make the banquet so her husband George accepted the award for her. The theme for Babe was "Par for Courage." Certainly, no other famous athlete has had more heartbreaking reversals than the once indestructible Babe, who even now is fighting cancer.

Nobody has made any secret of it. But Babe's spirit is as indomitable as ever. Her courage has been an inspiration to millions and as ill as she herself was, she was among the first to send an encouraging note to a fellow golfer, President Eisenhower, last summer.

And how about Jesse Owens? When he went to Berlin with the American Olympic team in 1936, vicious stories greeted him about the "black American auxiliaries." This, of course, was Adolph Hitler's Germany. Der Fuehrer virtually snubbed Owens in presenting the laurel wreath of victory and, of course, Owens won three events.

It was in the broad jump championship that Hitler was taught a lesson he never learned. The favored was a typical Aryan, Lutz Long, so ruddy-faced and blond that he could have been the poster boy for Hitler's progadanda campaign. Owens twice was penalized for fouling in the broad jump before he barely qualified. Then he set a new world record of 26 feet, 5 5/16 inches.

Reminiscing about that magnificent jump the New York Times' gifted columnist, Arthur Daley, told of how Long was the first to hug Owens and then walked off the field with his arm draped around the copper-colored shoulders of the American while Der Fuehrer was kept waiting.

As Daley recalled the incident: "Lutz Long was giving his Fuehrer a lesson in elementary sportsmanship, a lesson that never was learned. On the athletic field, man is never measured by race, creed, or color. He stands on his own."

Jackie Robinson's story, of course, is well known. Almost singlehanded, he obliterated the color line in baseball and opened a new field in our national pastime.

Shelley Mann was an ugly duckling at 10—a little girl who could do nothing well. Today, she has grown into a lovely swan.

There is a thread connecting all these winners. They have overcome tremendous obstacles to reach the top. They have been sharecroppers, cobblers, dockworkers, newsboys, and miners. Most of the family backgrounds were humble. But here they are, kings and queens, no less. To rub again the well-worn cliché, it could only happen here.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence was celebrated and observed on February 16. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in that respect.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. President, it is again an honor to salute the gallant nation of Lithuania and Lithuanian people everywhere on the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Although it was short-lived, snuffed out in the clash of totalitarian giants in the Baltic, Lithuania's freedom has been a particular inspiration to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. That Lithuania still fights against heavy odds for her freedom is a monument to the courage and determination of her people and to the eternal attraction of the torch of liberty.

Since the 16th century, Lithuanians have worked tirelessly for their freedom. But located in a strategic corner of turbulent Europe, Lithuania became a prize for the aggressive drives of land-hungry governments.

Hard-won independence, declared on February 16, 1918, ended in the now-familiar treachery of Communist dictators who casually added more peace treaties and nonaggression pacts to the waste pile as they forced another 3 million people under their yoke.

Perhaps most significant to the people of my State of Nebraska are the well-documented reports of the ordeal of enslaved Lithuanians, are those dealing with the collectivization of a once prosperous agricultural economy. The drive for collectivization of Lithuania's traditional family farms began in 1947. It was ruthless oppression culminating in collectivization of 99 percent of the farms into the kolkhozes—the Soviet collective farm.

Testimony before the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress painted a tragic picture of the deterioration of Lithuanian agriculture in the kolkhoze system.

The efficiency of the collectivized farmer dropped sharply. Production per hectare of Lithuanias basic crops fell off—in wheat from 24 bushels per hectare to 10, and in rye from 25 bushels to 11. Lithuania's livestock population has declined—from 1,200,000 head of sheep to only 260,000 and from more than 1 million head of hogs to 315,000.

The achievements of our free enterprise farmer stand in stark contrast.

The select committee concluded in its report to the House, "The expropriation of private property destroyed the very foundation of the Lithuanian economy and turned her prosperous population into paupers."

The iron control of Lithuania by the Kremlin appears complete. But, as free men everywhere know, it is not. The determination of once independent nations and peoples to regain their freedom can never be stamped out.

As long as we continue to remind these enslaved people that they are not forgotten and as long as we continue to reassert in ourselves our determination to protect our own freedom, we can confidently look forword to the day when these indomitable Lithuanians will again achieve the right of self-determination.

Upper Colorado Project's Terrific Costs Would Be Borne by Nation's Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, 98 percent of the upper Colorado River project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located. This hidden subsidy for the four States benefited is unconscionable. Total direct and hidden costs run to $5 billion. It cannot and would never be repaid from project reve-

nues and would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers. The percent of the Federal tax burden by States as computed by the Tax Foundation shows that less than 2 percent of this required Federal subsidy would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the chief beneficiaries of the projects. For example, the State of New York would pay over 12 percent, Ohio about 6 percent, Illinois and Pennsylvania about 7 percent each, and so forth. It will be a burden on all of the taxpayers for generations to come.

Based on repayment schedules presented to the House and Senate Interior Committees by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each State, as computed by the Tax Foundation of New York City and Washington, D. C., here in tabular form are the costs, State by State:

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,611,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin	2.65	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

Total direct construction costs of the overall project of $1,651,000,000 when added to the interest on irrigation phases of $3,429,000,000 totals $5,080,000,000.

This, of course, dictates the defeat of the proposal.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. William Kuehn, of New Rockford, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK.,
February 2, 1956.

DEAR BILL: Am returning checked bulletin list. Also noticed that the 1955 yearbook entitled "Water" is available, free of charge, while the supply lasts, by writing to you. Would certainly appreciate the book.

I will also take the liberty of expressing some of my views. Shall say at the start of this letter that I am not censuring you. On the contrary, I think you've done a wonderful job, considering the obstacles you have before you. But for heavens sake, wise up your Republican colleagues before it is too late. We farmers are not really the country hicks, rubes, and other things we're supposed to be. We are well aware, that according to the wishes of big business, the farmers are supposed to hate labor and labor is supposed to hate the farmer, and fight each other, using up their energy fighting each other, thereby keeping their attention away from big business, letting them pull their dirty, crooked, slimy shyster deals, which has in the last 4 years, become synonymous with big business. Another thing, we are of the impression that members of Cabinets are supposed to labor for the good of recipients under their department. Therefore, we farmers think we have a right to have a man at the head of the Agricultural Department who will fight for them—not against them. A man whose eyes do not shine with hatred, when he speaks about the farmer before the TV cameras. We are well aware that the farmers' share of the consumers' dollar is now down to 39 cents. A drop of 3 cents this year while the middleman's profits are up 10 cents this year. We know also that big corporations' rise in profits have ranged for 4 successive years to a profit of from 33 percent to 62 percent increase each year over the preceding year.

In closing I remain, a former Republican turned Democrat, in self defense, and you'll do the same if you are wise..

Yours,

WILLIAM KUEHN,
New Rockford, N. Dak.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at the Lincoln Day Dinner of the Alexander Hamilton Club and the Republican City Committee of Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] at the Lincoln Day Dinner of the Alexander Hamilton Club and the Republican City Committee of Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On April 14, 1865, an assasin's bullet cut down a man who through 4 years of bitter and heart-rending internal strife had emerged as the symbol of union and democracy. Abraham Lincoln was a great and compassionate man whose respect for the sanctity and the innate dignity of the human being, the child of God, gave us some of the most beautiful and enduring passages we have in the English tongue.

Coming at a time when there was never more need of compassion and understanding to heal the wounds inflicted by fratricidal strife, his death was a tragic loss to the whole Nation. It is ironic and saddening indeed that nearly 91 years later we are confronted by happenings which in their ugly implications threaten to return us to the bitterness and rancor he had hoped to avoid and which we thought was now long since behind us.

I refer in particular to recent events at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa.

A week ago on Friday, a young woman eager to improve her education and make

herself a better citizen, began attending classes at the university. Within hours, this young woman became the target of rowdyism, wild tempers and mob action, newspapers in this area have reported. The president of the university pleaded for calmness and humane consideration, but the lawless mobs—apparently in large part composed of persons from outside the campus—took over and the university's board of trustees felt obliged to suspend the young woman for her own protection.

Now, why this threat to her security of person, why this virulence and utter contempt for lawful and orderly processes? The answer, as you readily recognize, is that she was the first Negro person to be admitted to this institution of higher learning.

Like Lincoln and others in our history who were willing to make great personal sacrifices to gain learning, she has reiterated her desire to return to the university. Let me read you part of her statement:

"I want to be an acceptable librarian and I have no other interest in this than that I want to get a good education. I don't think I'm asking for anything I am not entitled to. I am proud of the university and I will be proud to be a student there."

It would be difficult for any American to quarrel with this frank statement. It is in the spirit of reasonableness which should prevail on a university campus.

Now since this is a Republican meeting, it probably would not be amiss to point out that this unhappy situation has developed in a State which has a Democratic administration from top to bottom. It is sometimes useful to remind some of my northern Democratic colleagues about such failures of State responsibility.

There are other denials of basic rights to Negroes in the South which are deeply troubling. The right to vote is a cornerstone of the whole practice of democracy, yet year after year reports come out of such States as Mississippi about various strategems aimed at denying this right.

This State, too, has a Democratic administration from top to bottom.

I do not mean to imply that the problems involved in assuring equality of educational opportunity, equality before the law, equality of economic opportunity are easy and can be solved overnight by the right stroke of the pen. Extremism, dogmatic overbearance on any side will not right the wrongs or achieve the results we seek. But I do suggest that there must be a real will to make progress and to do so, steadily step by step, in orderly ways that will avoid violent disruption and unnecessary affront. This is what the Eisenhower administration has been trying to do. And under the President's leadership we have been making steady progress, the more impressive and lasting because it has been largely accomplished without incitement to racial passion and demagoguery.

Let us frankly recognize that the ending of segregation in all our public schools does mean a real break with the long traditional pattern in many States. The adjustments that it requires, however right and needed, are nonetheless difficult for some to make. Those States and communities now striving to bring their school systems into conformity with the Supreme Court decision need and should have the understanding and sympathetic support of all of us.

But let us not forget either that the basis of our whole system of government is the assumption that all citizens will abide by the will of the majority arrived at and by lawfully constituted process. We are used to taking it for granted that, once an issue has been resolved, we will all "go along" with it and whatever our view refrain from attempts to subvert or frustrate the majority will.

That is what is so deeply troubling about the outbreak of violence at the University of Alabama. That is what, in more subtle form, is so disturbing about the attempts of some States to nullify a judicial decision by our highest court. They are using means that may stop short of violence but that nonetheless clearly indicate a determination not to accept that decision for even a moment on any terms.

Let me illustrate by what might be called A Tale of Two States.

One is your own great Free State headed by Gov. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, and the one on the other side of our Nation's Capital, the State of Virginia, the Mother of Presidents. This State is headed by a Democrat, Gov. Thomas B. Stanley.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court declared segregation in the public schools unconstitutional—more than 20 months ago. In Maryland, Governor McKeldin met the announcement of the decision with these simple words, "Maryland has always been a law-abiding State." He said the State would "proceed in an orderly manner to bring an end to racial segregation." And it has done so. The law of the land is being carried out in Maryland. This is a tribute to the Governor's great leadership and the intelligence and patience of his constitutents. A wholehearted supporter of the Eisenhower approach, he has been taking a step at a time, knowing this is the only true way to success.

Meanwhile, on the other side of the Potomac River, in this land of the great giants of American history—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and James Madison, leaders of the State have been working steadily to find ways of nullifying the Supreme Court decision. At first, the Virginia attorney general and officials of other Southern States appeared before the Supreme Court pleading for time for a gradual adjustment to the ruling and asked that the cases be remanded to the Federal district courts. The Supreme Court's decree of May 31, 1955, was substantially in accordance with this request.

Then what happened—did Virginia begin integration of public schools? No; it did not. Instead, the strategy of interposition was developed—an attempt to enact an amendment to the Constitution directing integration of public schools. This is an ironic goal for those opposed to integration and obviously they are not sincere in putting forward the proposal. They believe that three-fourths of the States would not ratify the amendments. This to them would be proof that, no matter what the Supreme Court says, segregation is constitutional.

There was one immediate obstacle on this road to disregard of the law of the land—this was the action by the Arlington County School Board to begin gradual integration of the schools. When this was decided, what did the Virginia leaders and professed champions of local rights do? Did they acknowledge the right of Arlington County to take action in accord with the Supreme Court decision?

The answer again is "No." Instead, several State leaders introduced a bill aimed at ending the elected school board and replacing it by an appointed body. This, mind you, would not only mean a probable change in the school-integration program, but would also spell the end of a unit which has won national recognition for the quality of its educational program.

When next you hear the Democrats shouting their devotion to civil rights, public-school education, and the welfare of the Negroes of our Nation, remind them of this Tale of the Two States. We in Washington have an excellent vantage point to see how a Republican governor and a Democratic governor go about carrying out the law of the land.

Address by Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence A. Davis Before National-Western Mining Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful address delivered by Hon. Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, before the National-Western Mining Conference, at Denver, Colo., on February 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be here. It is wonderful to have an excuse to come back to Colorado, where I have spent so much of my time and where the scenes are so familiar.

I am sure you all know that I was born and much of my life was spent just over the line in southwestern Nebraska, and that I feel perfectly at home in Colorado. We in Nebraska, especially in our occasional hot, dry summers, have always been a little envious of you in Colorado. We have envied your great irrigation developments, and we have envied the great role that mining has played in the development of your State.

Now I am addressing you in a different role and one which, for the first time, embraces the mining industry.

No one can live very long in Nebraska without becoming conscious of the important role that the great State of Colorado plays in both mining and agriculture. Nor can one be Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior very long without realizing how heavy are the responsibilities within the minerals field falling on that Department. Not only are we concerned with programs to foster the orderly development of the country's mineral resources, but we are concerned also that the Nation shall be assured of an adequate supply of mineral raw materials for defense and for an expanding economy.

I am especially glad to be appearing before you at this time when the policy of the Eisenhower administration of allowing the free energies of the people to go untrammeled, relieved of the threat of the imposition of Government control, is beginning to bear fruit. The industrial progress we have made in the last 2 years in this country is without parallel in history. Never before have so many people had so many economic opportunities and such a high standard of living. Judging by the plans of industry for expansion to meet the future needs of the citizens, the end is not in sight.

The mining industry of the country has had a substantial share of this prosperity. According to a preliminary review of 1955 by the Bureau of Mines, the year just closed was the best ever for the mining industry as a whole. The Nation's mineral output during the year reached a new high of 15.8 billions of dollars.

The fuels, the metals, the nonmetallics, almost all had good years—good production and good prices. The record output of steel was accompanied by an upward surge in demand for ferroalloying metals. Bituminous coal and ignite reversed a 2-year downward trend. Domestic mine output of lead and zinc continued to rise, as world demand for these materials remained strong, with

prices moving upward. Consumption of refined copper was excellent and prices, shall we say, in the stratosphere.

Colorado has obviously shared in this and rare and precious metals continued to grow in importance and significance. Petroleum, fertilizers, and materials for the building trades—all enjoyed record years. With few exceptions, all segments of the mining industry, showed vigor and strength.

Colorado has obviously shared in this prosperity. The resources of the State add greatly to the mineral wealth of the Nation. In 1954, the last year for which a complete record is available, Colorado produced some $340 million worth of minerals—a handsome addition to our commerce—including petroleum, coal, iron, copper, lead, zinc, gold, silver, and last but not least, uranium.

The saga of Colorado's uranium production is fabulous. The State has become one of the world's leading sources of indispensable uranium.

A few months ago the Geological Survey issued a report entitled "Search for Uranium in the United States." The author of this report says that the number of geologists employed by the Government and industry in the search for uranium is comparable to or larger than the total number of geologists engaged in the study of all other minerals put together, with the exception of oil.

This widespread interest has led to important discoveries of large deposits capable of being mined immediately, and of extensive resources in lower grade deposits that insure our future supply.

This is a brilliant record of geological and technical research at work to find and utilize a mineral formerly of little interest. It is also a good example of the fact that there are still treasures to be found in our country, particularly of newer metals and minerals, some with jawbreaking names, that are only now finding application in industry.

As a counterpart to the domestic program the Eisenhower administration has pursued a policy of encouraging expansion of world trade. These efforts have resulted in greatly increased production in every part of the free world with resultant increased world demands for mineral raw materials and a rising standard of living.

The mounting foreign demands for energy are providing export markets for American coal miners. So great is the foreign demand for United States coal that shortages of coal cars and port facilities are making it difficult to fill all orders. Shipments are now at a rate of 45 million tons a year, a half a billion dollars added to our commerce.

Growing demand abroad for lead and zinc has taken an increasing portion of foreign production. United States commercial stocks of both the commodities are now at such low levels the Government is being offered virtually none for the strategic stockpile.

This spectacular growth in industrial production abroad, particularly in the countries of Western Europe, but not confined to them, is a testimonial to our own way of doing business. Some of these older cultures are coming at last to recognize that industry, once free of government intervention, relieved of the constant threat of government control, and out of the hands of cartels, makes an amazing response.

In my opinion this miracle of industrial technology, democracy, and capitalism in the United States is the greatest single influence in the world today. There isn't a country in the world that isn't challenged and inspired by what has happened in America. Nor is there a country which is not in one way or another attempting to find out how we have done it and trying, at least in part, to duplicate it.

We are misreading the signs of our times if we assume that it is only the ideology of the Communists that is responsible for unrest in colonial areas or revolutions in other areas. On the contrary, it is the achievement of America, our property, our standard of living, as much as anything else, that has kindled in the minds of peoples everywhere the hope that they too may, for the first time in the history of their countries, translate their natural and human resources into a higher living standard—enough to eat, more adequate housing and clothing, a little leisure.

The men of the Kremlin can only promise that if you follow the Moscow line you can have even more than they have in America, and you can have it more quickly and more efficiently.

The Moscow tune is, of course, sweet music to the ears of those who put no faith in freedom, no trust in men. So it is that nation after nation, wanting most of all to achieve the miracle results of American capitalism, try to do it directly by government decree, and by government financing. They do not realize—and we do not point out to them clearly enough—that the miracle of American capitalism is a byproduct of freedom and democracy. It could never have been accomplished by direct planning.

Can you imagine central economic planning creating, for instance, a petroleum industry such as we have in the United States? There are 200,000 different businesses making up what we call the petroleum industry. Some are big integrated companies; some are medium-sized producers or refiners; thousands are small independent filling stations.

No Government bureaucracy planning an economy, would consider such diversity within an industry as a sign of strength. By Government monopoly it could be done more quickly, they would allege, more efficiently, and what's more the profits would go to the people—not to the "capitalistic imperialists" would built and operate the industry.

Well, wha is the record? With faith in the ingenuity and initiative of ordinary men—thousands of them—we have been able to produce over the years as much oil as the rest of the world put together. We have carried American investment, technology and know-how in the oil business to every part of the world to which we have been invited. In every year during the past decade we have discovered more oil than we have taken from the ground. We have explored and drilled 50 miles out into the Gulf of Mexico. We have developed huge aviation and automotive industries whose outputs are coordinated with petroleum output.

While we have been doing this, many other governments have sought to follow a different program. They have locked up their petroleum reserves and bar the door to private development. They have established government monopolies and are trying desperately to meet their countries' need for oil.

The results have not been very happy in most places. The lack of finances, the lack of technical know-how, the unwillingness of responsible government leaders to risk public funds in drilling for new structures, all have served to restrict such developments to less than subsistence enterprises in most places.

But the lesson of the American way is getting across. Turkey, Guatemala, Bolivia, Peru, and others have recently joined the ranks of Venezuela, the Middle East, and some of the European countries in revising their petroleum laws to open the way for private investment. One of the great missions of the United States as a member of the family of nations is constantly to point out that there is only one path to the full and complete development of resources to provide the abundance which we seek, and that in the path of freedom—not the path of regimentation, of forced labor, and planned production.

Although the American people have thoroughly discredited the doctrine of a planned and regulated economy to the point that few people will endorse the doctrine itself, many of the ideas underlying that doctrine are still abroad in the land, disguised by other names, and unfortunately, many of them are not recognized for what they are.

It is so simple and so attractive policically to argue that the Government may simply step in to various business enterprises and by so doing make the profits and keep them "for the people", without paying the slightest regard to the economic factors and the human equations that necessarily accompany that philosophy.

The operation of a business involves planning for the future. It involves taking risks. It involves backing your judgment with capital investments, and none of these things fit into the pattern of Government thinking, where risk is to be avoided and "play it safe" is necessarily the watchword. It is not in the nature of ours or any other government to take the chances, to risk the capital, that is necessary for the development and the expansion of our economy. Business plans whether made by Government or private enterprise may go wrong, but when Government plans miscarry, the effect may be disastrous for all; when those of the private citizen go sour only he or his company is hurt.

In the field of mining and the mineral industries I know we shall continue to rely upon the enegies and skill of the people to develop our natural resources. We have had too great success to think of abandoning this approach.

As a matter of fact, the inspiration of our people for well over a hundred years has been the establishment of homes and the development of the land and mineral resources of the West.

The trappers and the Indian traders ploughed their way through the wilderness, and behind them came the settlers. The trapper made his livelihood, such as it was, from the furs and the goods that he collected largely from the public domain. I suspect that was one of the first "give aways". We should never have let him do it. "A Government sponsored agent could have done it better." He was taking "a resource that belonged to all the people."

As the settler progressed to the West and the pressure of our population began to increase, the far seeing man of that day recognized that the stability of a nation depends upon the anchoring of its people to lands and homes and means of livelihood, and so they opened up the development of the West by the passage of the Homestead Laws, incidentally during the presidency of Abraham Lincoln, no less. We said to the American citizen, that if he could locate 160 acres of land in the Middlewest and Western States, that if he would go upon it, live upon it and establish a home, it might become his by the payment of a very nominal sum. We settled the West under the Homestead Acts, and we "gave away" millions of acres of the most fertile soil of the United States.

Meantime, here in Colorado and elsewhere throughout this great mountain region came the miner and his burro, poking into unexplored gulches, camping along undiscovered rivers in his search for that allusive thing called gold, and the discovery of gold and silver and the other metals of this region brought with it a great influx of population, great wealth to a few, moderate wealth to many, and homes and a living for all.

We provided in those mining laws in 1872, and we haven't changed them substantially since, that if this miner could locate minerals in paying quantities upon the public domain,

the claim might be his if he developed his minerals, that he might receive a patent or a deed from the Government of the United States, and so again, in the parlance of these modern critics, we "gave away" most of the richest of the mineral resources of the United States.

As the homesteads became exhausted, we passed the Desert Land Acts and the Timber Claim Acts, and we brought still thousands of others into this western region to settle upon land, to develop it from the desert, to market its products, and to establish still further the economy of the Western States. Out of the courage and the labor of these settlers upon the lands, in the timber and in the mines of the West we have developed great cities, great States, including Colorado, and a prosperous and a happy people.

I say that is the traditional American way, and I say that I do not think God and the American people have done such a bad job.

Neither our resources nor our opportunities are as yet exhausted. Our future holds promise almost as great as the past has proven.

For instance, I am told that what is probably the world's greatest deposit of rare earth, cerium, lanthanum, scandium, and others was discovered only a few years ago a stone's throw from the main highway between Los Angeles and Salt Lake City. Any one of you could have done it. Who knows what other treasures await the enterprising prospector in the future? The world is going to need larger and larger amounts of metals and minerals as the standard of living rises everywhere.

There is, of course, important work for the Government to do in the field of mineral resources as in every other field of natural resources. The constant search for ways to find hidden ore bodies, and they are getting harder to find, the continued study of improvement in recovery from low-grade ores, and the perennial task of getting abundant materials like titanium and magnesium into the stream of industrial use to substitute for the scarcer materials—these are among the important functions which Government can perform in order to multiply the economic opportunities for the mining industries and lift the living standards of the people.

The Government also continues to own important mineral bearing lands. The wise and orderly development of these resources calls for close cooperation between the Government and industry. A good illustration is the tidelands legislation designed to bring into production the petroleum resources presumed to lie beneath the shores off the Gulf of Mexico and the coast of California. This has been termed a "giveaway" by some unkind critics. But look at the record. Already the Federal Government has obtained over $275 million in bonuses from oil companies merely for the privilege of drilling and finding the hidden wealth. In addition, the Government will obtain a royalty of one-sixth of the oil found as well as a goodly part of the income of those who are successful. And its bears no losses.

In our insistence upon keeping the field of mining free from Government intervention, we are conscious of the dilemma of agriculture as a result of the Government's well-intended intervention.

Here we have our most important industry confronted with problems of surpluses and resulting falling prices constituting a national problem of great concern to all of us.

The surplus agricultural problem even has its repercusions in the field of minerals. The authorization by the Congress of barter transactions by which agricultural commodities may be exchange for mineral commodities can have its effect, either helpful or harmful, upon the markets of many minerals. Thus does the effect of a Government-controlled economy in one field tend to affect other economic fields.

The President's Advisory Committee on Minerals has recommended that preference shall be given to the domestic producer in the acquisition of minerals and metals for stockpiling which should constitute substantial protection of the domestic mining industry.

That same committee has emphasized that we must maintain a strong, vigorous, and efficient domestic minerals industry in the United States, and that such an industry is vital to our long-term economic development.

We shall continue to work for the maintenance of the kind of governmental and economic climate in which the energies of free people shall be given every opportunity to develop the mineral resources of the country and dedicate them to an even higher standard of living.

A Billion Invested by United States in United Nations With Questionable Results

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Fulton, writing in the Chicago Tribune, states that Uncle Sam has sunk more than a billion dollars so far in the United Nations and its mushrooming activities. American people are beginning to wonder as to how much longer we can continue to spend on an international agency which has shown so little tangible results.

The Korean war was fought in the name of the United Nations and yet there is no peace in that area as the Communists violate every truce provision by building a greater war potential every day.

It was the United Nations that declared the partition of Palestine and today the United Nations cannot bring peace in that trobuled area.

It is time to give our earnest attention to this expanding international failure.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Mr. William Fulton, referred to above:

BILLION SUNK BY UNITED STATES INTO U. N. IN FIRST DECADE

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK., February 11.—Uncle Sam has sunk more than a billion dollars so far in the United Nations and its multitudinous mushrooming activities around the earth. The rate of the global spending spree is accelerating.

This was disclosed today upon a toting up of fiscal records at the Park Avenue office of the United States mission to here.

The spending covers the U. N. decade from 1946 through 1955.

United States taxpayers dig in their pockets anually to support various U. N. activities in varying percentages, according to the organization in question.

The largest American contribution has been 95 percent toward the U. N. emergency relief program for Korea.

PAYS THIRD OF SALARIES

Here at U. N. headquarters, with its secretariat bureaucracy of 3,000, half of whom are foreign nationals, the United States picks up the tab for one-third of the budget, which, incidentally, has skyrocketed to an all-time high.

A big spender itself, the U. N. has spawned numerous offshoots that bid fair to outstrip the parent organization.

These are known as "permanent organizations" and "special programs."

A table showing the official figures for United States contributions in this country's 10-year venture into internationalism follows:

Permanent organizations

United Nations in New York and field offices abroad	$130,831,104
Food and agricultural organization	13,156,174
International civil aviation organization	5,463,024
International labor organization	10,812,214
International telecommunication union	1,233,401
Universal postal union	118,912
World health organization	5,993,400
World meteorological organization	133,614
United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organization	24,037,797
Subototal	191,779,640

The above figures do not reflect the crushing military costs of the Korean war on the United States.

COMMUNISTS PAY NOTHING

The U. N. Children's Fund, probably the most sympathetically regarded subordinate activity of the world organization, draws 68 percent of its financial support from the United States. Although the Soviet Union and its satellites, Byelorussia, and Czechoslovakia, have been members of the children's fund executive board, they are not contributing toward this activity.

Thus, the Communists have been voting how and where the funds may be spent, as well as reaping any gratitude from health or educational betterment, but have made no financial sacrifice toward the project.

Four Soviet satellites, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria, gave a total of $2,115,617 to the children's fund but this was before they were swallowed up in the Kremlin's orbit. Russia, Romania, and the Ukraine have given nothing.

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF ILO COSTS

The U. N. International Labor Organization embraces 70 member nations. At its outset in 1945, the United States kicked in 25 percent toward the ILO.

The United States contribution toward the International Civil Aviation Organization has jumped from 11 to 32 percent. In the Food and Agriculture Organization, it has increased from 25 to 30 percent.

Toward the subsistence of the Palestine refugees, the United States puts up 65 percent. The refugee agency is building many resettlement projects, with the United States paying 75 percent of the costs.

In the fertile minds of the U. N. diplomats there is no end to projects in which the United States would supply the major share. The latest idea hereabouts is SUNFED—special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—hitched to the lofty idea of raising the standard of living of underdeveloped peoples all over the world.

Under SUNFED, the United States would pay at least one-third of the estimated $14 billion required for heisting peoples up by their bootstraps. So far the United States Government hasn't given its approval to SUNFED, but some of the dedicated American votaries of U. N. are all for it.

Commemorative Stamp for Amelia Earhart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter written by Al Bennett, editor of the Atchison Globe, in regard to a commemorative stamp for Amelia Earhart.

Last year I introduced a joint resolution, which was cosponsored by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], providing for the issuance of such a commemorative stamp.

I think the editor of the Atchison Globe expressed it well when he stated:

It was her courage that broke the barrier for women pilots everywhere. It was her contagious smile that won friends for aviation, and for America, on the airstrips of Europe and Asia. Amelia Earhart was the Nation's Lady Lindy.

Mr. President, I am again urging the Post Office Department to give early consideration to the issuance of this stamp. I know it would be gratefully received by millions of our people, and while it would be a great honor to the name of Amelia Earhart, it would also be appreciated by millions of women and our people generally. It is a stamp that should be issued.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Al Bennett)

Here is an open letter to Senator FRANK CARLSON, Washington:

"DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: We saw you for a few moments during Kansas Day festivities in Topeka last weekend but didn't have an opportunity to talk with you about an Amelia Earhart postage stamp.

"We recognize that such a commemorative stamp is not of earthshattering importance. No serious damage will result if an Amelia Earhart stamp is never issued. And we know you are very busy with 1,001 other things that are important, and we ask you to forgive us for imposing upon your time.

"Yet we also know you have always boosted your State and worked hard for its citizens. We know you have been interested in getting authorization for such a stamp, honoring the world's first lady of aviation. And we know that the entire matter is within the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General.

"But we should like to ask that you redouble your efforts in working toward an Amelia Earhart commemorative stamp at this time. Of course we realize that it will publicize Atchison, where she was born and reared. We realize it will publicize the State—your State and ours. But more than all this, it will pay tribute to a wonderful pioneer girl who was known and loved throughout the world and to whom aviation owes an eternal debt.

"It was her courage, Senator, that broke the barrier for women pilots everywhere. It was her contagious smile that won friends for aviation, and for America, on the airstrips of Europe and Asia.

"Amelia Earhart was the Nation's Lady Lindy.

"A commemorative stamp issued in her honor seems a fitting and proper way to indicate her country's appreciation and gratitude.

"Thanks a lot. We know you will do all you can, and better than that, that you'll get the job done. If we can help at this end, feel free to call on us.

"Yours,

"THE GLOBE."

GTA Daily Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the GTA Daily Roundup dated January 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIDAY, *January 13, 1956*

Let's talk about prices for a minute. They're matters of vital concern to farmers and to industry. But, there's a world of difference between the way they're made in agriculture and business. As everybody knows, General Motors is a giant among giants in industry. Not long ago, a Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, summoned a group of GM officials before it to inquire into the huge corporation's policies towards dealers. And, one of the matters the GM executives were closely questioned about was this matter of car prices. What were the company's pricing methods How did it decide what kind of price tag was to be put on those automobiles rolling off the assembly lines?

What the Senators heard was a nice, neat formula used to make the price on that new Chevrolet, Buick, Oldsmobile, Pontiac, or Cadillac. The steps—and they're only four—go like this:

1. Cost of making cars are recorded by GM factories. Average breakdown runs: Materials, 60 percent; wages and salaries, 30 percent; office overhead, 1 percent; then depreciation, local taxes, etc., come to around 9 percent.

2. Profit to GM—that's added to the costs and GM has a goal. It strives to get an average return on net capital investment of 15 to 20 percent over the years, or 10 percent of the value of sales.

3. Dealer's mark-up is figured next. It's figured at 25 percent, and that gives the list price. Then as competition rises, dealers can cut this mark-up and try to make an over-all profit by increased sales.

4. Other charges are added in next. They cover freight, Federal excise, local taxes, dealer's handling.

Then the items in the four steps are added together, and you have the final price that a buyer pays for a new car. It's all set forth in a recent issue of the U. S. News magazine. If demand slackens will GM slash prices? No. They'll hold prices and cut production, aiming to protect profit margins. That's the way prices are made for GM. Quite a contrast to the making of prices for the farmer. He oftens hears that he's supposed to take his chances on the free market, that supply and demand will determine his price. He's got no chance to name a price to cover his costs—depreciation—a wage for himself and his family—return on his investment and so on.

So, the farmer must look to Washington, for the helping hand of Government to intervene, to give him some protection from the hazards of free markets. And his costs, set by formulas like the one at GM have been rising, while his prices for what he produces have been tumbling. He's got to turn to Government for farm laws to protect him in this economy of legislated and administered prices. Congress now has the job to consider the agricultural troubles of the Nation and develop a program to get the farmer back on the road of prosperity like the rest of the economy. He simply can't do it by himself. He's got to have legislation.

This is GTA, the co-op way.

Financing the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the deficit in the Post Office Department is so large that it is one of the major factors to be considered in balancing the Federal budget. Millions of thoughtful Americans are convinced that something ought to be done about it. Certainly the recommendations of the Postmaster General merit a hearing. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service cannot fulfill its duty without giving this matter attention.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the most recent issue of Time magazine and also an editorial from the State, published at Columbia, S. C., on February 9, 1956.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time of February 20, 1956]

THE POST OFFICE—THE CASE FOR A RAISE

Despite the ire that it regularly arouses in its 166 million clients, the United States Post Office Department in recent years has been a surprisingly well-run organization. Harry Truman's last Postmaster General, careerman Jesse Donaldson, did his best to cut the Department's traditional deficits by adopting the most drastic possible economy measure—abolition of twice-a-day mail delivery in residential districts. Under Eisenhower's Postmaster General, Michigan Chevrolet dealer Arthur Summerfield, the volume of mail handled by the Department has jumped from 52 billion to 56 billion pieces a year, while the annual deficit has been chopped from a record $727 million in fiscal 1952 to an estimated $467 million for fiscal 1957.

In their efforts to make the Post Office Department pay its own way (the books have balanced only 13 times in the last 100 years), both Donaldson and Summerfield came up against one insurmountable obstacle. Postal rates today are substantially the same as they were in 1932. Meantime, the cost of everything else, including Post Office operations, has more than doubled. Result: a built-in Post Office Department deficit that, given present rates, promises to run at least $500 million a year, and could well reach a billion dollars

if volume and population continue to expand.

To rid the Post Office of this incubus, Summerfield last week asked Congress for a raise in postal rates calculated to add more than $400 million to Post Office income next year. He was backed four-square by President Eisenhower, who told his press conference that "self-respect demands a raise in postal rates."

OVERHAULED BOOKS

Summerfield was in a strong position to make the request. Soon after he was sworn in as Postmaster General in January 1953, Summerfield discovered that the Post Office Department's 509,000 employees did not include a single certified public accountant and that the most up-to-date financial report on departmental operations month by month was a year and a half old. To remedy this state of affairs, he called in topflight Chicago Accountant Maurice Stans, who overhauled post-office accounting procedures from top to bottom.

Along with an improved accounting system, Summerfield adopted a variety of moneysaving devices ranging from elimination of 3,000 small post offices to use of production-line delivery trucks instead of expensive, specially built models. (Some noteworthy Summerfield innovations: abolition of the silly regulation that prohibited enclosures of letters in packages; installation of "snorkel" mailboxes that can be reached from automobiles; distribution of bright, new ballpoints to replace that traditional bane of United States life, the scratchy, ink-spitting post-office pen.)

CLEAR CHOICE

Most impressive of all, Summerfield managed to combine a sharp cut in Post Office Department costs with a long-overdue salary raise for postal employees and improved service to the public.

Summerfield's specific proposals for new rates—first-class mail to 4 cents an ounce, air mail to 7 cents, and a 30 percent increase in second- and third-class mail—were open to argument on detail. But there could be no doubt that some increase was necessary in all 3 classes of mail. Congress—which last year denied a similar Summerfield request—was faced with a clear choice: higher postal rates or indefinite continuance of the built-in Post Office deficit.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of February 9, 1956]

POST OFFICE IN EXTREMIS

The Post Office Department points out that it is operating on a prewar price level and a postwar cost level, with the result that it is going in the red at the rate of at least a million dollars every working day. That is to say the Department would be losing its shirt if the shirt didn't have tails that reached into the pockets of every taxpayer.

Although economies and efficiencies have reduced the postal deficit approximately 40 percent in the past 2 years the Department still faces a deficit of nearly half a billion dollars during fiscal 1956, $200 million of which is the yearly cost of the new pay increase.

The Department says it has gone about as far as possible in reducing costs without impairing efficiency of service, and that new postal revenue is needed immediately to meet the increased costs of operation and to handle the mounting volume of mail.

The Department declares that it is not true, as often declared, that it has never operated at a profit. Originally, it was a moneymaker and in 1936 Postmaster General Kendall stated his policy as "Everything shall pay its own way. The yearly average loss from 1789 to 1940 was less than $10 million. During the war years from 1941 to 1945 the Department operated at an accumulated surplus of $163 million, largely due to stabilized costs with greatly increased volume of business, plus the fact that the armed services took over a large part of the cost of overseas mail transportation.

But during the period of unprecedented national prosperity the last 10 years the postal deficit has zoomed to $4.6 billion. While per capita disposable income has gone up 314 percent, the wholesale price index 162 percent, and the postal cost (to the Department) 107 percent, and 6 wage increases to employees have been given, third-class rates, since 1932 have been raised only 38 percent and second-class 3 percent.

Third-class mail is largely advertising. Second-class customers are largely newspapers and magazines. With individual large daily customers a small percentage of increase could and does make a tremendous annual increase in company costs. So, percentagewise increases are sometimes far from indicative of the added load to the user. And increases should consider the situation.

However, the fact remains that Americans believe in self-support and pay as you go, and passing the buck to the taxpayer is not according to the great American custom, and steps should be taken to relieve the situation.

Russia and the Soviet Threat to the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from an 81-year-old constituent of mine, a very fine gentleman, who has written a very interesting letter concerning some of the events of today, particularly respecting Russia and the Soviet threat to our country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWALK, CONN., *February 6, 1956.*

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: We all live from day to day. The good Lord has blessed me for 81 years thus far and before it is too late, may I please contribute my viewpoint in the interest of world peace so vital to all of us everywhere.

Prime Minister Bulganin's letter and his draft, a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, addressed to our President Eisenhower, and the text of Eisenhower's reply, all of which appears on page 26 in the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, January 29, 1956 paper, which I have read very thoughtfully, prompts me to remark upon it for your attention.

The Russian treaty of friendship offer to the United States rejected by President Eisenhower, is a pretty clear propaganda try at turning the tables, especially so, after refusing to go along with some of President Eisenhower's proposals at the Big Four Summit Conference in July 1955, in Geneva.

The entire Russian regime no doubt is based on concealment, while we always are willing and want an honorable pact, the Russians surely have proven to be men without any honor.

We read that the late President Roosevelt renewed diplomatic relations with Russia back in 1933. We all know the sad state of world conditions today because of the Russian communistic infiltration everywhere including the several discovered in our own State Department.

According to 2 articles which I have read, they inform me that since 1933 the Russians and the United States of America have held 3,400 meetings to discuss better relations, resulting in 52 major written agreements of which the Russians have honored and lived up to only 2, to enter the war against Japan and to permit air corridors into Berlin. The other 50 they have broken.

The Communists are raising a great cry for peaceful coexistence. What they are after is simply the opportunity to continue without interference their ideological warfare and conquests from within. What they want is for the United States to relax its opposition.

They have no compassion which helps us share the pain of others. Abraham Lincoln had a compassion for everything alive. A compassionate man whatever his race or creed is a man after Christ's own heart.

I thank God daily for our President Eisenhower, a real man of God of the highest integrity, considerate of all humans everywhere, asking, I believe, God's guidance in every decision he has to make.

In his reply to Bulganin's letter he said in part, "This Nation holds out the hand of friendship to all who would grasp it in sincerity, I have often said, and I now repeat that there is nothing I would not do to promote peace with justice for the world. But we know that it is deeds and not words alone which count." He stated also, "If the Russians really want peace, they can prove it by deeds, such as the unification of Germany and freeing of the satellites.

Charles Sumner said, "Give me the money that has been spent in the war and I will clothe every man, woman, and child in an attire of which kings and queens would be proud, I will build a schoolhouse in every valley over the whole earth, I will crown every hillside with a place of worship consecrated to the gospel of peace."

Thomas Jefferson said, "The whole of government consists in the art of being honest."

World peace begins in the hearts of individuals. Pain makes man think, thinking makes man wise, wisdom makes life endurable.

Now, then, to come to the real issue, I think, and I hope, you can agree that in view of our actual experience with the Russian officials as stated above, since 1933, when the late President Roosevelt renewed diplomatic relations with Russia until Prime Minister Bulganin's recent letter to President Eisenhower, together with another false treaty to sign, since it already is included and signed for in the United Nations organization, that the time has arrived to call a halt to the Russians' continuous false propaganda and dishonorable dealings and make them face the real issue.

I leave it to your good judgment as to the best and proper procedure. I personally feel that the best results would be obtained at a United Nations meeting by our representative being empowered to at the first opportune time to present all the facts as above stated and finally asking the Russian representative why they agreed to and signed 52 major agreements and then broke them all but 2, that will make them realize their dishonesty and put them on the spot, in the presence of the other nations' representatives. "By their fruit ye shall know them."

Russia is the real cause of the cold war, our heavy budget and our high taxes for many years now. It is high time they be so informed and corrective measures applied.

Here is hoping that somehow all Members of Congress and the Senate, yes, and also the President can see and read my letter.

With every good wish to you all,

Respectfully yours,

FREDERICK BRACK.

Address of Hon. Percy Priest, Member of Congress From the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, at the Launching of the U. S. S. "John Willis," at Camden, N. J., February 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1956, our colleague, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, made an outstanding and memorable address at the launching of the U. S. S. *John Willis*, at the yard of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., located at Camden, N. J.

There have been many naval vessels constructed at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. that carry the names of distinguished naval heroes. There has been no one with a more commendable record of heroism than Pharmacist Mate (1c.) John Harlan Willis, who was a platoon corpsman serving with the Third Battalion, 27th Marines, Fifth Marine Division. The State of Tennessee is proud of the illustrious service of John Harlan Willis that was so vividly and forcibly set forth in an address by our distinguished colleague, Hon. PERCY PRIEST, a Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee.

Under a unanimous consent request that was granted, I herewith submit a copy of the address of Congressman PRIEST as part of these remarks. It reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Wolverton, Rear Admiral Von Heinberg, General Hansen, Mr. Teale, and distinguished guests, I am deeply grateful for the honor you have done by inviting me to say a few words on this very significant occasion.

I am happy that it was possible for my friend and colleague, the Honorable CHARLES WOLVERTON to be here today. He has represented this district with ability and distinction for many years during which time he has demonstrated a devotion to the public good.

I am aware, as you are, that words are weak and only deeds and acts are great.

As we assemble here today to launch this new destroyer escort we are aware that above the sound of the surf and the whine of the winds we can hear some overtones of history; the thrilling undertones of gallantry and heroism; some muted notes of sorrow and sadness; and the challenging call to duty in the service of our country.

On the tough, steel-ribbed sides of this new unit of the greatest Navy in the world is the name U. S. S. *John Willis*. He was a sturdy and stalwart son of the Volunteer State. And in giving his name to this new destroyer escort, the Navy and the Nation do fitting honor to a young man who, in going far beyond the call of duty, exemplified and reemphasized the treasured traditions of the United States Navy and of the inland State of Tennessee where his gallantry and sacrifice shall, through the years, be cherished by the people of that State as hallowed memories.

John Willis was born in the same county in which I was born and attended the same high school, although several years later. Maury County, his birthplace, was named for Matthew Fontaine Maury, known to every seaman, to every navigator of the oceans, as the pathfinder of the seas. And from his native Tennessee came David Farragut the first person ever to be commissioned as an admiral of the United States Navy. These are some of the historical overtones we hear today.

John Willis grew to manhood near the banks of Duck River, a small, nonnavigable stream. I was informed by Congressman Ross Bass, who represents that district, that a new bridge over Duck River, near Columbia, has been named the "John Harlan Willis Bridge." But when time came for him to answer his country's call, he came to my hometown of Nashville and volunteered for service in the Navy. You of the seaboard and others will find all the proud annals of the United States Navy crowded with records of valor made by men from all our States who never saw the ocean until they enlisted in the Navy.

That is as it should be. The Navy is not limited to seaboard States alone. It is the Navy of all the States and has carried the flag of our country to honor and glory around the world.

I have had an opportunity to read within recent days the citation which conferred upon John Willis the greatest military honor the Nation can bestow, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

And on this occasion I deem it to be only fitting and proper that we look back to February just 11 years ago when a raging battle took place on the Island of Iwo Jima.

Pharmacist's Mate First Class John Harlan Willis was a platoon corpsman serving with the 3d Battalion, 27th Marines, 5th Marine Division. Pillboxes and caves covered hill 362 in the cross-island defense of the Japanese forces. Marines were falling, wounded and dying on all sides, in fierce close-in fighting.

Willis administered first aid to the many wounded until he was hit by shrapnel and was ordered back to battle aid station. There, where he might have received treatment for his own wounds, he refused to tarry and hurried back to his company.

During savage hand-to-hand enemy counterattacks, he advanced to the extreme front lines under mortar and sniper fire to aid a badly wounded marine lying in a shellhole.

The fury and frenzy of the enemy attack was intensified until it became a dread barrage of unleashed lightning. Under that withering fire Willis calmly continued to administer blood plasma to his patient. Then an enemy grenade landed in the shellhole. Willis threw it back. They continued to land in the hole and he continued, even while attending the wounded marine, to throw them back. Finally after tossing eight of them back into the teeth of the enemy who threw them, the ninth one exploded in his hand, killing him instantly.

He had made the greatest sacrifice a man can make, and by his personal valor in sacrificing himself to save others, and by his example of fortitude and courage, he inspired his companions to launch a determined counterattack and repulse the enemy force.

Even with this brief recital of those events, I am sure you will agree with me when I said in the beginning that words are weak and only deeds and acts are great.

This occasion today is significant also because it underscores the continuing progress that is making the United States Navy stronger and better able anywhere in the world and under any circumstances to defend this country.

The U. S. S. *John Willis* is the first of four destroyer escorts to be launched here. Others will follow at intervals. And in other shipyards around our coastline naval craft of other classifications are being constructed, launched, given shakedown cruises, and taking their places in a magnificent fleet in near and remote areas of the world.

It is essential that we continue to build, because the great battle in which John Willis and thousands of others have died has not been won. Fervently we hope and pray that the free world can win that battle without another shot being fired. Ardently we plan, confer, and study in a zealous quest for a stabilized peace built on law and order and decency and justice.

We must continue that search for a peaceful solution of the problems that are rooted so deeply in the blood-soaked soil of a fearful and frustrated world. We must press with unabated ardor toward the goal of a world in which the dignity of man once more is a sacred thing, and in which all men may look up to God rather than bow down to the dictators of a totalitarian state.

But until such time as the light of real brotherhood and mutual respect breaks through the overcast of suspicion, hatred, and deceit, we must see to it that our aims, ideals, and aspirations for peace are backed by strength on the sea, the land, and in the air.

So let us launch this fleet and sturdy vessel. As she slides into the sea let us cherish the hope that always her officers and crew shall be inspired and upheld by the challenge that comes like a clarion call from a shellhole on Iwo Jima.

To you, Mr. and Mrs. Duke, as you share in the future the privilege and responsibility and training and educating John Willis Duke, may I remind you that his is a great heritage and may God richly bless you.

Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the anniversary of Armenian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

On February 18, 1921, 35 years ago, the people of Armenia waged the only successful revolution in history against an established Soviet Government.

In the years just prior to this revolt, and following the Second World War, the Communists took over Armenia and subjected that country to a vicious reign of terror, killing, jailing, and exiling thousands of people. Finally, on February 18, 1921 the people of Armenia rose, as a man, and drove out the Communist tyrants. To be sure, Armenian independence was short-lived. Before long, Red Army hordes once again invaded this little country, and put the Armenian people back in chains. But February 18, 1921, will live in history as a stirring example of man's devotion to freedom, and of his willingness to fight for that freedom against insuperable odds. The Armenian people still, to this day, live under the heel of the most brutal tyranny ever known; but they live and hope and pray for the day when they will regain their freedom.

I think it is fitting that we in the United States today, on the anniversary of the

heroic Armenian uprising, pay tribute to the Armenian people. It is fitting that we once again dedicate ourselves to the reestablishment of freedom in this oppressed land.

On August 12, 1941, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain met together aboard an American warship in the Middle Atlantic, and signed a document that was later to be known as the Atlantic Charter. In the Atlantic Charter, the United States proclaimed to the world that: "[We] respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and . . . [We] wish to see soverign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

After the war, at Yalta and Teheran, the Roosevelt administration callously forsook the high principles on behalf of which millions of young men died. It is a matter of national honor that we reestablish these principles today as the objectives of American foreign policy. We dare not rest until the blight of communism has been erased from the face of the earth; until freedom and independence is restored to all of those people who are now in slavery.

Slogans by Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles by Bruce Catton, one entitled "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" and the other "Our Country, Right or Wrong."

Mr. Catton is editor of American Heritage, a magazine which should be read by every American.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GIVE ME LIBERTY OR GIVE ME DEATH"

(By Bruce Catton)

Patrick Henry was one of the happy men who lived by an ideal and had the courage to speak out for it. He said what it was in him to say, and his words have had a bell-like ring in American history ever since.

It happened in the memorable spring of 1775, when the second Revolutionary Convention of Virginia was meeting to determine whether to make armed resistance to the British crown.

Henry had spent years arguing for a wider charter of freedom for Americans. Now he supported with hot passion the bill to arm the Virginia militia. After summing up the arguments, and predicting—accurately—that the next news from the North would be tidings of open conflict, he demanded: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" And he gave his own answer:

"I know not what course others may take, but as for me—give me liberty or give me death."

It became a battlecry—words to die for. Men did die for them on many battlefields; and liberty was won.

In some ways Henry himself was an ordinary sort of man. Born in Hanover County, Va., in 1736, he had a hard time finding himself. He had been an indifferent student; when he set out to make a living he failed twice as a storekeeper and once as a farmer. Then he became a lawyer, got into politics, served in the Virginia legislature—and was a brilliant spokesman for freedom. He is remembered today chiefly because he uttered that one sentence.

But that alone is very much. This is a sentence that deserves to live. It is a timeless challenge to all Americans. In every generation, each American sooner or later has to search his heart to see whether the freedom he enjoys here is worth more than life—for liberty must always be bought anew. When that time of searching comes, what better guide is there than Patrick Henry's defiant outcry?

"I know not what course others may take" (that is, I am not going to play it safe and see what the crowd does) "but as for me" (seeing that everything I have is based on my freedom as an American, which is worth all else combined) "give me liberty or give me death."

We will be in a bad way if we ever stop cherishing these words.

"OUR COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG"

(By Bruce Catton)

Stephen Decatur lived in the days of the tough sea dog, when the naval officer was expected to be a good seaman and a stout-hearted fighter.

He was born in Sinnepuxent, Md., on January 5, 1779, entered the Navy as a midshipman in 1798—and made a lot of naval history. He commanded the *Enterprise* against the Tripoli corsairs in 1803, captured the British frigate *Macedonian* in 1812, had to surrender the *President* to a British squadron in 1815, and altogether was as courageous a fighter as the Navy ever had.

In those pre-radio days a naval officer was pretty much on his own, operating a long way from home without detailed instructions and with no time to ask for advice in a crisis. Like other officers, Decatur had nothing to go on except the knowledge that he must defend his country's interest at all costs and at all times and places. Near the end of his life (he died in 1820), at a state banquet, Decatur summed up his simple creed. Offering a toast, he raised his glass and said:

"Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

For generations this was one of the most popular of all American slogans. Schoolchildren memorized it; adult Americans kept it handy as a good rule of thumb for a national crisis. Then, sometime after the First World War, the famous remark began to be criticized.

Patriotism, it was urged, ought not to be unthinking. Suppose, just once, our country, happened to be wrong? Shouldn't the citizen form his own judgments? Wasn't Decatur being narrow, old-fashioned, unintellectual?

The answers to such questions seemed obvious back in the carefee twenties when it looked as if the good times would go on forever, with no effort or sacrifice needed from any of us. Since then we have learned a lot, and the hard way. Among other things, we know that America, which gives so much, may on occasion ask the ultimate of us. When it does, everything depends on our unhesitating response. The Nation has been built on an infinite number of sacrifices, and those sacrifices were not made by folk who stopped to quibble and ask, "Is this really worth it?" They were just made. Period.

We have learned, in other words, that patriotism is not out of date. Like any other kind of love, it must at times act on a no-questions-asked basis. Decatur may have been a simple sailorman, but he expressed in his creed a sturdy quality that we lose only at our dire peril. We could do worse than think about it now and then—

"Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

Winter Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article on the winter Olympics written for the Canton (Ohio) Economist by my good friends, Mrs. Agnes Frank. I think that Mrs. Frank has presented an idea that many Americans will indorse.

The article follows:

EVERYDAY LIVING—YANKEES NEED ATHLETIC STARS AS DIPLOMATS FOR OLYMPICS AND SYMBOLS OF UNITED STATES VALOR

(By Ada)

Being about as sporty a character as, say Little Orphan Annie or Old Mother Hubbard, I rarely venture into the sports pages of the news

In the first place, if you haven't kept up, locally and nationally, with who is doing what to whom in the latest sports classics, it is a bit like trying to read in a foreign language about personalities from Mars.

Maybe, in reverse, it is the very distance and foreignness of the winter Olympic games, which puts news coverage of them into normally intelligible tongue.

Anyway, it has gotten through to this athletically uninitiated character that we Americanos are taking a shellacking at everything from the giant slalom to the bobsledding, on the snow-covered slopes of the Italian Alps.

Straight sad headlines such as "United States Has Darkest Olympic Hour" and "Americans Fail To Win One Event" need no translation even for me.

What hurts especially is that not only are we not winning, but our No. 1 rival for the world's attention, Russia, is making us look like a bunch of sissy softies. The rugged Soviets, in this their first appearance at the winter Olympics, have racked up a stunning 60 points to our puny 6½ points. They are first, way out in front, and we are tied with little Switzerland for seventh place.

Apparently our last hope for averting an avalanche of ignominy rests upon the pretty shoulders of a couple of girl figure skaters, and a few fellows, due to perform next Sunday. This, I submit, is a far from pretty pass.

Why, in all our beautiful, vast, fat, rich, privileged, and protected Nation haven't we produced some champion athletes to carry the Stars and Stripes to the peak of the 1956 Olympic winter games?

Actually, there may well be dozens of star sled and slalom performers lurking like the groundhog, in our native mountain passes. But so far, we have not had sufficient yen, either variety, to lure them out of their lairs.

This, in my opinion, seriously, is a national disgrace * * * and a tragic error in top diplomatic policy.

Winning friends and influencing people is an accepted legitimate aim of all parties and most persons in this postwar, peaceless world.

So far, old Uncle Sam has been a winner of wars and a dispenser of aid, alms, and ammunition, without ever having won the "best-loved" title in his life. Even our allies

sometimes wonder if we, from our more geographically isolated vantage point of enormous military might and industrial strength, don't go in too much for the saber-rattling bit.

It seems to me that by failing to find and finance the exportation of our top winter sports competitors to the Olympics, we have missed a big bet. If our foreign friends view us as military-minded, our flop on the frozen fields of sport marks us as a nation of centrally heated, pampered weaklings, without natural spine or muscle to compete successfully with athletes from far smaller countries. Their respect for our physical prowess dwindles to nil, and they are thereby tempted to underestimate us on other fields and try to start trouble for us elsewhere.

By putting into the Olympic lists a bang-up batch of contenders we would illustrate our natural strength as well as our concern with unmechanized peaceful pursuits. And in the wholesome man to man, or individual to individual, sports contests of the Olympic events we would show the world that we Americans can export more than one brand of tough guy * * * and that even when automobiles, guns, and gelt are not part of our equipment, we can be good.

Granted that always winning gains us no more friends than does our perpetually picking up the tab, still the richest boy in the crowd has to learn to compete successfully on the playing field before he is accepted as really one of the boys and respected as such. * * *

There is more to being a good sport than being just a good loser.

A Bill To Make Labor Organizations Subject to the Antimonopoly Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, for some years the Federal Government has been unable to prosecute labor organizations for violations of the antimonopoly laws. Labor organizations can merge or combine, or their leaders can conspire without restrictions, whether or not they conspire in restraint of trade or against the freedom of the worker.

The document most important to the worker and the individual citizen is the Constitution of the United States—and the Bill of Rights. That is the last protection of his freedom. If our Federal laws specifically exempt the worker from that protection, they deny it to him. He is being discriminated against, and I don't think it is fair to him—or right.

Why should the labor racketeers, without the support of the workers, be above the law? Why should they make rules and regulations and issue mandates to the workers without the workers' knowledge and consent?

That is not our free America as our forefathers founded it. It is not the much praised freedom of the individual which made our country great. It is a tyranny over the individual and that tyranny is now condoned by law.

I am now introducing a bill to free millions of workers of the United States from that tyranny. I propose to make labor organizations subject to the antimonopoly laws protecting the individual citizen against any other form of monopoly.

The great prosperity we have built has provided 3 million more jobs and the highest wages in history. We have checked the inflation and held the cost of living level for these 3 years. The American workingman and his family are now better off then ever, financially. We must protect this standard by all means.

My bill would restore to the individual worker the protection of the Federal courts.

I am for the American workingman. But he has been tricked, swindled and coerced into doing things in which he does not believe, simply to get or hold his job and provide for his family.

Specifically, my bill repeals two sections of the Clayton Anti-Monopoly Act, section 17, which at present exempts labor organizations from compliance with the act by stating that nothing in the act shall be construed as making labor organizations illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade.

The other one is section 52 which provides that Federal courts at present cannot restrain either side in a labor dispute unless there is imminent danger or irreparable injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law and which lists a number of activities which may not be considered in violation of any Federal law. In effect, it restores the protection of the courts in such cases.

Repealing the exemption of labor organizations from Federal antimonopoly laws would make them obey the laws that other organizations have to obey. Any labor organization which is sincerely opposed to monopolies, and which is truly representing the best interests of the American workers, I believe surely should welcome this legislation.

I am sure the adoption of this monopoly measure will be for the best interests of America and its vast groups of workers and citizens.

Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 each year nationality groups over large portions of the globe should pause to thank the Almighty that their lands offer a present and ever available opportunity for free individual expression. The inhabitants of many nations do not share these same opportunities as we in America and other members of the free world. The brave Armenian people represent one such group whose geographical boundaries have been swallowed into the Soviet orbit of domination.

February 18 is a day to remind us of Armenia. For it was just 31 years ago that the Armenian people staged the only successful full-scale uprising against established Soviet Government. This hard-won freedom was soon blotted out, for it did not take Red terrorists long to again flow into this small country, absorbing it into an unnatural state of totalitarian domination where it has remained.

Although the small Armenian country later lost her independence as a self-governing political state, she represents more than a match against the godless materially minded rulers in the Kremlin. Animal and selfish ambitions continue to guide the Soviet rulers in their domination of Armenia.

But Armenia offers more than an equal match against the Soviet imperialists if other qualities are taken into account. For within the hearts of these brave people rest qualities which the Soviets unwisely disclaim, but qualities freedom-loving nations know to be indispensable to their lasting and ultimate peace, progress, and freedom. These are the mighty spiritual and moral forces provided by faith in God and proved by a look into history. The lesson of history shows quite vividly that whenever a nation uses sheer material force as a weapon of conquest, that nation does not long endure.

And history illustrates, as it will again, that the power of right and spiritual wisdom turns the tide against an alleged sense of godless materiality. The tide will turn again in favor of the Armenians and other Soviet-dominated countries when vigilant hopes and dreams of the vanquished take actual form in a return to their rightful national identity of freedom and independence.

In Salute to the Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this means of saluting the Future Farmers of America.

I am in accord with the sentiment expressed in the creed of the FFA, "I believe in the future of farming," and since being elected a Representative in Congress, have exerted every effort to see that those in our district and State who are engaged in agricultural pursuits are afforded a standard of living commensurate with the contributions they make to the national economy. It is an undeniable fact that this great country of ours cannot be sound economically unless we have prosperous and expanding agriculture. Therefore, it is to the Future Farmers of America that we look for our successful farmers of tomorrow. By virtue of their study of vocational agriculture, their practice of farming programs, their various activities and their good citizenship, I am certain they can meet this challenge.

Since the number of people working on farms has declined almost steadily since 1910, I was particularly pleased to

note that the membership of the Future Farmers of America is 380,000. Through their training and practice, it will be up to them to adjust themselves to marked changes in the demand for specific commodities, and thereby be able to develop more outlets at home and abroad. Sound foreign commerce is essential to the well-being of this country, and especially so in agriculture.

It seems to me most appropriate that National Future Farmers of America Week should be observed during the week of the anniversary of George Washington's birth. Our first President was not only a great general, an outstanding engineer, but a farmer as well. On the farm he called Mount Vernon, he practiced crop rotation and soil conservation methods. Some of the methods he advocated found practice many years after his death. Had George Washington been a youth of today I have no doubt that the FFA could number him among its membership. Like the Father of our Country, many of our great leaders have been farmers, or have been interested in some form of agriculture. Thomas Jefferson retired to his beautiful Monticello, and, to come down to more modern times, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in some degree, used his estate at Hyde Park to experiment in agricultural projects.

Even if none of the members of the FFA should become President of the United States—though there is a chance that one of their number might be so chosen—still each individual in that organization who conscientiously carries out the aims and purposes of the Future Farmers of America, as set forth in their creed, will indeed have done his full share toward making this country a better place in which to live, as well as to insure future happiness and prosperity for generations to come.

Had I been a Member of Congress on August 30, 1950, the vote of my congressional district would have been cast for the passage of Public Law 740, which granted a Federal Charter to the Future Farmers of America organization. The rapid, but healthy, expansion of this organization has been a source of gratification to many people, and to me personally. I cannot say too much in praise of the young people of which the FFA is comprised. Their achievements have been outstanding. They are developing a trained leadership and a farm citizenry which exerts an influence for good in our communities. I am proud of them individually and collectively.

Again I salute the Future Farmers of America. May they always enjoy good fellowship of one another.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following well-deserved editorial from the Boston Post, Saturday, February 18, 1956:

A REALIST WITH COURAGE

J. Edgar Hoover is a realist with courage. He knows more of the truth about communism than any other American, and he has never ceased to speak out bluntly, even in those periods when it was impolitic to do so.

No other official voice has been raised so often and so honestly as his. He has embarrassed politicians and others by refusing to walk softly and to talk the same way.

As head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation he has done an extraordinary job of keeping in touch with the Communist conspiracy in this country.

Time and again his information, produced in court, has set the commies scurrying to cover. The revelations of Bostonian Herbert L. Philbrick alone caused a frantic burrowing below the surface by the whole Red party. Mr. Philbrick was reporting from the heart of the Red movement in Boston to the agents of Mr. Hoover here.

Each time an agent had been "surfaced" because this was necessary for legal reasons, the FBI has been deprived of his services. At the same time, the Reds have conducted another drastic survey of their membership in order to prevent further infiltration.

Despite all the handicaps, Mr. Hoover's agents have continued to penetrate into the central secrets of the conspiracy. In so doing they have become our first and most vital line of defense against the greatest menace in American history.

J. Edgar Hoover is a modest man. He is no petty dictator, but a great public servant. His pronouncements prove this. When he speaks, it is necessary, and he should be heard.

His latest statement, made to an interviewer of the Pilot, is worth heeding.

The Communist Party in this country has dwindled noticeably in size during the past few years, he says. The total number of card-carrying members is down now to 20,000. But this shrinkage, and this comparatively small number, cannot be taken as indication that the party is finished.

On the contrary, says J. Edgar Hoover, the party is even more dangerous now than it was with greater numbers. For the 20,000 now at work have been screened and rescreened. They are the real fanatics, the hard core of the underground, dedicated in conviction to carry out the dictates of the Kremlin with blind subservience.

They are "more subtle in their propaganda" than ever before, more given to smiles, less addicted to tough talk.

But if we let them fool us into thinking they are any less dangerous, says Mr. Hoover, we will be dangerously unwise.

Mr. Hoover is a man to heed.

No Cause for Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, spoke at the General Electric dinner in my home city of Cincinnati on Thursday, February 9. General White was a logical choice of speaker for this dinner and the dinner was a proper place for General White to warn that Russia has almost closed the airpower gap by beating the United States at the game in which we think we excel—production. The total research and development effort of the United States Armed Forces is not sufficient to insure our survival. We need the help of private industry added to Government sponsored efforts to keep us ahead technologically. General Electric is one American industry using private funds for research designed to keep the United States ahead. If we are to survive, more industries must follow the lead of General Electric.

I have observed that General White has for some time been alarmed by the fact that in Russia the technical training for young men and women long ago outdistanced our own efforts, numerically speaking. In his speech at Cincinnati, General White warned that this intensive training effort is bringing results. As General White said, the Communist leaders resent the limitation that American airpower imposes upon their freedom of action. They have set about to neutralize our superiority. "They have not attained this goal, yet, but I say that with little pride and less comfort."

We believe that we have a better Air Force, but our superiority no longer rests on the superiority of American production. It rests today almost entirely upon our better system of world-wide bases and upon our better, more experienced crews. The Soviets are presently beating us at production. They have halved our lead-time on the heavy jet bomber and in developing and producing all other aircraft, their lead-time is considerably less than ours. Soviet achievements derive in large part from the fact that they can put not one but several projects on a crash basis. They can exert the iron rule of dictatorship. They can direct bright young Communists into scientific and technical careers by no choice of their own. They can determine to build the weapons of war rather than the luxuries of peace. They can keep the standard of living down and the standard of mililtary power high.

Since ours is not a totalitarian form of government, we must face the fact that the defense of this Nation is not just the concern of our own Government. Defense is everybody's business. That is both the price and privilege of democracy.

Private industries must devote ever increasing attention to research. The taxpayer and the legislator quite understandably prefer to see our national income spent on success, not failure. In our democracy, it is all but impossible to devote enough of the budget to research and development to insure our survival. Furthermore, if our Government paid for and therefore controlled all the research necessary to keep us ahead, there would be little difference between our Government and that of the Soviet Union. As General White said, "Private initiative would become stifled as it is in Russia." Mr. Speaker, if we are to keep the United States ahead in the air and be able to prevent war by being able to win one, our industries must roll up their sleeves and pitch in even harder to add to the effort of the Armed Forces to

assure the technological superiority of our weapons of combat.

General Electric has a moto quoted by General White which might well become the motto for the Nation in this arms race which has been forced upon us. That motto is, "Progress is our most important product." The private citizen, private industry, and the Armed Forces must work together to insure this progress.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that General White recognized the contribution of General Electric and of the citizens of Cincinnati to the defense effort. I am proud to ask the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD his important speech, which follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT THE GENERAL ELECTRIC DINNER, CINCINNATI, OHIO, FEBRUARY 9, 1956

A little over a month ago, General Hansell dropped in on General Twining in Washington. He told him of this affair and asked if he could come out to see it. General Twining said yes.

Then General Hansell very casually asked if General Twining would mind saying a few words to a small group at an informal gathering. Without thinking, General Twining said yes again.

A few days later came the joker. Jack Parker wrote enclosing a schedule of events. On that schedule General Twining found himself listed as guest speaker at the dinner. I do not know whether that scared him, or whether it was the fact that he had unexpected demands for his presence in Washington.

All I can say is, here I am.

Actually, General Twining was extremely disappointed when he found he could not be here. He was really looking forward to this event.

In this case his misfortune is my gain. I am extremely pleased to be here and to be able to talk with you.

This has been a very interesting day. I am sure that those who saw today's displays and demonstrations are much heartened by this evidence of scientific ingenuity and progress. We are going to need a lot more of this same kind of effort to maintain for the United States its present position in the world. The position I speak of is not only one of world leadership, with the great partnership of free nations, but also one of relative safety and security.

From this position we have been able to play a paramount role in opposing the spread of militant communism.

To insure our safety and security, and to discourage Communist aggression, the United States has used its outstanding strength—our technological leadership.

We are dealing with potential aggressors who care little for public opinion, neither are they bound by any moral or ethical codes. They have lied, cheated, and stolen their way through history. Past performances also show that the Communists are likely to start a fight only when they are sure they can win.

We have translated our technology into instruments of such power that we have been able so far to convince the Soviets of the futility of aggression. I refer primarily to American airpower.

There is no question about it. The ready-to-go pressures of the United States Air Force has discouraged the Communists from attempting to achieve their goals by war.

We must depend on our airpower to continue exerting this beneficial influence. Certainly military forces on land or water are little threat to the rulers of the vast Eurasian land mass. It is the ability of our Air Force to retaliate—to stab directly at the Communist heart and brain that has convinced the Soviets that it is better to use words instead of weapons. Furthermore, the increasing continuity of this airpower pressure remains our best hope that the Soviets will always find peace more prudent than brutal aggression.

Obviously, the Communist leaders resent the limitation that American airpower imposes upon their freedom of action. They have set about to neutralize our superiority. During the past several years, they have expended great effort to make Soviet airpower equal or superior to our own.

They have not attained this goal, yet, but I say that with little pride and less comfort.

Consider these four factors: The Soviet war-ravaged economy right after World War II, their production base, their technology, and the resources readily available to them.

The distance they have come in 10 years is remarkable. When one compares these four factors to like factors in the United States, the fact that the Soviets have almost closed the airpower gap is more than remarkable.

Were the Communist leaders truly peaceful and friendly, we could take pleasure in their progress—and we would be happy to help them progress even more. Certainly it is to our own advantage when technology advances and living standards go up in any friendly nation.

But the Communists have not demonstrated their friendliness or peaceful intentions. Therefore, we must view the airpower products of their technology as weapons designed for possible use against us.

You are familiar with the latest weapons in the Soviet arsenal. They now have a swept-wing heavy jet bomber, the Bison. In many respects it equals our new B–52 which is the best that American technology has yet been able to produce.

They have a long-range turboprop bomber, the Bear. The Bear is their longest range airplane, comparable to our B–36. The B–36 is gradually moving into retirement.

The Soviets also have a medium jet bomber very similar to our B–47. We still have a big lead on them in medium jet bombers.

They have several thousand fighters which are better than our F–86's and F–84's. They also are producing newer fighters which compare to our F–100.

I could go on and on. In airplane after airplane they are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity.

We believe we have a better Air Force—but that superiority now rests almost entirely upon our better system of worldwide bases and upon our better, more experienced crews.

Let us now examine the implications of the Soviet achievements in airpower.

Facing high performance airpower is not a new problem to us.

The United States has never held a monopoly in quality of equipment. During World War II, for instance, both our allies and our opponents brought forth top-notch aircraft. So although the apparent technological progress in Soviet aircraft and engines may startle us, it does not present us with a problem that we have not met and overcome before.

During the last few decades, we Americans have had a talent in which we reigned supreme. I refer to our talent for production—mass production. When challenged by aggressors, we have always depended upon our mass production methods to bail us out.

Here, gentlemen, is the area of deep concern—the Soviets are presently beating us at our own grame—production. They have halved our lead-time on the heavy jet bomber, and in developing and producing all other aircraft, their lead-time is considerably less than ours.

Furthermore, it is useless to debate whether or not their production engineering is as sophisticated as ours. The fact is that they have been and are outproducing us in all categories but medium jet bombers.

No strategist or planner has ever advocated that we must match a potential enemy fighter for fighter, bomber for bomber, and bomb for bomb. What the Soviets think they need may be different from what we think we need. For instance, they have far greater area and a longer border. They are vulnerable to retaliatory attack from all directions. Therefore, the Communist defensive problem is bigger thon ours. In their defense-offense equation—they would need far more fighter interceptors than we.

Of course we can outproduce the Communists. There is no question about that. Our production potential is not the reason we are falling behind.

One of the reasons that we are dropping behind is that the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we.

The fact that the Communists can put not one, but several projects on a crash basis indicates a tremendous capacity for research and development. I add that this also indicates a disregard for cost and for safety factors, and a willingness to gamble.

There are other reasons for Communist success. They achieved their gains in weapons by exerting the iron rule of a ruthless dictatorship. Bright young Soviets are directed into scientific and technical careers—by no choice of their own. They build trucks instead of automobiles, submarines instead of commercial vessels, bombers at the cost of refrigerators and radar instead of television sets. The Soviet standard of living is forced down and kept low so that their standard of military power may be kept high.

Most significantly, every action and decision affecting research, development, or production of anything is made by the dictatorship. By quotas, schedules, norms, and plans, the Soviet government controls everything right down to the last nut and bolt.

This is the Soviet brand of communism in action. It is a system of life in competition with our own, and a system which threatens our own. It is up to us to win this competition. It is important to our own safety that we keep strong enough to discourage aggression. If we fail to prevent aggression, it is important that we have enough strength to defeat the aggressor.

But it seems to me that there is something even more important in the long run. Whether our way of life be thought of as capitalism, democracy, or simply freedom, we must be abe to save it against a way of life we know is bad. If our system were to allow itself to run second in strength to communism, or any other degrading political and economic system, how strong then would be the argument for free enterprise?

We must realize that the defense of this Nation is everybody's business, not just our own Government's. That is both the price and privilege of democracy. The products of American capitalism, our great corporations, must accept, along with their comparative freedom of action, their share of our national responsibility to provide our own defense.

Since force levels, numbers of aircraft and weapons are necessarily decided by our political and military leaders, no one could expect our private industries to seize the initiative in production. Our great corporations can best volunteer increased efforts to the area of research and development.

I am speaking specifically of the research and development efforts necessary to keep our weapons superior to weapons in the hands of potential enemies.

The United States Government does not have to pay for all the research and development necessary to insure our survival. Furthermore, research is characterized by success only after many failures. It is a business in which failure is routine and

success extraordinary. The taxpayer and the legislator quite understandably prefer to see our national income spent on success, not failure. This makes the research and development dollar hard to get.

This is one reason that our private industries must devote ever increasing efforts to research.

There is another reason. Research, especially basic research, is best accomplished by unfettered initiative working in an environment of complete freedom. Governmental projects are accountable to too many people to be able to operate in a completely free environment.

There is a third reason that we should depend, in part, upon private efforts. If our Government paid for, and therefore controlled, all the research necessary to keep us ahead—there would be little difference between our Government and that of the Soviet Union. Private initiative would become stifled, as it is in Russia.

This presents large corporations with three alternatives:

One, they can sit back and wait for Government research and development money to come their way. This would eventually allow the Communists to get so far ahead of us that our Nation would lose its freedom of action.

Two, our Government, in desperation and emergency, could step in and control the research and development and all the other activities of our industries. This, of course, would be similar to the very way of life we are trying to defend against.

Third, our industries can roll up their sleeves and pitch in even harder to add to governmental sponsored efforts to keep us ahead technologically. Only in this way can we keep the United States ahead in the air and able to prevent war by being able to win one.

Actually, this leaves little choice, and the third alternative is being accepted by our leading industries. In my opinion, privately sponsored research and development is far from sufficient yet. However, several companies are making encouraging moves in the right direction.

General Electric is one of these companies using private funds for research designed to keep the United States ahead. The facility that is going to be here in Cincinnati will be a valuable addition to the Nation's research effort. Other companies are building up their research potential.

These actions are the results of patriotism and good business. Our military forces must stay ahead. Therefore, if any manufacturer comes up with a significantly better piece of equipment, we have no choice but to buy it.

It is good business to survive—and I am convinced that our survival depends on our technological progress.

From what I have said, you can see why I was so glad to see today's evidence of technological progress. All I can say to General Electric, and to all our other great companies is—keep it up.

If you do not mind I will borrow General Electric's motto. In achieving security for the United States, "Progress is our most important product."

Smear Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on February 5, 1956, there was published in the Examiner-Enterprise of Bartlesville, Okla., a very pertinent editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMEAR ATTACKS

Drew Pearson, Washington columnist, made a personal attack in his column published last Wednesday upon Senator ROBERT S. KERR of Oklahoma, Senators RUSSELL LONG and ALLEN ELLENDER, of LOUISIANA, and Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and PRICE DANIELS, of Texas, with which we completely disagree.

The reason for his attack was their support of the bill to end Federal price-fixing on natural gas sold at the well by independent producers. This bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas and is practically identical with the bill by Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, which was passed by the House in 1955. It will probably come to a vote early this week, after 3 weeks of debate.

Pearson attacked these five Senators by name and other supporters by implication, charging "flagrant abuse of rule 12" which he said "disqualifies any Senator with a pecuniary or pocketbook interest in any legislation."

He added that "the rule does not force a Senator to refrain from voting but, according to the Senate parliamentarian, it has been the practice to abide strictly by that rule."

Pearson would disqualify the five Senators because, he said, Senators KERR, LONG, and ELLENDER own interests in oil and gas companies, and Senators JOHNSON and DANIEL received campaign contributions from people in the oil and gas industry.

Let's take a look at his idea of Senate ethics. It is unique and utterly absurd.

If every Senator were barred from voting on any matter in which he had a pecuniary interest, the work of the Senate would come to a dead stop.

Every Senator is a taxpayer and votes on tax and appropriation bills.

Probably half of the Senators own farms and vote on farm legislation.

It's likely all of them either borrow or lend money and pay interest, and they vote on bills which affect the money supply and interest rates.

Every citizen of the United States, including Senators, has a peecuniary interest in everything the Senate does or refuses to do.

If Pearson's interpretation of rule 12 were correct, no Senator could ethically vote on anything unless he could establish that he owns nothing, owes nothing, has no personal interest in the Nation's economy and has no friends engaged in any enterprise for profit. It is impossible to believe that "it has been the practice to abide strictly by that rule," as he interprets it.

The reason for Pearson's attack is his violently partisan opposition to the natural gas bill, which has been evident in his column for weeks. He has accepted as final truth his own version of the matter, including the fantastic claims of its opponents, and has ignored the arguments of its supporters.

He has, for example, accepted and stated as fact that passage of the bill would increase consumers' gas bills by $600 million a year and create fantastic profit windfalls for the gas producers. He and other opponents have ignored the obvious fact that Federal controls of gas prices at the well never existed until the Supreme Court on June 7, 1954, ordered controls and no such runaway prices for gas developed in all those years of free competition in the sale of gas in the field.

The distorted view of rule 12 is not factual reporting but twisted propaganda designed to influence the gullible—to the great delight of those people who believe private enterprise is disgraceful and everything should be put under Federal controls.

With a Senate vote scheduled for this week, Pearson attacked the personal integrity and ethical conduct of these Senators who are, in our opinion, fighting to restore freedom of contract in a highly competitive and hazardous enterprise and to preserve a necessary incentive to discover and make available to gas users everywhere continuing abundant supplies.

The people of the Southwest who have elected these Senators over and over to high political office have confidence in them—confidence that will not be disturbed by smear attacks to influence votes on a question of national importance.

Action Needed To Solve the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the salient features of "Action Needed To Solve the Farm Problem" brochure produced by the Agriculture-Business Relations Committee of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. The committee recognizes that the farmers problem merits serious consideration and careful attention by the Congress, the executive agencies of the Federal Government and all our people:

ACTION NEEDED TO SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM

(By the Agriculture-Business Relations Committee of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce)

The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce supports a program for agriculture which will strengthen farmer purchasing power, reward efficiency in producing and marketing of farm products, assure adequate supplies for consumers now and in the foreseeable future, work toward elimination of Government-held surpluses, protect our Nation's soil and water resources, be consistent with general economic development, permit a more effective use of Federal funds, preserve the independence of farmers, encourage the American ideal of free enterprise.

The Illinois State chamber's 8-point action program for a sound farm economy:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reduce the inflow, and eventually eliminate, Government-held surpluses by lowering support prices so that the Government ceases to be a market for farm commodities.

High, rigid price supports have encouraged overproduction and priced some commodities so high that markets at home and abroad have been lost. As a result of its price-support activity at such a high level, the Commodity Credit Corporation has accumulated more than $8 billion of deteriorating farm commodities. Supports at the 90-percent level were initiated as a wartime expedient, and while the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 provided for flexible supports, they were not allowed to go into effect. The Agricultural Act of 1954, which also introduced some flexibility into support prices, was a step in the right direction. The degree of flexibility was negligible, however, and considerable rigidity still exists in current price-support operations.

The rigidity is evidenced by these facts:

The range of support prices is high and narrow.

In 1955, support levels of 5 basic commodities, wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and peanuts ranged between 82½ to 90 percent of parity, and the sixth, tobacco, was supported at 90 percent when marketing quotas were approved. Actually, wheat was the only basic commodity supported at the 82½-percent level. Current levels of support on basic commodities range between 75 and 90 percent and are still too high in relation to production. Flexible price supports should be given greater opportunity to be effective by lowering the lower limit of support below the present 75-percent minimum on basic commodities so that supports are only a protection against extremely low prices.

Minimum support schedules are too high.

The present act uses a rigid schedule to set the minimum support prices of basic commodities. This schedule is such that if supplies are reduced measurably, the support price can rise to the 90-percent level and the buildup will begin again. For example, if by some chance the Commodity Credit Corporation were able to dispose of its entire stock of wheat, the support price would immediately rise to 90 percent of parity and experience has shown that growers would again expand production. This difficulty could be alleviated by lowering the yearly supply percentage necessary to establish price support at a specific level. (Supply percentage is the percentage that the total existing supply on hand at the beginning of the crop year is of the normal supply.) It is imperative that there be a lowered level of support to prevent the Government from continuing to be a major market for farm commodities.

2. Apply the modernized parity formula to all price-supported commodities as soon as practicable.

Parity is not a measure of income; it relates the price received for a commodity to the prices the farmer pays for commodities and services purchased.

Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, a new parity formula was devised which recognized gradually changing relationships between production costs of individual farm commodities and consequent shifts in their relative market prices. This provision was made for adjustment of parity prices of individual commodities so as to reflect the relative prices in the most recent preceding 10-year period.

To prevent a sharp drop from the old to new formula prices, a formula known as transitional parity was put into effect. Under this, through 1955, parity prices on basic commodities were not to be less than what they would have been if computed prior to 1950. In 1956, they will drop to 95 percent of the old formula and continue to drop 5 percent per year until all basic commodities have shifted to the new formula.

Since the new parity formula is more realistic, it should be introduced faster than existing law now provides.

3. Enact legislation for a soil-bank plan which will take sufficient land out of production to reduce surpluses and store fertility in the soil. The plan should be voluntary, require participation to establish eligibility for price supports, and not result in transferring difficulties of one farm product to another.

Because prevention of further accumulation and elimination of existing stocks of Government-held surpluses is of utmost importance to the well-being of American agriculture, a sound soil-bank plan should be put into operation as soon as possible.

An effective soil-bank plan will reduce considerably the acreage planted to crops and pasture and the resulting unneeded production. At the same time, it will provide an opportunity for farmers to practice good conservation of their land and store fertility in the soil. It can serve as a step toward the eventual permanent retirement of many acres of low-grade land which, ideally, should not be under cultivation. Thus, it can be a long-range as well as a short-range solution to some of our most serious farm problems.

While the objectives of a soil-bank plan are desirable, they will not be attained unless all of the conditions set forth in the State chamber's recommendation are met in their entirety. A plan without these provisions would not be in the best interests of agriculture or the American people.

4. Increase public and private efforts to expand marketing of farm products at home and abroad. This should include liberalizing restrictions on sales of farm commodities to Iron Curtain countries.

It is apparent that there are no ready markets at home or in other countries for our surplus farm commodities. However, it is desirable that efforts be made to find and develop even the smallest markets wherever and whenever they exist.

Everything possible should be done to encourage an increase in sales made through private channels.

While it is not desirable to dump our surpluses on the world markets, it is still highly important that strong competitive selling be continued. Domestically, care should be taken not to disturb private sales by unusually high marketings of Government-held surplus commodities during or immediately following harvest periods. Trade with Iron Curtain countries should be encouraged so long as it is advantageous to the United States.

5. Repeal the agricultural products provisions of the Cargo Preference Act and ease any other restrictions which may retard the movement of surplus farm commodities into foreign trade channels.

The Cargo Preference Act requires that 50 percent of all exported products carried in ships and which are financed by Government loan, sold for foreign currency, or given away under foreign-aid programs, be shipped in United States-flag vessels. This, of course, also applies to surplus farm commodities.

Since some of our best foreign customers for agricultural products are also maritime nations, this is a real impediment to the rapid disposal of surplus farm commodities. This requirement, as it applies to surplus agricultural products, has proved to be a deciding factor in several instances of failures to effect sales.

While it is important that a strong merchant marine be maintained, its subsidization should be considered a separate matter and should not be done at the risk of impairing to any extent the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

Other restrictions impeding the flow of farm products to foreign countries should be carefully examined with a view toward making disposal efforts more effective and should be eased whenever they will aid the movement of surplus farm commodities into foreign-trade channels.

6. Adopt a policy to coordinate the interrelated functions of Federal agencies responsible for management of Government-owned land, price-support activities, soil-conservation work, and land reclamation and development projects. Development of future irrigation portions of Federal multipurpose power projects should be discouraged until additional acreage is needed.

Many inconsistencies have become apparent in the program of several Government agencies responsible for activities having a direct bearing on the problems of agriculture. Some Government agencies have been found working to reach goals which are at cross-purposes with those of other agencies. Inconsistencies have also existed too often within the same agency.

For example, even though there is almost universal recognition of the fact that there is overproduction of several farm products in relation to markets to absorb them, several Government agencies have been engaging in activities which unduly stimulate agricultural production.

High price supports have encouraged the growing of crops on soils not adapted to their production while technical and financial assistance has been given to farmers in an effort to improve conservation on their farms.

Consideration is now being given to a soil-bank plan which would have as its main objective the taking of millions of acres of land out of production. At the same time, federally sponsored projects are going forward and other projects are being planned to reclaim new lands and expand irrigation. (The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that further irrigation in the West is possible on 17 million acres.)

These and many similar paradoxes should be avoided by the adoption of a coordinated policy for all agencies dealing with these matters of such vital concern.

7. Expand and encourage public and private agricultural research and educational programs to reduce production and marketing costs, develop new uses and new markets, and to assist in other ways in the long-range improvement of agriculture.

Research can help to provide long-range solutions to many of the problems of agriculture. Through it are found answers to some basic farm problems, making it possible for individual farmers to solve their own problems. The major benefits of agricultural research, however, inure to consumers, not to farmers, since competition causes prices to follow production costs. Therefore, research that reduces costs also benefits consumers by providing commodities at lower prices than otherwise would prevail. Research has been responsible for the vast improvement in the efficiency of farm production and marketing and has raised the quality and quantity of farm products.

Individual farmers are unable to bear the cost of expensive research programs. It, therefore, is appropriate that the Federal Government continue to assist in financing this research and bringing its results to the farmer in the most efficient manner possible.

8. Encourage farmers with limited opportunities to move into more rewarding pursuits so as to better their standard of living.

The problems of the more than 1 million rural families existing on pitifully meager incomes merit serious consideration. These marginal farmers are generally located on farms which are too small to be efficient, or are on hilly, infertile land. They have inadequate capital or lack training in modern farming methods.

Many of these marginal farmers should be encouraged to supplement their income with off-farm work or to make full shifts to industrial work. This is a natural and desirable result of progress in agriculture and should be fostered by all means possible.

In order to hasten this desirable shift from marginal farming to industry and to other fields offering more opportunity, appropriate Federal agencies should be oriented to offer aid and guidance. Such agencies as the Farmers Home Administration, the Extension Service and others in the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, can assist in encouraging and counseling in the best ways to make this shift.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE FARM PROBLEM

Farm legislation proposals should be carefully reviewed against the background of the actual, and not imagined, problems of agriculture. It is important, therefore, that the difficulties in which farmers now find themselves be carefully defined.

Following is an analysis of the major current problems of agriculture which are a matter of concern to all citizens. A constructive farm program should recognize these problems and their causes and offer some short- and long-range possibilities for their solution.

Production greater than consumption

With the advent of mechanized farming, improved technology, and the vastly increased knowledge of better farming practices available to farmers, production per farmworker has increased tremendously. This increase in productivity has enabled fewer farmers to increase overall production at a faster rate than the population has grown. The vast increases in production during the past 25 years have been accomplished on a relatively stable acreage of farmland.

At the same time that this increase in production was taking place, the continuing trend toward mechanization on farms has released large quantities of feed crops for other purposes.

While the effects of this overproduction in relation to consumption caused some difficulties prior to World War II, it became an asset during the war. High price supports encouraged greater and greater production on existing cropland and some additional marginal land was brought into production.

Overproduction on the farm was not a problem immediately following the war because hungry nations throughout the world provided a ready market for our excess production. As the farm production of foreign countries was restored, however, our shipments to foreign markets declined. During the years 1946–51 our exports averaged 13 percent of our total crop acreage; in 1953 they amounted to only 9½ percent. Part of this drop was due to the fact that higher price support on some of our farm commodities priced them out of the reach of foreign consumers. Competition with synthetic products caused considerable losses of markets for such farm products as cotton. As a result of the interaction of these factors, American farms are presently producing about 5 percent more than we are consuming and selling. The amount of imbalance has been greater in some recent years.

Surplus accumulation

This overproduction in relation to consumption has resulted in vast stocks of farm commodities being accumulated by the Federal Government. On November 30, 1955, the Commodity Credit Corporation had $8,206,826,000 tied up in farm surplus commodities. This represented an increase of more than $1 billion over the same date in 1954. It is expected that the total investment will rise to $10 billion during 1956.

The bulk of this investment is in corn, cotton, and wheat; the inventory of these 3 commodities alone amounted to over $6 billion on November 30, 1955.

The various price support activities have resulted in tremendous losses. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, the realized losses in handling these surpluses were $799 million. Realized losses for the 5 months ending November 30, 1955, were almost $470 million. Storage expenses alone on these huge stocks of Government-held commodities amount to over $1 million per day.

The existence of these surpluses naturally depresses farm commodity prices.

Farm income

With surpluses depressing farm commodity prices, the problem of the farmers' falling income is created. Total net income from farm operations fell 38 percent from its all-time high of $17.2 billion in 1947 to an estimated $10.6 billion in 1955. Some observers expect it to fall another 5 percent in 1956. This situation is not so serious as it might appear on the surface, however, because of a reduction in the number engaged in farming and increased nonfarm income earned by farmers. The number of farmers declined 10 percent between 1951 and 1954. In 1954 farm persons received about $1 in nonfarm income (mostly wages) for every $2 of net farm income.

During the war years, incomes of farmers rose more rapidly than did the incomes of nonfarm people. In recent years, however, per capita income for persons on farms has declined slightly while income of nonfarm people has generally increased.

Other factors besides prices should be considered in an appraisal of farm income. Costs of production and the total quantity produced are also important in the determination of net profit. Many farmers on efficient, well-run farms of reasonable size are showing a good profit even at the lower prices in today's markets.

With the price of farmland remaining high and the relatively high ratio of net worth to net liabilities of agriculture, it is clear that there is definite strength in the farm economy as a whole and disaster measures by the Federal Government are not called for at this time.

Underemployment in agriculture

A great number of farmers in the United States, particularly in the South, are working on small, inefficient farms or on land unsuited for farming. According to the 1954 census of agriculture, 2.1 million farms (44 percent of the total) are producing about 85 percent of our marketable farm products. The other 2.7 million farms produced only 15 percent. Disregarding the noncommercial or residential farms and those of retired or semi-retired persons in this latter figure, there are still more than 1 million farmers eking out a bare existence. Their relatively lower income reduces the average income figures for all farmers and distorts the overall farm income picture. This group of low production farms is often used to justify the need for high support to all farmers, however. Government price-support programs have not, and will not, be of any material assistance in solving the problems of these people.

The so-called "cost-price squeeze" is cutting the income of all farmers but is squeezing most those less efficient producers who have the least opportunity for success in farming.

Inability to control total production

Difficulties faced by the farmer are magnified by the fact that he is unable to exert any significant control over total farm production. Even though he may stop all production on his farm, he will have little effect on the total supply. Thus, individual farmers tend to operate close to capacity at all times. But they intensify their operations when prices are high relative to their costs. This is one of the weaknesses of high price supports and explains why acreage controls have not been highly successful in controlling output.

Hon. Chauncey W. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I was out of the city on the day that the House received the sorrowful news of the death of our beloved colleague and friend, Chauncey W. Reed. Consequently I could not join with our colleagues who paid tribute to the service and to the character of this distinguished legislator at that time. And so I avail myself of this opportunity to express my deep regret at the death of one of our ablest colleagues and one of my dearest friends.

I had known for some time that Chauncey Reed was seriously afflicted and that his days among us were numbered. But this knowledge did not soften the sadness with which we received the news of his passing from this world.

He possessed a keen, intelligent mind. His judgments were sound and reliable. It was a pleasure to work with him because one knew he had given most careful study and thought to any problem to which he addressed himself. The solution was bound to have had the benefit of his great wisdom and experience. A lawyer of fine attainments, he was a tower of strength in the deliberations of the great Judiciary Committe, of which he had been chairman and which he served with great distinction.

The Congress and our country have lost one of the ablest legislators of our times. Those who, like myself, were privileged to enjoy his friendship have lost a real and valued friend. His death is a real personal loss to me.

To Mrs. Reed and his children, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great bereavement.

Farmers Have Right To Gripe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems of California agriculture is the competitive disadvantage in which our farmers are placed because of the great distance between our farms and eastern markets.

We are extremely concerned over the possibility of a raise in freght rates which would increase the gravity of our problem. I submit an editorial from the San Jose News which describes our problem in clear cut terms:

FARMERS HAVE RIGHT TO GRIPE

Seldom, if ever, do California farmers raise their voice in the matter of farm subsidies or any specific type grants from the Government.

They are not looking for handouts. They are willing to compete on the open market with all producers, all things being equal.

At the same time, they are not ones to sit back silently and allow the economic cards to be stacked against them.

As of today, the farmers are howling. They are receiving strong support from influential sources, but it is still a question whether or not it came soon enough or in sufficient volume.

In Washington, the Interstate Commerce Commission has before it a request to increase railroad freight rates 7 percent. If favorably received following hearings, which opened Monday, the new overall rates will go in effect February 25.

The 7-percent rate hike is particularly disturbing to our California farmers. It's an

across-the-board increase applicable to all commodities and disregards previous long-haul rate provisions zealously guarded by the California grower.

Opposition to the rate, coming from several weight-laden fronts, is based on economically sound principles.

Farmers have been carrying the brunt of freight-rate hikes for many years, facing up to them despite decreasing farm incomes.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, a controversial figure at best among the Nation's farm interests, has made a detailed study of this freight-rate situation, the results of which have been outlined in his report to the ICC asking the proposed 7 percent rate increase be denied the railroads.

Benson points out the unfairness of jumping rates, specifically on raw and processed farm products, farm supplies, and fish, and backs up his objections with rather startling figures, some to jolt the thinking of many of the opinion the farmer's harvest is one of solid gold.

The Secretary reviewed the history of rail-freight rates. He reported a total of 11 general freight rate increases had been effected since 1946 amounting to a 63 percent increase in the 9-year period for shipments of agricultural products.

While freight rates soared 63 percent, farm prices actually fell 8 percent during the same period; farm costs went up 32 percent, and net farm income fell off 29 percent.

Revealing figures.

And there are more and just as startling facts going before the ICC hearing.

In a report prepared for presentation at the hearing by the California Public Utilities Commission, C. Ray Bryant, the PUC's transportation rate expert, charges railroads have made no case showing increases warranted; the rate asked is unreasonable, and the decision should be deferred until ample time is allowed for investigations and hearings on this vital matter.

Organized opposition has been brought, too, by the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee in a protest taking into consideration the welfare of Californians as a whole as well as that of the farm producer.

The cost of all imported and exported commodities in California will be raised, penalizing all Californians.

Freight-rate increase now will work a definite hardship on all industry, business, and labor—all of which participate in and share to some degree the State's gross $2½ billion annual farm income.

Representative CHARLES GUBSER and Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL have been solicited and have assured support in blocking the rate increase proposal.

The ICC must step cautiously, it being quite obvious the type rate hike requested at this time is not in keeping with a general economic picture.

A United Nations Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the lack of a United Nations police force for carrying out United Nations decisions in cases of aggression has long been a serious cause of criticism of the United Nations.

Collective measures to maintain peace and security and to suppress acts of aggression are envisaged in the first article of the United Nations Charter. However, due mainly to Soviet obstruction, a permanent United Nations force which would give effect to this article has never been established.

Impetus to the idea of a United Nations force was given by the General Assembly in 1950 when it passed the uniting-for-peace resolution, which aimed at promoting reliable collective protection against aggression and thereby contributing to the achievement of international peace. This resolution recommended that the United Nations members earmark trained, organized, and equipped forces that could be called promptly, in accordance with each nation's constitutional provisions, to meet aggression immediately anywhere in the world. The earmarked units would constitute the United Nations police force. Unfortunately, the resolution has never been implemented to any great extent.

The experience of the Korean war has underscored the necessity for the United Nations to have immediately available forces from many countries in order that no one nation may be burdened with excessive responsibility in countering aggression. The United States carried by far the major burden in the fight against Communist aggression in Korea, despite the fact that all members have an equal responsibility under the charter in maintaining collective security.

Various blueprints have been suggested for the type of international contingent that would be most effective. Some have recommended a force made up of individual volunteers trained and armed by a special United Nations Command and always ready for duty. Others have proposed a plan by which the United Nations members would "earmark" certain units of their individual armed forces for on-call duty, if requested by the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations. Still others feel that a legion made up of volunteers already serving in national armed forces, that is, servicemen who indicate their willingness to serve under the United Nations in any case of aggression, would be the most effective force.

Any plan for a United Nations police force, however, should seek the greatest possible contribution from each member so that the combined effort against aggression could be brought to a maximum as equitably as possible.

Perhaps the solution to the establishment of a United Nations police force would be to make the provisions of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution more authoritative by incorporating it in the United Nations Charter by an amendment. The General Assembly, as well as the Security Council, would then have permanent authority, solidly grounded in the charter, to recommend the use of armed forces to meet aggression anywhere in the world. The ability of the Assembly to act immediately would counteract Soviet Russia's flagrant abuse of the veto which has prevented the Security Council from effectively discharging its responsibilities under the charter.

However, the type of police force is perhaps not as important as the recognition by members of the United Nations that the continuance of international tensions makes the organization of an international police force a matter of urgency, and that they should make a determined effort, immediately, to take the necessary steps to establish a ready-for-combat international contingent under the auspices of the United Nations, a contingent which could make a prompt contribution to halt aggression wherever it should erupt. For only through advance preparations can we be assured that the burden in any future conflict will be shared equitably and effectively by the greatest number of member states.

An Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Republican-Courier, a newspaper published in Findlay, Ohio, has been recognized by the United States Treasury Department for promoting the sale of United States savings bonds. According to the citation, the paper led all other daily newspapers in the State of Ohio in supporting this vitally important program.

This recognition is all the more significant because Findlay is a relatively small city—between 25,000 and 30,000 population. Newspaper competition is keen and lively throughout the State. To have been selected from this wide field is ample reason for calling attention to this outstanding achievement.

I am sure that this work of the Findlay newspaper is symbolic of that done by other publications throughout the Nation, as well as every patriotic American who wishes to promote the welfare of the country.

In addition to my remarks, I am including an editorial from the February 18, 1956, issue of the Republican-Courier commenting on this honor:

AN AWARD

The Republican-Courier acknowledges, with appreciation, the honor which came to it this week in the award of a Treasury Department citation as the daily newspaper which led all others in the State of Ohio in support of the savings bond program of the Federal Government.

The honor is especially appreciated because an integral part of the award consists of framed copy of the famous Eisenhower prayer at the time of his inaugural in January 1952, with the frame made from wood from the platform on which President Eisenhower spoke when he uttered the now well-known entreaty to God.

Both the citation and the framed prayer are awards for which the Republican-Courier is deeply grateful. The newspaper is proud to be enrolled in the service of the Treasury Department in the advancement of the United States savings bond program which, as the citation says, is "dedicated to

the economic strength of the Nation and the financial independence of its citizens."

The savings bond program, which has been in effect for some time now, dating back nearly a score of years, is a sound one, with strong appeal to investors and all who wish to not only make a good investment, but also contribute to the economic stability of the country and its general welfare.

Tribute to Frederick Douglass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the death of one of the great figures in American history, Frederick Douglass. Although more than six decades have elapsed since his death, his influence is still a powerful factor in the promotion of an improved status for his race and for enlightened government. We would do well today to pause and reflect on the example of courage and tenacity this man showed in his struggle to gain freedom for his people in the dark days prior to the Emancipation Proclamation.

I feel especially honored to salute him today because Frederick Douglass made Rochester his home for many years. He was born a slave in Maryland in 1817. From this obscure and humble origin, he rose to become the greatest Negro abolitionist, a brilliant orator, a successful journalist, and one of the greatest advocates of liberty in this Nation's history. He preached the gospel of liberty with a fervor given only to those who have known the absence of liberty.

Because he was born in Maryland, Douglass never experienced the worst brutalities of slavery as practiced in the deep South. But in the 21 years he lived as a slave he learned fully the degrading effect of the slave system both on slave and on master.

After an unsuccessful attempt, he escaped to the North in 1838. He learned to read while a slave and he continued his education when he reached freedom. As a slave his search for knowledge had led him into constant trouble but when he gained his freedom, his intelligence and quest for betterment enabled him to become a great force for good. As soon as he reached the North, he became interested in the abolitionist cause and addressed some of the numerous conventions that the abolitionist societies promoted. At one of these meetings in 1841, William Lloyd Garrison, the great abolitionist leader, heard him speak. Garrison was greatly impressed and the two men became fast friends. On Garrison's recommendation, the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society asked Douglass to become a paid lecturer in the cause and Douglass accepted—although with great hesitation because he doubted his own adequacy.

That decision marked the second great turning point in Douglass' life. In 1838 he had escaped from slavery and freedom. In 1841 he decided that his freedom must be dedicated to the liberation of the other members of his race. Douglass worked hard at his lecturing and soon became an accomplished orator and creative thinker in the abolitionist ranks.

One of his great contributions to the cause was a newspaper he published to support the rights of the Negro. He chose to publish this paper in Rochester because it was, as he said:

> The center of a virtuous, intelligent, enterprising, liberal, and growing population. Its people were industrious and in comfortable circumstances—not so rich as to be indifferent to the claims of humanity, and not so poor as to be unable to help any good cause which commanded the approval of their judgment.

He published his paper, the North Star, later called Frederick Douglass' Weekly, for 17 years. During that period it was a great factor in the fight for Negro rights.

His house in Rochester became an important terminal station in the Underground Railway that smuggled fugitive slaves into Canada. One of his greatest victories over discrimination in the North occurred in Rochester. He had sent his daughter to a private school there, but because of the opposition of a single parent she was excluded. Douglass refused to send her to the segregated Negro school that was at the far end of town from where he lived. After a long campaign of agitation led by Douglass, segregation was abolished in the Rochester schools.

Frederick Douglass, I am proud to state, was a staunch member of my party and he performed many services in the cause of the Republican Party. He was given many official appointments, including that of United States Minister to Haiti.

He died on February 20, 1895. On this, the 61st anniversary of his death, we are again in the throes of a struggle to insure the rights of various segments of our population. It is indeed a good time for all of us to look back to the example and work of Frederick Douglass for proof of what is possible for any man, regardless of his humble beginnings, to accomplish with the aid of determination and grit. It is fitting to honor this son of Rochester this month—along with those other great emancipators, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony.

Demands Without Qualifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from one of America's oldest newspapers, the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier.

The editor of this distinguished newspaper, Mr. Thomas Warring, is one of the Nation's most distinguished journalists.

The editorial follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of February 15, 1956]

DEMANDS WITHOUT QUALIFICATIONS

Opposing Adlai Stevenson's counsel of moderation, a spokesman for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People says that the Negro is the only American who "is being advised to take his citizenship rights on the installment plan."

While rights of citizenship long ago were extended to all Negroes, and have been enjoyed by them within their qualifications in the South as well as the North, this spokesman has put his finger on one of the keys to race tension at this moment of American history. He is Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP. The NAACP and its allies are not demanding "rights"—the Negroes already have their rights; they are demanding that whites be forced to associate with Negroes. Association is a privilege, not a right. And a privilege is something to be earned, not something to be demand, at the point of a political gun.

The behavior of hordes of Negroes who have migrated from the segregated South into the unsegregated North does not indicate success in racial mingling. In several of the biggest northern cities these Negroes have created new and frightening problems. Removal of racial barriers that have kept peace in the South would be disastrous for both races.

In the past, the News and Courier has tried to point out racial differences on many levels, including marital, health and moral. An example that has come to our attention is 1 of the 2 Negro women ordered by a court to be admitted to the University of Alabama. Autherine Lucy was admitted and the admission caused a riot. The other woman was Pollie Anner Myers. She was rejected by the university because her "conduct and marital record" did not meet admission standards. She tried to have university officials cited for contempt of court.

South magazine, with commendable enterprise, went to official records and printed the following:

"Pollie Anner Myers, unmarried and pregnant, applied for admission the third week in September 1952. To months later, November 14, 1952, she married Edward Hudson, whose 3-year sentence for burglary had been revoked in Jefferson County in 1948. Six months and 4 days after the marriage Pollie Anner Myers gave birth on May 18, 1953, to a male child. It was a normal birth, length of pregnancy was 40 weeks. Henry Myers, the woman's father, was sentenced from Elmore County on September 26, 1938, for 1 year and a day for possession of still and manufacture of whisky. Edward Hudson, from whom the Associated Press reported she was separated and seeking a divorce, was sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary February 14, 1947, for daytime burglary of an uninhabited dwelling in Jefferson County. Probation was revoked October 8, 1948, and sentence was imposed. He was sentenced for a year and a day on August 28, 1948, on another charge of burglary of an uninhabited dwelling."

Not all Negro applicants would have such a record. But Pollie Anner Myers' record is not nearly as extraordinary as some may think who demand that white schools open their doors. Illegitimacy and jail are not the stigmas in many colored circles that they are in white society.

Is the NAACP offering to raise the moral and other levels of the Negros on the installment plan? Respect and acceptance must be earned, not demanded. Until this elementary fact is understood throughout the country, the South will be fighting a lone battle to preserve decency, integrity and life itself.

J. Edgar Hoover's Report on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article that appeared in the Pilot, of Boston, Mass., in reference to an exclusive interview by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

UNITED STATES REDS ARE STILL DANGEROUS, FBI CHIEF TELLS PILOT WRITER—J. EDGAR HOOVER CITES ARCHBISHOP AS FORTHRIGHT LEADER FOR YOUTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—J. Edgar Hoover, frequently publicized but rarely interviewed, has granted an exclusive interview for the Pilot this week. Readers will recall that Mr. Hoover gave the Pilot the same honor when he was visiting Boston in October 1952.)

(By Rev. Finan Lancaster, O. F. M.)

"Today communism is a more dangerous threat to the Nation than ever before," said J. Edgar Hoover, famed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in an exclusive interview given the Pilot in his Washington, D. C., office.

Asked whether he found communism less of a menace to the Nation than in 1952 when he was last interviewed by the Pilot, the law enforcer replied emphatically in the negative.

"Today Communists are far more dangerous because they are far less crude in their methods than in former years. Today they are more subtle in their propaganda, particularly since the Geneva Conference. And unhappily, many citizens hoping desperately for peace are putting too much credence in the Kremlin smiles. Our Christian nation should remember and remember well, that communism and Christianity can no more mix than oil and water."

"And if," said Mr. Hoover, wagging his finger in emphasis, "If these smiles of the Communists are so sincere, tell me, why do they use every opportunity they can to collect information on every phase of life in the United States?"

TWENTY THOUSAND DANGEROUS FEW

To those who decry the menace of communism in this country because their number has been drastically reduced the Director has a ready answer.

"It is true," he said, "that at one time there were upward of 80,000 card-carrying Communists in this country and now there are approximately 20,000. But these 20,000," warned Mr. Hoover, "are the hard core Communists, men and women who devote themselves unselfishly to the cause and who are dedicated to the proposition that the United States Government must be overthrown by force and violence."

History, cautioned Mr. Hoover, shows that every revolution was inspired and initiated by a small group. Hence the 20,000 Communists are not to be lightly regarded. "They are," he said, "a powerful conspiracy whose avowed intention is the destruction of the United States Government."

The inherent danger that communism presents along intellectual levels was underscored by the FBI head. For that reason he deplored the harm done by teachers and men in position to shape the malleable minds of youth. Men who present communism in attractive and/or conciliatory terms.

To buttress his statement, Mr. Hoover pointed out that a Communist leader in the United States once said that for every card carrying Communist there are ten fellow travelers who have infiltrated their way into education, business and most tragically of all, religious faith. The latter the FBI Director found the hardest to take.

"To think that some ministers find Christianity and communism compatible," he said, shaking his head, "is incredible."

"In this latter area, the intellectual plane," continued Mr. Hoover, "is where the party makes its greatest inroads. They have the ability to hoodwink non-Communists into doing its work. Here is where critical judgment is needed by all patriotic citizens, to see that they don't become sympathizers, fellow travelers or dupes of the Communists."

A reason for college students giving in to the wiles of communism, said Mr. Hoover, was the lack of home training where love and attention had been deficient and the boy winds up nursing an outsized inferiority complex.

In college this inferiority complex is aggravated by the multitudinous activities going on around him of which he is no part. Recognition and companionship which he craves do not come easily. Communists, aware of this, form young people's groups which carefully cater to the boy. And the boy, starved and grateful for their attention, eagerly accepts their companionship and communism along with it.

In his experience, Mr. Hoover related, he has come across a few Catholics who have succumbed to communism. These Catholics, however, he found to be nominal, almost in every instance lacking any substantial Catholic upbringing, and in most cases coming back to the faith before death. Mr. Hoover pointed out that when life comes to a slow crawl and these people feel the frost of death, then all the deep things in them that demand a God cry out in protest against communism and they capitulate. One of the more famous persons who has come back along such a path and has shaken off the fetters of communism, said Mr. Hoover, is Louis Budenz "* * * who is doing an outstanding job exposing communism."

In the 1952 Pilot interview Mr. Hoover stated, "I believe that crime and communism are almost parallel in constituting a threat to the security of this Nation. Each could be characterized as a corroding acid."

Now the question was put to him—

"Humanly speaking at least, the false attraction and lure of crime are apparent. But communism with its unbending severity, its unreasonableness in the denial of a God, its record time and again of rewarding loyalty with the basest kind of treachery has no such pull. What then, in your opinion, makes a man throw in his lot with communism?"

Mr. Hoover replied, "Communism is a many-faced monster endeavoring to gain the allegiance of our citizens. The Communist operates under a cloak of doubletalk and hypocrisy, always concealing his true intentions. He falsely appeals to the noblest of men's thoughts—proclaiming that he works in the interest of 'peace,' 'justice,' and 'mercy.' He promises all things to all men.

"All too often the uncritical citizen accepts these exterior cries of communism, being unable or unwilling to see through the outer veneer of hypocrisy into the inner core of deceit and terror. Communism is a way of life, embodying many types of appeals—economic, social, political, philosophical. The citizen must always be alert."

It was pointed out to the Director that since the solution of the Brink's case once again the eyes of the country were riveted on the FBI and once again another remarkable phenomenon was underscored: of all the Government agencies, the Supreme Court not excepted, the Bureau is the only one which has never been publicly flayed. Now it seems too much to lay this esteem entirely upon the appeal that the Bureau has a kind of David against the Goliath of crime. What then is the full answer?

In reply Mr. Hoover said that it is not correct as very many assume that the FBI is immune from such attacks. "For," he said, "the Bureau has naturally stepped on a number of toes and earned the animosity of selfish interests over the years. The FBI has been and still is subject to attack by the Communist press and the leftwing newspapers."

FIDELITY—BRAVERY—INTEGRITY

"The fact still remains, however," he said, "that the FBI has been most fortunate in holding a position of respect in the eyes of the general public. The confidence which the FBI has won can be traced directly to its personnel, dedicated public servants who conscientiously strive to uphold the FBI's motto of 'Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity' in both official and private life."

How does he get such personnel?

"First," said Mr. Hoover, "by diligent effort on our part to seek them out. People who will, we feel, become dedicated to their jobs."

"Second, by making sure they get the proper training. Obviously no one knows all the answers," said Mr. Hoover, "hence every agent, no matter how long he has been in the field frequently has to go back to the FBI Academy in Quantico, Va., for refresher courses."

"Third, by insisting on the maintenance of standards. Hence this calls for periodic inspection, that is, scheduled inspections of field offices to see how they are getting along and to determine how and in what manner they can be improved. No Government agency," he said, "can avoid scandal unless it constantly takes measures to be on the alert, that is, to subject itself to periods of inspection. Not inspection," he added, "for the sake of inspection or to find fault, but as a helpful and precautionary measure, like a person who gets a physical examination once a year. Not to be morbid or find fault but rather to check and halt any defect that might be found there."

When the Director finished speaking he studied the gavel which lay in front of him for a moment and then in an offhand manner he quoted the prophet Micheas, recalling how the sacred writer reminded man that "* * * he should carry himself humbly in the presence of his God."

This basic humility, Mr. Hoover found wanting a great deal in public life where important men, seeing themselves as the sole agency of their greatness, fail to realize a commonplace obvious to any child; all greatness comes from God.

One thing to help such men, the Director stated, would be to set some time apart for meditation, where and when they could take stock to refurnish and nourish their spiritual life. Some quiet place aside where their own smallness and God's munificence would come into proper focus, and where consequently "man is bound to become more humble," he said.

For this purpose, Mr. Hoover likes the quiet of the sea and also the heights of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California where he finds it easy to meditate and get a stronger grip on the truer values of life.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The questioning then swung on to juvenile delinquency and the Director was asked: As a practical measure to help parents, do you believe that a trip to the woodshed is in order when a child, aged 7 to 12, or thereabouts, commits some deliberate and grave misdemeanor? Or should punishment be left on more adult lines, for example, the deprivation of some privilege or right?

"I am sure," said Mr. Hoover, "that the old axiom, 'spare the rod and spoil the child' is still a timely and worthwhile guide. However," he continued, "there are certain modi-

fications to this guide. Certain it is that punishment should not be inflicted upon the child when the parent is angry. Too often under such circumstances brutal and unreasonable punishment may follow."

On the other hand, Mr. Hoover looked dimly at those parents who say, "If you do that again I'll * * *" and then do nothing. Children, he said, can sense these vacillations and wishy-washiness of parents and exploit them to the full.

PARENTAL LOVE RUNS DEEP

"This is not true parental love," said Mr. Hoover, "when children are neglected like this. For there are times when physical punishment is desirable. And I am sure that while any parent who takes his erring youngsters to the woodshed is hurt more than the child, yet I am also sure that this parent's love also runs deeper than the one who overlooks the fundamental necessity of insuring proper discipline."

Parents, thought the law enforcer, should not talk down to youth. Even as youngsters they should be given a responsibility fitting their capacity. They ought to be given a reason for things and not be handled as so many spiritless things. They should not be told merely, "do this or that" in the fashion of one turning on a mechanical switch. The reason for things should be explained. Then if the child persists in his ways, concluded Mr. Hoover, no other reasonable recourse is left but punishment.

The FBI head then went on to relate how he appeared before the House Appropriations Committee on February 1, 1956, to report that during the first 6 months of 1955 a major crime was committed every 13.9 seconds, reaching a total of 1,128,350 major crimes. Broken down into more concrete terms that meant that every 41.8 minutes there was a murder, every 5.7 minutes a dangerous assault, every 28 minutes a rape, every three-tenths of a minutes a larceny and every 2.4 minutes an auto theft. The cost of these crimes set the Nation back $20 billion or roughly $122 per person.

For these crimes, Mr. Hoover recommended three deterrents:

1. Swift apprehension.
2. Prompt trials.
3. Adequate punishment.

Mr. Hoover scored the pardoning or paroling of criminals who are not ready to enter society. "No man," emphasized Mr. Hoover, "should be released until he has adequately and justly earned his freedom. Such false sympathy extended to hardened criminals has resulted in disaster."

"Almost every special agent of the Bureau," he said, "who has been killed in the line of duty has been killed by a person who has been paroled or received some form of clemency. This would not have happened if false sympathy and hasty decisions had been eliminated. The protection of society comes first, and only then, the rehabilitation of the individual," said the FBI head.

What about those, he was asked, who poo-poo juvenile delinquency and claim that the few bad are headlined and blown out of true proportion to fact? In your experience has juvenile delinquency shown a definite increase in the past decade or has it merely kept pace with the increasing population?

JUVENILE CRIME RATE

In answer Mr. Hoover ticked off these figures: In 1954 out of a total of 1,389 cities of over 2,500 population juveniles represent 57.6 percent of all arrests for auto theft, 49 percent burglary; and 43.6 percent larceny. Of all the major crimes committed in 1954, 9.7 percent were perpetrated by those under 18, 16 percent by those under 21, 25.8 percent by those under 25.

"It is significant to note," said Mr. Hoover, "that while the vast majority of our youth are good citizens, in answer to the question proposed and in answer to those who underestimate the juvenile problem it should be noted that in these cities reported there has been an increase of 2.3 percent in arrests of those under 18 years of age while those over 18 decreased 1.9 percent in comparison."

Mr. Hoover further showed that "* * * since the end of the war the number of serious crimes has increased 62.7 percent, while our population increased only 21.3 percent. More specifically we have had a population increase of 7 percent since 1950 yet have had a crime increase of 26.7 percent. In this increase, juveniles have had too much of a share."

"While it is true," continued Mr. Hoover, "that over 95 percent of our youth are good, it is also true that the remaining bad percentage stigmatizes the whole and the bad percentage while small balloons up tragically when counted in concrete persons."

"Often over the years," said Mr. Hoover, pursuing the subject further, "I have observed that the juvenile delinquent is morally confused—he doesn't know the rules of good citizenship. He is confused with temptation and he possesses no moral standards to give him guidance."

How then, was direction to be given such youngsters?

"I would urge," said Mr. Hoover, "first, regular attendance at church and the re-establishment of religious exercises in the homes, which, of course, would include reading the Bible and grace before and after every meal. I would also make attendance at Sunday school compulsory for every child."

"Secondly," he said, "the church must realize how dependent they are upon the next generation. Consequently good, down-to-earth sermons to youth are badly needed. Too much preaching today is obscured behind clouds of abstract, dogmatic terms that have no real flesh or blood for young people." As happy exceptions to this he cited Bishop Fulton Sheen, the late Rabbi Liebman, of Boston, and Norman Vincent Peale.

"Thirdly," he said, "in religions of today youth finds serious shortages of leaders—two-fisted, forthright men who are not afraid to trample on toes when the honor of God or country is at stake. Immediately there comes to mind," he continued, "your great Archbishop of Boston, Richard J. Cushing. He is a forthright, courageous man—a truly great American."

The interview took place in the private office of Mr. Hoover on the fifth floor of the Justice Building in Washington, D. C. He speaks with almost a military precision, softened somewhat by a wisp of a drawl, with a fluidity and command one ordinarily doesn't expect to come from behind a badge.

Massive chested and trim, he looks fit enough right now to go bowling down dark alleys or up creaky stairs wherever duty would demand.

After finishing talking with him, somehow one has the feeling akin to the little boy who peered out of his bedroom window one night and suddenly lost the terror and hidden menace of the darting shadows. Because just below him, under the lamppost light, he had just seen the broad back of a patrolman disappear into the night.

More Political Than Practical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial from the San Jose Mercury, which I heartily agree with and commend to the attention of my colleagues:

MORE POLITICAL THAN PRACTICAL

There are indications that, should the Senate pass the democratic farm bill, President Eisenhower will veto it and there is considerable opinion Congress will not be able to override the veto.

The reason is the bill as now presented is far more political than it is practical. It is self-defeating. As the Eisenhower administration intended it, it should reduce surpluses and start agriculture on the road of at least a semblance of sound economics.

Those surpluses, now amounting to more than $7 billion, are not only depressing farm prices but they are increasing taxes on farmers as well as the rest of the people. They are a threat to domestic and foreign markets.

The soil bank section of the President's bill, although far from a perfect instrument, is designed to take millions of acres of farmland out of production and thus prevent more surpluses and the possible reduction of those on hand now.

But, by inserting the high rigid price support, the Democratic version will tend to increase production on the acres that are left and thus continue or increase surplus stocks held at taxpayers' and farmers' expense.

The politicis created by the Democrats seems quite plain and should be to the farmers whose votes the gimmick seeks to win.

Should President Eisenhower sign the bill, he will be endorsing principles which he has consistently held to be wrong, and which a great many farmers, including members of the powerful Farm Bureau Federation, know to be wrong. If he vetoes it, then he lays himself open to the political charge sure to be made of refusing to help the farmers.

The measure passed the House of Representatives last year by a narrow margin, but will have to go back there for further action because of inclusion in the present bill of the soil bank provision. Last week the omnibus bill containing both the soil bank and return to 90 percent price support passed the Senate Agriculture Committee 12 to 3. But a vote on the high rigid support passed by only 1 vote, 8 to 7.

The bill will come before the Senate for debate probably starting February 20. A hard fight is anticipated. Meanwhile it is entirely probable a lot of Senators and Representatives will be hearing from a lot of farmers who don't want their industry used as a political football.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I call the attention of our colleagues to the following letter which I have sent to the American Lithuanian American Information Center:

FEBRUARY 15, 1956.
LITHUANIAN AMERICAN INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y.
(Attention Mary M. Kizis, director.)

DEAR MISS KIZIS: I wish to take this opportunity to salute the freedom loving Lithuanian people on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania. The Lithuanian American Information

Center is to be commended for its diligent and perservering effort to alert the peoples of the world of the sad condition of your former homeland.

You may be assured of my sincere and complete support of all efforts and movements directed toward the eventual and final liberation of Lithuania from the yoke of the oppressor. I look forward to the day when Lithuania will again take its place among the great nations of the world.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT ZELENKO,
Member of Congress.

Status of Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine:

STATUS OF FORCES

Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, New York, visited American servicemen imprisoned in foreign jails. He concluded that the protection of the United States Constitution has been taken away from these citizens serving us overseas by the Status of Forces Treaty. These are the GI's who have been tried and convicted in foreign courts and are now serving sentences in foreign prisons.

Those imprisoned in France and England were visited. All the GI's in England said that they would have preferred to be tried by Army or Air Force court martial. They felt that they would have had a much fairer trial and would have preferred to have an American officer defend them, even if they would have received more severe penalties from United States authorities. This was the rule before the Status of Forces Treaty.

In France, a man is guilty until proven innocent; under our Constitution a man is presumed innocent and must be proven guilty. All but one GI would have preferred the court martial to prosecution in the French courts. Their trials were conducted in French; in two cases the French lawyers could not speak English.

The resolutions to revise the Status of Forces Treaty will probably be reported out of the committees in both the Senate and the House of Representatives soon after Congress reconvenes in January.

Let your Congressmen know that you urge them to vote for these resolutions that will return their constitutional rights to our servicemen abroad.

FIRST LAW WAS THE LOYALTY OATH

A little thin calf-bound volume of 185 pages containing the first acts of Congress, and bearing the signature of "G. Washington" is one of the rare possessions of the Library of Congress. On its title page, it states, "Acts passed at a Congress of the United States of America, begun and held in the city of New York the 4th day of March in the year 1789 and of the independence of the United States the 11th." The book was published in 1789.

The first law ever passed under the Constitution of these United States and which our first President signed on June 1, 1789, and printed in this volume of 185 pages, lays down the form and also the method of administrating the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, to be required of every officer of the Government, elected or appointed, high or low.

Thus stands the first recorded law of our country. It originated in the House of Representatives and was proposed by Representative Daniel Carroll, of Maryland. With very little debate, the Senate concurred and it was signed by the President of the United States.

THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Acts of the First Congress of the United States, passed at the first session, which was begun and held at the city of New York on Wednesday, March 4, 1789, and continued to September 29, 1789)

(George Washington, President, John Adams, Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate, Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Speaker of the House of Representatives)

STATUTE I

Chapter I.—An act to regulate the time and manner of administering certain oaths

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and [House of] Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the oath or affirmation required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, shall be administered in the form following, to wit: "I, A. B. do solemnly swear or affirm (as the case may be) that I will support the Constitution of the United States." The said oath or affirmation shall be administered within 3 days after the passing of this act, by any one Member of the Senate, to the President of the Senate, and by him to all the members and to the secretary; and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to all the Members who have not taken a similar oath, by virtue of a particular resolution of the said House, and to the clerk: and in case of the absence of any Member from the service of either House, at the time prescribed for taking the said oath or affirmation, the same shall be administered to such Member, when he shall appear to take his seat.

Interposition or Nullification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include herewith a series of questions and answers dealing with the subject of interposition, prepared by a distinguished jurist of the State of Mississippi, the Honorable M. M. McGowan. I feel sure that this may answer many questions which Members may have regarding this legal and historic doctrine, and I am pleased to submit this for the information of the Congress:

INTERPOSITION OR NULLIFICATION

Question. What is the meaning of interposition or nullification?

Answer. It means interposing or placing the sovereignty of the State against that of the Federal Government; a matter of contested sovereignty; and a refusal to follow the Federal directive, whether it be an act of the Congress, judgment of the Supreme Court, or order of the Chief Executive until the question of who is right is settled by constitutional processes.

An example of interposition or nullification is found in a sentence like this: "I (the State) deny that you (the Federal Government) have the right to do this, because the right to do so was never conferred on you by the Constitution, but was retained as one of the sovereign rights of the States when the Union was formed, and I (the State) will not follow the directive or order until the question is settled by constitutional processes as to who is right."

Question. There has been some confusion about the words "interposition" and "nullification." Do they mean the same things?

Answer. Yes. It would be an empty gesture to say "we never gave you this authority," without following up with "we will not follow your directive or order until it is settled by constitutional processes who is right." Just to lamely say, "We never gave you this authority, it belongs to us," would be meaningless, or a mere petition or memorial to Congress. The words are considered as one and the same thing, and in fact are one and the same thing.

Question. What is a memorial or petition to Congress?

Answer. A petition or memorial to Congress is a mere petition asking Congress to do or not to do a thing. The mail bags going to Washington are full of them. They are usually disregarded. A memorial or petition to Congress has no relation whatsoever to interposition or nullification.

Question. Is it necessary to use the word "nullification" to void an act of the general or Federal Government by this means?

Answer. It certainly is not. Sincere and responsible men should never quibble over words, when other words may be used that have exactly the same meaning. Such words as "illegal and of no force and effect," or "unconstitutional and not to be obeyed," would have the same effect. In fact even the word "interposition" was not too much used in the early days. The words "State veto" were used by John C. Calhoun and others in South Carolina in the early 1830's. Frankly, the word "Interposition," as a proper noun, seems to have come into use as a designation of the entire process late in 1955, some 2 or 3 months ago. True, Calhoun and Jefferson used the noun "interposition" but merely as a common noun.

Question. What relation does the fifth article of the Constitution have to interposition or nullification?

Answer. None, except as a vehicle to settle the question raised when an interposition is made, that is to settle the question as to who is right about the matter. The fifth article of the Constitution simply provides means of amending the Constitution, and this is sometimes (but not always) necessary to settle the question as to who is right. For instance when, in 1859, the State of Wisconsin nullified the Fugitive Slave Act and also the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, nothing was done; the Federal Government just called it quits, and let it go at that. On the other hand, when, in 1792, the State of Georgia nullified a decree of the Federal courts granting a judgment against Georgia at the suit of an individual suitor the Congress got busy and enacted the 11th amendment to the constitution saying no individual could sue a State.

The fifth article of the Constitution provides two methods of amending the Constitution: (1) By two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives proposing an amendment which will become effective when ratified by three-fourths of the States, or (2) by two-thirds of the States petitioning Congress to submit amendments upon which event Congress shall cause to be assembled in the States conventions to submit the amendments and these shall become effective when ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Question. What is meant by State sovereignty?

Answer. It means that in the beginning the several States were free, independent, and sovereign States. This can best be demonstrated by examining the first sentence of the treaty of peace signed by Great Britain and the Colonies after the Revolutionary War, which reads as follows: "His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia to be free, sovereign, and independent States." So the fact that we started as free, independent, and sovereign States cannot be denied.

Question. What happened to the sovereignty of the States, and how can the Federal Government by sovereign and the States composing it at the same time be sovereign?

Answer. The States granted sufficient of their sovereignty to found a "more perfect Union" (the articles of Confederation of 1781 being imperfect) and retained certain others to themselves. The 10th amendment settles this question. It is as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Not one of the Colonies would have adopted the Constitution unless the 10th amendment had been incorporated therein. It was a part of the Bill of Rights when the Constitution was adopted. It was a peculiar work of genius wrought by the great statesmen of the time.

Question. What is meant by settling the question as to who is right by constitutional processes?

Answer. It was thought by Jefferson and Madison that dignity and right would require that when a State felt its sovereignty had been invaded by the Federal Government, the State itself should not be the sole judge of the matter, but that an appeal should be made to Congress to "arrest the progress of the evil" and that the several sister States be invited to join in said appeal. Thus the appeal is to the Congress with the sister States invited to join therein, and the appeal is that the "question of contested sovereignty" be settled by processes set in motion by Congress under the Constitution.

Question. Is interposition or nullification illegal?

Answer. No. No one can reach the conclusion that it is illegal without at first admitting that the States have surrendered their total sovereignty to the Federal Government. By the plainest sense and logic, if they have not surrendered their total sovereignty to the Federal Government, they have the right to raise the question for settlement. Only to those who claim such a surrender has been made is it or can it be illegal.

It would be a foolish thing indeed to say that the States had sovereign rights, but could not assert them. It would be a monstrous thing to say the Supreme Court could order a person hanged for criticizing the President or other Federal officer. (The alien and sedition laws merely provided one could be sent to prison for a long term for just that—and the Constitution was only 9 years old then.)

Of course there are those who make this contention. Many of them are honest people who have never stopped to think. And of course we have the left-wing Socialist groups who will of necessity have to have it declared illegal or go out of business. Until State sovereignty and local government are destroyed, they can never accomplish their purpose.

Question. Under what circumstances should interposition or nullification be invoked?

Answer. Certainly under none other than the most grave and solemn circumstances. It should be only upon the last resort to save the life and sovereignty of the State. There should be danger to the State that is not only imminent and perilous, but as Jefferson and Madison put it, "palpable and dangerous." To invoke it under capricious or even ordinary serious circumstances would only bring upon a State the well deserved rebuke of the sister States.

Question. Would interposition or nullification bring violence or disorder within the State?

Answer. Certainly not. It would in the matter now threatening us insure peace and good order.

Question. Would it result in Federal troops being sent into our State?

Answer. Certainly not. Sending troops into a quiet and tranquil community would be no more than a farce or comic opera.

Question. What does the Army have to do with enforcing court orders?

Answer. Not a thing in the world.

Question. Just how will interposition or nullification work?

Answer. It will work perfectly by the people standing solidly together and placing their cause upon their own sovereignty and that of their States. It is to be remembered that the sovereignty not delegated to the Federal Government was retained "to the States respectively or to the people."

No law can be enforced that is repugnant to all of the people and shocking to their inherent sensibilities.

Sir Edmund Burke, debating in Parliament the revolt of the American Colonies, threw up his hands and said in despair: "I would not know how to write an indictment against an entire people." If we had not stood together in 1776, we would still be an English colony.

Question. It has been said that when a State interposes its sovereignty against that of the Federal Government, it calls for a settlement of the controversy by constitutional processes," and invites the sister States to join in the petition. Now, pursue that further and tell just exactly how the matter has been or may be carried to a conclusion?

Answer. In the light of actual experience and history, a wide variety of courses may be taken, with different conclusions reached.

When Georgia interposed in 1792 (the Constitution then being only 3 or 4 years old, over an individual suing the State of Georgia in a Federal court, the Congress rather hastily submitted an amendment to the Constitution (the 11th) which was approved by three-fourths of the States, vindicating Georgia's position.

When South Carolina interposed in 1832, on the question of the tariff laws, Congress promptly passed an act relieving the State of the oppressive burden of the tariff complained of. In case of the other acts of interposition, you might say that nothing was done; the States merely had their way about the matter.

However, if Congress refused to grant the relief by legislative act, and the Federal Government refused to give up and persisted in enforcing the act or court decision, then it must be admitted that the truly classical concept of interposition as conceived by Jefferson and Madison might come into play, which was that Congress at the address of the complaining States and such of the sister States as elected to join, would submit an amendment under article V of the Constitution, and submit it to the people, the amendment embracing the disputed question, and let the result abide the action of three-fourths of the States, either by affirmative or negative action.

Question. If three-fourths of the States in this instance should ratify an amendment which affirmatively granted to the Federal Government the right to take over the education and nurture of our children and mix members of the white and Negro races in the schools, would the States be bound thereby?

Answer. According to the theoretical concept of the principle, they would be.

Question. Would Mississippi accept it upon such a result?

Answer. The State officials would attempt to, but the entire people would have to be reckoned with. That crisis would have to be handled if and when it arose.

Question. Is there any legal means, other than interposition to avoid the effect of the school decisions of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954?

Answer. It is quite apparent that there is not. Unless it exceeds the powers granted the Federal Government to make such decision, then it is legal. There is no other avenue of attack that can be made upon it except upon this ground. All that would be left is open defiance or resistance.

Question. What if the Congress refused to submit an amendment which would settle the controversy?

Answer. They could not be compelled to do it unless at the petition of 32 of the States. This is the alternative method provided for in article V of the Constitution. The first method is, as said before, two-thirds of the Members of Congress may submit an amendment upon their own initiative, which will be ratified when approved by three-fourths of the States; or two-thirds of the States may petition Congress to submit amendments, and if it does so, these will likewise become valid when ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Question. What if Congress refused to submit the amendment and also two-thirds of the States never petitioned them to do so? How would that effect the interposition?

Answer. It is quite clear that the interposition would stand. It should be readily conceded that the States of this Union, none of them, would interpose upon only the gravest and most solemn circumstances.

Question. But this is dealing here with a judgment of the Supreme Court. Can interposition be restored to against that?

Answer. Certainly. It is true that people are much more reluctant to challenge the courts than the Congress or Chief Executive. Reverence for courts of law and justice is perhaps the finest of all our traits. However, tyranny must be resisted from whatever source it might come.

The Supreme Court is a creature of the Constitution; the Constitution in turn is a creature of the States. It is Thomas Jefferson who is credited with saying that the germ of the dissolution of the Republic lies in the judiciary or Supreme Court.

Question. Now who, in the very last analysis, is to be the judge in a case of contested sovereignty between the Federal Government and a State or group of States?

Answer. That is a vital question indeed, and actually goes to the very heart of the matter. It became a very heated question less than 10 years after the Constitution was adopted.

Jefferson and Madison, always clearly logical, reasoned thus: The sovereign States entered into a Compact as they called it; that was the Constitution itself; the States granted a part of their sovereignty to the general government and retained a part; that was the dual sovereignty system, truly a work of genius, and as they believe, and rightly so, the only and sole guaranty of liberty and freedom. Now, when a dispute came up as to who should exercise that phase of sovereignty, who was to be the judge? Jefferson, who wrote the first Kentucky Resolution of Interposition, expressed it in these words:

"That the Government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that as in all other cases of compact among parties having no

common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress.

So these great statesmen argued that the Constitution or Compact by its plain meaning prohibited Congress from passing the objectionable portions of the alien and sedition laws, but if there was any doubt about its meaning, then the sovereign States who formed the compact would be the ones to decide, not the Congress or the Supreme Court. There was no common judge provided for in specific words, so reason and principle, aided by the purest of logic, would dictate that the creature could not dictate to the creator. Hence the appeal to the States.

Question. It has been said that interposition is the only truly legal means by which segregation may be preserved. Elaborate on this.

Answer. Always turning first to commonsense and plain logic, we are confronted with this proposition: The Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is legal unless the Court did not have the right to render it; that is, in lawyers' terms, it did not have jurisdiction of the subject matter. By logical processes and in regular sequence, this brings us to the question of whether or not the States, in forming the Union, ever granted to the Federal Government the right to take over the education and nurture of their youth. All of the southern and many of the northern States say that they did not. The Federal Government seems to assert that they did. This brings up the essential question involved in interposition—a case of contested sovereignty. Whose sovereign right is it to control the education and nature of the youth of the land—the States or the Federal Government?

Question. Several of the States have passed legislative acts, and constitutional amendments, seeking to provide means of preserving segregation. Comment on the efficiency of these.

Answer. Several of the States have proposed and passed legislative acts, the intent and purpose of which is to avoid the consequences of the school decisions. Several of the States have enacted constitutional amendments providing varying powers, such as the power to abolish public schools, the power to subsidize pupils in private schools, or public schools rented out to private individuals.

The defect in all of these maneuvers is that they, tacitly at least, admit the validity of the school decisions, and seek means and methods to evade or avoid them. We should keep in mind that the same Supreme Court that enacted the school decisions will almost surely decree that Negroes be admitted to private schools.

Question. What about the situation at Hoxie, Ark.?

Answer. At Hoxie, Ark., a Federal court has already issued a temporary injunction against the residents of the community, enjoining them from "boycotting" the integrated school there. This means that if they failed or refused to send their children to the integrated school set up there, or attempted to set up a private school, they would be subject to fine and imprisonment. However, this court injunction has not been read by the writer, and comment upon its contents is with reservations, but the information comes direct from the attorney handling the case for the citizens of the Hoxie community.

Question. Upon whom will the burden of enforcing the school decisions in this State fall, if they are accepted as legal?

Answer. Just as much on the officers and courts of this State as on the Federal authorities. There is nothing peculiarly Federal about the jurisdiction. The duty would fall just as much on our court as the Federal.

Question. In the event no interposition or nullification resolution is passed, in what position will this leave the executive and judicial officers of this State?

Answer. It would leave them in a very bad position indeed. They should know exactly upon what legal ground they stand.

Question. Is there any higher ground upon which they could stand than the asserted sovereignty of their State?

Answer. No. They would be in company of people like Jefferson and Madison, and that is concededly good company.

Question. Reverting to the historical side of the question once again, what instance of interposition or nullification was based upon the least right, so far as the State making the complaint was concerned?

Answer. Undoubtedly, the Nullification of the Tariff Act by South Carolina in 1832. This nullification stood upon practically no right because the right to control interstate and foreign commerce had been specifically granted to the Federal or general government. Paragraph 3 of article I, section VIII, of the Constitution, the article which specifically names the powers conferred upon the Federal Government, states: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." So the nullification was actually without right, except it might be said that the second paragraph of the same section said that tariffs and imposts should be "uniform." However, it should be admitted that this factual deviation would not justify nullification. Still it worked. The Congress promptly passed a bill alleviating South Carolina of the unfair and onerous tariff.

Question. What effect has the South Carolina episode had upon the public understanding of the subject of Interposition and Nullification?

Answer. It has caused great misunderstanding and disapprobations for the simple reason that for the many generations since that time, the history books used and taught in school never mentioned any other type or form of interposition, and the true principle as taught by Jefferson and Madison and other great statesmen of early times was completely lost and forgotten. For example, the Encyclopedia Brittanica, under the title, "Nullification" mentions no other instance of such procedure in our history, and that is mentioned with disapproval. Brittanica does not mention the word "interposition" at all.

Few people know it but in 1833 the South Carolina incident had gained such unpopularity that Mississippi completely under the domination of Andrew Jackson, passed a strong resolution condemning nullification. Jackson practically ruled Mississippi at that time so far as political affairs were concerned. However, Old Hickory was temperamental about the matter. When, in 1838, Georgia nullified the Supreme Court order halting the removal of the Cherokee Indians, Jackson made his famed remark: "Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it."

Question. From what has been said there is but one side to this controversy. Is there another side, or if not, to what do the proponents of Federal control of education and nurture of our children hold?

Answer. What comfort they have only come from the 14th amendment, a rather vague and indefinite pronouncement itself, enacted as a punitive measure after the Civil War when the South was prostrate. It is sometimes called the "shotgun amendment" for the reason that the validity of same must rely upon the ratification of at least some of the Southern States, all of which were helpless and under Federal military control. Governor Coleman of Mississippi contends that it was never legally and validly adopted. He is undoubtedly backed up by historical data or he would not have made the assertion. No doubt the "due process of law" clause of the amendment, and "equal protection of the law" clause of the amendment are relied upon to sustain the proponents of Federal control of education and nurture of our children.

But the fact remains that the 14th amendment was enacted more than 80 years ago; the very Congress that enacted it set up separate schools in the District of Columbia for Negroes and whites; a consistent course of action has ensued whereby for more than 80 years all parties to the compact have understood and treated the amendment as not having anything whatsoever to do with the Federal Government taking over the education and nurture of the youth of the land; innumerable Court decisions of the Court itself have plainly adhered to this interpretation. In fact the education and nurture of the youth of the land was understood to be the prerogative of the States since the founding of the Republic some 165 years ago. After all, the States founded and created the Federal Government; they founded and adopted the Constitution itself, as well as all of the amendments thereto. What the States over a long course of action construe them to be, verily they are.

Question. Enumerate the instances of interposition or nullification in our history, with the results in each case?

Answer—

1. In 1792, an individual sued the State of Georgia and against its vigorous protest, took judgment. Georgia nullified the Federal court judgment against it, and passed an act through the House of Representatives that if the marshal tried to collect same, he would be hanged. The Congress rather hastily proposed the 11th amendment which prohibited suits against the States at the instance of individual suitors.

2. Next came the nullification resolutions against the alien and sedition laws, which in the teeth of the constitutional prohibition against abridgment of free speech and a free press, levied heavy criminal penalties against anyone who dared criticize the Government or any officer thereof. A delegation from Kentucky came to Jefferson and implored him to prepare a nullification resolution for Kentucky. Jefferson complied with the first Kentucky resolution of November 1798, the first classical exposition of the doctrine of interposition and nullification in this country. In December Madison followed suit with a similar resolution for Virginia. The alien and sedition laws expired in 1801 without any prosecution thereunder.

3. In 1814, smarting under the restrictions imposed by the War of 1812, tremendously unpopular in New England, all of the New England States met in the Hartford Convention which enacted: a nullification of the draft act of Congress to provide soldiers for the war; drew up resolutions of actual secession which were never put into effect.

4. In 1828 the Creek Indians procured from the Federal Courts a judgment which would have prevented the State of Georgia from removing them from the State. Georgia promptly nullified the judgments and removed the Indians by force.

5. In 1829, the State of Alabama, under similar circumstances, nullified the Federal Courts, and removed from its territory the Creek Indians therein.

6. In 1832, the State of South Carolina nullified an act of Congress levying an unfair and onerous tariff upon the products of the State. The nature and result of this act has been commented upon.

7. In 1838, the Cherokee Indians violated a treaty whereby they would be removed from Georgia, and appealed to the Federal Courts. The Courts sustained them. Georgia nullified the act of the Courts and removed them by force. President Andrew Jackson sustained them this time and this is when he made his famous remark: "Marshall has rendered his judgment; now let him enforce it."

8. In 1859, Wisconsin nullified the Fugitive Slave Act of the Congress and the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court. Nothing was done.

9. Some 13 other Northern States joined Wisconsin in the nullification of these acts and decisions. Nothing was done.

10. The Supreme Court of Iowa nullified and disregarded a Supreme Court decision relative to the disposition of public lands appropriated to the railroads for building lines across the State. Nothing was done.

11. On January 20, 1956, the Legislature of the State of Alabama nullified the Supreme Court decisions of May 17, 1954, the import of which was to forcibly mix in schools of that State members of the white and Negro race. Result: dependent only upon courage and unified action of the people of Alabama.

Question. Has there ever been any other occasion of interposition or nullification comparable in importance to the nullification of the school decisions of May 17, 1954?

Answer. No. It is the last-ditch stand to preserve constitutional government in this country, and turn back the forces of the tyranny of centralized government and the minions of socialism and communism.

Question. It has been declared that even if the Congress did set in motion what is called "constitutional processes" to settle the question of who is right about the matter, and pursuant thereto three-fourths of the States did ratify an amendment which granted to the Federal Government the exclusive right to manage and control the education and nurture of our youth, the people of Mississippi would not accept it. That poses a grave question. Discuss it further.

Answer. It does indeed pose a very grave question. You note it was said the "people" of Mississippi. As Senator EASTLAND has pointed out, this school decision is impossible of performance. It shocks the sensibilities of all of the people. The revulsion is too great to be overcome. It runs counter to universal laws of nature that man-made laws cannot control.

In the next place, while unbridled and salacious attacks upon the Supreme Court have no place in a dignified discussion among responsible men, still there is a deep-seated conviction among the people that this decision, coupled with other and numerous acts and predilections, shows a studied intention to change the form of this Government. It should be conceded that the fifth article of the Constitution was never intended as a vehicle for accomplishing this purpose.

Question. Why would the constitutional amendments abolishing public schools, with pupil subsidizing funds, accomplish nothing? Comment further.

Answer. The Supreme Court will strike it down. Few people realize that the civil-rights mania has spread so far that three States have already passed laws providing that even private schools will have to admit Negroes, that is, except certain religious and denominational schools.

Question. What does interposition or nullification have to do with secession?

Answer. Nothing. The two principles are actually diametrically opposed. Secession talk would be pure madness at any time, and especially now when our existence is threatened and a division would spell certain ruin.

Question. If the general or Federal Government has absolute power through construction of the Constitution by Court decree, as many seem to think it has, what is the need for having the amending machinery of the Constitution, that is, article V?

Answer. None at all. Calhoun sensed this when he said: "Without it (interposition), the amending power must become obsolete, and the Constitution, through the power of construction, in the end utterly subverted."

CONCLUSION

Since the coming of the present crisis, the very word "interposition" has precipitated somewhat of a furore in the land. A southern governor has said it will become a household word throughout the country. To its advocates, it has become a symbol of liberty and freedom from oppression. To its opponents, it is anethama, of near treasonable import.

The public opinion is the ungovernable master of all human disputation. How has it been received? What do those who solemnly aver that the Federal power is absolute and supreme have to say about it?

It can be truthfully said that it has been received in the main with the same solemn dignity with which it has been offered.

It appears that the arguments presently being waged and to be continued perhaps for a long time will follow the same line, with the same contentions being made as prevailed in the early days of the Republic. The advocates of absolute Federal sovereignty say the power and efficiency of the general government will be enfeebled by constant and capricious challenges of the States. The advocates of the dual sovereignty system as originally set up in the Constitution solemnly answer that interposition cannot and will not ever be raised except upon the most grave and serious circumstances, such as would threaten the very life of the state and freedom of people. The entire proposition is fraught with grave and onerous difficulties. They adopt as their answer what Calhoun said in his Reports of 1828:

"So powerful, in fact, are its difficulties, that nothing but truth and a deep sense of oppression on the part of the people of the state, will ever sustain the exercise of the power;—and if it should be attempted under other circumstances, it must speedily terminate in the expulsion of those in power, to be replaced by others who would make a merit of closing the controversy, by yielding the point in dispute."

Hon. Hulan E. Jack, President of the Borough of Manhattan, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1956, the Honorable Hulan E. Jack, president of the Borough of Manhattan, was presented a scroll for his "untiring efforts to further better understanding among Americans of all races and creeds," by the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the remarks of President Jack on that occasion:

There are moments in the life of a man when the friendship expressed by his fellow citizens fill his heart with a sense of gratitude which cannot be evaluated with mere words. Tonight I find myself in this position for your presence here will always remain a cherished treasure, an evening filled with memories never to be forgotten.

For many years I have labored in the vineyards of brotherhood where the seed of understanding among all men was planted long ago. I have seen the bright dawn of fellowship obscured by the gray clouds of bigotry. I have witnessed the gradual crumbling of the walls of prejudice. I have walked in the dark caves of discrimination. And yet, despite all these dying embers of intolerance, in one form or another, I am thankfully aware that mankind is moving forward along the road to universal understanding where neighbors can one day break bread together within the kingdom of sincere friendship.

Progress in human relationship is often like a continuous drop of water spending its strength upon a seemingly immovable rock. But the day comes when the obstruction gives way and a torrent of fresh water unleashes its mighty force, to remove for all time, the barriers which held back the greater abundance of the restless energy found in the handiwork of God and nature.

Our own country is like that restless torrent of water. From the first day when the Declaration of Independence was signed by men dedicated to the philosophy of the equality of freedom, liberty, and justice, we have expanded our endeavors in the field of human relationship. We have become a symbol of hope and faith to new and unborn nations whose people are concerned with the realization that they, too, may be counted as belonging to the family of a free world.

But we cannot remain forever an example of true democracy if our own house contains elements of mentality where the evil of segregation still lingers. The honors you have given to me here tonight are indeed proof that true democracy can be a living and workable demonstration of our American society.

Further evidence of true democracy can be found only a few miles from here where the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University is located. Founded under Jewish auspices it has opened its doors to both faculty and students regardless of their race, creed, color, or national origin. Such an ideal in medical education is worthy of your cooperation and support.

There is no room whatsoever for the ugly scars of discrimination and segregation in any field of education for we are all children of God whose minds are born free from the curse of hate and prejudice.

I could not be your guest of honor tonight except for the friendship and efforts of men and women from every walk of life and from every section of our community. I wish I could reach out and clasp your hand in thankfulness for the spiritual warmth of your hearts. If I could do so, it would not be Hulan E. Jack, president of the Borough of Manhattan speaking, but an immigrant boy of 16 who came to a glorious land and was given the opportunity of sharing the priceless relationship with so many, many unforgettable friends.

From the deepest corners of our hearts, my wife, Mira and I, reach out and embrace every one of you with a prayer of thankfulness.

The National Forest Recreation Use Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important conservation measures before this Congress is the national forest recreation use bill.

Its principal sponsor in the 84th Congress is the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. I have joined as a cosponsor and similar, or identical, bills have been introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Here is a press release on Mr. METCALF's H. R. 1823 from the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners: Carl D. Shoemaker, general counsel, 232 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The bill (H. R. 1823) introduced by Congressman LEE METCALF, of Montana, is one of the most important conservation measures to be considered by the 2d session of the 84th Congress which convened last Tuesday, according to Carl D. Shoemaker, general counsel of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners.

This bill establishes as a policy the public use of all of the national forests and authorizes the necessary funds to carry out an extensive program for the development and operation of these areas for recreational use. Other features of the bill provide for adequate safety and sanitation in these areas and the improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat. All of these features are of far-reaching importance to the forty-odd millions of people who annually spend a part or all of their leisure time in these forest areas.

To insure the needed funds the bill authorizes the setting aside of not to exceed $5,500,000 from the annual forest receipts derived from timber sales, grazing fees, and other forest revenues.

Where a recreational area has been developed with special sanitary facilities and improvement such as outdoor camp stoves, necessary fire wood, and cleanup services, the bill authorizes the Forest Service to charge a small fee for them. No charge or fee for hunting or fishing in the forests is authorized nor contemplated.

Congressman METCALF has shown a real interest in conservation problems. This bill was introduced by him in response to a widespread need for better development of the forests in the interest of those Americans who use them for recreational purposes. Nothing in the bill interferes with or limits the other uses of the forests for watershed protection, grazing, and timber production.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to my colleagues that the Forest Service now has the authority to charge fees for recreation use anywhere in the national forest system. It is doing so in almost 50 places. The national forest recreation use bill limits this authority to those substantially improved areas where special services or facilities are provided.

The American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include an interesting paper on the American Indian.

My distinguished constituent who wrote this is himself a member of the Chickasaw Tribe. I feel that my colleagues will thoroughly enjoy this fine treatise on our neighbors, the American Indians.

Incidentally "the Westerners" is a fine group of outstanding citizens very much interested in the continued constructive progress of the West and the fair and sound solutions of its problems:

THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN IN FACT AND FICTION

(Paper prepared for the Spokane Chapter of the Westerners by Frank Lilly, October 20, 1955)

Since the time, 463 years and 12 days ago, when Christopher Columbus first set foot on San Salvador and dubbed its inhabitants "Indios" in the belief that he had reached an outlying island of India, popular ideas regarding the "Indian" of the Western Continent have been in too many important respects as far out of line with facts as was Columbus in the matter of the land he had reached.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to present and discuss facts in connection with some of the more important fictions about the North American Indians—fictions commonly and generally accepted as facts. Of course some generalization and oversimplification must be taken for granted because of the limitation of a paper. Omissions and exceptions must also be taken for granted.

One of the first facts to learn about the American Indians is that there are many different groups of them; as many, perhaps more, than is the case in connection with Europeans or Asiatics. The Scot is one thing, the Welshman another, and the Irishman, although he may have a Spanish surname, is still another—not just in customs alone but also in physique and to some extent in complexion.

It should surprise no one that while the Iroquoise is one thing, the Sioux is quite another and the Chinook still another. Nor should it be surprising that they should differ so much from one another in customs, physique and complexion. It seems reasonable to assume that, as in the case of the people of the British Isles, these differences in customs, physiques and complexion have been due to infiltrations of blood from various parts of the Eastern Hemisphere; Norse, Teuton, Roman, Spanish, Phoenician and others.

There is, in my opinion, unmistakable evidence of the infiltration of Norse blood among the Indians of the North and Central Atlantic States, semitic blood in some of the tribes of the North Central States, and Mongolian blood among some of the tribes along the Pacific coastline.

The chances are that the human mind is basically the same everywhere. However, it is a fact that due to "time, place and circumstances," foods, climate and topography, people do not all think alike about what they see and feel. Nonetheless, it is a fact that certain basic concepts and feelings prevail among Europeans, Asiatics and Africans as integral groups of people, and the same is true of the American Indian.

Exceptions being the rule, there will be exceptions in connection with some American Indian social units to the facts that I shall comment upon, but these facts will still remain true for American Indians as a whole. Some tribes, for example—only a very few—were polygamous and/or polyandrous but monogamy was the rule.

The picture of the North American Indian held by most people is that of a half-naked, war-bonneted, bloodthirsty warrior with a tomahawk in one hand and a scalping knife in the other; or, if not that, blanketed, lazy lout blissfully smoking his pipe while his squaw toiled incessantly; an ignorant heathen, whose speech was limited to an occasional "Ugh" and whose main desire was for the white man's "firewater."

That the Indian was basically bloodthirsty is fiction. Never was he so bloodthirsty as the white man who in Europe has warred almost continuously since recorded history. Indians did not wage war with others of their race over religious concepts; Indians did not conceive and develop means and methods for killing defenseless noncombatant men and women and children by the tens of thousands. The facts speak for themselves.

It is true that from time to time pre-Columbian Indians had disputes over hunting grounds, but these were usually settled without the shedding of much blood. It was the reluctance of the Indian to kill a fellow man—even the invading white man—that made it possible for European emigrants to secure a firm foothold in North America. How easy it would have been for the Indian to have completely destroyed those early settlers. Instead the Indians nurtured them and taught them how to survive in the new environment.

But what did the early settlers do in return? After failing to eliminate the Indian by enslavement, they resorted to outright killing; then incited the Indians to warfare, not only with the settlers, but among themselves. This, by the way, was achieved in large measure through the use of "firewater," made by Christianized white men and sold to the Indians with full knowledge of its evil effects. These early Indian wars, it has been agreed, were the basis for the fiction that arose as to the Indian's bloodthirstiness.

It is fiction that the American Indians were primarily nomadic hunters. All Indians were agriculturists to some extent and most of them were primarily so, living in houses and settlements. The tepee is in effect an Indian tent; the log house, where logs were available, was typically Indian.

At this point, it should be brought out that over half of this country's agricultural products, and a substantial and increasing part of the world's farm produce, comes from plants domesticated and developed by the pre-Columbian Indians, corn (maize), "Irish" potato, sweetpotato, tomato, pumpkin, squash, beans, popcorn, peanuts, etc. They also developed the pineapple, avocado and cotton and knew how to extract and use chocolate, quinine and rubber.

It is fiction that the Indian was addicted to tobacco, although he developed and cultivated the plant. The fact is that tobacco was only one of several aromatic leaves that he smoked, not habitually, but occasionally, as a token of friendship or in connection with the formal sealing of an agreement. The white man shakes hands on such occasions; the Indian smoked what is now generally called the "peace pipe."

The facts about the Indian's idea of the ownership of land have never been understood by the white man. In the thinking of the Indian as best expressed by Tecumseh, the Great Spirit gave the land, as he did air and water, to all in common and none of each could be sold by any individual or family; theirs was simply the right to the use of the land.

Thomas Yallup, Yakima Indian, in a speech made at Walla Walla on June 9, 1955, explained the Indian's attitude about the land in the following words:

"Our people did not see the land as the white people see it. The earth was the very life of the Indian. Long before there was record of time, the Indian looked upon the earth as a child looks upon its mother. His mother earth provided him with water to drink, food to eat, and clothing for his family and himself. These things born of the earth he cherished and when compelled to do so he fought for the earth."

In reply to the Government's offer to buy Nez Perce lands, Chief Joseph said:

"We have no right to sell this land for we do not own it. This land belongs to our forefathers and their forefathers whose bodies have become a part of it, and it belongs to our children and our children's children. We cannot sell it."

The Indian could occupy any tribal land not in use just so long as he used it. There

were no absentee landlords among the Indians and the soil was not abused. In this connection, I read you the prize-winning essay of a Cherokee youth as reported by the United Press. The boy, after being shown a picture of a delapidated house and a washed-out field wrote.

"Both pictures show white man crazy. Make big tepee. Plow much ground. Water wash. Wind blow. Soil, grass all gone. House rot down; no corn; no potatoes; no hay; no pony; no hog; no chickens. Squaw gone with papoose."

Indian no plow much ground. Keep grass. Cattle eat grass. Indian eat steer. Hide make tepee, moccasins too. Indian no make terrace; no make dam; no hunt job not hitch-hike. Great Spirit make water, also sunshine. Indian no waste anything. Indian no go on relief. White man heap crazy."

The American Indian was by nature a conservationist of the first order. He caught no more fish than he could use. He killed only for food and not as a sport, and even, in a little prayer, asked the pardon of the animal he killed. He believed that every form of life had been designed by the Great Spirit to play its own integral part in the overall scheme of things.

One of the most prevalent and unjust fictions about the Indian is the one that says he was a godless heathen. Charles Russell, one of the very few white men who really knew the soul of the Indian, wrote as follows:

"Nature taught her child
To read and write and spell;
And with her books before him
He reads his lesson well.

"He loves his mother earth
Where all her creatures trod;
Yet he is called a heathen
Who always lived with God."

The white man's attempt to force the Indian, willy-nilly, to accept the Christian religion puzzled him and his confusion is well expressed in the following excerpt from a speech by Red Jacket (Sa-go-ye-wat-ha), made in 1805 at a council of the chiefs of the Six Nations after a white missionary had addressed them. Directing his remarks to the missionary, he said:

"Brother, you say that you are sent to instruct us how to worship the Great Spirit and that if we do not take hold of the religion you white people teach we shall be unhappy hereafter. You say you are right and we are wrong. How do you know this to be true? Your religion is written in a book. We only know what you tell us about it. How shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people?

"Brother, you say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why not all agree, as you can all read the book?

"Brother, we do not understand these things. We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion which was given to our forefathers and has been handed down to us. We worship and serve in that way. It teaches us to be thankful for all the favors we receive, to love each other and to be united. We never quarrel about religion.

"Brother, we do not wish to destroy your religion or take it from you; we only want to enjoy our own."

The Indian had no concept of a hell or future punishment. He could not conceive of a Great Spirit who would, as the Creator of everything, create a devil god and permit this devil to punish him either here on in the after life. He believed that in committing a wrong against another person, one did not so much wrong that person as he wronged himself.

In connection with this matter of a hell, you will recall that one of the great divines of early Colonial days gave thanks to his God, following the massacre of the Pequots by his people, that "no less than 600 were brought down to hell that day" (Cotton Mather).

There was something, either in the very nature of the Indian or in his religion, possibly both, that, although he had no laws or penal institutions, operated in such a way that there was very little crime. On this fact, I quote Thomas Jefferson as follows:

"Crimes are very rare among the Indians, so much so that it is a question of whether no law, as among the Indians, or too much law as among civilized Europeans, submits man to the greatest evil. One who has seen both conditions of existence would pronounce it to be the latter."

Standards of conduct among the Indians were based upon nature's laws, which are moral laws. Force was seldom used to enforce conduct. Each person was his own judge. Misconduct hurt the wrongdoer and that hurt was his punishment. Deceit of any kind was the highest form of offense. Interesting evidence of this fact is that among the white children in this country to give one's word "honest Injun" is the most binding of oaths.

It is fiction that Thomas Paine or Jean Jacques Rousseau originated the basic concepts of our form of government. The fact is that the distinctive political ideals of American life were provided by the American Indian who, long before Columbus landed, had developed a social organization in which the community recognized the equality of men and respected their right to a diversity of opinion.

The North American Indian was a free man enjoying the rights and privileges of a true democracy during hundreds of years when Europeans lived abject lives in semistarvation, accepting crusts of bread and royal circuses in exchange for the surrender of their freedom.

Noting the confusion in Colonial governments, Conestago, Onondago chief, called the attention of the Colonial governors meeting at Lancaster, Pa., in 1744, to the fact that "our wise forefathers established unity and amity (by a confederation of tribes) and by your observing the same methods you will secure unity and strength."

Commenting on this matter, Benjamin Franklin, in addressing the Albany Congress, said:

"It would be a strange thing that these Indians should have been able to form a union that has existed for ages and yet that a like union should be impracticable for ten or a dozen English Colonies."

In connection with the foregoing, I quote in part from a recent address by Hon. Christian Herter, Governor of Massachusetts:

"In the realm of the science of government, the Indians are only today winning long overdue credit for establishing some advanced forms of union and compact. These they developed before contact was made with the great traditions of European civilization. It is significant that in 1954 we are observing the 200th anniversary of the adoption of Benjamin Franklin's plan of union by the Congress of Commissioners, which was attended by 7 of the 13 Colonies at Albany in 1754.

"None of the Colonies, indeed, ratified the plan, but this foundation stone was implemented 35 years later when, in 1787, Franklin had the satisfaction of helping to draft the Constitution of the United States of America. Significantly, Franklin drew the inspiration for the Albany Plan of Union from the Iroquoise Confederacy of the Five Nations, which included our own Mohawks.

"This confederacy, formed as far back as the middle of the 16th century, gave women the right to vote centuries before such enfranchisement was accepted by the American Republic, and it carried on functions which demonstrated the high state of intelligent living and understanding that the Indians possessed as a people. It would be well for all of us to examine more carefully the life, mores, and government of the red men who inhabited our Nation before our own ancestors came.

"The student of Indian life and lore is acutely aware of and impressed with the variety of his talents, the dignity of his life and attainments within the sphere of his wants and needs, and the propriety and equity of the laws by which he lived. The Indian's mark is, indeed, on our land, and indelibly so; and the significance of his pioneer contribution to the American way should not be lost upon us."

It is fiction that the Indians had kings or dictators. Their chiefs were servants of the members of the tribe, exercising only such powers as were delegated to them. A chief, by the way, owed his nomination to the women of the tribe and was chosen by the votes of both the men and women.

It is fiction that the family life of the American Indian was dominated by the man. The fact is that the ownership of property and the descent of name was vested in woman. She bore the children and they were hers in name and at her command, and not the father's, so long as she lived. It was the mother, and not the father, who could permit or forbid, as she chose, her son's going to war.

In connection with this comment, I quote from bulletin 30 of the Bureau of American Ethnology:

"The matrons had only to interpose their influence and authority to bring to naught the best conceived designs and enterprises leading to war."

Oh that the mothers of sons throughout what we call the civilized (?) world had such influence today.

Children of the American Indians were well behaved and obedient, although they were never touched by a punishing hand. Their fathers and mothers considered the white people brutal in treating their children like enemies that must be threatened and/or punished, or weak when they coddled them with gifts and/or promises. They believed that children so treated would grow up belligerent and subject to fits of uncontrolled anger or immature and dependent.

The increasing lawlessness and violence of non-Indian young people, often against their own fathers and mothers, unheard of among the American Indians, gives weight to the Indians belief in a discipline developed by setting an example rather than by the use of corporal punishment or gifts.

The American Indian way of life was praised and recommended to our people by Theodore Roosevelt after he had lived with the Indians for several years and attained the measure of health that made him one of our country's most vigorous and progressive Presidents. He called the Indian way of life the "simple life," and it is simple in the best sense of the word, because it is sensible.

In this way of life, no attempt was made to improve upon nature by refining and adulterating foods or damaging them by overcooking. The American Indian believed that the Great Spirit had created everything in its proper season, so he ate vegetables, fruits, grains and meats in their proper season, and he ate all of each that was edible. He dressed for the season and not for fashion. Me did not poison his loungs with habitual smoking nor convert either grain or fruit into deadly alcohol to dull his senses.

He lived always close to Mother Nature and recognized her laws, those impersonal, basic principles in which there is justice for all and hatred for none. He blamed no deity, no one but himself, when he made mistakes. He depended upon himself for his

livelihood and was quick to share food, clothing and shelter with others in their need.

He loved peace but would fight when necessary, just as he has voluntarily done for the country that has violated almost every treaty it ever made with him. He hated no one on account of race, creed, color or political ideas, and never killed or mistreated any man on any of these counts.

These are some of the facts that made the American Indian way of life a simple and sensible way of life. This country might have been a better and happier land if the white man had become American-Indianized instead of the Indian becoming partially Europeanized. Be that as it may, however, there is no disputing the fact that without the Indian's gifts to American agriculture and his contribution of the unique democratic tradition he had developed, we might not have become today the world's greatest and most prosperous nation.

Hail and honor the American Indian.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the upper Colorado River storage project are attempting to create in the minds of the public the conception that, since they have withdrawn the controversial features dealing with the invasion of our national parks and monuments, all opposition to this bill has now ceased.

The public has not been lulled into any false sense of security by this action. They still realize that this project will only directly benefit the 4 States involved, and the burden to pay for the cost of the project will fall on the remaining 44 States.

This awareness of the public is very well expressed in an editorial of the Sentinel, a newspaper published in Carlisle, Pa.

The editorial follows:

[From the Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel of January 10, 1956]

COLORADO PROJECT A NIGHTMARE

One of the matters before Congress for consideration is the gigantic upper Colorado River project. As Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, puts it, this irrigation project which the Bureau of Reclamation under the Eisenhower administration is asking Congress to approve is the most expensive and unsound scheme yet devised. Although it would be a windfall to private power interests, the project would bring into production only half a million acres in high, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico, while a survey soon to be submitted to Congress shows that 21 million acres of fine farm lands are now lying idle in 19 eastern, southern, and midwestern States.

Yet despite the fact that there are at least 21 million acres awaiting the plow in areas where rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, the Bureau would force the burden of the upper Colorado project on the American taxpayers.

In addition to the best acreage now lying idle, there are millions of acres in lower soil classes and in other States that are idle in the humid area of the Nation. Much of this lower class land could be improved with little cost and developed into pasture.

These idle acres lie close to markets, population centers, transportation, schools, and established municipal governments. The upper Colorado project has none of these advantages and it would cost extra billions to provide them.

The Reclamation Bureau has been attempting to sell the idea that projects such as the upper Colorado must be developed, at tremendous cost, to provide food and fiber for our growing population. That is a false claim if there ever was one. Even on the present producing farm lands such huge amount of food and fiber are grown that the demand is not great enough and adequate storage space is unavailable. Despite the plans of the Eisenhower administration for reducing this output and increasing the farmers' income and purchasing dollar we have, this year, and will have again next year in all probability, enormous new surpluses and record yields. Still the Reclamation Bureau would have Congress appropriate billions of dollars on unnecessary and wasteful projects as the upper Colorado Basin. The Colorado project would cost $4 billion alone. The 4 States which would benefit would pay less than 2 percent of the cost. The cost of bringing the millions of acres of good land into full production would run from $15 to $150. Building the upper Colorado project would cost the taxpayers $5,000 an acre. As Representative HOSMER says, the project would be economic idiocy.

Too, it must not be forgotten that the project would be an invasion of what is now a great national park, that much of the national beauty in the area set aside years ago for a park would be desecrated for the sake of private interests and votes. In the face of the so-called farm program the President has submitted to Congress, which program proves that we have more production than demand, that the situation is extremely serious even with the lesser number of acres of farm lands under cultivation today, and that more acreage, according to the program, should be taken out of production, to be paid for in surpluses or cash—whichever the farmers desire—even mention of cultivation of the upper Colorado area borders on fantasy.

Freedom of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-American Council of Jurists is a technical agency of the Organization of American States which meets every 2 years to study the technical aspects of international law as they affect the relations among the republics of this hemisphere.

On the agenda of its meeting concluded earlier this month at Mexico City, the Council of Jurists had the item "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions: Preparatory Study for the Specialized Inter-American Conference Provided for in Resolution LXXXIV of the Caracas Conference."

The Council did not make such a study. Instead a resolution on the subject had been drafted in secrecy by a number of delegates which covered not only legal, but economic, political, and scientific subjects with which the delegates at this technical conference were not competent to deal. This resolution was drafted in such a manner as to appeal to the narrow, nationalistic feelings of the delegates. It was then railroaded through without study or debate over the opposition of the United States without giving the delegate from this country opportunity to have his points of opposition discussed.

Among the provisions of the resolution which was thus adopted were these:

1. The distance of 3 miles as the limit of territorial waters is insufficient, and does not constitute a rule of general international law. Therefore, the enlargement of the zone of the sea traditionally called territorial waters is justifiable.

2. Each State is competent to establish its territorial waters within reasonable limits, taking into account geographical, geological, and biological factors, as well as the economic needs of its population, and its security and defense.

Among the nations who sponsored this resolution are three who have already made individual claims to a minimum distance of sovereignty extending 200 marine miles from their coasts. Another has already made claim to sovereignty over a belt of sea which at some points extends as much as 500 miles from its coast. This is what they mean by the word "reasonable."

Such extensions of sovereignty into the high seas by individual countries simply cannot be accepted by the community of nations. The high seas are not free for common use by mankind because of the selfish aspirations of the big maritime nations. They are free for such use because this is a requirement of our civilization. These seas and the air spaces above them carry the commerce of the world. Raw material comes to manufacturers along these highways, manufactured goods radiate out of these avenues from factories to users; and food travels them from the harvester to the consumer.

Many of these highways of the sea, which are so vital to this world's ability to feed, clothe, and house its thronging billions, come close to land either where island and mainlands concentrate them or where lee shores give protection to seafarers from local storm areas. For instance all avenues of normal approach to the Pacific Ocean from the Indian and Atlantic Oceans skirt near to some point of land.

It is not compatible with the needs of nations that individual countries can, at their will, extend their sovereign territory out over these lanes of free passage. It does not matter what protestations are made by such sovereign country that free passage through this territory will be guaranteed by it to all other countries, because whatever rights a sovereign can grant for passage through its territory it can later modify or withdraw. This is a far different matter than existing international law which permits every sovereign to use these vital traffic lanes of its own free right without asking or being granted that right by another.

The objectives of security, defense, and conservation of resources which these

countries seek are sought equally avidly by the United States and the other maritime countries. They can be attained by international cooperation through means now under study in the United Nations without possible disruption of the world's commerce and, in fact, its defenses.

The United States, which has had thrust upon it such a heavy burden of responsibility for defending and aiding the smaller nations of the free world, cannot adequately fulfill those responsibilities if its ability to do so is restricted by great broadenings of the territorial area of nations into the high seas.

These overwhelming aspects of the problem obviously were not given consideration by the delegates at Mexico City who were technically trained juridical personages. As the United States delegate said in recording the contrary vote of this country:

In addition, the United States delegation wishes to record the fact that when the resolution, in the drafting of which the United States had no part, was submitted to committee I, despite fundamental considerations raised by the United States and other delegations against the resolution, there was no discussion of those considerations at the one and only session of the committee held to debate the document.

Mr. Speaker, the Organization of American States serves a most useful function in providing a forum where the republics of this hemisphere can study, debate, and work out problems of common concern. But when technical bodies of that organization pass resolutions on such fundamental and basic subjects without study and in such a glib, lighthearted matter it shakes faith in the whole organization. We sincerely hope that the parent Organization of American States will take much more serious consideration of this matter before it proceeds to further action on it.

France's Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "France's Government," which appeared in the February 13, 1956, issue of the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FRANCE'S GOVERNMENT

The perennial French pessimists, whose gloom has been well nourished by postwar events, predict an early demise for the new government of France. They may be right. Perhaps only great exercise of skill by the new Socialist Premier, Guy Mollet, can prolong this regime beyond a few months.

It rests on a very shaky base. Though Mollet was invested as Premier by a 420 to 71 vote of the French Assembly, the actual strength of his left-of-center governing coalition comes to just about 170 votes.

This means that every time a major domestic or foreign issue comes before the Assembly, Mollet will have to fabricate a new majority for that specific purpose. If in any given instance he cannot do it, his regime will fall.

Mollet won the premiership so handily because he was able to corral the support of 140 Communists and many center-right moderates who actively oppose much of his specific program for France. He managed to achieve this without bringing representatives of either group into the government, and without making any commitments to them.

Why did they back him at this stage?

Logically, the center-right group, including many who formed the previous government of Edgar Faure, should fit into a powerful coalition of moderates. But Mollet and his close associate, Pierre Mendes-France, outraged this wing by refusing coalition on any but their own terms.

The center-right group is cool to the Mollet program of domestic reform. But many members feared failure to support Mollet would force him to deal directly with the Communists, leading possibly to a popular front regime having Red representatives. They saw support of Mollet now as a lesser evil.

As for the Communists, they envision their backing of the Socialist leaders as the first step toward a new popular front on the model which governed France in the late 1930's. The Reds think divisions in the moderate ranks are sufficiently deep so that soon one or the other of the center groups will have to draw the Communists into the government in order to rule at all.

The Communists helped put Mollet in but they will not vote for much of his program—except perhaps some domestic reform measures. The center-rightists also helped, yet they are likely to stand with him only on his NATO-oriented foreign policy.

The curious manner in which Mollet gained support for his premiership only underlines the basic tragedy of France. Together the left and right moderates are the country's most powerful political force. But they will not get together. In their separation, they stand in peril. And the Communists prepare to benefit.

Address by James G. Patton, President of the National Farmers Union at the Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the speakers at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis last month was James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union.

I know my colleagues will be interested in the remarks made by this distinguished leader of a great American farm organization, an organization that has been in the vanguard of those sponsoring multipurpose development of our water resources.

Mr. Patton's speech follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES G. PATTON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, AT ST. LOUIS, MO., JANUARY 25, 1956

I am both honored and pleased to be invited to speak before this great convention of the rural electric cooperatives of America.

Your organization is performing a tremendously valuable and necessary service for rural people. It is perfectly logical, perfectly natural, perfectly commonsense, for the Farmers Union to support your efforts to protect and advance the progress of rural electrification. The Farmers Union is a farmers' farm organization. We are unalterably committed, both by the convictions of our leaders and the mandate of more than 300,000 farm families in our membership, to fight for the interests of farm people. Rural electric cooperatives are very close to the top of what we consider most important to the welfare of farmers. I pledge you, here and now, that the Farmers Union will never fail to back you up to the full extent of our power in your fight to advance the cause of rural electrification.

I would not dwell upon this except for the amazing fact—which many of us have come unhappily to recognize in recent years—that you cannot take it for granted that all who purport to speak for organized farmers will support you in your fight for the welfare of rural people. I don't want to leave any question in your minds about where I stand—and where the Farmers Union stands. We are behind you all the way.

I am particularly pleased to be here with my good friend, Clyde Ellis. Clyde and I have been friends since he came to Congress from Arkansas a good many years ago. He has done, and is doing, a tremendously valuable and important job in Washington for the REA co-ops of this country. The National Farmers Union recognized the contribution Clyde Ellis was making by giving him our award for outstanding service to agriculture a few years ago. That was during the period shortly after World War II when, in the space of a few years, the rural electric cooperatives accomplished the prodigious task of bringing electricity to about half of this Nation's farmers. Never before nor since has anything of comparable scale been done in so short a time to advance the material well-being of farmers.

The rural electrification movement is faced with even greater difficulties today. At the same time, the tasks that remain to be done in the field of rural electrification and farm electrification are of even greater scale than the impossible job of connecting America's farms to powerlines that you accomplished yesterday.

The present difficulties of rural electrification are compounded by the tragic and unnecessary collapse of farm income that has taken place in the last few years. This, in fact, is the overriding problem of agriculture at this time.

The most pressing immediate concern of National Farmers Union is to reverse the disastrous depression that has been inflicted upon farm people. It is the most basic problem facing rural electrification too. Farmers simply can't pay their power bills if they don't have incomes. Nor can they invest in the marvelous new electrically powered farm equipment that is already coming into the showrooms—and which every farmer will need in order to compete and to earn an American standard of living as soon as tomorrow.

The depression in agriculture is shattering the very foundations of our rural communities. It is liquidating farm homes by the hundreds of thousands. It is undermining the economic foundations of rural churches, rural schools, rural business. If it is permitted to proceed on this rapid course to its inevitable end, rural life in America will be

drastically altered. The implications are drastic and dangerous for all rural enterprise, REA co-ops among them.

The Farmers Union is fighting back against this planned and deliberate depression in agriculture. To be perfectly plain and blunt, we don't agree that farmers ought to be singled out from all other groups in our economy for the depression treatment.

There is a remarkable uniformity in the pattern of the attacks that are being made these days against the welfare of farmers.

Your enemies don't argue against the merits of your efforts to obtain low-cost electricity for rural people. They don't say that a private utility monopoly will give you and the public more service and more satisfaction for your money—because it is easy to prove that is not true. Instead, they try to make you ashamed of being in business for yourselves. They call it "creeping socialism."

The people who are fighting against the principle of public responsibility to help farmers get a fair share of the national income don't argue the merits of that question either. They don't come right out and say that farmers ought to be satisfied with a few cents an hour for their labor, and little or no return on their investment. That's exactly what their agricultural policies have led to. But they know that, if they base their argument on the facts in the case, they simply won't make headway.

Instead, the opponents of Government farm programs try to make farmers ashamed of using their own Government to help themselves get their fair share out of the Nation's productivity and prosperity. They call our farm programs, also, "creeping socialism." They say that farm programs, the kind that can and will do the job of getting a fair share for the farmers, will destroy character.

This is not legitimate public debate. This is nothing more or less than brainwashing. This is an attempt to make the farmers ashamed of standing up and fighting for their rights.

I can tell you right now that the Farmers Union is made up of farmers who aren't going to sit back and relax and let a bunch of slick hucksters brainwash them into turning their pockets inside out.

I am not in the least ashamed of admitting I believe farmers are entitled to 100 percent of a fair parity price for the product of their labor and their capital.

I am not ashamed either that I have learned the plain and clear lesson of history, that farmers will never get a fair parity return out of the so-called free market.

I am not at all bashful about telling you, and the rest of the world, that I think farmers are entitled to whatever help they need from their own Government to civilize this so-called free market, to make it work justice for all the people including farmers, instead of inflicting chronic depressions upon the farmers between wars and national emergencies.

I have not noticed any of the so-called business-managed electric utilities hurrying into the United States Treasury to hand back the billions of dollars in tax subsidies that have been granted to them in the last few years. Since the Korean war, the private utilities have received tax subsidy benefits worth $4 billion—which the Federal Power Commission says they don't have to pass on to their customers, nor return in any way to the public.

That's $4 billion worth of subsidy benefits received in just 5 years, mind you. This makes the $2½ billion or so that has been loaned at interest to the REA co-ops of this country in 21 years look like a piker. This makes the $2½ billion invested in Federal power projects during the past 50 years look puny indeed.

No, there is a completely different standard applied to subsidies, outright grants, tax favors, and other forms of help from the United States Government, when it is passed out to a few big corporations, than when it is invested in projects and programs that help ordinary people directly.

It is high time we country people come to our senses. It is high time we start looking at the facts, and quit letting a bunch of hired hucksters browbeat us with a few well-chosen slanders.

We paid with the lives of more than 250 American citizens in 1955 alone for the wanton luxury of satisfying the profit utility lobby's crusade against "creeping socialism." We paid about $1 billion in property destroyed by the deadly floods of New England last summer and the Pacific coast this winter, to boot. Practically all of this flood damage would have been prevented if projects that are already planned had been built, instead of shoved into Washington, D. C. pigeonholes.

We know that we can build dams that will prevent floods, at a fraction of the cost of replacing the property that will be destroyed by the floods which we can predict with certainty to come sooner or later. We know that those dams can produce cheap and abundant electricity, which can be sold at low rates to light our farms and homes, to energize new factories that create new jobs and make whole regions flower in a new level of prosperity. We know we can do these things—and make them pay for themselves. We know also that if wo don't do them, we will sooner or later pay for our neglect with our lives and our property.

If it is "creeping socialism" to protect the lives and the property of our people who live and work in the valleys, then I say it is to our everlasting shame we didn't lay on the lash and make it gallop.

Not a single new multipurpose dam has been started since the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953. Projects which had been recommended for immediate starts, and which could have been completed in time to save some of the people who drowned in the floods last year, were withdrawn from consideration when the Eisenhower administration was inaugurated.

That action was not taken without full consciousness that it would cost lives. Floods are predictable. They have been predicted. The only unknown is the time nature will choose to send them. All sensible men know that, sooner or later, floods will come—just as they have come in the past. The responsible officials in the Eisenhower administration knew the floods would come.

Yet the Eisenhower administration chose the more costly and more wasteful course of leaving the rivers uncontrolled.

Let's consider some of the other fruits of this choice by the Eisenhower administration.

We are not to get the full benefits from our great rivers. The administration is giving up our remaining dam sites to private utilities for fractional development of their potentialities.

Instead of Hells Canyon, if the administration's pro-utility power officials get their way, we will get 1, or 2, or 3, little run-of-the-river dams with just one-quarter as much flood control and storage capacity. We will get power costing twice as much, and much less of it. Farmers of the West will get no opportunity to develop the low-cost phosphate fertilizer that is indispensable to the future prosperity and productivity of our agriculture.

And on top of this, the taxpayers will pay the bill. Idaho Power Co. is asking for a tax subsidy for two of its little "spite dams." This is described by the Federal Power Commission as an interest-free loan from the taxpayers. The benefits of this tax subsidy to Idaho Power Co. will amount to more than it would cost the Government to build the whole high dam project in Hells Canyon. This is the perfect example of the "partnership" policy in which the taxpayers and consumers pay the costs and take the risks, and the Wall Street-owned utility interests pocket the benefits.

The public will pay heavy subsidies to the private utilities for inadequate utilization of our waterpower resources, with too little and too late protection against devastating floods. We will get less power, and we will have to pay higher rates on top of the cost of our subsidies to the utilities.

When measured against what we ought to do, the joint proposals of the private utility lobby and the Eisenhower administration are nothing less than a tragic sellout of our national future.

Our future needs for electricity in this country are simply staggering. Our power supply must be doubled every 10 years. By 1960, we will need to add half again as much as all the generating capacity now installed. By 1965, we will need to add as much new power generating capacity as the total we have presently installed.

These estimates are made by the Federal Power Commission. They are responsible, conservative figures. They are the basis on which our Government grants billions of dollars in tax subsidies to private utility companies. That ought to make them perfectly respectable estimates.

Think of it. In the next 10 years, we have got to build as much new electric generating capacity as everything we have in this country right now.

I can tell you we'll have to hustle to keep up with this demand for new powerplants. We are not doing it now. Our economy is being retarded by failure to do it. Most of you REA co-op people know the stupendous requirements you face to keep abreast of your members' demands for electricity.

Now I hope you will forgive me for a moment if I digress to talk about a matter of particular concern to me as a citizen of Colorado. There has been a great deal of talk recently about a shotgun wedding that took place out in western Colorado. I don't think the full truth about the Colorado–Ute power project has been made known to many of you, nor that we have heard the last of it yet by any means.

It is a very serious thing—serious to the whole national REA movement—that we have an Administration in power which has forced a lease-operation deal with a big private electric company onto the Colorado–Ute REA co-op—when the essential facts about what it will cost the cooperative and its farmer-members was withheld from the board of directors. The essential facts in the whole economics of this deal are contained in REA's official power study on the project. This official REA power study reveals that the lease-operation deal will cost $111,500 more in the next 8 years than it would cost for the co-op to operate independently. This is the information that REA withheld from the cooperative. In my opinion, this Colorado–Ute experience has grave implications far beyond western Colorado. It seems to me that the pattern that is demonstrated here has very grave implications for the future of our whole cooperative generation and transmission program—and you know better than I do that if we hadn't had our own cooperative wholesale power yardstick we never would have gotten electricity out to the farms in many, many parts of the country.

Now, let's get back to the overall picture of our nation-wide needs for electricity in our immediate future.

We've already learned that the private utilities won't do the job on their own—and we've had to hand out subsidies at a staggering rate to induce them to stay in the picture at all.

It's high time the people of this country began to exercise some of their proprietary responsibilities to see to it that the needs

of this country are met—in full, in time, and in an effcient, orderly, and economical way.

We have some of the best engineering minds in the world here in the United States. There is no reason why we, of all nations, should lag behind in any field of development—yet that is exactly what is happening in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The big utility companies, which are linked directly through their common origins in Wall Street to the big manufacturing companies that have been permitted and subsidized in the process to get a monopoly on atomic know-how, are holding back the use of atomic power for generating electricity.

Contrast what the atomic energy monopolists are doing for the people of this country with what other countries are doing for their people in the field of atom-electric generation. The Soviet Union has announced it plans to install, in the next 5 years, atom-electric plants with capacity equal to half of all the Bureau of Reclamation hydro now existing in our Pacific Northwest. Great Britain is already building atom-electric powerplants to supply a big chunk of its future power requirements. Even the smaller countries of Europe are moving ahead right now to put atom-electric power into a major place in their new powerplant construction.

Why should the United States, which pioneered atomic energy in the first place, be content to sit back and fall behind in developing useful harnesses for this revolutionary new source of power? I'll tell you why we are falling behind. Simply because we are letting the age-old policy of the private electric monopoly—scarcity and high prices—dictate this Nation's power policy. We are back to the same old situation that existed 21 years ago—when the farmers of this country were far behind those of every other civilized nation in rural electrification, when our farmers still were sitting in the dark while most of the farms in Europe, and even in the Canadian province of Ontario, already had electricity.

Leland Olds, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, has revealed that most of the REA co-ops in the country could save money on their wholesale power if they could get atom-electric power.

Address by James G. Patton, President of the National Farmers Union, at the Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, there follows part II of an address by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, delivered at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis last month:

American companies, ironically, are taking a leading part in building atom-electric plants for other countries. General Electric Corp. just a few weeks ago announced it is building an atom-electric powerplant for Japan which will make electricity at low rates.

The American atom power monopoly—whose know-how was bought and paid for at the cost of billions of United States taxpayers' dollars—has put the label, "For export only," on the immediate peaceful benefits of the atom.

If we let private monopoly make the decision for us, American manufacturers will peddle our atomic know-how all over the world, while we sit here in the United States just like farmers sat in the dark up to 20 years ago, victimized by the scarcity and high price policy of the unreformed, unashamed, unreconstructed private electric utility monopoly.

We in the nonprofit power movement have been on the defensive too long. We have fought to save each dam, and each transmission line, and each REA generation and transmission project. But at best we only stay where we were a few years ago. And every time we lose a fight, we get pushed that far backwards. Now we have an administration that denounces the public power laws on the statute books, and calls them creeping socialism—despite the fact that they have raised their right hands and sworn to uphold those laws.

I am convinced we have got to start fighting to advance what we believe in. If we don't, not only will we fail to go ahead—we will see our nonprofit power programs squeezed into impotence and uselessness.

Let's take a look at the resources we have under our feet here in this great section of the country westward of the Mississippi River. Let's try to visualize what we could build here in the West, if we took advantage of every opportunity to develop fully every resource that we have, and to do it in the most orderly and efficient manner possible, to get the greatest possible benefits for the people, at the lowest possible cost to the people.

A splendid beginning on this kind of inventory of the people's resources has already been made. The Bureau of Reclamation published a prospectus of a Giant Power Plan for the West 3 years ago. It has been gathering dust ever since. We need to dust it off and take a fresh look at it. This far-seeing study should give everyone of us a new inspiration about what we are fighting for, and a renewed vision of where we can go from here—if we will only remember that the people are the boss in this country and decide to do it.

First of all, the hydro power potentialities of the 22 States west of the Mississippi River have barely been touched. We have put a harness on only one-fifth of the total stream runoff in this region. It is possible to develop that much more—and to do it on a paying, economical, self-liquidating basis.

We should not lose another month without starting to hitch up these remaining water power resources whose energy is now wasting itself into the sea, without benefit to anyone.

Even this great remaining hydroelectric resource would only scratch the surface as far as meeting our real needs for electricity.

We need to hitch atomic energy onto the tremendous load that needs to be pulled to do the work of this region—and other regions of the country too. I am just as sure as I am of anything, that the private utility monopoly is just as wrong today in saying that atom-electric power "can't be done" as they were 20 years ago in saying that the farms of this country could not be electrified.

Even with low-cost atomic energy, we can and we must hitch up our great fuel resources in our power team too. There are three giant coal and lignite fields in the West. One is in the Colorado-Utah-Wyoming Rocky Mountain area. Another is in the Dakotas and Montana. The third is in the Iowa-Missouri-Arkansas area. These tremendous energy sources should be harnessed to work in a team with hydro and atomic power to work for the people of the West and the Nation. They can, and they should without delay, be harnessed to generate low-cost electricity.

Hydro power and fuel-generated power fit together like cogs in the precision gears of high-powered machines. When hydro and steam-generated power are worked together as a team, the result is more useable power, at lower average cost, than if they are hitched up separately.

Hydro power and steam-generated power resources of the entire West should be harnessed together with high-voltage, long-distance transmission lines, to pull the greatest possible load for the lowest possible cost for the people. That would give your REA co-ops a chance to tie your systems to a new, vast source of low-cost wholesale power that you must have to meet the future needs of farmers.

There is another reason for high-voltage, long-distance transmission. The giant coal fields of the West are located great distances from the big industrial and population centers of the West. These big industrial and population centers, where vast quantities of low-cost electricity are needed, are located in the Twin Cities area, the Pacific Northwest, on the California coast, and on the gulf coast of Texas.

These big population centers lie on the fringers of a vast, 22-State western empire, with both giant hydroelectric sites and giant coal energy sites within the big circle that they form.

The "giant power plan" calls for using high-voltage, long-distance transmission lines for hauling enormous quantities of energy out of the center of the Western Empire to the industries on its edges. That is a mammoth undertaking. It would be tremendously more costly, however, to attempt to haul the needed energy in the form of coal over a vastly-expanded railway system. Our engineering experts tell us that the energy from a ton of coal can be hauled from North Dakota to Minneapolis much more cheaply in the form of electricity, over high-voltage transmission lines, than on the most efficient railroad ever built.

Transmission lines adequate for doing this job, for harnessing together the steam-generated energy of these three midcontinental coal fields with the big hydroplants of the river systems and atom-electric powerplants located in the most feasible sites, would have to be much longer than any in use today anywhere in the world. Power would have to be transmitted for distances of up to 700 miles. The giant basic powerplants in the coal fields, and the biggest hydroelectric dams, would all have to be tied together.

This giant power plan would require voltages much higher than anything in use today in this country—at least half a million volts, twice as high as the highest voltage in use by utilities in this country today.

The longest distance transmission in use in the country today is only 300 miles, less than half as far as the 700 miles that would be needed for a giant power project for the West.

But the Swedes right now have a transmission line in use that is 600 miles long, from their big hydroelectric plants north of the Arctic Circle to the centers of Swedish industry and population in the south. They are transmitting electricity at voltages approximating the half-million volts needed for a giant power system to serve the west. We can do what Sweden has already done to make the giant power plan a reality.

You may wonder why a farm leader should be telling a group of farmers about a plan for hauling fabulous blocks of energy out of the mountains and prairies of the West to the big cities on the coasts. This giant

power plan means two great things for the future of agriculture in this region.

If almost undreamed-of quantities of electric energy were made available to western industrial and population centers, at rock-bottom prices such as would be possible under the giant power plan, it would start a tremendous boom of economic expansion.

It would open up literally millions of new jobs in the space of a few years. It would result in great population growth not only in existing industrial centers, but throughout the West. There are huge stores of rich mineral and chemical resources in our mountains and prairies, waiting only for low-cost electricity to unfold into new and flourishing industrial developments.

That means new markets for the farmers of the West. It means market for farm products that we don't even bother to produce in quantity now, for dairy products, fresh fruits and vegetables, poultry and eggs.

In short, it will give western farmers profitable local markets for their products for the first time in history.

This giant power plan has real meaning for our own farming operations, too.

We have all heard time and time again that the surface of rural electrification has barely been scratched. I don't think that any of us really grasps what the potentialities of the use of electricity in agriculture might be.

But scientists talk about using electricity to warm up the soil of entire farms, so that crops can be started earlier to take advantage of spring rainfall and sunshine.

They talk about using electricity for killing weed seeds electronically, field by field, before the crops are planted.

They talk about electric-powered tractors. You'll back them into the shed at night to get their storage batteries charged off the high line, and run them all the next day at a small fraction of the cost of petroleum-fueled tractors.

They even talk about some day being able to transmit electricity in tremendous surges of power directly to the moving tractor in the field—not over wires, but by wireless. You'd just tune in your radio on the power-plant, and take off. The United States Navy is engaged in research on wireless transmission of power right now.

This sounds fantastic, I know. But up to only 10 years ago, probably not a single one of us would have believed that it would be possible to propel a huge submarine under the Atlantic ocean on a few pounds of fuel. With atomic energy, that is a reality today.

I do not believe we are in any danger of overestimating our possibilities. On the contrary, I think we will find that our imaginations are falling far short of what the real potentials for the future are. We have got to look far, far beyond the narrow limitations of the present in order to visualize the opportunities that lie ahead. Our real danger is not that we will dream too much, but that we will cheat the generations ahead of us because we did not dream enough.

When you count the potentialities of atomic energy, and the new, even more terrible and more wonderful potentialities of thermo nuclear fusion, the process that we know as the hydrogen bomb, the strain on our abilities to dream enough is beyond the capacity of most human minds.

It is thought not inconceivable that some day we will learn how to transmit electrical energy directly out of atomic energy, instead of using the present roundabout method of having the atomic reactor boil water to create stem to turn a regular turbine.

If ever that day should come, and I believe we should be prepared to see it, or to have our children see it, then energy will become as free as the water in a modern city. Consumers simply will pay an assessment to cover the cost of installing and maintaining the electrical facilities needed to serve them, and will be able to use all the electrical energy they want without further charge.

Mankind already has learned how to create energy on that scale. The hydrogen bomb that was exploded in the middle of the Pacific a few years ago completely burned up a fairly good-sized island, sand and rock and all, so that the sea closed over it and it is gone. Possibly man can never harness such terrible fury as thermonuclear fusion, to make it do our work, but that is the challenge laid on our doorstep in this atomic age.

I have talked about the West, because I am from the West, and I know it better. Also, other sections of the country have not had the benefit of resource planning on the scale that has been done for the 22 States of the Bureau of Reclamation area.

But there is no doubt in the least that equally great achievements can be planned for the South, and for the Northeast, and for the Midwest. We can put an end to death-dealing floods in New England. We can give that great region, with its marvelous resources of skilled people, the cheap electric power that it needs to halt and reverse the economic decline that now afflicts it. We can revitalize the South, creating new employment opportunities at a high standard of living for its populations, utilizing its many natural resources that now lie fallow. We can further enrich the agriculture and industry of the Midwest by introducing the cheap and abundant energy our technical skill can provide for us tomorrow if only we have the vision and the imagination to raise our hands to the task.

To whom shall we entrust the grave decisions that will determine the shape of our future? Will we leave those decisions to the short-sighted private utility monopoly, which always has demonstrated a policy of scarcity, restricted use, and high prices? Or shall the basic decisions on electric power policy, the basic decisions as to whether this Nation can grow to its full potentialities—be made by the people of this country?

For my part, I have only to recall recent history to find the answer. The private electric companies of this country decided, up to 20 years ago, that farmers could not have electricity. They did not change their minds 20 years ago. The decision was taken out of their hands, and the people of this country decided that farmers would get electricity whether the utilities wanted them to have it or not.

That exercise of their sovereignty by the people has not resulted in socialism. It has not even hurt the utilities. On the contrary, the private power companies are far, far better off today than they ever were before. They prospered more during the height of the "creeping socialism" of a few years ago than ever before in their history.

In the same way, the people must exercise again their sovereign right to decide whether this Nation will grow to its full dimensions of productivity and prosperity.

That decision must mean more Federal and cooperative power, not less. It must mean bigger public power, not smaller. It must mean more effective public influence on rates and expansion policies, not the destruction of the yardsticks that have been constructed in the past generation.

There is plenty of room within a giant power plan in the West, and in other regions, for the private utilities, so long as they fit their policies and their practices to the needs of the people.

But the big decisions must be made, the broad outlines must be drawn, by the people, and for the people.

No one less than the people, no one smaller than all the citizens of this country, should be left with such enormous power over the lives and the futures of our children.

Lithuania's Fortitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa., published on February 16:

LITHUANIA'S FORTITUDE

In the hearts and minds of many thousands of area residents, February 16 is a date regarded with special significance.

It marks the 38th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent country. Unfortunately, what should be an occasion of joyous celebration, comparable to our own Fourth of July, in reality is one of painful and sorrowing recollection. This unhappy condition has existed for almost 16 years.

Because of the ruthless bondage into which it was forced by the armed might of Soviet Russia June 14, 1941, an evil violation of treaty, Lithuania dare not publicly refer to those golden years when liberty and democracy flourished throughout this Baltic country. Her enslaved people, however, secretly commemorate the day. They nurture their hopes for eventual release from the Communist shackles.

History has shown repeatedly that tyrants cannot vanquish the will and spirit of a courageous people who treasure their former liberties, endure long years of misery, and hope and pray for release. This is the situation in Lithuania; her brave sons and daughters continue to display remarkable fortitude in the face of incredible oppression.

Under a puppet government which executes orders from Moscow exactly to the letter, the country is known in Communist circles as the Lithuanian Soviet Socialistic Republic. Latvia and Estonia suffered a similar fate. The United States Government and many of its allies have never officially recognized Lithuania's changed status. The Soviet's wanton aggression has been condemned in many of our state papers and by our last three Presidents.

To relate a bit of history, Lithuania's territories stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea as early as the 15th century. But in 1795 she became a victim of Russian aggression. Time and again, the people waged futile struggles to regain independence until, finally, in 1918, it was reborn as a democratic and independent power.

In 1939 another dark period of national history came to pass in the form of Russo-German aggression. The Red invasion in 1940 was followed a year later by a program of mass annihilation. A brief revolt in June 1941, restored independence for a few days, but the invading Nazi war machine was impossible to resist. The tide turned against Hitler during the summer offensive of 1944, and Communist forces reoccupied Lithuania.

The ensuing program of cruelty and terror, which the Reds label "Soviet social engineering," is difficult to imagine. Firing squads have accounted for a vast segment of Lithuania's population. Men, women, and children have been thrown into Red slave-labor camps in the frozen wastes of Siberia. Since the Red wave of terror, it is estimated that the country's population has been reduced from over 3 million to almost half that number. These victims have been replaced to a large extent by Russian "imports," many of whom undoubtedly were loathe to leave

their own land, others hoping to profit by the change.

Have the Reds ever attempted to justify this rape of an innocent country? Indeed, they have the audacity to affirm that the Lithuanian people "voted" to join the Soviet Union. The rest of the world, though, recognizes the fate of Lithuania and its neighbors as sheer barbarity. The tragic record of these atrocities is impossible to ignore. This crime against humanity represents an abomination.

Meanwhile, the anti-Soviet underground in Lithuania strikes whenever it can. Major handicap is lack of arms and supplies, yet the resistance has never ceased. Nightly forays are carried on in country districts. Now and then some of the patriots are captured and summarily executed.

Americans of Lithuanian descent—and they number in the millions—along with a host of friends and well-wishers voice deep sympathy today for the enslaved people of Lithuania. Hope and encouragement are extended to bear up under the sufferings until the Communist yoke is thrown off and precious independence finally restored.

Statement by Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, to the House Committee on the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of our colleagues to the following statement which I presented on Febraury 6, 1956, to the House Committee on the Judiciary during its hearings on bills relating to the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of United States justices and judges:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am appreciative of the opportunity to present my views concerning the bills before you, which would amend Chapter 17 of Title 28 of the United States to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of United States justices and judges.

It is a matter of public record that in recent years experienced judges have resigned, and at the same time able candidates have debarred themselves from judicial ranks, only because they could envision no security for their families by accepting appointment to the Federal judiciary.

I have been advocating annuities or pensions for members of our judiciary for some years past. I am unable to dismiss from my mind the remarks made a few years ago by one of our judges during the course of giving testimony before another subcommittee of this committee. In describing the sad plight of judges' widows, he remarked that in order to earn a bare livelihood the widow of a former United States judge had been working in the clerk's office. She was then close to 90 years of age.

It is my recollection that in past years the objection to proposed legislation of a similar nature was on the ground that judges should contribute to the cost of an annuity program for their families. It is my information that there is no objection among the judiciary to contributing to the cost of an annuity system.

It is an acknowledged truism that one cannot expect the fullest professional enthusiasm or zeal from a man who can have no hope of security for his family after his death. I am not talking about the conscientious performance of duties, but I refer to that zest by which the brilliancy of man can spark if free from economic worries for the future.

How sad but true is the implication that results by metaphorically applying to this situation the legal maxim: the law provides for the future and the judge for the past, lex de futuro, judex de praeterito—judges are not able to plan for their future because they are already too worried about how to resolve the economic obligations of their unprosperous judicial past.

I urge the enactment of a bill that will set up a fair annuity system for our judges' dependents.

The New Aid Client

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, how utterly silly the foreign policy—if it can be called that—of the United States must appear to what is left of the Asiatic world that has not fallen behind the Iron Curtain.

An editorial in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of the date of February 14, 1956, tells the story. Read the following and weep:

Five years ago, in the midst of the Korean war, the Government of Ceylon announced that it would ignore the Anglo-American embargo on war goods to Red China.

Ceylon did just that. She deliberately arranged to send rubber, which was Red China's crucial need at the time. No one knows how many Red Chinese trucks and bomber planes went to war against the United States equipped with Ceylonese rubber.

Three years ago Columnist David Lawrence wrote a bitter piece saying that no diplomats from Ceylon should be allowed in Washington so long as that country aided Red China. And the then-new Dulles regime in the State Department made it clear that Ceylon would never, never receive aid or other American favors so long as she continued her rubber trade with China.

Ceylon has never given an inch in this dispute. In 1954, when Washington offered her foreign aid, conditioned on stopping the rubber shipments, Ceylon said "no." In 1955, when the China Reds actually were trying to wriggle out of their high-priced deal, Ceylon still said "no."

But now, after Sir Anthony Eden's recent visit, the United States has decided to forget its stern principles of three years ago and put Ceylon on the giveaway list. According to Secretary Dulles, the little Asiatic country is to get $5 million a year, plus an atomic energy plant, plus the cordial hand of United States friendship.

Behind the scenes it is explained that this booty is really a payoff for Ceylon's anti-Communist stand at the Bandung Conference last year. And, besides, Eden wants it that way. And furthermore, what an inspiration it will be to other Asian nations to learn that Ceylon is on the United States gravy train.

The truth is that this action makes a joke of the embargo against Red China. If Ceylon is to be rewarded for breaching the embargo, why should any other country pay attention to trade restrictions on Red China?

The "lesson" to be drawn by other nations would seem to be something like this: "Kick Uncle Sam in the teeth and he'll come crawling to you with a handout."

Kin of Don Juan Who Saved New Orleans From the British Observes Her 95th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent news item from Bay Saint Louis, Miss., reports the birthday celebration of Mrs. Gabrielle Cuevas Hale who is 95 years of age. Reaching of this venerable milestone is in itself worthy of special attention, but in Mrs. Hale's case there is particular significance since she is the last surviving grandchild of the Spanish don whose action resulted in New Orleans being saved from capture by the British in 1812.

Of added interest is the fact that Mrs. Hale is the grandmother of our colleague, Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana.

The Hancock County Eagle of Bay Saint Louis, in its issue of Thursday, February 9, 1956, has a photograph of Mrs. Hale and the following account:

WOMAN, 95 SUNDAY, KIN OF FAMOUS DON

(By Caroline Kiefer)

Ninety-five-year-old Mrs. Gabrielle Cuevas Hale celebrated her birthday Sunday at her North Second Street home.

Born February 5, 1861, Mrs. Hale is the last surviving grandchild of Don Juan Cuevas, Spanish grandee who changed the course of history of the United States.

Don Juan, who in 1812 was in New Orleans on official business for Spain, was a great sportsman and desired a hunting trip. The city of New Orleans provided him equipment, slaves, etc., and Cat Island in the Mississippi Sound was selected for the shooting, as it abounded in game and the surrounding waters in fish.

While the hunting party was on the island seeking game, the British Fleet was seeking the city of New Orleans. They stopped at the island and inquired of Don Cuevas the route to reach the city.

He refused to tell them, saying he was a guest of the city and would not betray it. For this gallantry he was put in chains by the British.

But the delay proved fatal to the British. While they lost time with Don Cuevas on Cat Island, American troops arrived in New Orleans, and when the British fleet reached the city it was prepared for defense and saved from the British at the Battle of Chalmette.

As a reward for his loyalty to the city in which he had been a guest, the United States Government made a gift of Cat Island, free of taxation, to the noble don.

Don Juan Cuevas later settled on the Mississippi Coast in Bay St. Louis and built for his bride the home on North Beach now owned by the Swoop family. Many of the household treasures which he brought from his native Spain are still in the home.

Don Cuevas was the paternal grandfather of Mrs. Hale. Her maternal grandfather, Judge Jules Monet, of France, was the first judge and lawyer on the Mississippi coast. He built for his family the home next to that of Don Cuevas on North Beach in Bay St. Louis, which is now owned by the deBen family.

It was in this house that Gabrielle Cuevas Hale was born 95 years ago.

Granddaughter of two of Mississippi's most distinguished men, she spent her entire life in Bay St. Louis with the exception of 18 years which were lived in Gulfport where her husband, the late Thomas P. Hale, was one of the pioneer railroad builders of South Mississippi.

From 1894 until 1912 he was vice president and general manager of the Gulf and Ship Island Railroad, now the Illinois Central.

Mrs. Hale is the mother of 6 children, four of whom are surviving. One son, Thomas Hale of Huntsville, Ala., and 3 daughters, Mrs. W. R. Boggs of Long Beach and Misses Irma and Mary Hale of Bay St. Louis.

Mrs. Hale has 6 grandchildren, among whom is HALE BOGGS, distinguished Congressman from Louisiana. There are also 13 great-grandchildren.

Last Sunday this venerable gentlewoman, who has lived through almost a century of radical change in the world, received members of the immediate family at her home on North Second Street. During this week open house is being held for her by her two daughters, Miss Irma and Miss Mary Hale, and each afternoon, relatives and friends call to pay their respects.

The American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the United Steelworkers of America, District 31, Local Union No. 1014, of Gary, Ind., unanimously adopted a resolution urging the Congress and our Government to do everything possible to aid the critical situation now existing concerning most of our Indian population throughout the United States.

The Anselm Forum, Inc., an outstanding civic organization of Gary, Ind., has been conducting an educational campaign for several years for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the American people the unfortunate economic situation involving our American Indian.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the United Steelworkers of America has always been interested in the problem of minority groups; and

Whereas the American Indian is the oldest minority group in the United States; and

Whereas the United Steelworkers of America has always been interested in the health of living standards of all of the people in the United States; and

Whereas the health and living standards of the American Indian are far below the standards enjoyed by other citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it has become the policy of the United States Government, since the passage of House Resolution 108 in 1953, to bring to an end as rapidly as possible all Federal considerations enjoyed by the American Indians because of their status as Indians, despite treaties, statutes, and long standing customs; and

Whereas his inexperience in business matters and self-government makes such legislation undesirable at this time; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United Steelworkers of America, Local Union No. 1014, go on record requesting the United States Government cooperate with, and assist the American Indians to improve their health and living standards; and that the United Steelworkers of America, Local No. 1014 go on record opposing all future legislation on behalf of the American Indians without prior consultation and agreement with the tribes involved.

Refugee Resettlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the many and varied proposals that have been advanced to resolve the Arab refugee problem. A practical solution to the refugee-settlement question appears in the following article describing the resettlement of 100,000 refugees in Southwestern Free Vietnam. The article appears in the January 21, 1956, issue of the Times of Vietnam:

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT IN THE WEST

Three weeks ago, on December 30, President Ngo dinh Diem announced that 100,000 refugees will soon be permanently resettled on abandoned riceland in Southwestern Free Vietnam. On the eve of the new year, that announcement opened a new phase in the history of the refugee movement by in augurating a bold positive policy of refugee resettlement, which will benefit the refugees from the north as well as their countrymen from the south. In fact, many of the rice farmers and their families are refugees from Communist-invaded North Vietnam. The remainder are residents of South Vietnam who were displaced from their homes and possession by former Communist activities in the south. The area they will occupy and restore to useful rice production, consists of 77,000 hectares of formerly productive land between Long Xuyen and Rach Gia.

The mass settlement project has been termed the "Cai San project," a derivation from the Vietnamese-French name "Cai-san" which the locale had in the old days before the Communists drove the people off the land and it became abandoned. In those prosperous days the area was heavily cultivated and full of farms with straight boundaries and square corners, which is why the French called it "land in the form of a chessboard," which translates into idiomatic English as "Cai-san checkerboard."

The resettlement, said President Diem, will be the largest movement of people since Operation Exodus ended last spring after 860,206 people chose freedom rather than remain in the North under control of the Viet Cong and the Communist Chinese.

The movement will be coordinated activity by several agencies of the Vietnamese Government, under the overall direction of Huynh Van Diem, newly designated Director of Plan and Reconstruction, and will be supported by American aid funds from the United States Operations Mission to Vietnam.

In the Cai San project, practically all government agencies are involved. The Ministry of Public Works, which is responsible for communications for the new project, is already at work surveying canals and roads which the settlers will need for irrigation and to move their products to market.

The Ministry of Agriculture will furnish production credit in the form of seed, tools, and work animals.

The Ministry of Agrarian Reform will be responsible for the difficult problem of resettling the farmers.

The commissariat general for refugees will select and transport volunteer refugees, including entire villages. It will administer allotments and provide materials for construction of housing and essential community building.

The Army will furnish security forces from the Bassac branch of the Mekong River to the sea at Rach Gia.

United States contribution to the project will consist of tractors and other mechanical equipment for preparation of the land, and beyond that, the type of economic aid being made to other villages, such as agricultural credit, schools, medical assistance, village industry, plus some subsistence in the early stages.

The mechanical equipment supplied by American economic aid will consist of one 12-inch and two 8-inch dredges, plus 100 tractors, of either wheeled or tracked type, or both, depending upon which can be delivered in Vietnam first, and plows, harrows, cultivators, disk harrows, and weed cutters in sufficient quantities to keep each unit in cultivating activities until the 77,000-hectare tract is ready for planting. The tractors and other equipment will cost approximately $975,000 (U. S.) and will be purchased in the United States from bidders who can guarantee the earliest delivery.

While no arrival dates have been received at the operations mission, it is believed that some of the equipment may be on hand by the end of this month and more by the end of February.

The tractors, it was announced by Mr. Leland Barrows, Director of the United States Operations Mission to Vietnam, will be used to break the land, estimated at 77,000 hectares, and then will be incorporated into a Vietnamese Government corporation called "Mechanical Agricultural Service," which will break other abandoned and unused tracts as a preliminary to additional resettlement.

However, Mr. Barrows added, of the projects will be permanently mechanized. Once the land is broken, cultivation will be in the traditional manner, involving hand labor and work animals.

"Thus," Mr. Barrows declared, "over the years, the equipment will be used again and again for clearing abandoned or unused land. It will be able to earn some revenue for the Vietnamese Government while increasing the productivity of the nation. It will assist Viet Nam in world trade while the cost of the equipment is amortized over a period of years. It is, therefore, an excellent investment in freedom."

According to initial plans, a contingent of some 2,500 volunteer settlers was to be transported into the area during the first week. They would be employed, along with 2,500 local residents, in preparing the land and building temporary housing for the others. Most of the first settlers will be working on land which they will occupy. Whenever feasible, entire villages of refugees will be permitted to volunteer.

But in less than a week, announced Mr. Bui van Luong, Commissioner General for Refugees, 42,850 refugees from North Viet-

nam volunteered to be resettled on abandoned ricelands of the Cai San project in the southwest.

"Not all of them have volunteered personally," the Commissioner General explained, "because they don't have the money to pay their fare to Saigon. But, when they learned the Cai San area is going to be rehabilitated and opened for permanent resettlement by the government, they appointed representatives to come to my office and make known their desire to live on the new land.

"The largest single group so far is from the Ho Nai camp in Bien Hoa province, where 20,000 people want to go to Cai San. In Gia Dinh province, 12,000 have so far registered their desire to live in the rice country where there is plenty of water and fish, as well as good land for raising rice.

"In Long Xuyen province, close to the new project, there are 2,350 refugees all of whom want to be part of the Cai San development. In Ba Beo refugee district of My Tho province, 3,000 refugees have sent representatives to my office" said Mr. Luong, "to register for Cai San. In Saigon, 100 heads of families, representing 500 people, signed up individually during the first few days. In Cholon, 5,000 have registered with my office through their village leaders."

While land, equipment and settlers have been readily found, two major problems remain to be solved. The first one concerns the size of tract to be allocated to a refugee family. According to a survey made by Mr. Wolf Ladejinsky, the world-famous specialist in agrarian reform, opinions in Saigon varied, suggesting a minimum of 3 hectares to a maximum of 10. Most of the farmers in the Cai San region stated that they cultivate from 3 to 5 hectares per family. Most of them have no livestock, but they are capable of cultivating by hand approximately 3 hectares, or even 5 of floating rice. Though mechanization at this point may not be the solution, the majority of farmers welcome use of tractors. On the basis of that information, the Government has decided to allocate about 4 hectares to a refugee farmer family cultivating floating rice, while land that produces a more diversified crop would be allotted in smaller quantities.

The second problem to be faced in the Cai San project is that of security. Though not critical at this point, the question of maintaining security in the West while the 100,000 refugees move in to resettle is a sine qua non condition for the success of the Cai San project. In fact, if the number of volunteer resettlers to this date has been high, it is largely due to the faith the people have in the strength of the national armed forces. In a country where for years people who have not dared to live in the country have flocked to the urban centers, the affluence of refugees to settle in the recently pacified West is something to be credited to the Army of Vietnam.

Mr. Tran Trung Dung, Assistant Secretary for Defense, stated that "the Vietnamese Army will furnish complete protection to the 100,000 settlers moving into the Long Xuyen-Rach Gia area under the sponsorship of the Cai San Project." The Department of Defense will also employ units of the Civilian Guard (Bao-an doan) and the newly formed self-defense units (Dan-ve-Doan). The Army is prepared to furnish special security forces from the Bassac Branch of the Mekong River to the sea at Rach Gai. Army and other paramilitary units will be assigned each convoy of settlers as they approach the 77,000-hectare strip of land occupied by the Cai San project and will accompany them to their lands. They will also remain on constant duty at the settlement to assure adequate protection for the new project.

Mr. Dung has appointed the Chief of Province and Provincial Military Commander, Major Nguyen Huynh of Long Xuyen, to coordinate the security forces in this area and supervise the settlement of the new farmers. Mobile security forces are already patrolling the area and controlling the movement of civilians and military personnel.

"There is no martial law in the area, and the civilian population can move freely throughout the two provinces day and night," the Secretary declared. "Our units are controlling the movement of strangers and Communist agents to prevent sabotage, isolated raids, and incidents. At the present time the area is well patrolled and quiet."

Secretary Dung explained that his department is working in close liaison with the Commissioner General of Refugees and the Office of the President concerning the Cai San project. He noted that, as the civilian guard units finish training and the self-defense corps acquires additional trained cadres, the Vietnamese Army will turn over the control of the long Xuyen-Rach Gia area to them. They will be operated under civilian control. Secretary Dung did not believe that special funds or personnel from other parts of Vietnam would have to be used in this operation. He expected that sufficient forces were in the area to give the Cai San project more than adequate protection.

Though just begun 2 weeks ago, the Cai San project seems to offer very bright prospects for success. Most important of all, the response of the refugees has been good. Confident in their Government, they have once more begun to pack up their belongings and move from the camps and towns where they have been living to the western plains where a new life awaits them. Months and years from now, settled on that prosperous land which is now theirs, side by side with their compatriots from the south, in communion with refugees from other settlement areas, moved by a stanch faith in the future and in democracy, the refugees of Cai San will be proud to know that they no longer are refugees, but a part of free Vietnam, where they have chosen to build their homes.

Then they will be able to contribute to the wealth of their country. Cai San has opened new horizons to 100,000 out of the 860,206 people who fled communism. May many others be able to follow in their steps.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, again we friends of Lithuania commemorate February 16, 1956, as the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. We in the United States have not forgotten our friends and relatives in Lithuania and the countries of Eastern Europe and look ahead to that wonderful day when freedom and independence will be restored.

We continue to celebrate this independence anniversary on February 16, 1956, with renewed hope. We are encouraged because of President Eisenhower taking the firm stand that our United States foreign policy will be aimed toward obtaining the liberty and freedom of all the citizens of Lithuania and the satellite countries now behind the Iron Curtain.

The fine spirit of new hope is shown by the determined resolve of the many United States citizens of Lithuanian descent as well as their friends, who met on Sunday, February 12, 1956, to celebrate this independence anniversary at the Lithuanian Hall on the South Side in Pittsburgh, Pa. We all renewed our pledge of devotion to the citizens of Lithuania, and it was inspiring to me as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to have this outpouring of citizens and clergy still strong in their resolution for liberty and freedom.

The citizens of Lithuania and the Eastern European countries will again be free and independent and peaceful nations dedicated to friendly progress and cooperation with the citizens of the free world.

Address of Maximilian Moss, Surrogate of Kings County, Brooklyn, N. Y., Delivered at a Testimonial Dinner Tendered Hon. Albert M. Leavitt, Chief Clerk of the Surrogate's Court, on January 22, 1956, at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address given by the Kings County surrogate, the Honorable Maximilian Moss, at the recent testimonial dinner tendered the Honorable Albert M. Leavitt, chief clerk of the surrogate's court of Brooklyn, N. Y. Surrogate Moss expresses the sentiments of all of us in Brooklyn who know and admire Mr. Leavitt.

The address follows:

Once again this evening, we are participants in an event which has become an essential aspect of our American way of life.

Although we live in the greatest community in the world, and there are many material factors which make it great—testimonial dinners of this kind demonstrate that America has become the force it is, by reason of its people; that basically the thing that gives our Nation breath, and vision, and spirit, and heart, is the sacrificing efforts of public-spirited citizens; and that people such as you are always proud to be present in large numbers to do honor "even unto but one humble citizen," who by stint of his own good works, has enriched the community.

That humble citizen is Albert M. Leavitt.

As I look around this room and see so many of Al's friends—the thought comes to me, that you who have been his close friends over so many years, can tell me far more than I can tell you of the love, admiration, and acclaim in which our guest of honor is held.

Therefore, I am sure that the deep unspoken words, which are in your hearts, are far more eloquent than anything that I can express.

I can merely tell you that I have had the good fortune of having Al Leavitt associated

with me as clerk of the surrogate's court. I say good fortune, because it is not always easy to obtain the right man for the right job. Usually it is a process of trial and error, which fortunately I did not have to go through.

The surrogate's court is the successor to the ecclesiastic courts. It is the widow's and orphan's court. As we conceive it, our business is to settle family quarrels so that families may remain together; to try to prevent differences and disruptions; and where wills are left, to untangle ambiguities with fairness to the living and reverential respect for those loved ones who have gone to their heavenly rest.

Our administration of the law—in such a widow's and orphan's court—has become more of a healing process; and we daily strive to do what Judge Cardozo referred to when he said that a way must be found to have law catch up with justice.

Now, I have just given you an indication of the work of our court so that you might know the type of person whom I was seeking for clerk of the surrogate's court.

Consistent with the philosophy expressed, I was anxious to get one who would subordinate himself to his fellow men for the enduring benefit of the community.

And it is to the credit of the person who recommended him, that I found Al Leavitt, one who possessed all the qualifications needed for this sensitive position.

When the honor of the office of chief clerk and clerk of the court was given to Mr. Leavitt, he accepted it with full realization that with that honor went deep responsibility and hard work.

If the public thinks that when a political leader takes a public office, he kisses work goodby, retires from toil and labor, and enters upon a life of rest and relaxtion, the public is mistaken.

Al Leavitt is at his desk generally from 8 o'clock to 8:30 every morning. We compete with each other as to who comes in earlier.

He opens the court at 9 a. m. He calls the calendar in open court at 9:30 a. m. He seldom leaves before 6 p. m.

I found Mr. Leavitt to be a warmhearted human being of great ability, who works intelligently, with energy unbounded, but with the pride and satisfaction of a job well done. He has committed all his talents to his work in the court; and in the short time of his incumbency, he has already proven his worth.

He is patient, courteous, and kind, and has my deep affection and admiration. He has a fine sense of humor and often practices his wit on you before you realize it.

He is an ardent worker for all charitable and communal endeavors, and has demonstrated an abiding devotion to his community, as illustrated by the many projects which have now become well-established. He is a man of deep faith and his thinking is consistent with the highest conception of citizen responsibility.

That Mr. Leavitt has won the high regard, goodwill, and cooperation of as able a court staff as ever existed—is best evidenced by the voluntary presence here tonight of a great number of the administrative staff of the surrogate's court.

From all the foregoing, you must readily grasp the fact, that the clerk of the court and the surrogate team up very well. As a result, the morale of the staff is at a peak. We intend to keep it that way.

In that respect, I am glad to see so many public officials present, and particularly the Budget Director.

Both Mr. Leavitt and I are in budget time, and I serve public notice that progressively together we shall endeavor to bring the payroll standards of the Kings County Surrogate's Court to those of Manhattan, until the rumor of Brooklyn being a stepchild shall have disappeared.

There is one other person here whom I wish to pay tribute to, and that is Mrs. Albert M. Leavitt.

She is a person of great charm who in a current charity drive has substantially aided the community with dignity but without fanfare. She and Al make a good team.

In closing, I cannot help but remember that Al was a public school teacher; and at one time I, too, was privileged to take a small part in the work of the board of education.

If as a result thereof the board asked me to write up an on-the-job report of Al Leavitt (consisting of not more than two sentences) I would say:

"Mr. Albert M. Leavitt combines the staid view of the professional schoolteacher with the fresh view of the non-professional, to which has been added the skill and dexterity of a practical politician.

"Like the work of an alchemist, an amalthe fresh view of the nonprofessional, to posite and dissimilar variables might well produce a new pattern on our horizon."

Forced Repatriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I insert a recent letter to the New York Herald Tribune published by that paper on February 16, 1956, dealing with the subject of forced repatriation in conneciton with which I have introduced House Resolution 137:

FORCED REPATRIATION

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The undersigned wish to call the American public's attention to the importance of House Resolution 137, which was introduced by Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH, of New York, on February 8, 1955. This resolution calls for the creation of a select committee authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and liberated civilians, as carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47 in Germany and other countries. As the preamble to the resolution points out, the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Soviet controlled countries brought death and misery to untold thousands who were shot, hanged, or died in the Siberian slave labor camps.

However, we urge such an investigation not only in order to establish the cause and fix the responsibility for a tragic mistake, but primarily in order to strengthen the right of asylum, which is still under constant threat from totalitarian powers. The recently increased Soviet pressure on the Austrian Government to refuse asylum to anti-Communist refugees, and the new threats to refugees in this country and elsewhere, warning them to return or face reprisals against their families behind the Iron Curtain, calls for an inquiry into both the past and present phases of the repatriation question, either by a special committee or an existing committee of the Congress.

It goes without saying that to fulfill its purpose such an inquiry must be conducted in a nonpartisan spirit. We would also like to point out that while the post-World War II record of forced repatriation is a blot on the honor of the Western democracies, the United States and its U. N. allies honorably upheld the right of asylum for prisoners of war in Korea. During the last year of that war the only aim for which the U. N. fought was to prevent the forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners, which was probably the first time in history that a group of nations continued a war solely on an issue of individual human rights. So, however frustrating the results of that war may have been in other respects, this is an achievement of which the free world can be proud.

We would also suggest that the best way to uphold the right of asylum in time of peace is by a more generous immigration policy toward refugees from Communist tyranny.

Arnold Beichman, Leo Cherne, Christopher Emmet, George S. Counts, Sidney Hook, Daniel James, Norbert Muhlen, Norman Thomas, Bertram D. Wolfe.

NEW YORK, *February 14, 1956.*

The Middle East Picture Confused Still Further

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a timely and exacting editorial from today's Baltimore Sun which clearly defines the confusion regarding the United States foreign policy—or lack of foreign policy—in the Middle East.

For many months the Israeli Government has been asking assistance from the United States in the form of defensive weapons. To date the United States has taken no action on the request, stating time and again that this country did not want to contribute to an arms race in the Middle East.

Yet, after all these declarations on the part of our State Department, we learned on Thursday—perhaps through sheer luck, thanks to some alert people in New York—that the United States Government was shipping 18 modern tanks to Saudi Arabia. These M–41 Walker Bulldog tanks can travel 40 miles an hour. They carry a 76-millimeter gun, a .50-caliber machinegun and a .30-caliber machinegun, and are manned by 4 men. The cost to our Government was $135,000 apiece. I wonder what Saudi Arabia paid for them.

Remember, these are not old tanks. They were developed after World War II and were delivered to our Armed Forces at the end of 1952 and early 1953. Now, mind you, all of this is being done now, while only a few weeks ago, following a conference in Washington between the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the President of the United States, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, and the Secretary of State of the United States, a statement was released that indicated that the United States, Great Britain, and France would seek to promote peace in the Middle East.

Just a few weeks ago we were loudly and strongly condemning Czechoslovakia for the sale of arms to Egypt. Members of Congress voiced in strong protests, their disapproval of the sale of arms to Egypt by the Communist satellite state. The President indicated to the world that the United States is opposed to an arms race in the Middle East. Yet, here we are, not through a broker, not through some back-door means, but through the Government of the United States, selling 18 modern tanks to Saudi Arabia. These tanks are some of the best tanks we have in the United States and we are selling them to a country that has declared the State of Israel shall be destroyed. We are selling them to a country whose King has declared he would be willing to give 10 million lives for the extinction of the State of Israel.

At the very time when the diplomatic and military situation is at its most grave point in the Middle East, as indicated last week by Under Secretary of State George Allen, we seem to play into the hands of the Reds. We have lost any argument we may have had in rebuking the Soviets and Communists for supplying arms to Egypt.

The shipping of arms, instead of reducing tensions in the Middle East, which the Secretary of State professes to be our aim, has vastly increased the tensions which exist. The indecision of our Government, with its on again, off again embargo has caused the United States embarrassment throughout the world.

As the following editorial advises, in such an explosive situation an effort should be made, at the least, not to add to the existing confusion. I, for one, strongly urge that the State Department approve the request of the State of Israel for defensive weapons, promptly and without delay.

The editorial follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST PICTURE CONFUSED STILL FURTHER

No region of the globe is so difficult to understand right now as is the Middle East. It is impossible to assess with any certainty the many interacting trends there. It is impossible to read clearly the foreign policies, and even impossible to measure the comparative military strengths of the Middle Eastern nations.

About all the ordinary Western citizen can be sure of is that the Middle East is explosive. It may be that the world's diplomats, even with their greater detailed knowledge, can themselves be sure of little more.

In such a situation an effort should be made, at the least, not to add to the existing confusion. Sufficient effort does not seem to have been made in the matter of the tanks for Saudi Arabia.

The story of the tanks broke with a news dispatch reporting that 18 light American tanks were ready for loading in New York, to be shipped to Saudi Arabia (whose ruler, incidentally, is considered one of the leaders committed neither to East nor West). A State Department spokesman next day confirmed the story, and said that the shipment was routine under this country's mutual defense agreement with Saudi Arabia.

This was bound to bring complaints from Israel, which claims that it has been unable to get arms needed for defense. It did bring complaints. That night, by Presidential order, the State Department embargoed arms shipments to the Middle East. This was bound to bring complaints from Saudi Arabia. It did bring complaints.

Forty-three hours after its imposition, the embargo was lifted. It had been imposed, the State Department explained, "pending an examination to assure that (arms exports to the Middle East) were being made in compliance with pertinent laws and regulations and were in conformity with the policies of the United States with respect to the maintenance of peace and stability in the area."

The ordinary citizen would think that such assurance might be obtained before tanks or other equipment reached the docks, ready for immediate shipment. He would think, too, that the branches of Government concerned would try a bit harder to avoid a sequence of decisions certain to raise tempers on all sides in the Middle East.

The Brand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 317 (a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

The purpose of this bill is to close up loopholes that have existed for many years. With the growth of the industry, and the increased interstate movement of cattle and other livestock, it has become more and more apparent that a somewhat uniform method of identifying and establishing ownership of livestock is necessary to protect buyers and marketing agencies against spurious transactions.

Through brand registration and inspection laws and regulations, many States or livestock associations have established a means for determining the title to livestock. In Nebraska, a "brand State," the law requires that livestock brands must be inspected and ownership established before the animals are moved into areas where such formalities are not prescribed. Purchasers are hereby protected. If the animals are not branded or marked, or if they bear a brand that is not registered to the shipper, he must produce a bill of sale or other document establishing his right to them. Marketing agencies are authorized to impound sale receipts until title has been perfected.

Unfortunately, these regulations have not been adopted in several large livestock producing States and, as a result, there has been no satisfactory way by which interstate livestock sales may be safely expedited or innocent purchasers protected.

This bill amends the existing law and removes some of its deficiencies. It provides for inspection of livestock shipped into a "brand" State and consequent determination of title or right of possession as a prerequisite of sale. The inspection must be made prior to the time the livestock are removed from the market, when required by State law or regulation, or when requested by the purchaser. Fees for the inspection service will be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, and he will designate the agency or agencies authorized to make the examination.

This bill will help to remove the hazard and the uncertainty that has many times imposed undue burdens upon the interstate movement of livestock. It has the support of the American National Cattleman's Association, the Nebraska Stockgrower's Association and similar groups from South Dakota, Montana, and other livestock-producing States.

A Real Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in any discussion of the farm problem we are usually confronted with a lot of statistics in an attempt to prove that the farmer is either in a good position or that his problems are his own doing. What the Department of Agriculture seems to ignore is the fact that the farmer is not a statistic, he is a human being, an important producer in our great economy, a husband, a father who is dedicating his life to seeing that his children are well fed, well clothed, well housed, well educated in the best American tradition.

Under present conditions this human farmer cannot make it, in spite of any figures prepared by the statisticians in the Department of Agriculture and by the city bed and reared theorists who are, unfortunately, in charge of too many aspects of the farm program.

We can best learn about farmers from the farmers themselves. We can get a real picture of the farm problem from the family-sized farmer who, under present policies, is being liquidated, forced off the farm and thrown into the urban labor market in competition with workers in factories and mills.

This week I received a letter from a farmer in my district in Texas. No figures, no fancy theories, no masterful oratory can tell the true story of what is happening to America's farmers better than this simple explanation of the facts by a farmer who is faced with the worst aspects of the problem. I hope every Member of the House will give strict attention and thought to what my constituent says. He may be sounding a last warning for American agriculture and our democratic system as we know it, for we cannot sacrifice him and his fellow farmers without bringing ruin to all of us.

The letter follows:

WELLINGTON, TEX., *February 9, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: This letter is written to ask you to help a small farmer who is at the end of the road. I have been helped by the Farmers' Home Administration for 7 years trying to make a living for a family of 6 on 120 acres, and this year FHA told me they couldn't help me any more. They said I

worked hard and paid good, but just didn't have enough cotton acreage. I have made 2 good crops up to date, paid my expenses back, and a substantial amount on my debt (41 acres year before last and 38 acres last year).

The FHA supervisor figures it would take me 7 years to pay it all back (barring crop failure), paying as much as I did this past year which wasn't as good as the year before. My father bought this land from the Government for $1 an acre. I bought 120 acres from my dad 18 years ago for $6,000 and have paid all of it back but $750 and cared for my family. I'm 40 years old, wife 33, oldest child a boy age 14, 3 girls, ages 13, 10, and 6. All children in school. My family and I gathered all our cotton but a couple of bales, turned it in except enough to pay other crop expenses, living and keeping children in school.

I paid to the bone, figuring on a reloan. He asked me to put it off to see if I could rent some more land. It is against their rules to work land more than 2 or 3 miles from home. I can't find any less than 12 miles away. Have been informed that we must have at least 90 acres of cotton before we can get a loan. If I had that much I could get rich. It is dead winter, snow spell, I'm broke, nothing to live on, and children going to school without lunch. Will have to take them out later, lack of clothes. I just made two good crops and then cut off. I couldn't leave if I wanted to, lack of money. So many small farmers have had to leave. Industry is filled up in 200 miles of here.

Why couldn't we be given a chance to pay for our tractor and a milk cow on terms so we could start over and save the Government that much?

Our stores have offered to carry me an open account if I can get my tractor back. Since the Republican administration has had control, the FHA insists we put in electricity, butane, etc., which has put us badly in the hole to them. Then they have the people we sell to to make the checks to FHA and don't release any to us for anything. They cut us clear off. The way it is run is cuting more farmers' throats than it is helping. Then the big farmers are taking over and we (the small farmers) be their slaves.

I'm sending a copy of this letter to each of the following:

Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture.
Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.
Senator PRICE DANIEL.
Congressman WALTER ROGERS.
R. B. McLeaish, Administrator, FHA.

Sincerely,

MILBERN GIBBS.

I have sent this letter to the Department of Agriculture with request that the matter be thoroughly investigated to see if something cannot be done to correct this type of situation. It is my sincere hope that the problem can be worked out before many others, who are presently standing on the brink of ruin, find themselves in the same area of frustration faced by Mr. Gibbs.

Ventura River Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support S. 926—also an identical bill by Mr. TEAGUE of California, H. R. 3488—which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura reclamation project, California.

When the bill was considered in the House on Thursday, February 16, 1956, I was in California meeting with numerous persons who had been injured by the great flood which did so much damage in our State. I learned firsthand of their difficulties. I visited the flooded areas in my district and am and will continue to do everything possible to help the victims of these floods.

Before leaving I handed the pair clerk my proxy to vote for the bill. He was unable to use the proxy as a rollcall was not demanded and consequently there was no specific record of my attitude on this bill. Had I been present I would have voted for the bill and will do all I can to help bring the project to completion.

Federal-Aid Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Board of Water Commissioners of the Town of West Bridgewater, Mass.:

TOWN OF WEST BRIDGEWATER, MASS.,
OFFICE OF WATER COMMISSIONERS.

"Whereas the 2d session of the 83d Congress enacted Public Law 350, amending the Federal-Aid Road Act, and section 11 of said Public Law 350 provided for a study by the Secretary of Commerce of the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under said act; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States will soon consider the possibility of making revisions in the Federal-Aid Road Act, and specifically will take action on H. R. 8836, commonly called the Fallon bill; and

"Whereas the water commissioners of the town of West Bridgewater, Mass., through actual experience with a Federal-aid highway project within their town, are aware of the extreme expense to said town occasioned by such a project, and feel it is only just that such expenses should be reimbursed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be hereby requested to give favorable consideration to legislation that would ease the burden on public utilities required to relocate facilities because of the construction of Federal-aid roads; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the water commissioners of the town of West Bridgewater, Mass., regard any such unreimbursed costs as a form of unfair taxation on the local residents, since it is manifestly highly inequitable to impose on the users of utility services the added costs of relocaton which are justified by nothng more substantial than an accident of geography; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That since the use of Federal funds for Federal-aid road purposes derives from the power and responsibility of the Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare, and since the benefits of the highway construction flow to the public at large, it is only just and fair that the costs of relocation of utility facilities should also be financed from funds derived from taxes levied on the general public; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the water commissioners of the town of West Bridgewater, Mass., who have already been forced to secure from their customers increased funds from which to pay the cost of relocation of their facilities occasioned by a Federal-aid road project within the town of West Bridgewater, request the Congress of the United States to make reimbursment aid retroactive to the start of the Federal-aid road program so that said town and other towns similarly affected may recover the costs of relocation of facilities which they have already been forced to pay."

Adopted by the Board of Water Commissioner of the Town of West Bridgewater, Mass., by unanimous vote on the 13th day of February 1956.

A true copy, attest:

GORDON A. MCDONALD,
Secretary.

Latin America, the Best Political and Economic Support for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a significant editorial taken from the February 10, 1956, issue of the Americas Daily, which points out the need for continued understanding, appreciation, and assistance on our part toward the friendly Latin American Republics to the south of us:

LATIN AMERICA, THE BEST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED STATES

The solidarity of the 170 million inhabitants of Latin America with the United States represents, beyond the slightest doubt, the largest sector of political support that this country can count upon in its international problems, as well as representing the best opportunity for the people of the United States in world trade.

The 20 Latin American Republics, situated in an enviable geographic position, with vast territorial expansions, with tremendous natural resources, with a population of 170 million at the present time, and with immense possibilities of increase, are, before the entire world, a bastion of extraordinary importance. In this era there is no other region of the world that, composed of so many countries, offers better prospects for the present and the future.

Because of that undeniable fact the sincere and unabashed friendship of the Latin American nations towards the United States constitutes, we repeat, the greatest support upon which this country can count in its international dealings, both politically and economically.

Fortunately, the high officials who help to formulate American policy, fully aware of the importance of Latin America, are advocating greater cooperation with those 20 sister countries of the hemisphere, in order to strengthen and fortify the ties of hemispheric solidarity.

In this same edition we are publishing a résumé of a most important speech, dealing

with Panamericanism, clearly conceived, that has just been made in the House of Representatives by ROBERT L. F. SIKES, in which he points out the importance and need for closer relations with the nations of Latin America. The aid that the United States has given to Latin America—SIKES says—is infinitesimal compared to what we have poured into Europe and Asia.

In this forthright statement we see the idea of the distinguished Congressman of recognizing the extraordinary importance that should be given by the United States to Latin America in its international relations.

Russia is so conscious of the great deal that American solidarity means to the United States that she loses no opportunity to undermine the foundations of friendship between the Latin American countries and the United States. Fortunately, both here as well as in all other countries of the hemisphere, there is open resistance to any attempt to destroy the ties of friendshp and reciprocal cooperation among the 21 republics of the Americas.

Address by John B. Fisher, Administrative Assistant to Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, at the Lincoln Day Dinner, Boston, Mass., February 13, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 13, I was privileged to attend the Lincoln Day dinner of the Middlesex Club of Massachusetts, the oldest Republican club in the country.

Although the entire program was an excellent one, perhaps the outstanding feature was the Lincoln oration presented by John B. Fisher, administrative assistant to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Unfortunately, the printed page cannot recapture the warmth and power of Mr. Fisher's speech, but because I would like to share it with others who regard Abraham Lincoln as one of our greatest Americans, I include it under leave to extend my remarks, as follows:

A EULOGY OF LINCOLN

(Address delivered by John B. Fisher, administrative assistant to United States Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, at the annual Lincoln Night dinner of the Middlesex Club, Boston, Mass., February 13, 1956)

Gen. George Pickett, a fighting Confederate commander, was to remember all the days of his life that third afternoon at Gettysburg when he led his long, gray lines against the Union barricades on Cemetery Ridge in the bloodiest assault of the war. And Mrs. George Pickett was to remember always that afternoon at the war's end when, in answering a knock at the door of her Richmond home, she opened it to find a tall stranger standing there in the shadows of the porch, asking her if George were at home, m'am?

She replied that George wasn't and wouldn't be for some time but might she ask in turn who the visitor was. The tall man in the frock coat, stove-pipe hat in hand, said simply, "Just an old friend of George's, m'am; just an old friend from before the war." With that he turned and stepped out into the sunlight and walked slowly down that Richmond street, leaving Mrs. Pickett to the startled realization that the President of the United States had come to call.

The President of the United States. Abraham Lincoln was that, of course he was, but really a great deal more, too. For this was a man of many parts, all of them human and most of them great.

This was the politician who in 30 long years of devoted service in his party's ranks came to realize that politics, like life, is the art of achieving the possible and who learned, with the decay of the Whig Party, the turbulence of the Mexican War period, and the onset of the Missouri Compromise that he had nothing whatever in common with political platforms whose planks were platitudes and with men of no discernible principle.

This, too, was the husband and father whose home life was torn by strife and dissension and the tragic death of children. Yet it is not for us, tonight or ever, to judge Mary Todd Lincoln. The heart of a wife and the heart of a husband can best be known only to themselves and what a woman says to a man or what a man says to a woman should often, as the ancients knew, be written on the wind. It will become us better to remember that Mary Todd and Abraham Lincoln sat fondly holding hands in a darkened box in Ford's Theater on the night of Good Friday, 1865.

But this, too, was the President—the President and Commander-in-Chief—devoted above all else to preserving the Union "with the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired". So he said; so he did.

And in so doing, he brought freedom to the enslaved. As he wrote in his annual message, following the Emancipation Proclamation: "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom for the free, honorable alike in what we give and in what we preserve."

Supported in this objective by the Abolitionists, yes, but fought by them every step of the way, for moderation was a word they never knew. He counseled with them patiently when he could; he blocked them ruthlessly when he must, fondly hoping that in time they'd learn, fervently praying that they'd learn in time.

Meanwhile, the war went on, with Jackson and Lee defeating the Union forces at almost every turn, crushing the Northern armies between them like a steel-hard finger and thumb, until at last the President came to put his trust in Grant—Ulysses S. Grant, who astonished everyone in Galena, Ill., by turning out to be somebody after all.

Agreeing completely with Grant's objective of smashing victory and peace, he occasionally questioned Grant's method but he remembered from the old days at Hodgenville and New Salem that you never cuss a good ax. To keep up with Grant, studying tactics late into the night, but, night and day, studying human nature as well; taking time out for needed laughter and humor; writing with a wry smile to a woman who had asked him for a sentiment and his autograph:

"DEAR MADAM: When you write to a stranger for something which is of interest only to yourself, always enclose a stamp. There's your sentiment and here's your autograph.

"A. LINCOLN."

Then, at long last, the tide of the battles and of the war turned under Grant's sledge-hammering — stubble-chinned, stubborn-jawed Grant, in whom the President had such faith—and the President was enabled to think beyond the war to the time of reconstruction, to the binding up of the Nation's wounds, when the road to reunion with the South would, he knew, have to be paved with justice and generosity and good will.

Blocked again in this because of his policy of moderation—not alone by many of the northern States and their leaders, not only by many members of his party, but often violently, profanely, by his very closest advisers and friends—yet knowing, as few men have even known, that wisdom as to ends must equal skill as to means or the work would be lost forever.

This, finally, was the martyr, the martyr to union, to freedom and to peace. Lincoln had a presentiment of death all his life but never more strongly or clearly than on the morning of April 14. Yet he knew that death was not the worst of life, that defeat was not the worst of failure, that not to have tried was the true failure and in his ceaseless trying to preserve this Union, for us and forever, achieving one of the greatest successes in all recorded time.

It was America's darkest hour since Valley Forge when they carried him out of Ford's Theater and into the little Petersen House across 10th Street and Dr. Charles Leale, 23 years old, assistant surgeon, United States Volunteers, who had been the first to attend him when he fell, sat through those long, black night hours and the long gray morning ones that following holding tightly to the President's hand, knowing, as he was to write later, that reason and recognition occasionally returned to the afflicted at the moment of departure and wanting the President to understand in his blindness that he was in touch with humanity and had a friend.

So it was that George Pickett's old friend from before the war himself had a friend at hand when the long war years were over.

This was Abraham Lincoln, politician, husband and father, President and Commander in Chief, martyr for all mankind. He was a man of such dimensions that he made all others seem small, though he would have been the very last to wish to do so. Those dimensions were not merely physical, not just the 6-feet-4 of him or the gaunt, bony frame of him, but the great soul and heart of him as well.

For this was the Bible-reading lad come out of the wilderness, following a prairie star, filled with wonder at the world and its maker, who all his life, boy and man, not only knew the 23d Psalm but, more importantly, know the Shepherd.

Now, in 1956, it seems possible that we shall never see his like again. This is a sobering thought, but it should be a kindling one, for upon us now, as a people and a party, has been laid perhaps the greatest responsibility any nation was ever asked to shoulder, yet certainly not greater than we can bear. Our days are no longer than were Lincoln's, our nights are no darker, and if there is any difference between his time and this, it lies in the tremendous advantage that is ours, that he stood so tall before us.

In such a time and at such a moment we surely can say then, from hopeful, brimful hearts:

We are coming, Father Abraham, devoted millions strong, firm in the faith that was yours and is ours, secure in the conviction bequeathed by you to us that right does make might and that if we but dare to do our duty as we understand it, we shall not only survive—we shall prevail.

We walk beside you now, long-striding, our feet firmly on the ground in this most practical of worlds but with an eye always on the heavens that we might never—never—lose sight of the stars.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the eighth of a series of articles on our mental health problem the writers deal with the need of training workers so vitally needed in institutions for the cure of the mentally ill. This is one of the most perplexing facets of the whole problem.

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times of January 13, 1956]

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—KANSAS SUBSTITUTES BRAINS FOR BRICKS—TRAINING PROGRAM FILLS VITAL NEED

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

All the oil in Texas won't buy the workers needed in the mental health field today. There aren't enough to go around; new ones must be trained.

The State and private institutions for the care of the mentally ill beg, borrow, and steal personnel from each other. Nationally, it is estimated that only 1 out of each 3 desperatedly needed workers is trained. In some phases of psychiatric work, there is only 1 trained where 10 are needed. State mental hospitals have only one-third of the workers they need for treatment, not custody, of patients.

There is nothing left for the hospitals and medical schools to do but to train the needed personnel, and it becomes a long-time project.

Physicians with medical degrees must spend from 3 to 5 years of further training in mental health to become psychiartists. Clinical psychologists, nurses, and social workers trained in psychiatric care are needed, all of whom must add the additional training to professional degrees.

Therapists must be secured and hundreds of aides for the ward work must first be interested in mental work, then trained intensively.

These aides are the first line of defense in the battle for restoring mental health. They are ones who are associated closely with the ill, and they find their very own moods reflected in the attitudes of the patients. Moreover, they are in a new field and endeavor—one in which the rules have not even been made—and they must be experimenters as well as dedicated, skilled workers.

MUST BE GOOD MAN

What is a psychiatrist? First, he is a physician with a medical degree from a college approved by the American Medical Association, and as a general rule he has a State license to practice medicine before he starts his additional training in psychiatry. The license is a requirement for those who train for the VA program. Then he spends from 3 to 5 years in intensive study of mental illness before being accredited by one American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.

But the Menninger School of Psychiatry holds that even such educational qualifications are not enough; a psychiatrist must be a good man, in the platonic sense, and "must believe in the inherent capacity of even the sickest individual for reconstruction • • • that people can be understood, and they are thereby helped."

The trainees may go into Winter Hospital (the VA psychiatric training hospital) or Topeka State Hospital and combine training and service. Salaries range from $300 a month upward.

At least 10 percent of the Nation's present psychiatrists-in-training are in Topeka now, working in the three-way program financed by the Menninger Foundation, the Veterans Administration and the State of Kansas. Of this number only eight are Kansas physicians, although it is hoped by Kansans that some others will settle in the State. At least they man the program of mental health in Kansas while they train, and Kansans seem to feel that their State appropriation for training is well spent.

GUIDANCE CENTERS INCLUDED

The hospitals maintained by the VA, the State and Menningers furnish the best of clinical training, but there are several other institutions in Topeka that rely heavily on this pool of psychiatric talent. These are the VA Mental Hygiene Clinic, the Shawnee Guidance Center for children, the Kansas Boys Industrial School, where juvenile delinquents below the age of 16 are housed, and the Woodsview Clinic for Alcoholics.

State agencies in other Kansas cities use the trainees services. These are the other two State hospitals at Larned and Osawatomie, the Psychiatric Department of the University of Kansas Health Service at Lawrence, the Winfield and Parsons Training Schools (for mentally retarded), the Kansas Girls Industrial School at Beloit, the Kansas Children's Home and Receiving Center at Atchison and the Alcoholic Recovery Unit of the Kansas Commission for Alcoholism at Wichita.

Children's guidance centers in Kansas City, Kan., Atchison, Lawrence, Salina and Wichita and many community programs for mental hygiene depend on this same pool of Topeka trainees and workers for guidance and help. Nursing and boarding homes licensed by the Kansas Board of Social Welfare also use their services.

MILLION TO START

When Kansas decided to substitute "brains for bricks," a phrase coined by Dr. William Menninger, its State hospital system stood at the bottom of the list of States in number and professional standing of hospital staffs. The hospital system did a little begging, borrowing, and stealing, but it decided on a teaching and intraining program for two reasons: (1) This was the only method that would bring the number of workers needed; (2) if one of the hospitals could be made into a teaching hospital, prestige alone would bring top-grade men and women who want the satisfaction of teaching.

The Kansas Legislature appropriated a million dollars to start the program. It is a commentary on the struggle to get psychiatric workers that the Topeka State Hospital was able to spend only $300,000 of the appropriation that first year. In fact, every year since, the training program has been long on funds from the annual million dollar appropriations.

But by 1955, the Topeka State Hospital has been the training site for 71 psychiatrists of the Menninger School of Psychiatry. It has trained 18 psychologists, 852 psychiatric aides, and numbers of therapists, nurses, and social workers. Most of the 754 staff members and employees of the hospital have been "home-trained."

In all, training programs for 13 kinds of specialists in mental health work are conducted at the hospital under the direction of Dr. Paul E. Feldman, director of research and education.

Kansas State law requires that every nurse trained in the State must have psychiatric training for 13 weeks. Topeka State Hospital takes over this instruction. Furthermore it trains its own psychiatric nurses for longer terms.

Social work students from the Kansas universities and colleges are assigned to the hospital by the deans who carefully screen for those who might become potential workers in the field of mental health.

Nursing and boarding home operators have 1 week's intensive training with special emphasis on geriactrics and organic brain disorders.

The term "occupational therapist" has given way to "adjunctive therapist." Within this group of workers can be found those who will train the mentally ill in industrial, occupational, recreational, and music therapy. Scores of these workers are needed in any State hospital system. The Topeka hospital has an intensive in-training program for these adjunctive therapists.

Even the dietitians, the barbers, the electricians, the phone operators, the kitchen workers, and the maintenance men need some in-training work for the specialized "plant" in which they are employed.

VOLUNTEERS HELP

The hospital has training programs for others who fight the battle of mental ill health on other battlefronts; the ministers, community workers in mental-health programs, and the volunteers—those thousands of Kansans who have made it possible for the Kansas State hospitals to prove to the patients that "outsiders" know and care about their welfare.

The State Hospital Aides in Recreation and Entertainment—SHARE—and the Red Cross furnish most of these volunteers, who follow a schedule in hospital visits. But the good Samaritan acts of mercy and kindness from Kansas citizens throughout the State have had their effect within the hospital system, also.

For instance, the superintendent of Larned believes that one of the most successful therapies he uses is that of providing just ordinary house dresses, each different in material and stylings for his women patients. No longer are bolts of cloth delivered to the hospital to be made into identical dresses. Each woman selects her own wear from the hospital store. Kansas volunteers help here, too. Each year tons of clothes are contributed to the store by the people who live near Larned.

In Topeka, the volunteers provide transportation for patients who want to go shopping in town. They operate the patients' library. They provide the Christmas and other holiday parties, and many work with individual patients as companions and teachers.

But all of these volunteers who work directly in the hospitals must be trained, and Topeka State Hospital has vital programs to hold their interest.

A 3-month period of training is provided for ministers who are preparing for careers as chaplains in mental hospitals. Many other pastoral students take these courses, because they are aware that they are 1 of the 3 groups of professional men to whom the mentally upset and ill naturally gravitate—doctors, lawyers, and ministers.

BROADER HORIZONS

"Because psychiatry is one of the newer areas of medicine, he (the psychiatrist) should also be a scientist seeking new knowledge. Discoveries comparable to those of Harvey, Pasteur, and Koch still wait to be made in this growing science."

These words from a United States Public Health Service bulletin may be another explanation for the dedicated interest one sees among the Topeka psychiatric workers.

For here are the misty frontiers of research, beckoning the young man to discover a technique that may someday bear his name. Such research, of course, is not confined to Topeka. National Institute of Public Health research funds are available for every State. In Topeka, research funds

have been secured, too, from the great private foundations such as Rockefeller.

At the Menninger Foundation, research projects vary from the study of the effects of the new wonder drugs through the clinical problems of thyroid gland dysfunction to children's ways of coping with their problems. There are studies underway on the psychological aspects of blindness. For past 4 years an intensive study has been given to the psychology of the schizophrenic child and the child on the borderline or schizophrenia—that disabling mental disease accounting for more than a third of all mental hospital patients and the one most resistant to treatment.

Harry Levinson, Ph. D. (who as a psycology student from Kansas University did the spadework that broke the scandal in the State hospitals), is deep in research—and education—in the field of industrial psychiatry. Many a great industry now known the importance of mental good health among its workers, and psychiatrists are added to the staff just as are those who work in physical health.

But Levinson and Dr. Will Menninger are working on an even more ambitious project: searching out the psychological factors that under the three a's—absenteeism, accidents, alcoholism—cost American industry billions of dollars annually.

And in every ward in every Topeka hospital the most intensive, highly personalized search goes—what is mental health? Where and when is it lost? From the patients in those wards each answer will be found—and each psychiatric worker, from psychiatrist to aids, adds his little bit of observation to the growing record.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Korean Republic, Seoul, Korea, dated Monday, January 30, 1956. The editorial is about General MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial on General MacArthur reflects not only the feeling and the thinking of the people of Korea but millions of people in the United States of America. It must warm the cockles of the general's heart to realize that the service he tried to render to these troubled people is fully appreciated.

This Congress should consider and pass legislation which has been introduced, which would give this distinguished statesman the well-deserved title of the General of the Armies. I am also convinced that this administration should use the knowledge and prestige of General MacArthur when it comes to dealing with the problems of Korea, Japan, and the Far East. He is respected; he is loved; he has great knowledge and understanding of the problems of the Orient. We should utilize this understanding and knowledge.

The editorial follows:

ASSIGNMENT FOR MACARTHUR

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was 76 years old the other day, and tributes from all over the world poured into his tower suite in New York's Waldorf Astoria Hotel. They could not have gone to a more deserving international statesman and military genius. When many of the other great names of our time have been reduced to insignificance, that of MacArthur will remain undiminished.

Of all American personalities, MacArthur has probably made the greatest impress on the Pacific world. Only part of that stems from his magnificent leadership and strategical conceptions in World War II and the Korean War. MacArthur is a prophet—and sometimes one without honor in his own country—who has always seen the shape of things to come in Asia.

He has often been called an "Asia firster." That is true, but not in the sense of a man obsessed with the love of given areas or peoples. MacArthur likes and understands Asians, of course. But his intense preoccupation with the Orient is based not upon Asiaphilism, but upon his great American patriotism. He knows that Asia is the power reservoir of the world, and that in time to come a free Asia will mean a free world and a slave Asia will mean a slave world.

In realizing this, MacArthur has become one of the most consistent advocates of national self-ditermination under any and all conditions. During the Japanese occupation period, for example, MacArthur never supposed nor advocated that Japan could be kept in a condition of permanent colonial thralldom. He knew that the Japanese soon would have to be freed to seek their own destiny, and he did all within his power to assure that Japan would follow peaceful and constructive ways. If Japan now is bent upon another direction, that is not his fault. With his departure from the Far East, weaker policies were substituted for his strong but impartial leadership, and the result is a Japan that is lined up with the Communists.

As Ambassador Ben Limb said in New York last week, the Korean war was stalemated only because MacArthur's views were vetoed. This was the man who had driven the Communists from the southern half of Korea only 4 months after their treacherous attack and penetration of all the Republic except the tiny ring of the Pusan perimeter. Yet when MacArthur warned that the price of the Manchurian sanctuary would be loss of the war, he was disregarded. From that decision not to carry the attack to Red Chinese bases across the Yalu stems the loss of half of Vietnam, the threat in the Formosa Straits, the continued division of Korea, and the great peril to all that remains of Free Asia.

It seems a great tragedy that a man of MacArthur's superlative qualifications should not be employed by his country at a time of crisis even more grave than that of December 7, 1941. We do not mean to imply that MacArthur is doing nothing. He is busy with his business interests and presumably with writing. He is generous in giving his time and advice to those who seek him out for advice and counsel. But he is needed for more than that, as is so often indicated by leading spokesmen of both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

We think that we speak for all Asia when we say that the United States could make no more sagacious move than to place General MacArthur in a position where his wisdom and driving energy could serve his own country, the Far East, and the Free World. With MacArthur there is no compromise with the ideals of freedom and democracy, no concessions to the Communists—and all peoples and nations know it. Such forthright leadership is the way to victory and to lasting peace that would follow.

Red Aim Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a well-considered article showing that basic Communist policy or strategy has not changed, written by Cornelius Dalton, and appearing in the Boston Traveler of February 17, 1956.

In his article Mr. Dalton has objectively evaluated the recent speech of Krushchev, the first secretary and Red leader in the Kremlin:

RED AIM UNCHANGED

(By Cornelius Dalton)

The speech by Nikita S. Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communists Party does not represent a basic change in Red policy or strategy.

Two general conclusions have been drawn from the speech by many observers. They are (1) that Khrushchev has emerged as Stalin's successor as dictator, and (2) that he has renounced the Marxist-Leninist dictum that capitalism must be overthrown by force and violence.

There is some evidence that the first conclusion may be correct, despite Khrushchev's references to "collective leadership" and his criticism of ""making a particular leader a hero and miracle worker."

He obviously is consolidating his power in his key position as first secretary of the Community Party's central committee, and he freely attacked Molotov and Malenkov. Unless he is challenged, the probability is that he will take over as supreme dictator.

But there is no convincing evidence that Khrushchev has repudiated force and violence as an instrument of achieving the triumph of world communism, even though he tried to give that impression.

After mentioning the Marxist-Leninist theory that "while imperialism exists wars are inevitable," Khrushchev said: "There is no fatal inevitability of war." He also advocated "peaceful coexistence" as the basis of relations between the U. S. S. R. and the United States.

Khrushchev implied that under cetrain conditions in certain countries the "transition to socialism" could be accomplished by "parliamentary" means.

But referring specifically to the use of force, he said this depends "not so much on the proletariat as on the extent of the resistance put up by the exploiters, and on the employment of violence by the exploiting class itself."

Then he made this extremely significant comment:

"Of course in countries where capitalism is still strong and where it controls an enormous military and police machine, the serious resistance of the reactionary forces is inevitable.

"There the transition to socialism will proceed amid conditions of an acute class revolutionary struggle."

What Khrushchev is saying is this:

If any country is willing to surrender peacefully to the Soviet Union, the "transition to socialism" will be accomplished without force and violence.

But if a country offers resistance to the Soviet Union, then the "transition" will be

enforced by "revolutionary" means, that is, by force and violence.

Khrushchev's prattle about "peaceful coexistence" is a continuance of the Kremlin's phony peace propaganda.

His appeal for a "popular front" is a new attempt to divide and weaken the anti-Communist forces.

The "peace loving" Soviet tyrants have already enslaved one-third of humanity.

The conquest and enslavement of the entire world is still their No. 1 objective.

A Chronology of Actions Since 1934 to Build Jefferson National Expansion Memorial—All Awaiting Modest $5 Million Appropriation for Federal Share of Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the people of St. Louis and surrounding areas to build the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial go back to the formation of an organization in St. Louis 22 years ago, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, in April, 1934. In June of that year, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a Federal Commission to plan construction of this national shrine. There have been many developments since then, but until a modest $5 million is forthcoming from the Federal Government, we cannot make this dream into a reality.

The series of articles in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat giving the history and plans for the memorial to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the West has traced in detail the many steps taken by the people of St. Louis to do their part in connection with this great project. These articles, which I am placing in the RECORD under unanimous consent,. have been written by Ted Schafers, Ray Noonan and Marsh Clark.

The fifth article in the series, by Globe-Democrat Washington Correspondent Marsh Clark, tells how President Roosevelt, President Truman and President Eisenhower all joined in supporting the memorial. It tells of the many steps which have been taken since 1934, as follows:

THREE PRESIDENTS HAVE SUPPORTED RIVER FRONT PROJECT TO NO AVAIL.

(By Marsh Clark)

(Fifth of a series)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Three Presidents of the United States have spoken out and acted in favor of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial for the St. Louis downtown riverfront. However, in the 20 years since it was first proposed it is still nothing but a parking lot.

The first presidential action was June 15, 1934, when the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a Federal commission to plan construction of this proposed national shrine. St. Louis was selected because of its historic role as the gateway to the West.

The last presidential act took place May 14, 1954, when President Eisenhower signed a bill passed by Congress authorizing $5 million to be appropriated for the memorial when the Federal budget was balanced. This is now a fact. However, the Federal Park Service, which has the job of constructing and operating the project, has indicated it will ask for only $150,000—to fence and landscape the old courthouse. There is nothing for memorial construction.

Under President Roosevelt's leadership the 82.5-acre tract was acquired and the old buildings along the riverfront were razed. World War II and the Korean conflict caused natural delays.

President Harry S. Truman exhibited his support. Once confronting an eastern Senator who was cool to the project, in his characteristic forthright fashion, he said:

"Sometime or other I wish you would come out to St. Louis and Kansas City and take a look at what we are trying to do out here for the establishment of historical markers for future generations.

"They are just as important here as they are in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut," Truman remarked.

President Eisenhower expressed his personal feelings in a letter to Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS July 7, 1954, when he presented the Republican Congressman from Webster Grooves with the pen with which he signed the $5 million authorization law. President Eisenhower said:

"I was very happy to sign into law the bill authorizing construction of a national shrine to Thomas Jefferson and the pioneers who made possible the peaceful expansion of our Nation, west of the Mississippi.

"Through this shrine the American people art fittingly commemorating a critical period in our history and the courageous men who lived during it.

"Accordingly I am delighted to learn the pen I used in signing this bill will repose in the United States Museum of National Expansion in the historic old courthouse in St. Louis."

It is obvious from the letter that President Eisenhower felt this bill would start construction of this memorial as soon as the budgetary restrictions had been met.

To the thousands of St. Louisans and public-spirited citizens in other parts of the country the slow progress of the memorial here is difficult to understand.

Perhaps they can take comfort in the observation made by the late Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War under President Wilson, and a charter member of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Commission, who said:

"This memorial will be like a cathedral; built slowly, but surely."

St. Louis Congressmen have made determined efforts to get funds. But these have been as unavailing as had they tried to swim up Niagara Falls.

Bills, hearings, motions, agreements, and resolutions have not been lacking here in Washington. In fact, they have occurred in startling profusion. What has been notable by its absence is money, Federal funds in sufficient quantity to give firm evidence that the Government intends to keep its part of a bargain struck years ago with the city of St. Louis.

A check of the chronology of principal events affecting the Jefferson Memorial in Washington shows at least 31 important actions in behalf of the project.

Memorial backers have never tired of trying to get their plans and hopes understood by Congress. At a hearing in 1950 before a House committee, St. Louisans filled 88 typewritten pages with testimony.

The patient supporters returned again in May 1953, and gave 23,000 words more of testimony before the same House group. And, later that same month they uttered 15,000 more words to a Senate committee.

To read this testimony today you have to go to Government storerooms and the National Archives, the graveyards where outdated material is stashed away for posterity.

Let's take a look at a few highlights in the years of busy activity to get Government gers grinding in a decisive way:

April 11, 1934: Public-spirited citizens from all over the country organize the nonprofit Jefferson National Memorial Association, which is still in existence today.

September 10, 1935: St. Louisans ballot a $7,500,000 bond issue for the city's share. The vote: 123,299 for; 50,713 opposed.

June 22, 1936: National Park Service establishes St. Louis office to develop memorial.

May 1940: President Roosevelt accepts old courthouse as a gift from St. Louis.

May 1942: Removal of buildings on memorial site completed.

May 25, 1948: Interior Secretary concurs in Federal commission's approval of winning design—submitted by Eero Saarinen. Highlight of proposal is a huge stainless steel arch, rising 200 feet higher than St. Louis' tallest building.

December 6, 1949: Agreement signed between the Government, the city, and interested railroads providing for the relocation of railroad tracks and, an easement to the city of St. Louis for underground parking in the memorial area.

June 19, 1950: Memorial site dedicated by President Truman.

January 29, 1953: Identical bills introduced in House by Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN (widow of John B. Sullivan), who introduced original bill in January 1950); MELVIN PRICE, of East St. Louis; THOMAS CURTIS, of Webster Groves; C. W. BISHOP, of Cartersville, Ill.; and FRANK B. KARSTEN, St. Louis.

February 18: A new bill introduced by Senator HENNINGS in the Senate with Senators SYMINGTON, ANDERSON, MARTIN, and MORSE.

May 14, 1954: President Eisenhower signs $5 million authorizing bill into law.

January 17, 1956: President Eisenhower submits balanced budget to Congress removing legal bars to appropriation.

January 26, 1956: Representatives CURTIS and SULLIVAN introduce bill calling for the $5 million previously authorized. Since then, representative KARSTEN and Senators HENNINGS and SYMINGTON have called for more funds for the river front.

The record is long. Yet, despite these myriad efforts, the Federal Government as a whole has dragged its feet in sad contrast to the dash and vision of the men and the deeds which the memorial is intended to commemorate.

Final Article in Globe-Democrat Series on Jefferson Memorial Puts Problem in Simplest Form: Federal Funds Are Key to Project's Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the series of articles in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial has detailed the long history of our efforts to build this great project as a shrine to the American spirit which opened the West. These articles,

written by Globe-Democrat staff writers Ray Noonan, Ted Schafers, and Marsh Clark, have told dramatically what this project will mean, when completed, not only to St. Louis but to the whole country.

The final article in the series is by Globe-Democrat Washington Correspondent Marsh Clark, and is entitled "Money Is Only Key to Solution of River Front Project Woes."

Mr. Clark dug into this story by going to the officials of the National Park Service to learn why, in a Federal budget of more than $60 billions, only $150,000 could be spared for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. Obviously, this is only a drop in the bucket. The Federal share of the project as now authorized is only $5 million. That is not much in a budget of more than $60 billions.

All of us in St. Louis feel the full $5 million should be provided, so that this long-delayed project can be put into construction. Mr. Clark's article sums it up as follows:

MONEY IS ONLY KEY TO SOLUTION OF RIVER-FRONT-PROJECT WOES

(By Marsh Clark)

(Sixth of a series)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—There is one key that will unlock all the troubles that have plagued the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial since its inception, two decades ago. That key is money.

It is true that small amounts have dribbled from Government coffers down through the years.

The amounts, however, have been paltry. Despite much flailing and many words, the proposed memorial has been grounded for lack of funds.

Here in Washington two groups are the keepers of that key which can open the door to the future achievement.

They are the Congress and the National Park Service.

It's easy to understand the importance of Congress. It alone can appropriate the money.

The National Park Service (part of the Interior Department) has a more indirect role, but, nonetheless, a crucial one. It administers all national parks and memorials—those actually in existence and those that are, like the Jefferson Memorial, still largely a pipe dream.

Congress attaches great importance to money requests to be spent on parks, made by the agency which has the job of administering those parks. Within the bounds of sound finances, the Congress tries to grant what the Service asks.

And what is the Park Service asking for the memorial for the next fiscal year?

The amount is $150,000, about 3 percent of what project backers would like to have.

Why is the Service asking for such a puny amount? To find an answer to this question, a Globe-Democrat representative conferred at length with Park Service officails. Here is their explanation:

The Park Service is being bombarded from all sides about the rundown condition of existing parks, they say. To fix the situation, the Service has launched Mission 66.

Mission 66 is a 10-year program that is supposed to put the parks in shape to accommodate 80 million annual visitors by 1966.

This will take lots of money. Not much is going to be left for starting new parks and memorials or continuing work on those already under way.

These officials seem genuinely perplexed about the St. Louis project. Scratching their heads, they admit it's in a unique status.

They allow (with loud sighs) that the Government has a very definite obligation to keep a bargain with St. Louis.

But, at least at present, they cannot see their way clear to giving more money to the long-delayed riverfront memorial.

Their argument rests. In part, upon the lamentably tired condition of existing parks. There is little controversy about that.

Here's a typical complaint about conditions at Yellowstone National Park: Speed limits have been raised to 45 miles an hour, the better to hurry visitors through a preserve dedicated to the leisurely appreciation of nature.

One day, the complaint continues, 16,000 people burned up gas driving into Yellowstone and 6,000 had to burn up gas driving right back out because of lack of accommodations.

Guard rails over precipitous cliffs are in disrepair. Park service employees are living in trailers, or in dingy barracks thrown up in the early 1930's to house laborers on public works projects. The Public Health Service is howling about the lack of sanitation in parks.

And here is the Park Service's punch line: "It wasn't our idea that our funds have been reduced to practically nothing."

Imposing though these arguments may be, where do they leave the 22-year-old Jefferson Expansion Memorial project and the agreement for Federal participation, now that all legal bars have been removed to an appropriation of funds?

Cannot a $66,238,000 Interior Department budget spare more than $150,000 to this worthy project and its long-suffering backers?

St. Louis Congressmen say "yes."

They are thinking in terms of $5,000,000, and are pressing for an appropriation in that amount despite the fact that the Park Service has not asked for it.

Both Missouri Senators have called for a substantial Federal appropriation.

Why was the $150,000 earmarked for restoring an iron fence and incidental landscaping around the Old Courthouse (a gift from St. Louis to the Government) when the Park Service's own priority lists put restoration of that structure far down the list of necessary steps?

The answer is simple.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is a drop in the bucket on a project the size of the proposed memorial.

Service officials say that the only part of the project where $150,000 would make the slightest dent is the Old Courthouse.

Relocation of railroad tracks is the No. 1 step that should be taken, they admit. But the estimated cost of this relocation is $2,500,000, and $150,000 wouldn't even buy a set of good blueprints.

Likewise, such vital steps as landscaping and constructing paved areas and utilities must be postponed until sizable chunks of money are made available, if they ever are.

That leaves these later steps: Construction of the arch, which is to be the highlight of the whole project (under present law, Federal money cannot be spent on the arch); construction of restaurants, getting a museum building and exhibits, and finally, historic reconstruction.

Perhaps the Park Service's feelings are best described by the words of one of its officials, who told the Globe-Democrat with obvious resignation:

"I'm sincere when I say we don't go out and buy up land just to let it stand there. This situation was brought about by a series of unfortunate circumstances beyond our control, including two wars.

"We'd do something tomorrow if we had the money."

St. Louisans are growing progressively more weary of hearing Government gobbledygook worded in the future tense.

They feel, after 20 years of delay, that the time to talk about is now.

Republican Deployment—1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the presidential campaign for 1956 is beginning to take shape. Everyone concedes that the Republican forces present a far different array this year than in the past two presidential elections. Their forces extend across the broad front of politics for the first time in many years.

One of the champions of the new era of Republicanism has been the Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, from the Sixth District of Pennsylvania. He saw his advice go unheeded in prior years and his party go down to defeat, despite his warnings. His former position is now vindicated by the positive social legislation of the Eisenhower administration, as is evidenced by a recent article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch.

The article follows:

REPUBLICAN DEPLOYMENT—1956

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

As the morning mist lifts from the great United States political battlefield of 1956, a surprising sight is disclosed.

The Republican array is deployed on a far broader front than it has presented to its ancient foe since Teddy Roosevelt raised the standard of his Square Deal.

Its right wing is anchored on the high ground of a promised balanced budget and a record of substantial encouragement to big industry.

Its left wing stretches off toward the broad plane of social security and welfare statism.

In the center is the heavy infantry of peace and prosperity.

This is a very different thing from the Republican force put into the field in either of the last two presidential elections.

In 1948 the Republicans were confident of victory. They had the old palace guard and the solitary figure of Thomas E. Dewey, who would be the "little giant" of the year. But between the champion and the guard there was little affection and almost no coordination.

Harry S. Truman turned out to be the doughtier champion; and the old guard, encumbered with antique armor, could not get into the fight in time to influence the result. With an appreciation for whimsy rare in United States politics, the voters of that year voted Democratic.

In 1952 there was no need for a broad front, or perhaps even for much of an army. The Republicans at last had a truly popular champion, a man so popular that the Democrats themselves had tried strenuously to persuade him to lead their forces. Dwight D. Eisenhower was what the Republicans had the most of in 1952, but it was enough to carry the country, though not enough to procure a real victory for the party itself.

This time it's different—to the Democrats startlingly different. As their field commanders scan the Republican line they realize that for the first time in many years there is no sure opportunity for their classic maneuver: the flanking movement around the Republican left which has so often before rolled up the Republican line and won the victory. Not since Teddy Roosevelt has the Republican high command so extended its line to the left and prepared so carefully to protect that flank.

This is what one Republican command casualty of other years dreamed of, yearned and begged and pleaded for, in his time. One of this reporter's most poignant memories is of HUGH SCOTT, Jr., Republican National Committee chairman of 1948, on the night the returns came in that year.

HUGH SCOTT had long recognized the appalling weakness of the Republican position on those endless open plains to the left. Against his pleas, his partisans of the 80th Congress had spent their time exclusively in fortifying their already impregnable position on the right. They built the great tower keep of Taft-Hartley and dug around it the broad moat of deafness to appeals from the Farm Belt for grain storage.

On that cold November night HUGH SCOTT watched from his command post as the Republican line was turned from the left and crushed against the castle walls, as he had suspected all along that it would be. When it was all over he turned to the little group of reporters who had waited to the end. Partly in bitterness, partly in frustration, and partly also in hope he commented, as nearly as memory serves me, as follows:

"It's a good thing. Those mastodons wouldn't listen to me. They had to learn their lesson. Now, maybe, they'll go out and pass some good social legislation."

HUGH SCOTT has suffered the fate of all field commanders who are required to join battle against superior forces. He is in command obscurity now along with Kimmel and Short, Ghormley, and Wavell, and Weygand. But the lessons of his failure have been noted by those who came after.

Under President Eisenhower, the Republican left has been extended to cover farm aid, school building, highways, social security for more people, higher minimum wages, public health. An orthodox Republican of the old Hoover school can be appalled at what has happened, and many a one is. This is not a garrison to hold the old citadel on the right. This is a field army raised to maneuver on hitherto unfamiliar ground. There is light infantry, and cavalry, and many a new weapon, besides the dragoons of the Old Guard.

The new Republican array is a sobering sight to Democrats. They are not, so far as is yet known, equipped to assault the Republican right. Their leader, Adlai E. Stevenson, is hardly the type to lead a massive charge through the center. And stretching out across the plain is the new Republican militia of the left.

There are two uncertainties about this new Republican array which could decide the issue. The identity of its battle commander is uncertain. And its cohesiveness and discipline are yet to be tested in combat.

But as the morning mist lifts from the field and before the battle is joined it looks unexpectedly extensive.

Upper Colorado Scheme's True Cost Exceeds $5 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation authorization of $760 million is misleading. The direct cost of the projects authorized by section 1 of the bill alone would amount to $933,468,300 based on Bureau of Reclamation estimates. The construction costs of all the projects covered in the bill amount to about $1.6 billion. The figure of $760 million in the pending bill hides from Congress the true cost of the development, which, when interest costs on its extensive noninterest returnable irrigation features are added to the $1.6 billion, total in excess of $5 billion. This is an unconscionable burden for Congress to place on the United States taxpayers to irrigate land to produce more crop surpluses to further burden the taxpayers.

The upper Colorado proposal should be defeated.

The Need for Simplification in Tax Return Forms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has sent to me a letter which I quote below. This letter points up the need for a government which is continually alert to escape from redtape in its relationship with the ordinary citizen and to adopt an overall attitude of sympathy to the individual citizen's problems.

It also points up the great need for a tremendous simplification in the tax return forms. The present forms present an increasing problem to the individual taxpayer and, I believe, results in a loss of revenue to the Government, as well as disrespect by the citizen for the Government itself.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 11, 1956.

Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I had an experience Friday, February 10, 1956, which I believe you may be interested in hearing about. To give you the picture I must go into some detail but I think you will appreciate hearing about this situation.

I am a tax accountant and went to the Internal Revenue office in Inglewood to get some corporation and partnership tax forms. There was one man only behind the counter giving so-called information and help to taxpayers. There were approximately 15 or 20 people trying to get help, etc. Also, a cashier was on duty. I asked the cashier if she would be kind enough to get me the forms or ask one of the employees in the back if they would. She said the only one who could help me was the man behind the counter and I would have to wait my turn. That was all right as far as I was concerned so I began to wait my turn.

An elderly lady was asking the internal revenue man to make out her return. He told her he couldn't unless she was illiterate or mentally incapacitated. He proceeded to explain to her how to prepare the return. It was obvious that she could not understand and after approximately 10 minutes of her pleading for help together with his incomprehensive explanations she took her forms and said that she guessed she would have to go to a private tax office and spend $5 or $10 to have the return made out. As she was leaving I called her aside and told her I was a former internal revenue agent and would be happy to make our her form if she wished. She told me that the internal revenue had always made out her return for her and I told her the policy had been changed this year. It took about 2 minutes to make out her return. Her earnings were $1,674. I asked her how old she was since she looked over 65 and I thought might be entitled to the extra exemption. She said she was 64 but would be 65 this year. Her tax amounted to $179 and the withholding was $207. I explained to her that she would get a $28 refund from the Government and she was indeed happy. She was a widow living in a little trailer park.

I could relate several other instances I observed while I waited to get my forms which clearly indicate this so-caleld "new policy" unconcern for the little people but will not because I know you are busy. But the point I want to make is this—the case of the little old lady is not unusual. This is happening to thousands of people who cannot understand tax tables and instructions on the forms. They can ill afford to pay for help in filing their returns. I worked for the Internal Revenue under your father's and President Truman's administration and we worked Saturdays and overtime to help taxpayers who needed help. The Internal Revenue now has more employees than ever before and there is no reason why any person working for wages or a salary should have to pay for tax help.

I believe this new policy is politically stupid and also that it is converting thousands of people to the Democrats if they have not already been converted. What do you think about this situation?

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY M. ANSITE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Anything New From Moscow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we must be ever alert to the threat of communism and its ultimate goal—rule of the entire world, including the United States. We cannot accept Soviet statements at face value, because we know, from past experience, that they change their statements, but not their ultimate goal, when to change will serve the need of the moment. At this time, they would like us to think their goal of world conquest is no longer in effect. The time is for actual, sincere, and constructive deeds, not mere words.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 19, 1956, edition of the Sunday News, New York City, which is, in my opinion, worthy of our consideration:

ANYTHING NEW FROM MOSCOW?

Has anything really new come out of the current 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow?

To hear some of our deep thinkers tell it, the affair marks a historic shift in Kremlin policy. We've read the parts of Nikita S. Khrushchev's 7-hour speech that were made available in the United States by Soviet agencies. Maybe we're dumb, but we can detect no novelty in what Khrushchev said.

It is true that Khrushchev who holds Joe Stalin's old job as first secretary of the Communist Party, appeared to emerge at this Congress as a Stalin II, despite other delegates' frantic denials of one-man rule; but even this was predicted sometime ago.

What, then, did Khrushchev say that led so many observers to think his speech marked a turning point in Russian history?

For one thing, he pretended to repeal the old Lenin-Stalin-Manuilsky doctrine of inevitable war between capitalism and communism.

There was nothing new in that. Stalin took it all back when it suited his convenience to do so, notably when he was fighting with his back to the wall against the invading German hordes in World War II.

A ZIG, A ZAG

Khrushy says war isn't inevitable because communism has spread far and wide beyond the boundaries of Russia, and can now scare the capitalists out of starting a fight.

But the reason for the shift is the same as always, obviously. It's in line with Nikolai Lenin's old principle that communism must zigzag its way to world conquest. This latest zig, Khrushchev evidently figures, should lull western suspicions of him and his comrade cutthroats, and give the time to choke off popular discontent in Russia over recent crop failures and shortages of goods.

Khrushchev also made believe to blow the whistle on the Commies' old hatred of Socialists in this Moscow speech of his. These two groups of Marxists habitually hate each other like poison; but the Commies are able to turn their hatred on or off as directed by the Kremlin.

They turned it off in the 1930's, when they seduced a lot of Socialists, especially in France, into so-called Popular Front movements. The idea was to use the Socialists' respectability as a path to power, then to slit the Socialists' gullets.

OLD POPULAR FRONT GAME

It seems plain enough that Khrushchev hopes similar maneuvers can succeed in France and Italy in the 1950's. It's to be hoped that Socialists won't be suckered a second time; but there's no certainty of that.

Another Khrushchev crack which excited a lot of Western observers was the one about violent revolution being now unnecessary to turn many countries Communist. These, said Stalin II, can be taken over by popular vote sooner or later, because more and more of their workers are coming to understand the blessings of communism.

Widely overlooked was the fact that Khrushy added: "Of course, in countries where capitalism is still strong and where it controls an enormous military and police machine * * * the transition to Socialism (meaning communism) will proceed amid conditions of an acute class revolutionary struggle."

THEY'RE STILL GUNNING FOR US

Foremost among such countries, as Khrushchev sees it, is the United States.

So, as far as this Nation is concerned, the Communists, as always, look forward to its government's overthrow some day by force and violence. We can't imagine any stronger justification for the Smith Act and all our other anti-subversive laws than this tip from the Moscow horse's, er, mouth that the United States commies are to go right on with their criminal conspiracy for an eventual overturn of the American system in blood and fire.

There is, then, nothing new from Moscow. The Reds are as determined as ever to grab the whole world by hook, crook, or hydrogen bomb, and that was the whole and sole meaning of the foreign-policy part of Stalin II's 7-hour spiel.

The Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, in the early part of this month, a group of men arrived at Yalta, the famous Russian Riviera, to decide the future and shape of the postwar world. Famous statesmen, politicians, counsels, and advisers, military leaders, and even some members of their families arrived there by plane, by ships and trains from distant places, in order to participate in a joint meeting aiming to organize a better and happier world and to determine upon the punishment of those responsible for the worldwide catastrophy.

They brought with them briefcases full of legal data, memoranda, technical books, historical documents, maps, and dictionaries. The teams occupied the premises of the Livadia Palace, the former summer residence of Czar Nicolaus II and his family.

For 6 days, American, British, and Soviet teams were debating, while in between sessions, receptions for the visitors were given. In old-fashioned Russian style, caviar was being consumed by the pound, while vodka and other liquors were freely dispensed. Each round was accompanied by long and weary toasts "To our great alliance," "To the father of our beloved motherland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," "Batiushka Stalin," "Long live our great victorious, invincible Red Army," "Death to the Fascists," and to the Hitler dictatorship.

While this was going on, in other parts of Soviet Russia there were countless human wrecks, representing almost all nationalities who were digging coal, chopping wood in the vast forests of Siberia, laying rails for the widely publicized Trans-Siberian Railroad. There were millions of people, securely guarded by entire divisions of members of the NKVD, dying by the thousands every day, and for each one of them who were relieved from their sufferings, there were many others being shipped as replacements in cattle trains. All of them were slaves. At the same time, in still another part of Russia, a new army was being created. It was an army of former SS men led by General Von Paulus, who only 2 years before that had tried to capture Stalingrad.

On February 4, 1945, at 5:17 p. m., the first formal meeting convened in the grand ballroom of the Livadia Palace. Among those present who were occupying seats around the large table were men of outstanding character, brilliant and well trained for their position, public servants with years of experience, who received their formal education at such outstanding colleges and universities as Oxford, Cambridge, Yale, and Harvard. It is felt that some who sat at the table were lacking in courage. There were also men who were shrewd and clever, who had grown up in one of the bloodiest revolutions history has known, men who had never traveled beyond the borders of Soviet Russia, educated in institutions operated by the party and the NKVD. There were others, great military leaders who have led armies to victory, and generals who knew how to administrate millions of slaves from their offices in the Kremlin.

Among them were lawyers, who were members of college fraternities where open discussions had been encouraged. There were men raised on America's main streets where differences could be settled by the courts and where rallies of all kinds and expressions of political opinions were permitted. Across the table were others, graduates of Soviet law schools. They sat there with grim faces, carefully observing their counterparts. To them the law was Stalin. Their experience was chiefly in purge trials held in the late thirties. Their weapon was prisons and slave-labor camps. Thus for the first time West met East at close hand.

After 6 days of long and tiresome discussions a mutual agreement was signed. Among the problems that were discussed and agreed upon were the future of the World Organization, the question of a free Poland, the release of war prisoners, postwar Germany, the war in Japan, and undoubtedly other questions. The documents signed 11 years ago contained eloquent words such as "a Poland liberated by the Red army" or "the Soviet Union shall enter into war against Japan on the side of the Allies on conditions that."

I do not believe for one moment that the above sentences need any commentary from any sound person. For that matter, neither do the Yalta meetings need commenting. The results of the Yalta conference we have experienced for the past 11 years are indeed unfortunate and we probably are still far away from the end of our experience. So far an entire continent has been swallowed by Russia. Part of eastern and central Europe is gone and what is more the threat of another world war has never ceased to harass us.

Eleven years ago those who dared to oppose the decisions mutually agreed upon at Yalta were called warmongers, which is a term out of the Soviet dictionary. But those who did oppose it, and I am proud to say that I was one of them, realized then the drastic consequences we would have to face. Mankind is facing it now.

The Crashes of Kansas-Based Airmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial entitled "The

Crashes of Kansas-Based Airmen," which appeared in the February 13, 1956, edition of the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal. The editorial refers to two fatal crashes of Air Force B–47 aircraft on Friday, February 10, 1956.

The editorial follows:

THE CRASHES OF KANSAS-BASED AIRMEN

A tragic lesson has come home once more.

Military duty in peace as in war is inoculated with peril that can break out at any moment to consume those who serve. Its life is one of anxious nights at home to those who stand and wait, as it is of instant danger to officers and men afield, at sea, or as thousands here in Topeka know it, in the high sky.

In Friday's B–47 crashes, in South Dakota and not far from here, death came with obliterating finality to 6 men of our own Forbes Air Force base, as to 4 men of Salina's Smoky Hill. Their lives, their work, their dreams, must now be counted done. Yet life and danger must go on unabated, undiminished, among the living they left behind. Those living will be the men who do the more soberly the duty before them, and will be the anguished wives and lovers, the grieving parents, the bewildered children. The service is like that. It is the way of the military, from old time until the end of all war, which is not in sight.

The fatal crashes of these Kansas-based crews must fill all of us with sympathy for the bereaved, as with profound respect for the dead. There is nothing really that we can say, but much that we can do to be friendly and grateful to these our surviving friends and neighbors.

It will remain to us, perhaps, in this lesson that has been repeated, that every airman's valor to heed the call of duty above and beyond, is not far from the valor above and beyond the call of duty.

Address of Timothy J. Murphy, Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Lincoln's Tomb in Springfield, Ill., February 2, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. MURRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 12, Mr. Timothy J. Murphy, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, made a most stirring address at the tomb of Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Ill.

I think it is most fitting that his remarks be preserved in our congressional annals. His remarks follow:

Today we gather on hallowed ground to pay homage to one of the greatest of all Americans—one who in the words of Stanton, truly, "belongs to the ages."

The privilege of rendering this tribute as the representative and commander in chief of the more than 1,250,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply felt. Because of my lifelong reverence of his name and a belief in his democratic ideals, I deem it a personal honor that I shall never forget. We should all have a fierce pride in being citizens of a country that provides the opportunity for the full development of a Lincoln. Of all the great men in American history, the life of Lincoln most accurately portrays the example of a man who sacrificed himself in devotion to a cause.

And in preserving the Union, Lincoln himself epitomized the American dream. His life, the success of his democratic philosophy, and his leadership of free people under the pressure of war, refute with compelling logic, the theory sometimes advanced, that we, the people, are incapable of governing ourselves. He also, by sheer accomplishment, fulfilled the fond hopes of the Founders; namely, that in the democratic system the poorest and the lowliest of the Republic are not barred by accident of birth from rising to the top. Of Lincoln it could be said, that it was not in spite of, but because of his struggle, labor, and grief, there emerged at the right time a strong and wise American who brought victory and unity to a divided land. Ever shall we call him great.

He was superior in so many ways. Would that time permitted more detailed comment upon his nobility of character, his intellectual grasp of the important thing in government, and his understanding of human behavior. In the highest sense, Lincoln had what is called for the want of a better name—the common touch: the rare genius of talking plainly to plain people and making them understand. This quality has received much comment but I do not think adequate mention is made in the average eulogy of his distinguished position and stature as a citizen of the world. Because he was a living example of the freedom of opportunity, it is not surprising that he became one of the most articulate of those who actions have become milestones along civilization's rugged and often bloody road to freedom. He hoped and prayed that by freeing the slaves and preserving the Union, "succeding millions of free, happy people, the world over, shall call us blessed, to the latest generations." And by the Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln moved a step farther to establish Jefferson's principle in the Declaration of Independence that, "all men are created free and equal."

Americans should cherish, as never before, the priceless documents and expressions of the spirit that reach from the Beatitudes to the Emancipation Proclamation; all of which gave hope and freedom to large segments and races of men. It is the job of the free world to live up to those democratic precepts in order to encourage 800 million people under the Communist yoke to break their mental and physical bonds. Those today who are struggling and planning to break the yoke of the Red master must often be reminded of the words of Lincoln, who said: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this to the extent of the difference is no democracy." I ask you, is that not the antithesis, the direct opposite of the materialistic philosophy of communism?

He said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." This, from a man who in youth experienced great privations and disappointments; this from one whose face, it has been remarked, portrayed to his dying day, a life of struggle—abject poverty in youth, repeated defeats for public office, and a domestic life that held much sorrow and tragedy. Lincoln never aspired to be a big shot, a tough boss, a master. That, in fact, he repeatedly accepted ruination of personal ambitions by sacrificing self in devotion to a cause because he respected the dignity of man.

No one appreciated more than Lincoln the vicissitudes and hardships of the poor. When nominated for the presidency, he was asked to give some material for an account of his boyhood. "Why," he said, "it is a great folly to make anything out of me or my early life. It can all be condensed into a single sentence. And that sentence you will find in Gray's Elegy: 'The short and simple annals of the poor.' That's my life, and that's all you can or anyone else can make out of it." Lincoln, who came from the poor, helped the poor all that he could, but he believed in the freedom of opportunity and not in radical socialism. He would have been the last to even think of the dictatorship of the proletariat or a monstrous conspiracy to dominate the world. Slavery was abhorrent to him in any form or by any class. He loved freedom as a man loves his family and prayed and hoped that in time democracy would extend to the ends of the earth. His was a spirit that soared beyond the Nation he saved.

It was a spirit that intuitively understood the mass: "The mass," as Carl Sandberg wrote, "the Napoleons and the Lincolns come from me. They die and then I send forth more Lincolns and Napoleons." No leaders in the Civil War could more accurately than Lincoln fathom what the soldiers or sailors were thinking. He did what he could to alleviate their hardships and mitigate their courts-martial—a man of kind and compassionate heart. History's greatest commoner would have been shocked by knowledge of the regimentation of the masses and the official murders decreed by a Stalin. Those who resist Red tyranny may find some comfort in what Lincoln said: "Men will pass away—die, but the principle of democracy will live forever."

He knew full well how these principles were established by the American Revolution. In later life, Lincoln recalled that when a boy, by the light of an open fire, he had lain on the floor and read Parson Weems' Life of Washington. The deeds and magnificent leadership of the Father of our Country moved him greatly, but not more than the heroism of the soldiers of the Revolution. He commented, "boy, even though I was, I though there must have been something more than common that those men struggled for." And do we not think that thought today when we visit Arlington Cemetery or our other national cemeteries at home and abroad. Yes, it was "something more than common that those men struggled for." Lincoln knew the veteran. Did he not ask all to resolve: "that these dead shall not have died in vain" and "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and his widows and orphans"?

That should be kept in mind as we struggle to gain the minds of men, as we continue to fight to make democracy live. Few will disagree that the career, the writings, and the sayings of Lincoln comprise the most splendid exhibit in the showcase of our democracy. He is a shining example of the worth of the system and his life should be used more in our overseas information programs and literature. He did not appear in a blaze of glory, although vindicated by victory. He remembered the sufferings on both sides. He recognized the desolation and despair of the vanquished, and his feelings were of compassion and forgiveness, which were so beautifully expressed in the immortal words, "With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphans, and to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations."

Those abroad who read the Lincoln papers and speeches will soon realize that in addition to his faith in the common man's capacity for self-government, that Lincoln also had an abiding faith in the mercy and goodness of Almighty God. His belief that "righteousness exalteth a Nation" inspired those around him. This again is the opposite of the Communist doctrine that, "re-

ligion is the opiate of the people." In his presidential candidacy, Lincoln said: "I know that there is a God and that he hates injustice and slavery. I see a storm coming, and I know that His hand is in it. If He has a place, and work for me, and I think He has, I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything."

I ask, are we ready and willing to carry on this struggle for human freedom? We have seen many fail in the struggle. In our own time, many governments that were of the people, for the people, and by the people have perished from the earth. Many people have been put to death for resisting the Red octopus and many still resist by underground activities. If Lincoln could speak, he would say: "Hold on. Your cause is worth fighting and dying for;" and for those who have died for the cause, he would say for them as he said to us: "These dead shall not have died in vain."

Ah—those deathless words, how many people have looked at and pondered the Gettysburg Address graven upon the south wall of the Lincoln Memorial at Washington will never be known, but the total is millions. There, day after day, people come by the hundreds to look at that incomparable memorial and to gaze at the heroic statue of a brooding Lincoln, in a majectic location, within the walls of a temple of Greek design like those once consecrated to the gods. Of those who come, one will note there are many young people—school boys and girls; Lincoln would have liked it that way, for he had a way with the young. It is reported that he was down on his knees with a group of boys playing marbles, when the news came that he was elected President of the United States. Youth would do well to remember that never did words of malice, hatred, or unforgiveness fell from his lips. We should remember also as veterans that Lincoln gave "the last full measure of devotion" as did our own good comrades who did not return.

Yes, this man of the people gave his all for us. His "malice toward none" philosophy, his unswerving fidelity to the Constitution, his emancipation of the Negro, and his preservation of the Republic, inspired his people to have graven high in stone over the statue in his memorial:

"In this temple, as in the hearts of his people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined."

We gather here today near his mortal remains to pay tribute because he is deeply enshrined in our hearts. Our few words of reflection on his consecrated life were also from the heart. But—unless we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and our fellow citizens accept his ideals with conviction and practice them with deep sincerity, our lip service will do little good. But, if we follow his precepts and determine to make a better place for all, we are carrying on his great tradition; and that is to strengthen the Nation. He knew as do we, that a nation cannot escape history; and what is this grave problem in our time? No one phrased it more eloquently than Lincoln. It is, whether "we shall nobly save—or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Building Up Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest and concern the following article by Mr. Budenz which appeared in the February 18, 1956, issue of the Advocate. Because I believe it points up a timely problem in a crystal clear manner I call it to the attention of the Members of Congress:

BUILDING UP RED CHINA

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

Moscow has apparently again hit its target—this time in regard to Red China. Unless Americans make their voices heard in Washington much more loudly than in the past, the Soviet regime will have been provided by us with the facilities to conquer Asia.

For some weeks Communist directive organs have been playing up Red China—the necessity for complete recognition of that regime and of western trade with it. One of those goals is on the eve of attainment—President Eisenhower and Premier Eden, of Great Britain, have agreed to soften restrictions on trade with Commmunist China.

The New York Times reveals that the first commodity which will be permitted to be sold is rubber. And rubber is the product on which armies are moved and military strength is built. This type of trade, if it is put through, will be more injurious to the United States than was the sale of scrap iron to Japan prior to World War II.

With the Communists trade is always accompanied by infiltration. Malaya is the country which will furnish the majority of rubber products in the proposed agreement. In anticipation of such an event the central committee of the Malayan Communist Party has just issued a manifesto announcing its new subversive activities for Malayan independence and, therefore, for the eventual sovietization of that land. This manifesto is published in the Cominform organ of January 13.

Trade between Malaya and Red China will facilitate the plans of the Communist Party and will imperil another section of Asia. Freedom from British rule will, in that case, be worked out according to the Soviet model of conquest rather than by any genuine independence for Malaya.

The background in which these moves are being made insures that the proposed trade agreement is dangerous. Moscow opened the new year with a new declaration of war on colonialism, appearing in the January 5 New Times. There it is asserted that the only hope of a lasting peace lies in the forwarding of Soviet moves against colonialism.

English and French rule over the so-called colonial peoples is, it is true, the Achilles' heel of the non-Soviet world in relation to Africa and Asia. But Soviet Russia uses its alleged war against colonialism to bring about a superrule over the colonial nations, making them vassals of the Kremlin.

This is in accord with Communist logic. For Stalin has said in his Foundations of Leninism that any genuine colonial liberation from the Communist viewpoint must be subsidiary and subservient to the dictatorship of the proletariat—that is, subservient to the Kremlin. Just as Lenin raised the slogan "land to the peasants" in order to take the land completely away from them, so Moscow agitates for colonial liberation in order to establish a supercolonialism that can be used to take over the world.

The New Times reminds comrades of this world goal in its very discussion of Soviet designs on the colonial countries. This reminder is furnished in the following quotation from Dictator Khrushchev's speech to the Supreme Soviet: "If certain politicians think that our confidence in the victory of socialism, of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism is a violation of the Geneva spirit, they obviously have an erroneous notion of that spirit; they ought to remember once and for all that we have never gone back and never will go back on our ideas, on our struggle for the victory of communism. They need never expect any ideological disarmament on our part."

We must recall that the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, to which Khrushchev so proudly refers, has as its core the establishment of the world Soviet dictatorship by violence. That is clearly stated by Lenin in State and Revolution and by Stalin in the Problems of Leninism. And these works are among the great classics of Marxism-Leninism.

Any aid to the Soviet war machine by trade, whether in Red China, or elsewhere, therefore, prepares the way for a violent attack upon the United States from within and without.

We can help prevent that by here and now letting our representative know that we are opposed to any dealings with the Soviet regimes, including specifically the Moa-Tse-tung cabal now in control of China.

Radioactive Fallout and Radioactive Strontium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks prepared by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, for delivery at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Thursday, January 19, 1956:

THE RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT AND RADIOACTIVE STRONTIUM

(Summary of remarks prepared by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, for delivery at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., January 19, 1956)

Althought the area of local damage from radioactive fallout is larger for a high-yield weapon than for one of lower yield, it can be shown that the long-term effects of fallout from the high-yield weapon are not as great as are generallly supposed. This conclusion is reached in the results of a special study of this subject known as Project Sunshine, sponsored by the AEC.

Some of the present confusion which exists regarding the hazard from the fallout can be clarified if one recognizes that the radioactive debris comes from two main sources. One of these depends upon the nature and type of weapon, and the second upon the conditions under which the weapon is fired. Surface bursts involve the production of a heavy local fallout as opposed to those fired in the air or under the sea. High-yield bursts, moreover, according to evidence in Project Sunshine, place the major part of the bomb debris in the stratosphere where it appears to reside for some 10 years, slowly descending to the earth. Commonly recognized as the greatest long-term danger is strontium-90, a chemical relative of calcium, and a bone seeker.

From worldwide evidence for fallout in relation to recent studies of the maximum permissible concentration of strontium-90 in humans, it can be concluded that the hazard from the present rate of testing nuclear weapons is insignificant. A total of 11,000 megatons of TNT equivalent of fission would just yield a Sr^{90} content in humans equal to the Maximum Permissible

Concentration (MPC) an amount considered safe; at less than 10 times this value, or below 110,000 megatons energy equivalent of fission, statistically observable incidence of bone tumor should not appear; but at 30 to 40 times the MPC, or 330,000 to 440,000 megatons, the likelihood of untoward effects would be appreciable. Even the lowest of these figures—11,000 megatons—is very far in excess of the total energy released to date.

An additional safety factor is that the half-life of most of the fission products, with the exception of strontium, is extremely short, and that nature has wisely provided a built-in mechanism for discriminating against the uptake of radiostrontium in favor of calcium by plants, animals, and human beings.

THE RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT AND RADIOACTIVE STRONTIUM

(Remarks prepared by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, for delivery at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., January 19, 1956)

The radioactivity which falls out of the atmosphere after the explosion of a nuclear weapon is called the radioactive fallout. In the ordinary atomic bomb, for example, for each 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent of explosive energy about 2 pounds of radioactive materials are produced. In these 2 pounds are some 90 different radioactive species varying in lieftime from a fraction of a second to many years. This mixture of radioactivity decreases in radioactivity in such a way that for every sevenfold increase in age the total radioactivity is decreased tenfold. Thus the radioactivity by 7 hours after the explosion has decreased to one-tenth the radioactivity of 1 hour, and in 49 hours to 1/100, and at 2 weeks to 1/1,000, and in 3 months to 1/10,000 and so forth.

The conditions of fallout are largely determined by the amount and type of material vaporized into the fireball of the bomb itself. A bomb fired in the air contributes such a relatively small amount of matter to the cloud that the particles formed after dissipation of the enormous energy released are of necessity very tiny and therefore very slow in settling. The result is that most of the radioactivities are expended in the air and the area over which the fallout occurs is rendered very large indeed, extending to the ends of the earth in minute although detectable amounts.

A bomb fired on the surface of the earth, however, may have an appreciable portion of its radioactivity reprecipitated within relatively short distances, while bombs fired beneath the surface of the earth may place essentially no fallout radioactivity in the atmosphere. Therefore, the question of the area of contamination to be expected from nuclear weapons cannot be answered categorically without specifying the degree of contact of the fireball with the surface of the earth and probably also specifying the characteristics of this surface. Obviously water would differ considerably from soil in its ability to precipitate radioactive fallout. The coral in the southern Pacific islands used for the larger United States weapons tests will under the great heat decompose to form calcium oxide which will then rehydrate to form calcium hydroxide, which in turn will absorb carbon dioxide to form a crust of calcium carbonate. Obviously such a complicated series of chemical reactions will make the fallout particles from the great tests at Eniwetok differ from what would be observed if the same weapons had been fired over ordinary sand or granite rock. We cannot imagine all of the details in which the nature of the soil will affect the local fallout, but it is clear that the effects will be substantial.

In the weapon test operations great care is taken to insure that no danger results from fallout. Criteria are used which are meant to insure that this be so. However, it is well to note that it is from the test operations that we have learned what we do know about the problem of civilian defense against fallout. We must speak of test experience for it is the only source of experimental information about the phenomena of radioactive fallout.

The radioactivities resulting from the burst of a nuclear weapon can be classified as follows: (a) radioactivities induced in the environment, and (b) products dependent directly on the nature of the weapon. The environment can be made radioactive only by neutrons, but all nuclear weapons involve large numbers of neutrons, some of which are certain to escape into the surroundings.

Taking air bursts first, our problem is—what do neutrons do to air? The answer is simple, they make radioactive carbon, C^{14}, half-life 5,600 years. Fortunately, this radioactivity is essentially safe because of its long lifetime and the enormous amount of diluting carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The cosmic rays themselves make neutrons, which, of course, make radiocarbon. In fact, the earth has on its surface a total of 80 tons of radiocarbon from the cosmic radiation. Now, since each neutron froms one C^{14} atom of mass 14 times the neutrons mass, this corresponds to 5.2 tons of neutrons, and we see that this enormous number of neutrons would have to be produced and escape in order that nuclear weapons would just double the feeble natural radioactivity of living matter due to radiocarbon. Such an increase would have no significance from the standpoint of health. The atmosphere itself contains only 1½ percent of the total carbon with which the cosmic ray produced radiocarbon is mixed, the main part being dissolved in the sea, so we expect that nuclear weapons could produce a short-range rise in the radioactive content of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which later would decrease as the atmospheric carbon dioxide mixed with the sea. Therefore, only 1½ percent as many neutrons would be required to double the natural radiocarbon content of atmospheric carbon dioxide for this time before mixing with the sea could occur, or about 78 kilograms or 170 pounds of neutrons. To orient ourselves, the 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent atomic weapon involves the fission of 1 kilogram of uranium or plutonium and the liberation of about 10 grams of neutrons. If all of these neutrons escaped into the atmosphere it would obviously require 7,800 such weapons to double the radiocarbon content of the atmospheric carbon dioxide even with no mixing with the sea, and about 520,000 with complete mixing. These correspond to explosive energies of 156 and 10,400 megatons of TNT, respectively, if all neutrons formed escaped. A reasonable escape figure might be 15 percent so we can expect that nearly 1,000 megatons of fission would be necessary just to double the atmospheric radiocarbon content, and that about 66,000 megatons would be necessary for the same effect on a long-term basis.

The interchange between the atmosphere and the seawater, which is constantly taking place, would deplete and remove the excess radioactive carbon dioxide. Now it is known from measurements of the radioactive hydrogen-tritium—which also is made in the atmosphere by the cosmic rays—that this interchange is slow. In fact, we learn that the radioactive water which is formed by the burning of the tritium made by the cosmic rays is not diluted by more than the top 100 meters or so of seawater in its lifetime of about 18 years. The carbon dioxide dissolved in this water is about equal to the total in the air. In other words, a dilution by more than the twofold which corresponds to the dissolved carbon dioxide in the top 100 meters of ocean water would take longer than 18 years. However, the dilution by this factor of two would occur essentially immediately within a matter of weeks or months. Therefore, we would have to double our estimates for even the short time scale activation of the atmosphere to reach the enormous figure of 2,000 megatons of fission required. Thermonuclear weapons, of course, also involve neutrons. For a given energy release they produce somewhat more neutrons than fission weapons, however, the order of magnitude of atmospheric activation would not be greatly different. So our estimates apply to all nuclear weapons. The essential point is that the atmosphere is difficult to activate and the activities produced are safe. In addition to carbon-14 there are a few others produced in low yield—they include tritium and very short-lived products but none is produced in sufficient amounts to be hazardous.

For weapons fired on the surface the activation of the surface materials is a possibility, but in general it appears that most of the neutrons from stable isotopes and that the amount of radioactivity produced, at least with ordinary surface materials, is relatively small. The principal radioactivities produced by nuclear weapons are produced in the weapons themselves, and not in the environment.

Turning now to the radioactivities naturally produced in nuclear weapons themselves, probably the most important is radioactive strontium, 28 years half-life. The reason that this is so important is that strontium is chemically similar to calmium, which is one of the main mineral constituents of the body. Bone consists principally of calcium phosphate, and for this reason radiostrontium, like calcium, is deposited in the bone. The amounts of ordinary nonradioactive strontium naturally present are so small that the radioactive strontium will follow ordinary calcium into the body. The second reason that radioactive strontium, Sr^{90}, is an important fallout radioactivity is that it has a long but finite lifetime—28 years half-life, 40 years average life—and thus has a persistent effect. Third, because of its bone seeking property it stays in the body a long time, and fourth, the probabilities of body ingestion can be high. Finally, the fifth reason for its importance is that Sr^{90} is produced in high yield in the fission reaction—about 4 or 5 percent of all fissioning atoms yield this isotope.

In order to orient ourselves about this, let us consider the maximum permissible concentration recommended by the National Committee on Radiation Protection for AEC workers for radiostrontium—one microcurie for the standard man—whose body is taken to contain 1,000 grams of calcium in total. The maximum permissible concentration is of course well below any level at which one would expect any damaging effects to appear. On the basis of experiments with animals, statistically observable increases in the number of bone tumors should not be expected to appear at less than 10 times this level. As we go above this figure the chance for bone tumors occurring increases rapidly so that the likelihood of bone cancer with 30 to 40 times that figure is appreciable.

Let us consider in some detail the mechanism by which this most important fallout radioactivity produced in nuclear weapons might be expected to enter the human body. The first point is that from the point of view of fallout there are two essential classes of nuclear weapons—the high yield megaton weapons, and the lower yield kiloton weapons. All nuclear weapons produce atomic clouds which rise to heights dependent upon the energy released, and the clouds from the the megaton class of weapons rise rapidly up through the tropopause and pass into the top layer of the atmosphere which we know as the stratosphere. This part of the atmosphere is essentially isolated from the lower layer in which we live, the tropo-

sphere, and where all of our normal winds and storms, and so forth, occur. Therefore, radioactivity produced in megaton weapons is placed largely immediately in the stratosphere while the smaller kiloton weapons produce clouds which in general do not reach into the stratosphere, but stop near the tropopause—the imaginary boundary between the stratosphere and troposphere—and have the bulk of their radioactivity left in the troposphere.

In the troposphere where rain occurs any particulate matter will be washed down in a period of days or weeks. It is easy to show, for example, that one-tenth inch of ordinary rainfall will probably remove essentially completely all particulate matter except for that which is so small as to be almost of molecular dimensions. In other words, for one-tenth of an inch of rainfall one can be quite certain that the air between the layer in which the rain originates and the ground is washed clean of fallout activity, except for the minute fraction which may be so small as to move with the air out of the way of the falling raindrops as they make their way toward the earth; and even this tiniest fallout material is likely to be precipitated also for it will migrate rapidly by molecular type motion and in this manner is likely to absorb itself on other particulate material and so be rained out. For these reasons, tropospheric radioactive fallout does not stay in the atmosphere for more than a matter of weeks. It may make two or three trips around the earth in a given latitude before being entirely removed, but its lifetime in the atmosphere will be a matter of weeks.

This is in very sharp contrast to the material which is placed in the stratosphere by megaton weapons which appears to stay there for a matter of years. Perhaps 10 years is a good average, at least for the weapons fired to date. It is well to bear in mind that this conclusion may be dependent upon the nature of the material carried up in the cloud, but our present experience indicates that the fallout from megaton weapons which does not occur essentially in the first few hours or days, and is therefore deposited mainly locally, is deposited only at a very slow rate corresponding to an average time in the stratosphere of about 10 years. As a result of this long residence time in the highest layers of the atmosphere, the winds mix and distribute the radioactive material broadly over the earth and one finds when the fallout does finally find its way down into the troposphere where the rain and snow wash it out, that the rates of precipitation are relatively uniform over the entire earth's surface.

Returning now to radiostrontium, at the rate of 1 kilogram of fission for 20 kilotons of TNT equivalent, 2 megatons of fission energy would be equivalent to very nearly 1 millicurie of strontium-90 per square mile of the earth's suface, or about 79 disintegrations per minute per square foot of the earth's surface. The average soil of the earth has about 20 grams of calcium, which is in form available for plant metabolism in the top 2½ inches for each square foot of area. Now recalling the maximum permissible concentration level of 1 microcurie per standard man and noting, as we will show later, that in order that this concentration not be exceeded, the topsoil of the earth should not contain any more radiostrontium than would correspond to 10 times the concentration in the human body which is just permissible, i. e., 1 microcurie per 1,000 grams of calcium, or 2,200 disintegrations per minute, per gram of calcium, we find that 11,000 megatons of fission energy would produce this average level of raidoactivity. Actually, as I will indicate later, there can be a concentration of strontium-90 in the soil about 10 times greater than the recommended maximum permissible concentration before one would expect man living in such an environment to accumulate a maximum permission concentration. Referring to my remarks of a few moments ago, the 11,000 megatons would yield a Sr^{90} content in humans just equal to the Maximum Permissible Concentration (MPC); at less than 10 times this value, or below 110,000 megatons energy equivalent, statistically observable incidence of bone tumor should not appear; but at 30 to 40 times the MPC, or 330,000 to 440,000 megatons, the likelihood of untoward effects would be appreciable. Even the lowest of these figures is very far in excess of the total energy released to date.

High yield weapons fired near the surface have a portion of their activity deposited in and on particles large enough to fall out in the first few hours or days. Thus we have three kinds of fallout from high yield weapons: The first, or local, which is due mainly to large-sized particles. This may cover a considerable area depending on winds mainly. In the February 15, 1955, release of the Atomic Energy Commission which described the experience in the Marshall Islands in the Castle test series in the spring of 1954, some 7,000 square miles were described as being contaminated by this type of fallout. The second fallout from the high yield weapons is that portion which resides on the small particles, but which never reaches the stratosphere and thus stays in the troposphere until it is carried down by rainfall or settles out. There is thus a band of fallout in the same general latitude as the test site; the material may circle the earth 2 or 3 times before being precipitated, but does fall out within the first few weeks. However, a large part, half or more depending on firing conditions, of the radioactive yield from high yield weapons resides in the third category which is the fallout which occurs from the stratosphere itself. Of course, some of the large local fallout may form particles which were lifted into the stratosphere, but which were so large and so bulky that they fell out rapidly anyhow. The finely divided material which reaches the stratosphere apparently stays there for years in the main. A slow leakage through the tropopause into the troposphere occurs with apparently something like 10 percent per year descending. Measurements of the strontium-90 content of soils, rain and snow, and biological materials on a worldwide basis have all shown that strontium-90 fallout occurs all over the world at rates which are not too dissimilar from one another, except that there is a tendency in the middle latitudes in which the tests are conducted for an extra fallout presumably of the tropospheric variety described above. Since the completion of the Castle series of tests, this worldwide rate of fallout has approximated 1½ millicuries of radiostrontium per square mile per year. We thus see that radioactive fallout from the stratosphere is a very slow process. This is very fortunate indeed, since the high yield weapons thus have a major part of their radioactivity dissipated in the atmosphere in a harmless way if they are fired in the air or on the surface.

The fallout apparently occurs in the final step by a washing down of the tropospheric air by rain together with direct falling. The radiostrontium descends from the stratosphere into the troposphere by the processes of diffusion and falling, and is then caught up by the tropospheric weather and in a matter of a few days is deposited. Reasonable estimates for the middle latitudes give the average life in the troposphere to be about 1 week.

The radiostrontium comes down mainly in raindrops although fine morning mists and fogs may be particularly effective in this regard also, as well as surface contact and direct falling. It descends on the foliage and on the soil. That fraction of it which falls on plant leaves has a good chance of being absorbed directly into the plant—much in the way the most modern leaf fertilizers operate. The Eniwetok tests were conducted on coral islands and as a result their fallout may be largely water soluble. In any case, direct measurements of the radiostrontium content of alfalfa and other crops show them to be appreciably higher in radioactivity than the soils on which they grew, strongly indicating a leaf assimilation mechanism to be important. The rain falls and carries radioactivity, but when it runs off to the rivers and the seas it is nearly pure due to the action of the soil in absorbing the fallout, so that rivers are essentially free from radiostrontium. Lakes and reservoirs have a content which corresponds approximately to their surface areas only. The radiostrontium is absorbed in the top 2 or 3 inches of soil and held there very tenaciously. Plowing, of course, buries it more deeply, but it appears that in unplowed soil the radiostrontium does not move in a matter of 2 or 3 years.

The researches on radiostrontium conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission have been extensive. They have consisted of sampling soils on a worldwide basis. The actual sampling was done by Dr. Lyle Alexander of the United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md. Dr. Alexander with great skill and care has repeatedly collected series of soil samples for study, analyzed them chemically and submitted them for measurement of radiostrontium content to the Health and Safety Laboratory of the New York Operations Office of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Lamont Geological Observatory of Columbia University, and the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago. Direct fallout collected on gummed papers, milk and cheese, alfalfa, animal meat and bone, and even human bodies has been extensively studied. On the basis of the information so obtained, it is possible to say unequivocably that nuclear weapons tests as carried out at the present time do not constitute a health hazard to the human population—insofar as radiostrontium is concerned and it is believed with good reason that radiostrontium is likely to be the most important of the redaioactivities produced. It is well to note that since radiostrontium is assimilated in the bones it constitutes essentially no genetic hazard, because its radiations do not reach the reproductive organs.

The milk and cheese radiostrontium content is not as high, relative to that of the grass which the cows eat, as one might expect. There appears to be a discrimination against the fallout material such that the calcium in milk and cheese is roughly one-fifth to one-tenth as radioactive with radiostrontium as the grass that the animals eat. There are various possible physiological explanations of this and the conclusion itself may not be completely certain, but the data available to date indicate this to be true. In addition, the plant uptake of radiostrontium from soil does discriminate somewhat against radiostrontium as compared to calcium. The calcium taken up from the soil into the plant has in general about one-half the radiostrontium content that the soil calcium has. These two results protect the human population against ingestion of radiostrontium, since milk and cheese are the principal sources of calcium in the human diet. We find, therefore, that the radiostrontium content of human bodies is the lowest of all animals measured and is lower than the average soil and the average foliage by tenfold. The Sr^{90} to calcium ratio in young people—whose bones are still forming—corresponds to about one one-thousandth of the maximum permissible concentration recommended for adults: one microcurie per standard man containing 1,000 grams of calcium. The average soil in the

United States is about tenfold higher, whereas abroad the radiostrontium content in other areas of the world not subject to the local test fallout is about one-third of that for the United States.

The surface air itself contains radiostrontium due to the fallout from the stratosphere and corresponding to the average time between rainstorms in which it can collect. Filtration of air at sea level discloses radiostrontium on filters if the filters are fine enough, even in periods when bombs are not being tested so the only fallout is from the stratosphere reservoir from the high yield weapons. Measurements in the Antarctic on snow samples collected there show that the fallout rate there in January and February 1955 was comparable with that observed in the middle latitudes.

Finally, though the main part of the radioactivity from high yield weapons fortunately dissipates in the stratosphere, the small but very significant part which falls out within a few hundred miles of the site of the explosion for weapons fired on the surfaec constitutes a very real hazard and nothing I have said this evening should be interpreted otherwise. The weapons tests are conducted with great attention to this and the other dangers and every effort made to protect against misadventure. What we have learned from the studies I have described—which by the way have been conducted under the name Project Sunshine—is that these local precautions should be entirely adequate and the worldwide health hazards from the present rate of testing are insignificant.

We Can Meet the Employment Handicapped Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following article which appeared in the December 1955–January 1956 issue of the publication the Purple Heart:

WE CAN MEET THE EMPLOYMENT HANDICAPPED PROBLEM

(By Col. Waldron E. Leonard)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer has been active in the work of veterans' affairs since World War I; served as the State's representative of veterans' affairs in Texas for 2 years and now coordinator of veterans' affairs for the District of Columbia, where he has been employed for 10 years; has served on several National Committees of Veterans' Organizations and has received over 50 citations for his aid and assistance to his disabled comrades.)

A veteran just left this office who had been hurt, a paraplegic, but no complaint or self-pity was expressed by him in any of our conversation. The wound he was suffering from was in the heart of disappointment in being assured in an interview several weeks ago that a position would be available for him in the near future. The disappointment was caused by the fact that he received a notice that a position as messenger was available and he could submit his qualifications for same.

It was difficult to try to explain how the error could occur that would cause him to be certified for this type of position, which job specifications certainly for this particular position would not qualify a paraplegic; or why after lengthy interviews that a counselor would not record or remember the physical condition of the applicant, but often I am afraid that those who have qualified for the responsibility of assisting the handicapped get careless in their interviews and leave the impression to the one seeking assistance that they have a motherly complex in sympathy for the applicant's condition or take the easiest route in discontinuing the interview regarding the applicant's qualifications for the possibility of employment by continuous suggestions of rehabilitation. While this program has rendered and is rendering excellent service, there certainly comes a time when counselors should recognize that their responsibilities are assisting the handicapped in obtaining employment; which brings us to the subject of what employment.

Throughout the country various agencies are doing a splendid job familiarizing industry with the excellent service and performance of the so-called handicapped individual. Statistics are prepared and proof given in many instances that these employees are the most valuable and productive, but I believe that too much stress is given to the employment of the handicapped where he is so likely to be placed in a position other than he is qualified for, when perhaps with less effort a review of job descriptions where the handicapped could serve would be more helpful.

While proclamations are issued by the Federal Government, State governments, and municipal governments encouraging industry to employ the handicapped and citations are given throughout the country by veterans' organizations and those interested for their cooperation in assisting in this program, it might be well if we could consider the possibilities of positions existing in Government that would seem a natural for many of our handicapped.

MUNICIPAL JOBS

For an example, in most towns and cities throughout the country hundreds of parking meters have been installed on the streets where coins are deposited for parking privileges. The requirement of the collectors for these meters is that they have a key and a sack, the key to unlock the meter and the sack to carry the coins. This about summarizes the entire responsibility. I wonder how many of the city fathers in issuing proclamations on employing the handicapped have thought of their responsibility.

Other positions in the municipal governments throughout the United States include traffic enumerators. This responsibility consists of standing or sitting in certain spaces on the street or in an office building in a window facing the traffic pushing a small button that totals the number of vehicles passing in a particular area so as to determine the flow of traffic for the purpose of installing stop signs, street lights, installation of bridges, widening highways, or generally improving traffic conditions in the area checked. Many cities have dozens of these enumerators. Their calculators are turned in to a centralized point at the end of the day and results tallied by clerks. Again, I wonder how many city fathers have given first consideration for these positions to the handicapped.

Many cities have discontinued the use of their acting police enforcement officers for walking along the sidewalks and issuing violation parking tickets and instead have employed auxiliary policemen and many cities are using ladies to carry out this responsibility. It appears to me that this type of position should be considered for the handicapped where qualified.

There are school guard crossing positions. Certainly no one would be more careful of your children and my children than those who know what it means to be hurt. These are just a few of the positions in your city that might be considered by the municipal government for the job opportunities of the handicapped.

STATE JOBS

In the State government you might review the qualifications needed to issue automobile license plates, watchmen or guards in State buildings or institutions, elevator operators in State buildings, positions of issuing traffic permits, road tests for applicants, and where toll roads and toll bridges are in existence and you see perfectly healthy individuals sitting on stools accepting payment for such privilege, ask yourself why the State government is not giving consideration to allocating these positions to the handicapped.

Several agencies of the Federal Government and the President's own Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped have done a remarkable job in calling to the attention of the public numerous instances where production increased or services rendered better by those listed as handicapped.

DISABILITY TO ABILITY

However, there seems to be a need for a committee or commission under the supervision of or working directly with the Civil Service Commission to iron out certain difficulties in job specifications and requirements that in some instances make it impossible for Government agencies to give assistance to the handicapped employment problem.

Certainly this review should not be limited to the positions heretofore described, as many of those referred to as handicapped do have administrative and supervisory qualifications that I feel are too often not given a position of responsibility due perhaps that a review of the actual duties required at the time of a vacancy might not correspond with the job specification sheet that had formerly been prepared for the position.

Perhaps the agency responsible for establishing rehabilitation centers should consider a business establishment in placing a new recruit, in allocating some funds direct to the agency for special attention, where he will most likely receive permanent employment after his initial training. Often in an organization where there are a variety of positions, it can be determined very soon as to whether the position the applicant is first placed on will be the most likely where he will succeed for future livelihood.

For an illustration, a veteran who was a former truck driver was given 3 years' training as an automoible mechanic in rehabilitration centers. His service-connected disability left the veteran almost deaf. The factory manager discovered soon after his employment it was difficult for him to hear the motor running, thereby it being difficult for him to properly tune motors.

The manager of the plant noticed that the veteran was continuously visiting the fabric-cutting table where seat covers were made. In talking with the veteran he found that he was fascinated by this type of work and transferred him to this department. In less than a year he was placed as general foreman in the department with several men under his supervision. This observation and consultation changed the employee from a disability to an ability and from a liability to an asset.

It might be well for Government agencies to consider giving an opportunity to some of the positions heretofore listed and certainly many others in their departments where satisfactory results could be obtained, first to the disabled veteran where qualified to perform such service, second, any handicapped person under the same circumstances, and third to those of 40 years of age and over, who because of their age find it most difficult to obtain employment.

Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Jersey—Proposals for Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey Department of Disabled American Veterans recently entertained members of the New Jersey State congressional delegation at breakfast at the Hotel Congressional here in the Nation's Capital. Maurice J. Sweeney, State commander, of Cedar Grove; Joseph J. Burke, national senior vice commander, of Bayonne; and John W. Bill, legislative director, of Clifton; presented a series of proposals for congressional action and addresses were made by Brig. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, retired, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, and Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The legislative proposals presented follow:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY—PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

1. Presumption of soundness at the time of enlistment should be considered once the veteran is accepted into military service, and any disability he might suffer during his course of military service should be recognized by the Federal Government as having been a direct result of his military service, and the veteran should be allowed direct service connection for such disabilities.

2. Legislation to prevent the severance of service connection unless obtained by fraud.

3. To prevent the reduction in compensation where dependency is considered, where disabilities show no improvement, only that the veteran is employed in his efforts to support his family.

4. Civil Service employment of disabled veterans upon completion of an examination, written or otherwise, and be given permanent status after 1 year of employment.

5. To permit all veterans to reinstate their war-risk insurance and national life insurance, also servicemen's indemnity insurance within 2 years after the enactment of the said law.

6. To permit disabled veterans to obtain out-patient treatment, hospitalization, and dental treatment in their own localities without having to lose time from employment in order to report to this regional office.

7. Proposed widow's pension for all widows of World War II and Korean veterans without regard to the cause of death.

8. Widow's legislation for World War I veterans by amending the law of 1944 recognizing the widow to be entitled to benefits regardless of the time of marriage.

9. To establish by law educational benefits for all children of World War II and Korean veterans who died before a service-incurred disability. That such legislation without the cooperation of States, permit the children to enter any university controlled by the State by awarding scholarships, and that the Federal Government join in bearing the expense.

10. That legislation be enacted directing the Army Review Board to review all cases of veterans who received discharges other than honorable, and who were denied benefits because of the said discharge by the Veterans Administration, that provisions be made in the said law so that the review board will appear in each State to give the veteran an opportunity to present his case by counsel to the review board, as it is a known fact that many veterans received discharges other than honorable because of some misunderstanding and not serious violation of the Army or Navy regulations, and that the same provision be made that all officers who had disabilities at the time of their release from service be given the right to appear before the Army Review Board and present their claims for direct retirement, and to be permitted to be represented by counsel if so desired. These two points are of importance to enlisted men and officers and to widows and orphans of those who have departed this life since their release from military service.

11. That there be created by law a court of appeals whereby decisions may be reviewed after the Board of Veteran's Appeals checks a claim for service connection or an increase in compensation, based on the evidence of record. If the said courts are created they should be allowed to travel from State to State so that the veteran may be presented to the said court of appeals and be represented by counsel who will present the claim for him. This is necessary since the veteran does not receive his constitutional rights to present his case to a court for further consideration of his claim for injuries sustained during his military service.

12. That Congress enact a law that there be at least one regional office in each of the 48 States and its Territories. That this be a matter of law rather than regulation set up by the Administrator who may change them by applying false economy. It is felt that each State and its Territory should be entitled to a regional office so that it may properly serve all disabled veterans, their dependents, and all other veterans who may need assistance.

The Federal Home Loan Bank System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Congress set up the Federal Home Loan Bank System with regional banks located in strategic parts of the country for the purpose of assisting homeownership. These reserve banks were designed to furnish credit to savings and loan association members throughout the country when their own funds were not adequate to take care of the home-financing demand. They were first created at a time when money for home financing was scarce and the need was extreme for this source of funds. These savings and loan member associations are the largest single source of home-mortgage financing in the country and account for over one-third of the home-mortgage lending each year.

Although the administration has proclaimed its support of homeownership, in practice the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has discouraged the financing of homes through private sources. I pointed this out recently when I commented on the action of the Board in restricting credit to the member savings and loan institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System at a time when there was strong demand for home-mortgage funds. This demand was so strong that after the credit curb, money could be obtained only at a high premium. The Rains Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee has just rendered a report calling attention to these restrictions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and I commend its reading to you.

Congress has made it very apparent that funds for the financing of homeownership should be made available without restriction. If the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the administration see fit to continue their policy of curbing the use of private funds for financing, in my opinion, Congress should take action to see that these funds are made available.

Can We Be Neutral in Such a Fight?—Remarks on the Middle East Crisis and a Declaration on Behalf of 25,000 Residents of the Wynnefield-Overbrook Park and Main Line Areas of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, several night ago, before the simply incredible — unbelievable — developments over those Walker tanks assigned to Saudi Arabia, I had the honor of addressing a large and sincerely concerned group of Philadelphians gathered at Har-Zion Temple to discuss the alarming situation in the Middle East.

I told the group that I would be pleased and honored to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of this body and of the Senate as well, the declaration and resolutions adopted that night by representatives of 25,000 members of major Jewish organizations in the Wynnefield-Overbrook Park and Main Line areas.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I therefore send to the desk for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the declaration and resolutions adopted at the meeting, followed by my own talk that night:

DECLARATION AND RESOLUTIONS

At the call of the leaders of 17 major American-Jewish organizations in the Wynnefield-Overbrook Park and Main Line areas, representing some 25,000 American citizens, this community meeting has been convened at Har-Zion Temple on February 16, 1956, to consider the deepening crisis in the Middle East which threatens the peace and security of America and the free world, and directly menaces the future of Israel.

1. THE BALANCE OF ARMS

Soviet imperialism has now moved into the Middle East. The Czech-Egyptian arms

agreement exposes the entire area to penetration by Communist arms, agents, technicians, and propagandists. This is a violation of the Tri-partite declaration of 1950 by which the United States, the United Kingdom, and France committed themselves to prevent aggression and to maintain the military balance in the Middle East. This military balance has now been destroyed.

Israel has appealed to the United States for arms to restore that balance so that she may defend herself from aggression long and publicly threatened by the Arab States. This is vital if war is to be averted in the Middle East: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Government to grant Israel's request to buy arms for defense without delay.

2. A SECURITY GUARANTY

Our Government has entered into security pacts with 44 nations in Europe and Asia to unite the peoples of the free world in the preservation of peace. It should extend this system of collective security to Israel. Such an undertaking would be a logical development of the tripartite declaration: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government immediately to negotiate a security treaty with Israel, and with such of the Arab States as are ready to join therein.

3. A PEACE SETTLEMENT

Israel's repeated offers to enter into peace negotiations have been rebuffed by the Arab States which have made impossible demands on Israel for territorial and other concessions. We are opposed to any efforts to force unacceptable conditions which violate the integrity and sovereignty of the parties. We urge our Government to decline to advocate peace on such terms and conditions, and to reject the threats made in the last few days by Russia in an attempt to disrupt the efforts of our Government to seek a peaceful settlement.

To aid in the defense of Israel at this critical hour is to strengthen America's own best interests: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Government to exert its best efforts to promote an honorable peace settlement in the Middle East, using as the basis for the negotiations the present boundaries of Israel.

REMARKS BY HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT COMMUNITYWIDE RALLY OF MAJOR JEWISH GROUPS ON THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, HAR ZION TEMPLE, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

I appreciate very much the invitation to speak to such a dedicated group of West Philadelphians who have room in their hearts for concern for others and not just themselves. It is, to me, a wonderful thing the way Americans generally show concern for their fellow man. But I think Americans of the Jewish faith are truly outstanding in that respect. I admire you for it, and I salute you for it.

True, your concern for Israel and its survival is understandable in view of the long history of persecution of Jews which made the establishment of Israel so vital. But I know it goes much deeper than that. The Jew in America has never been under real danger—I mean the kind of brutal, beastlike attacks which happened in many other countries. Yet you have given so much of yourselves to help in the building of that Nation, and you have a right to be proud of your great and unselfish achievement.

I would say I am proud to be on the same platform here with a past national president of Hadassah, Judith Epstein. Every one I know who has visited Israel has come back with the most extravagant praise of what Hadassah has meant to that country, in hospitals, in health, in welfare, and well-being.

But we didn't come here tonight to hear us pat each other on the back for what has been done in the past to help fellow human beings to live in decency instead of in dread and in degradation. These rallies which you are holding all over the city, leading to a Philadelphiawide affair next month, are not parties or socials; they are deadly serious affairs based on a deadly serious international problem.

All of you who know me or who know anything about me, know that I have joined you over the years in your great humanitarian concern for the establishment of Israel and for its survival. As a neighbor living three blocks from here, and who has had many occasions to visit this temple and others in the Second Congressional District at bar mitzvahs and weddings and funerals and social affairs—and as a Member of Congress since 1945—I have worried along with you over the tragic period when we were afraid the hope of a homeland in Palestine might be destroyed before it ever became a reality. There was that tense period when the British suddenly pulled out, and left chaos behind them, after having stood in the way of a real Jewish national homeland for so long. There was the fighting to secure the country. There was the issue of American recognition, and of American economic help.

Now we are back to the tense dangers of another period, as once again Israel stands menaced and her existence—her survival—threatened by envious and aggressive neighbors.

Can we be "neutral" in such a fight? Can we stand idly by and watch lawless aggressors try to murder a whole nation of innocent people who desire only to live in peace? Of course not. We are not "neutral" as between those who believe in peace and those who believe in achieving their ends by aggression.

I say "we are not neutral" but sometimes there is a question of whether we can speak in that respect for some of our officials in high governmental office—particularly some of those who feel that the Arab States, with their millions of acres, need more land at the expense of tiny Israel.

Of course it is not a need for more land which stimulates Arab threats to Israel. It is an envious desire to capture and exploit what others have labored so hard to cultivate and bring into flower. It is fear of Israel as a dynamic force for democracy and freedom in the Near East. It is the suspicion, perhaps, that Israel may demonstrate to the people of the neighboring states that the rank and file of the people do not have to live in near slavery to a few rich and powerful leaders, but through democracy and enlightenment can improve living standards for all.

The Communists talk in those terms, but have failed miserably to make good on them. Israel, following in the path of the United States, has already shown how even a country under constant military danger can dream big dreams and carry through on the hard work of making good on those dreams. But the drain of defense costs is obvious.

I say we must guarantee the survival of any nation with such a spirit of progress and decency. I say we must make sure no aggressor or combination of aggressors can push Israel into the sea and destroy her. I say we must not base our strategy simply on counteracting Soviet moves in the Near East the way you would play a checker game. Instead, we must proceed on the basis of what is right for the free world, and what is right for humanity. And that means assuring a free, independent, secure Israel—just as we have the duty to use our influence in foreign affairs to accomplish that same goal for every free and decent nation.

Many of you may remember my letter to the Jewish Times some time ago in answer to an editorial in that paper asking Members of Congress direct questions about the high dam projected on the Nile River in Egypt. Here was a case where our Government apparently was being panicked into meeting any offer the Soviets made. As I said then:

"I for one will certainly want to know what steps, if any, our Government is taking to use our foreign aid programs, including those in the Middle East, as a means of promoting world peace. Naturaly, prompt settlement of the situation in the Middle East is fundamental to any real peace, since the tensions there could easily explode into a world conflict."

Events since then have certainly borne that out, I would say. I also stated then:

"It is unfortunate that the countries who seek to destroy Israel have now discovered that in dealing with Mr. Dulles it seems to help them a great deal to flirt openly with the Soviet bloc, and then watch this country's State Department fall all over itself trying to compete with Russia for their favor."

It is not just unfortunate that we have seen this happen; I would say it is rather tragic.

All of you, I know, welcomed the statement by Mrs. Roosevelt, by former President Truman, and others, including many of us in the House of Represents in the Congress in Washington, that we dare not sit idly by and see Israel destroyed by Communist arms in the hands of Egyptian troops. I am pleased that my position on this has right along been the one which now has such general support from such distinguished Americans. Let us press on, then, for a happy conclusion to this serious problem. Thank you.

More Kilowatts and Less Conversation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the people of Idaho, after a prolonged fight, are about to get kilowatts instead of conversation out of their water-power resources. Private enterprise, having at long last gotten the green light, is now getting on with the job of developing these greatly needed resources.

How long will it be before we can get on with the job at Niagara Falls? Private enterprise stands ready, willing, and able to develop the power potential there, and the people have registered overwhelming sentiment in favor of private, rather than public development. Labor and management are in complete agreement on the point. Municipalities want private enterprise to do the job. Civic groups agree. The voters agree.

I can supply some statistical evidence on the last point. I am at present conducting a poll among the voters of my district on this and other issues. The poll is still going on, but preliminary tabulations show 74 percent of the voters in favor of private developments of the power potential at Niagara Falls. What are we waiting for?

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a pertinent editorial on the subject from the Democrat and Chronicle, of Rochester, N. Y., of February 14:

POWER FAILURE

In a deep and winter-ridden canyon of Idaho, workmen are at work on a power project. Their blasting, tunneling and building is being paid for by private enterprise. For the people of Idaho have at last won a victory over public power enthusiasts who fought for years in Congress to let the taxpayer pick up the tab. As their governor, Robert E. Smylie says, they now are to get kilowatts instead of conversation.

Idaho's venture has meaning here in New York. Development of Niagara Falls power is held back because a comparatively few politicians are determined that the taxpayer shall foot the bill. All this despite the fact that private enterprise is completely ready to tackle the job, right down to preliminary and final blueprints.

Obviously the way to get action at Niagara is to start building. We can't get it because what seems to be a mere handful of powerful enthusiasts insist on a public project. And even they are split between ideologies, whether it shall be a State or a National undertaking. We are quite certain in our own minds that the great majority of citizens would prefer to trust experts in the power field to do the job economically, yet profitably to them and to the State.

It is ridiculous that 1 or 2, 6 or a dozen individuals should be able to deny progress unless it is achieved in their way. It is time that ambition and political theories be curbed, that work be permitted to start. We need more kilowatts and less conversation.

Upper Colorado Scheme Runs Into Geologic and Engineering Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there are physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit which cast doubt on the engineering and financial feasibility of the entire upper Colorado River storage proposal.

Section 1 of the original H. R. 3383 was amended in committee so as to require the Secretary to take adequate measures, as a part of the Glen Canyon "cash register" unit, to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. This calls up a series of questionable aspects with respect to Glen Canyon.

(a) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam. In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified at that time before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built. At 700 feet Glen Canyon would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. This formation is nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune. It was created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of another.

(b) There is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam upon which the Bureau's cost estimates are based. These plans on which costs have been estimated are set forth in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, which is the Bureau's basic planning report on the upper Colorado River project. These plans reveal that the cross section of the dam, which would be about the same height as Hoover Dam, is materially slimmer than Hoover Dam—this in the face of the fact that the foundation rock at Glen Canyon, as testified to by Bureau engineers and geologists, is only about one-fifth as strong as the rock at Hoover. It appears, therefore, that if a safe dam can be built at Glen Canyon, it will require a much more massive structure than the plans set forth in House Document No. 364, and that the construction cost will be substantially greater than estimated.

(c) The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge. Although the new H. R. 3383 now provides in section 1 that the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, so far there are no plans, and hence no assurance that protective measures can be provided which will be adequate, nor is there evidence that the cost of protection has been included in the cost estimates. As presently planned, the reservoir would back up close to the foundations of the Rainbow Natural Bridge, which is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. The Bureau has indicated that a dam would be built in the canyon below the bridge to keep out the reservoir water, but it appears that water would seep through the dam and also collect from natural drainage and back up under the Rainbow arch, thus jeopardizing this marvelous monument. The opinion of an independent consulting geologist given to one member of the Interior Committee, Mr. HOSMER, is that "regardless of the cost expended this low area will be subject to flooding by seepage of water from the proposed reservoir" through the porous and permeable Navaho sandstone.

(d) Large quantities of water may be absorbed into the formations surrounding the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Geologic reports show that the Kaiparawits and Henry Mountains' basins, both adjacent to the reservoir site, contain tremendous formations of pervious sandstone which have a combined capacity of 350 million acre-feet. The reports indicate that these formations at the present time are practically empty of water. Thus, as the reservoir fills, these formations could absorb tremendous quantities of water making it impossible to accomplish the storage and regulation of water and the production of power contemplated by the project. Since these basins have a capacity some 14 times greater than the proposed reservoir, it would appear absolutely essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and thus free to drain water from the reservoir.

(e) The Chinle shale problem must be satisfactorily investigated and explained. One member of the Interior Committee [Mr. HOSMER] visited the Glen Canyon Reservoir site in company with a consulting geologist in December 1955. The trip showed that there exists along some 50 miles of the canyon sides of the reservoir a formation designated as Chinle shale, which is overlain by massive formations of sandstone. The Chinle is not thin. Neglected U. S. G. S. reports show that it has a thickness of 300–1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, and its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the Colorado River appears similar. Its importance to the reservoir area lies in the fact that it immediately underlies the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones and, in areas of exposure of this shale provides the only foundation support for these overlying cliff-forming rocks. This Chinle formation, when subjected to water, immediately disintegrates into mud. As a result, the entire overburden mass of sandstone could crumble and be precipitated into the reservoir basin with untold adverse effect on the functioning of the reservoir.

The foregoing engineering problems are not of first impression. Surveys of the area now three decades old indicated the Glen Canyon site to be an impressive one but possessed of formation difficulties needing the most exhaustive tests. If $421,270,000—the Bureau estimate—is to be spent here the record on Glen Canyon must be unassailable. Congress should demand a thorough evaluation by an independent board of engineers before authorizing this key structure.

Disabled Veterans—Their Message of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for the improvement and rehabilitation practices continues. The Veterans' Administration still carries on. I am, therefore, with your permission, including a piece of information coming from the Veterans' Administration:

DISABLED VETERANS—THEIR MESSAGE OF HOPE

(By the Office of Information, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.)

Disabled veterans, trained under Veterans' Administration vocational rehabilitation programs, have given America a message of hope over the past decade.

Through their achievements they have demonstrated that there is practically no type or degree of handicap that need be beyond the ken of rehabilitation; that there is practically no type of occupation out of reach of the properly trained, properly placed

handicapped worker; that the handicapped, given the opportunity, can become valued, self-sustaining members of their community.

The record of the more than 600,000 disabled veterans who have received vocational rehabilitation training speaks for itself.

Ninety-five out of every 100 of the rehabilitated veterans are employed; nearly all are using skills they learned in training; more than 99 percent report they are satisfied with their jobs; they have doubled their prewar earnings and now are making $400 a year above the national income average.

Many rehabilitated veterans of today never would have been considered for vocational rehabilitation in an earlier day. "Medically infeasible for training" would have been the verdict. But advanced rehabilitation techniques, coupled with the courage of the veterans themselves, have opened the doors to hope and achievement.

Veteran-trainees have had nearly every conceivable type of service-connected disability. Forty-one percent are orthopedic cases, such as arm and leg amputees; 24 percent have had nervous or mental illnesses; 8 percent had been treated for tuberculosis; 7 percent have had heart and circulatory conditions; the remainder had a wide variety of other types of ailments.

Handicaps did not serve to limit veterans' choices of training objectives. They set their sights for nearly every occupation at which man earns his living—from aeronautical engineer to zoologist, from officeworker to machinist, from farmer to businessman.

Thirty-five percent trained for top-level positions in the professions and managerial field; 38 percent for highly skilled trades; 14 percent in farming; and the remaining 13 percent for clerical, sales, and service jobs.

Disabled veterans have shown the world there can be new hope for the handicapped. They have demonstrated that the emphasis can be shifted from disability to ability. The strength they have gained through rehabilitation is added strength for all America.

Address by the Honorable George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, to the Southern Governors' Conference, Point Clear, Ala., October 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a speech delivered at the Southern Governors' Conference on October 19, 1955.

I hope that every Member of the House will have time to read Gov. George Bell Timmerman's speech, as he has dwelt on some very important subjects in his talk to the governors' conference.

We are very proud of our Governor, and I am happy to insert a copy of his speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

Our topic for discussion—water conservation and development—is one of increasing importance.

While water is vital to plant and animal life, it is also essential to our economic life. For that reason, the problems relating to the effective use of our water resources merit our attention.

THE NEED FOR A DEPENDABLE WATER SUPPLY

Water conservation and development can be defined as an attempt to meet the demand for water at a given place at a given time.

Within that definition, our problem is not a lack of water but a lack of a dependable water supply. The total volume of water is relatively unchanged.

In 1954 South Carolina endured a period of unprecedented drought, but enough rain fell during the year to drown every crop that is grown in our State.

The average rainfall in nearly all areas of the South is approximately 45 inches a year. That is more than adequate for the foreseeable future, but most of our rainfall is recorded during about 3 months of each year. The demand is likewise concentrated, and the greatest demand comes during that period when the smallest amount falls.

The rainfall as yet cannot be controlled, but the rain that falls can be conserved. The crux of our problem is the conservation of our water supply for use when needed and in a way that is practical.

I believe there is no simple solution. The problem is complex and it becomes more complex with the population growth and the subsequent demand for water in expanding agricultural, domestic, industrial and municipal use.

THE INCREASED DEMAND FOR WATER

Fundamentally, the growing demand for water lies with the additional use to which it is put for the individual.

Not only is our population gaining, but with it the per capita use of water is gaining.

Not too many years ago, an engineer in designing a municipal water system could safely base his plans on an estimated per capita consumption of 100 gallons a day. The estimate was thought to be sufficiently high to allow a reserve supply for any eventuality. But now the per capita demand in urban areas has jumped to approximately 125 gallons a day. Within the next twenty years the per capita use is expected to hit 175 to 200 gallons a day.

In agriculture, the demand for water has multiplied. The farmer invests heavily in high-cost labor, in high-cost fertilizer and in high cost machinery. The greater cost of production has made consistently higher crop-yields mandatory. To provide higher yields our farmers are turning more and more to irrigation, but one ear of corn from germination to maturity requires 100 gallons of water for maximum yield.

Diversification in agriculture has also accelerated the farm demand for water. A milk cow needs 30 gallons of water a day, a beef cow 15 gallons a day.

In industry, all plants use water in some quantity and new industrial plants are being constructed daily in the South.

Prominent among southern industry are the manufacture of synthetic fiber, the making of paper from woodpulp, and the refining of petroleum. In these three fields, the South can expect continued growth.

To manufacture a pound of rayon, 90 to 100 gallons of water are required. A ton of woodpulp needs 60 to 85 thousand gallons of water. A barrel of refined gasoline takes 100 to 150 gallons of water.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRIMARY USERS OF WATER

The task of conservation and development falls to some extent upon the primary users of water.

Industry and municipalities have the responsibility of protecting the quality of the streams which serve to transport their wastes.

The landowner in rural areas is in a key position to further the job of water conservation. Our streams rise in rural areas.

In many sections of the South the construction of small farm ponds is proceeding rapidly.

These ponds have provided water immediately for livestock expansion and for limited irrigation. Already in several States they have served to meet the emergency needs of agriculture and industry during periods of drought. Also, the impounding of water has a tendency to recharge ground storage.

Land use is another field in water conservation which must depend on the farmer. A good watershed program would include the prevention of erosion and increased agricultural production.

Such a program also offers the advantages of less silting to clog our downstream reservoirs and more protection to fish and other water life. This, in turn, enhances the recreational value of reservoirs and streams.

However, the problem of conserving and developing our water resources is too intricate and too important to be left to the chance of individual initiative.

STATE RESPONSIBILITY

One important job in a sound program of water conservation and development is the initiation of State action.

Action on the State level can assure a program that will fit the needs of each locality. There seems to be no one ideal water-conservation program that will meet the needs of every section. What may be suitable in one area may not be suitable in another part.

The impounding of huge supplies of water in large reservoirs for later distribution over extensive landed areas may be the solution for some sections. It would not be the answer in another section.

In South Carolina we have many small independently owned farms. Although there is a trend toward larger farm ownership, it still would not be practical to transport water for great distances from a reservoir to our farms. The cost would be prohibitive. Moreover, we can supply our farms with water in a more inexpensive manner.

I am convinced that the problem of water conservation and development is primarily one involving State responsibility.

I am equally convinced that if our States fail to take adequate steps to promote sound water conservation programs within their respective territories, that the Federal sovereignty may eventually move in to fulfill that need. To me, that is an unwholesome alternative.

This not to say that the Federal Government should take no interest in the interstate aspects of the problem.

For instance, most of the South is in a humid region and until recent years had an abundant supply of water and such a small demand that an inventory of ground water was unnecessary. At the present time, I am told, that there is a very inadequate inventory of ground water in the southern region of the United States. I believe the Federal Government might well undertake such an important survey. The Committee on Irrigated Agriculture and Water Resources of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities has made a study of this problem and has recommended that the Federal Government undertake such a survey.

There are, perhaps, other aspects of water conservation and development that may merit cooperative action on the Federal level. In some instances, a watershed may have international as well as interstate aspects that would merit Federal action.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

In order to use our water resources to the best advantage it is necessary to conserve water not only in quantity, but also in quality. The usefulness of water should be preserved from the point of origin to final discharge into the sea.

In my State, a water pollution control authority was established in 1950 to deal with the problem of preserving the purity of our water. Operating as a unit of the State health department, it seeks to prevent new pollution and to correct the old causes of lower water quality. It must approve any new plans for disposing of wastes into rivers and streams.

Our experience with water pollution control has been most satisfactory. It has encouraged users of water to see that the purity of our streams is preserved.

Rather than discouraging our industrial development, it has encouraged confidence in the stability of our water policy. Within the first 6 months of the current calendar year our capital investment in new and expanding industries exceeded $91 million. This figure exceeded that of any previous full calendar year in our industrial history. Within the following 3 months, we have added an additional $85 million in capital investment, making a total of $176 million for the first 9 months of the year, or an average of $14 million a month in new industries and expansion. With that record, we consider that water pollution control is a positive factor in our industrial development.

WATER RIGHTS

The demand for water merits consideration of the need for State enactment of sound water-rights laws, but there is perhaps no law that demands greater care in its preparation. It can be an asset or a great detriment. These laws should define water rights in terms of modern usage and insure equitable distribution with full protection for all. Care should be taken to avoid the enactment of laws that may hamper industrial development and opportunities for profitable employment. Equal care must be taken to avoid giving a priority of right that would be detrimental to others. The rights of those individuals who invest in water conservation should be protected in order to make such investments attractive and profitable.

Water rights should not be confused with water conservation. While a sound water-rights law is closely related to water conservation, the two are separate problems.

The best way to simplify the problem of a water-rights law is to provide by conservation as much water as possible. An adequate supply of water necessarily reduces the need for regulatory controls and the intricate problems that regulatory controls inevitably involve.

In South Carolina a working committee to make a study of water conservation and water rights has been established. It is too early to draw any recommendation from the study but we think that a step has been taken in the right direction. We are moving slowly because we think it is wise, but we are moving.

STATE ABILITY TO FINANCE PROGRAM

The question now arises: Can the States financially afford to undertake an active and effective program of conservation and development?

I think they can.

Four years ago, South Carolina had more than 1,200 school districts, many of which because of their small size and lack of wealth were totally inadequate in their school programs. Our educational standards were as variable as the number of our districts. Some districts had excellent schools, in terms of facility, curriculum, and teacher qualification. Other districts only had schools of a sort. This variableness was unrelated to our system of segregation, notwithstanding representations to the contrary. Within less than 4 years, South Carolina has rebuilt her public school system. Today our school facilities have been made substantially equal for all the children of our State. Our school districts have been reduced to less than 105. Our school curriculum has been equalized. Teacher certification insures teacher equality. In short, we have accomplished an educational renaissance. Of equal importance, we have financed our own program without Federal help or advice and despite some Federal interference. Today, our State is more prosperous than it has ever been. Our per-capita income has risen rapidly. Our credit rating is double A. It must be remembered that we did this on our own although we were 45th in the Nation in per capita income.

If South Carolina can do this and maintain a double A credit rating despite her limited financial resources, I am sure that every State represented here today can afford a sound water conservation program without financial assistance from the Federal Government and the inevitably inapplicable Federal controls that Federal assistance would eventually involve.

CONCLUSION

I have endeavored in what I have said to cover in a general way some of the aspects of water conservation and development. I have not sought to supply a solution.

I hope that out of our discussion will come more concrete proposals for solving our problem of how best to conserve and develop our water resources.

We have four panel members who will lead our discussion. I hope you will all take part. The panel members are: Gov. Marvin Griffin of Georgia, Gov. Luther H. Hodges of North Carolina, Gov. Allan Shivers of Texas, and Gov. Thomas B. Stanley of Virginia.

The Segregation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a statement I made during October 1955 on the segregation problem. I also expressed my opinion on the Supreme Court's ruling on the subject of segregation and hope that every Member of Congress has an opportunity to read same.

We people in South Carolina feel that the Supreme Court went completely beyond its jurisdiction in reinterpreting the Constitution of the United States as this subject has been interpreted by previous Supreme Court Judges and the schools throughout the country were of the opinion, during the past 50 years, that they were operating under the provisions of the Constitution by having separate school facilities for colored and white children in the United States.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT

The following statement is my personal opinion on the recent Supreme Court decision relative to school segregation.

First, I would like to state that it is my sincere opinion that the Supreme Court made a serious error by rendering their decision on the basis of social reforms instead of the legal facts in the cases. I have always been of the opinion that it was the intention of the framers of our Constitution that the public schools in the individual States be controlled, supported, and administered by the individual States. I certainly feel that if the individual States are not permitted under the Constitution to handle their own school affairs, they had just about as well dissolve their charter. I can't see where the States have any rights at all if they do not possess the authority to control their public school affairs. I have talked with colored people residing in practically every county in my district, and I have not found a single colored man who is insistent or even interested in having his children attend white schools. I have found each person whom I have interviewed to be only interested in having good schools and good teachers for his children and not any more interested in having his children enter white schools than the white people are in having their children enter colored schools.

I fully realize that we have in our midst a number of agitators who are not residents of the State of South Carolina or any other Southern State. These people are here under the guidance of the NAACP, whose expenses are paid in a great part by the nontaxable Ford Foundation funds.

From all the information that I have been able to secure during the brief time I have been at home since Congress adjourned, it seems that the Citizens Council committees now being formed in the individual towns may be the answer to this problem, since these councils are made up of the leading citizens of the towns and people who are permanent residents and well acquainted with school problems. I was delighted to read where our Governor and State legislature had created a school committee to study the school-integration problem. I have purposely refrained from making any public statements on this subject for the simple reason that this is a State problem and should be settled in a calm manner by the school authorities with the assistance of the Citizen Committees and also the colored and white leaders here in our State without any interference from the NAACP or any other agitators from outside the boundaries of our State.

I fully realize that some people are interested in getting this subject mixed up with politics, and I, for one, do not care to have any part in making this serious problem a political football. I certainly do not feel that the people of South Carolina elected the Members of the United States Congress to tell them how to vote or to tell them how to handle their school affairs here in the State of South Carolina. My simple belief is that the Federal Government should not interfere with our public-school system, and this includes the members of the Supreme Court, the President, and the Congress of the United States. We all know that the Supreme Court completely bypassed the Congress in making its decision in school integration. I am fully aware of the fact, and I think every thinking person realizes, that when the Supreme Court makes a decision it is the law of the land, and I certainly will be the last person to advise any person in the State of South Carolina to ignore the Supreme Court's decision. However, I am just as completely satisfied, on the other hand, that the thinking people of South Carolina, both colored and white, can solve this problem within the State and continue to have good relations between the races.

It is difficult for me to believe that there will be any integration of races in the southern schools without the consent and desire on the part of the colored and white people within the Southern States. As I have previously stated, there must be some calm thinking on the part of both colored and white leaders. I am perfectly willing to leave this matter, as much as possible, in the hands of the individual school boards and superintendents in our State to work out plans whereby colored children will continue

to attend their schools and the white children will continue to attend separate schools without any compulsion by either side. I am certain that 90 percent of the colored people in South Carolina desire to have their children continue to attend colored schools and the few agitators in the State can be outlawed and overruled by the good colored people themselves.

I have had more experience with this problem than the average person in South Carolina since I have been chairman of the District Committee in Washington, which has jurisdiction over schools and business establishments in the District of Columbia, which is the Nation's Capital. Congress passed a law many years ago calling for equal facilities and separated schools for colored and white children in the District of Columbia. However, when the Supreme Court rendered its decision for integration in the public schools in all States, they also declared the congressional act calling for segregated but equal schools in the District of Columbia illegal. Up until the recent Supreme Court decision, the colored and white people attended segregated schools, segregated theaters, segregated hotels, and segregated eating establishments the same as we do in the State of South Carolina. There was a drive on the part of certain agitators from New York and other States to break down the segregation in the District of Columbia during the 10 years prior to the Supreme Court decision. However, they were unsuccessful with the exception of when the Interior Department, who had jurisdiction over the swimming pools in the District of Columbia, with the assistance of President Truman, did away with segregation in all the Washington swimming pools. There were a number of colored agitators from New York who insisted on swimming in the white pools and they caused a great deal of disturbance in the District. I feel that this is the same type of agitators we have visiting South Carolina under the name of NAACP.

I was born and reared on a farm with colored people and feel that I understand them and their problems. No race or class of people in the world has advanced so much as the colored race in the United States during the past 50 years under the supervision of the white people. I feel that the majority of the colored people prefer to continue to have equal facilities and separate schools.

The State of South Carolina has built some of the finest school buildings in the United States during the past 10 years and the majority of these buildings have been assigned to the colored people. I am making this statement in order to give the people of my State my opinion on this problem and to plead with the press, the school officials, our Governor and our State officials to do everything possible to prevent this serious problem from becoming a political football. There is a strong suspicion on the part of numerous people in this country that the Supreme Court's decision was motivated from a social or political viewpoint.

Thanks for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Martins Ferry Times-Leader dated February 9. This editorial is succinct and to the point and needs no elaboration by me.

THANKS FOR NOTHING

The Post Office Department, with evident pride, informs Congress that it has developed a tape recording which says "Thank you" when a customer makes a purchase from a coin stamp-vending machine. The first 7 of these gadgets cost $4,000 apiece, but it is hoped to bring the cost down later to $1,000 or so.

What still eludes us is why anybody expects thanks for buying a stamp. Without a stamp he can't get his letter mailed. If he wants his letter to go anywhere, he has no option in the matter. Maybe Postmaster General Summerfield, who has already earned a secure place in history by painting mailboxes red, white, and blue, instead of the familiar green, can introduce a refinement. The tape recording will be made to say, if not "Kiss me," then, at least, "Lick me." The letter writer will have to carry on the conversation on his own from there.

Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I want to state that on January 13, 1955, I introduced House Joint Resolution 129, proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. I want to join today with the many other Members of Congress, who have sponsored such legislation, in commemorating the birth of Susan B. Anthony.

Susan B. Anthony was born of a Quaker family in Adams, Mass., on February 15, 1820. For over 60 years, despite prejudice and popular apathy, she devoted her life and effort to the cause of political and social reform: the abolition of slavery, the temperance movement, and her greatest work, political equality for women.

After 1854 her efforts were almost entirely devoted to the movement for the emancipation of women. It was her belief that attainment of the franchise through a constitutional amendment was the key to full political equality for women, and a necessary step to their economic independence.

From 1868 to 1870 Susan B. Anthony was copublisher of a weekly newspaper in New York, The Revolution, advocating women's rights. A founder of the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1869, Miss Anthony served as its vice president until 1892, when she became president of the association at the age of 72.

Miss Anthony was a tireless campaigner, speaker, and organizer. She directed eight State campaigns for the adoption of a constitutional amendment enfranchising women.

Susan B. Anthony, at the time of her death in 1906, had gained wide recognition as an advocate of women's rights both in the United States and in Europe. Unfortunately, she did not live to see the fulfillment of her life's work and the acceptance of those principles for which she had so long fought. Legal recognition in the form of a constitutional amendment, permitting women to vote, was not adopted until 1919, 13 years after her death.

Susan B. Anthony will always be remembered for her undaunted belief in womanly courage.

The Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, who is the chief sponsor of the equal-rights amendment legislation, stated in an address on the floor of the House during the 82d Congress:

It is the last step on the long road toward freedom for women in the United States. We want equality, not protection. We want justice, not privilege.

Referring further to the equal-rights amendment she was proposing, Mrs. ST. GEORGE said:

If women have the right to vote they certainly have the right to be considered equal under the Constitution.

Address of Hon. A. J. Multer, of New York, Before Kings Highway Democratic Club, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1956, it was my privilege to address the Kings Highway Democratic Club at the dinner held at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn on the occasion of its 40th anniversary. The text of my address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, it is fitting at functions like this to talk about our great American way of life and the contribution to it of our Democratic Party and its workers and leaders.

For many years Republican campaigns have been based on untruths, half-truths, and vilification, mixed with high-sounding slogans. An intensification of that low type of appeal is now underway.

Among the myths that have been given credence in our country is the illusion, created, nourished, and propogated by Republicans that Tammany is synonymous with Democrat and that that means bad government. We have done much to overcome that malicious propaganda and more recently with greater success. Much of the credit therefore, is due to our own great national committeeman, whom you will hear tonight, Carmine G. De Sapio.

Unlike many leaders of the past, who remained men of mystery to the general public, He has traveled wide and far, has been accessible to all who sought him out, and most important, has carried the message of our party, eloquently and effectively.

Wherever he has been, people say: "This man is all right. He is truly American. He makes sense." At all times, he brings us credit.

Permit me to point up the moral bankruptcy in the Republican Party, which is being reflected in the executive department of our Government.

We have just had further evidence thereof when the President vetoed the natural-gas bill. He said it was a good bill with a good purpose, but he must veto it because of the arrogance of some people—obviously the oil producers—as evidenced by a $2,500 contribution to a Republican Senator up for reelection.

I ask the President and his Republican campaigners of 1952 and of 1956, to tell us what is the difference in arrogance and in morality between that and the millions of oil dollars contributed to his compaign in 1952 and which brought about in 1953 the enactment into law, with his signature of approval, of the give-away of the vast United States tidal oil lands.

No doubt that comes under his description of Conservatism with property rights.

Let us look for a moment at his policy of liberalism with human rights. I know he meant liberalism in saving human life. It is being implemented, however, by his State Department to mean liberalism in sacrificing human life.

Everybody in this world knows that the situation is so tense in the Middle East that any day we may be propelled into world war three. American oil money, British stupid colonialism, and Russian imperialism vie with each other there in stirring up antagonisms among the Arab States and by them against the outside world.

With Russia and Britain falling over each other in an arms race to see who can supply more arms to the Arabs, our State Department issues releases saying: "No arms to the Middle East." All the time that our State Department has been saying to Israel: No arms to you, because we want no arms race, it has been approving the sale and shipment of United States arms to Saudi Arabia, who in turn has been transshipping them to Jordan, Syria, and Egypt.

During this same period, while the United States has been following Britain's urging that we sell no arms to Israel, Britain has been selling arms to Jordan, Syria, and Egypt.

Our State Department exhibits surprise at the consummation of an agreement by Czechoslovakia to send arms to Egypt, when for more than 3 years the Arabs have been getting Russian arms.

No wonder Republicans would like us not to talk about foreign policy. But from now until election day we will expose them on both fronts, the foreign and the domestic.

Now, my good friends, it is my extreme pleasure to give you our great leader, the Honorable Joseph B. Whitty.

Illinois Support of H. R. 4470

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, ably chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], in support of H. R. 4470. I am extending my remarks to include my statement to the subcommittee, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, a number of my constituents in the Second District of Illinois own summer homes in the dunes of Indiana and on the shores of the lake in southern Michigan in the district represented by our colleague, the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN. They have suffered great loss because of erosion.

On June 1, 1955, I introduced H. R. 6605 to provide for a survey by the Corps of Army Engineers to determine the feasibility of construction projects for the protection of both public and private properties on the shores of the United States against erosion, by waves and currents. My bill defines the word "shores" to include all the shorelines of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, and lakes, estuaries and bays directly connected therewith.

Among my constituents who had alerted me to the urgent need of legislation in this field was Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, a distinguished and nationally renowned educator, a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago holding the professorship of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions.

On February 8, 1956, I wrote Dr. Kerwin that in view of the fact that H. R. 4470 had had a favorable report from the Army engineers and enjoyed the support of many Members from the eastern seaboard, and moreover covered damage both to public and private property, I thought it advisable that we should join forces in its support. I requested his evaluation of the bill.

Dr. Kerwin in his reply said: "As I read the Auchincloss bill, it provides for action by local public authorities such as cities, counties, and the like. This has its merits. It may, however, be difficult to get action in many localities, since the number of people owning lake-front or ocean-front property is often small compared with the whole population of the local area. They might have difficulty getting action. I find that to be true along the Michigan shore. Nevertheless, the bill deserves support."

Therefore, I am appearing before your subcommittee today in support of H. R. 4470. It enactment is urgently required and I trust the committee will take prompt and favorable action.

In fairness to the subcommittee I think I should state that while the enactment of H. R. 4470 would be of great benefit, and in the public interest, it alone will not meet in full measure the emergency that erosion has brought to my constituents owning homes on the shores of Lake Michigan. In his letter to me Dr. Kerwin further said:

"I had heard that as a result of flood conditions in the East a form of Federal disaster insurance was being considered. This might well apply to us unfortunates along Lake Michigan. We cannot even deduct these losses from our income taxes, because losses from 'erosion' are not considered."

A number of bills providing for Federal disaster insurance are now under consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I hope and believe that when and if the committee reports out a disaster insurance bill it will give disaster insurance coverage to properties endangered by erosion.

IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 4470

Imagine. Mr. Chairman, how you would feel if you should learn that you must move your family and furniture within the next few hours before your front yard is washed away and the foundations of your house crumble. Perhaps I am asking too much for you to imagine this happening to you. But since the late summer of 1949, it has happened to many home owners along the shores of the Great Lakes. This particular case happened on the shore of Lake Michigan, a little east and north of Chicago. There had been a prolonged spell of rain with high winds off the lake. In the evening, as the homeowner returned from his work, he heard the roar of the waves and watched the lake with some feeling of apprehension. But the first realization of danger to his property came when he entered the house and his wife called attention to expanding cracks in the living room. Even as she spoke, the waves were pounding on the edge of his property and great chunks were tumbling off the lot for whose purchase he had saved and scrimped. Immediately, he began phoning for a mover to come and get the furniture, and then arranged with a friend to provide temporary shelter for his family.

Only to the extent that I am trying to put you in the picture am I drawing on my imagination, Mr. Chairman. This has happened, not only to the family I have in mind, but with minor changes to numbers of my friends and constituents in the region around Chicago, and to hundreds, if not thousands of people with property fronting on the Great Lakes. Those of my personal acquaintance are Chicago residents, many of them my constituents. They have sought refuge from a confining life in the city by building summer homes among the dunes of Indiana, or topping the bluffs along the southwestern shores of Michigan. They are neighbors of the constituents of my colleagues who represent the 1st and 3d Congressional Districts of Indiana, and the 4th District of Michigan. No doubt you will hear from them, as well as the many Representatives of other congressional districts in the seven States that front on one or more of the Great Lakes.

HOW LAKE LEVELS FLUCTUATE

Because my home is in Chicago I have an especial interest in Lake Michigan. Being connected with Lake Huron by the open water of the Straits of Mackinac, the two have the same level above the sea. Accordingly, they are considered a single body by the United States Lake Survey of the Corps of Army Engineers. For the other lakes, however, each has its own level. All are measured in relation to the mean tide of the sea at New York. The levels fluctuate with the seasons. Their high stages are in the summer, usually in June, July, or August. Thereafter, the levels drop away to the low stages which occur in winter.

The engineers have a way of describing these fluctuations in simple, direct language. During the fall and early winter the outflow from the lakes, plus evaporation from their vast surfaces, is greater than the combined normal inflow, plus the rain and snow that fall upon their surfaces. But in the spring, rains merge with the melting snow from the tributaries of the Great Lakes to reverse the process. This continues until mid-summer when it reaches a peak. From year to year this normal pattern of rise and fall varies with the differing amounts of rain and snowfall in the surrounding region.

LAKE LEVELS SINCE 1860

Records of the lake levels have been kept since 1860. They indicate an average of 580.58 feet above sea level for Lakes Michigan and Huron. This has varied through the past 95 years from a record high of 583.68 feet in June 1886, to a record low of 577.35 feet in February 1926. The extreme from the high level to the low level is thus 6.33 feet. As shown by the following records of the United States Lake Survey, the water level of Lake Michigan and Lake Hurton rose a total of nearly 3 feet (2.94 feet) during 3 years from July 1949, to August 1952.

Selected levels of Lake Michigan-Huron, 1860–1955

	Feet
Average level, 1860–1953	580.58
Highest monthly average, June 1886	583.68
Lowest monthly average, February 1926	577.35
Spread between extremes	6.33

Recent high water levels

	Feet
Highest monthly average, July 1948	580.85
Highest monthly average, July 1949	579.76
Highest monthly average, August-September 1950	579.96
Highest monthly average, 1951	[1] 581.46
Highest monthly average, August 1952	582.70
Highest monthly average, July 1953	582.14
Highest monthly average, July 1954	581.66
Highest monthly average, July 1955	581.38
Rise from July 1949 to August 1952	2.94
Subsidence from high of August 1952 to July 1955	1.32
Difference between level of August 1952 and 94-year average	2.12
Difference between level of July 1955 and 94-year average	.80

[1] Annual Report of the Lake Carriers' Association, 1951: "* * * during 1951, Lakes Huron and Michigan (averaged) 1.5 feet above the level of 1950." (p. 51.)

All levels are above mean tide at New York, 1935 datum.

Source: United States Lake Survey, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Detroit, Mich.

DAMAGE REACHES $61 MILLION

The most recent high level record of 582.70 feet was recorded in August 1952. Since then a moderate subsidence has occurred. But during the 12 months ending in June 1952 damages of some $61 million were reported by the Corps of Engineers. This is the total suffered by the shore owners on the entire Great Lakes system, from Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence River. Approximately $50 million was the result of wave action, and some $11 million represented losses from inundation of property. Since 1952 water levels have abated slightly, but they are still nearly a foot above the average of the past 95 years.

The cause of all this damage, according to the Corps of Engineers, is several years of rain and snowfall above normal on the country tributary to the Great Lakes. It is as simple as all that, and cannot be credited to any of the man-made changes of the past quarter century. Neither is it the result of any combination of man's actions. This frees the city of Chicago from the charges that it stems back to the limit of 1,500 cubic feet per second now being diverted from the lake for sanitary purposes. Such diversions have been limited to this amount since 1938, following a decision of the United States Supreme Court. Before that as much as 9,000 cubic feet per second were being taken from Lake Michigan to flush out the Chicago Drainage Canal. With the added amount being diverted to supply water for the Chicago area, the current total is only 3,100 cubic feet per second. This amount is credited with lowering the level of Lakes Michigan and Huron less than a quarter of a foot.

Even were the diversion stepped up as high as 10,000 cubic feet per second, the Army engineers estimate the levels of the two lakes would be reduced by no more than a third of a foot in 3 years. Were it continued for 10 years, they estimate the level would be lowered only a little more than a half foot. At the same time the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario would be lowered about a third of a foot.

PEAK REACHED IN 1952

Current reports can lead to an assumption that the lake level reached a peak in 1952 and is now receding. Therefore, why worry? It may never happen again. This, Mr. Chairman, is an argument for which there is no basis in fact. In all probability the recent high water stages will be repeated again and again.

A more important question is whether new records of high water can be expected. Twice during the past 95 years the level of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron exceeded 585.5 feet, and once during this period it equalled this level. Curves plotted by engineers with the Michigan Department of Health indicate a little more rain or snow in the region, or a cooler summer with reduced evaporation, could have raised the levels of the lakes to similar heights two or three times additional to those recorded during that same period. Fortunately, the combination of natural phenomena did not occur and our people were spared the inevitable losses. But all the records and all the observations point to the conclusion that the high and destructive lake levels prevailing since 1948 and 1949 will be repeated at indefinite intervals in the future.

This being the case, Mr. Chairman, a final question comes to mind. What can be done to meet this recurring and accelerating hazard? Of all the authorities on lake levels, no organization is so well versed on this as the Corps of Engineers. They offer two lines of attack. Both deserve consideration. They compensate one another, but do not compete. Only one can be considered at this time. The other would involve the possibility of international action with our neighbor to the north—the Dominion of Canada. It consists of lowering the high stages of the lakes by permitting greater outflow. I mention it because it has been proposed by responsible officers of the Corps. However, it is not contemplated in H. R. 4470, and is outside the jurisdiction of this committee.

IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION DEMANDED

More imperative and at the same time more local is the Corps' recommendation that protective devices be constructed as rapidly as practicable. This is just what is contemplated in the bill before this committee. The bill is specific in that it proposes the possibility of Federal aid to the States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of the States in carrying out the ideas and recommendations of the Corps of Engineers. Basic to this is the assumption that the States, municipalities, and political subdivisions want to do something permanent and worthwhile, but that they need help.

In this regard I would remind you that the city of Chicago, whose 2d district I have the honor to represent, is already going far to meet the hazards created by the high lake levels. In the spring of 1952, at the height of the most recent onslaught from Lake Michigan, the city bonded itself in the amount of nearly $7 million to carry out the beginnings of a program with which to meet the problem. This has resulted in relocating some 4 miles of our Lake Shore Drive, and the expenditure of nearly a million dollars for structures designed to protect the shore from pounding waves resulting from the high-water levels. No one realizes better than the engineers connected with the city of Chicago, and those serving the nearby municipalities, that this is only a beginning. Much more remains to be done. More engineering structures must be constructed as the changing water levels make other shore properties vulnerable to wave attacks. And once constructed, they must be maintained. All of this costs money.

COSTLY RELOCATION OF TRACKS

During the first years of this current spell of high lake levels, the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad was forced to spend no less than $2½ million to relocate the tracks and protect the right-of-way of the road that serves Chicago and much of western Michigan. Similarly, costly projects were undertaken by the States and municipalities along the shore. As with the city of Chicago, these improvements must all be maintained and new ones planned if the taxpaying properties are to be adequately protected.

I opened this important discussion with a description of what has happened to the home of one of my constituents. That story could be duplicated dozens of times and it would still be limited to citizens who are residents of my congressional district. They are a small part, however, of those who have suffered losses. From Chicago to northern New York, where the waters of Lake Ontario enter the St. Lawrence River, and on down the river, property owners have found themselves face to face with similar situations. Individuals and corporations, municipalities and States throughout that entire area, and across on the shores of Canada, began in 1949 to install protective devices against the onslaughts of the high water. And as the high levels continued, many of them have continued their costly investments.

Fortunately for all concerned the Federal Government was reasonably quick to provide assistance. As early as May 1952, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation began making loans for repair of the damage, and the Corps of Engineers has been of invaluable service. But after nearly 6 years the situation remains imperative and many local political subdivisions are finding their responsibilities burdensome.

Reasons for prompt action

This, Mr. Chairman, brings me to direct consideration of the bill before this committee. Early enactment of H. R. 4470 will go far to encourage the States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of the States to construct the necessary seawalls and other structures to protect the shores. At the same time, it will relieve those same governmental groups from part of the oppressive burdens incident to their construction.

It will hasten the necessary planning of future structures for continuous protection of the lake shores. Planning of this sort is no less vital than the immediate work because of the probability that lake levels will again and again assume dangerous proportions. Such plans for the future assume greater and greater importance as the shore property values increase and as the population of our country grows.

By no means the least important consideration in this bill is the opportunity it provides for clarifying the responsibilities and cooperative possibilities of the Corps of Engineers, with particular reference to the United States Lake Survey. The history of the corps is a long record of service to the States. Under the impetus of this bill the corps can do even more to serve the several affected States and unify their programs. Thus, it will strengthen our internal defenses against the forces of nature.

These, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the reasons why this bill deserves prompt approval and early enactment. As compared with the needs for comparable and concerted action to protect the shores of our great Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf of Mexico coasts, the needs of this interior "heartland of America" are relatively small. But they are not inconsequential. And together with those of our ocean fronts they present a combination of problems for whose solution concerted action is long overdue. I urge, therefore, that no time be lost in giving this bill the consideration that will permit this committee to approve it and recommend its early enactment by the Congress.

Love of Neighbor Is God's Guided Missile to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my extension of remarks an inspiring address that

should be as widely read as possible, delivered by our great archbishop of Boston, Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

The address was delivered on February 14, 1956, when Archbishop Cushing was presented the Man of the Year Award of the Benjamin S. Pouzzner lodge, B'nai B'rith of Lowell, Mass.

In response, Archbishop Cushing made a plea for all men of good will to adopt love of neighbor as God's guided missile to peace. The text of Archbishop Cushing's address, Love of Neighbor Is God's Guided Missile to Peace, follows:

With emotion too deep for utterance, with mingled gratitude and pride, I receive this award with sincere humility.

For tonight doing me this great honor—you do yourselves greater honor; because truly all the kind things that have been said of me tonight describe me more graciously than accurately, more generously than exactly. Tonight you have been describing me not indeed just as I am, but with a moving generosity of spirit, as I wish I were, as I pray daily and try daily to be. But in thus too generously picturing me—you have portrayed yourselves as you are. This award is indeed an idealized painting of me, but of you who have made it, and whose presence here tonight approve it, it is in deepest reality as a clear mirror wherein your true selves are reflected.

GRACIOUS GESTURE

For as no man can talk about another without revealing to an intelligent listener much of himself, so in describing me, you have truly revealed yourselves. Every kind and magnanimous word said here about me, said more the speaker, and of all of you whose applause endorsed and approved the generous sentiments so eloquently phrased, and written. For in invisible yet indelible ink, between the lines of this tribute, is written for angels to read the bigness of heart and the broadness of mind, the dynamic and inspiring Americanism, the true godliness, of those who voted for and prepared this award; and of all here assembled, men of all faiths, who have come here in support and approval of this Hebrew community's most gracious gesture.

Nominating, as it has this year, a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, a priest and servant of God—naming me as its choice, as man of the year, for exemplary and outstanding good will and good service to men of all creeds—this Hebrew brotherhood has not nominated—but proved itself, the Hebrew Community group of the year, for the very same virtues. This award you have bestowed upon me tonight, I firmly believe, God gives to each and every one of you the Book of Eternal Life.

Surely in Heaven before the throne of your God and mine, the erudite Master of the Talmud sings your praises. He once said of the good man, as written in that inspiring book, In Time and Eternity, edited by Nahum Glatzer, a great Jewish scholar, and rendered into noble English by Olga Marx, another Jewish scholar of note—"Let the good man increase peace with his brothers, with his relatives, and with every man, even with the stranger in the market place, that he may be beloved above and desired below, and well received by all creatures."

Thus tonight, being so kind to me, you have in essential reality been true to yourselves and your own religion—loyal at once to your Jewish tradition and to your American tradition; obedient to God who three centuries ago inspired a Syrian Rabbi, Samuel Ben Abraham Laniado to write, that the love of one's neighbor shall be considered in Heaven as if God Himself had received it. Yes, and long before that, nearly 20 centuries ago, that same God Incarnate said, "Amen I say unto you—as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to Me."

BROTHERHOOD MANIFEST

And myself one of His least brethren, the stranger to whom you have opened the door of your hearts will never forget your kindness tonight, nor cease in my efforts to be worthy of it; to nourish and increase that awareness of brotherhood here manifest tonight, a blessed warmth and a holy light in us and upon us. Nor shall I cease while I live to oppose all movements and men who through ignorance or malice would infect us with the spiritual disease of bigotry, the contagious germs of racial hatreds. To such men, who knowingly or not, serve the enemies of God and country I would say:

"Whoever degrades another degrades me,
And whatever is said or done against another,
Returns in the end to hurt me."

Though the years of my priesthood have not dimmed my ideals, they have made me a realist. That is why even now, while I speak rejoicing, a shadow falls on my happiness, as I realize that some among you may be silently thinking, But is the archbishop unaware that Protestants and Jews may be disliked and distrusted by some of his Catholics?" To that silent question, if anyone here present be in thought asking it now, in sadness and humility I must answer, "I know." Among my own people, my own children in Christ, there may be those who offend you—and their God. A splinter minority of my flock may be prejudiced and intolerant, only a comparatively few—yet if there were but 3 such, that would be 3 too many. There may be indeed intolerant Catholics; but—I beg of you please believe and remember what I tell you now—if they are bigoted it is not because of their Catholic faith, but in spite of it, in betrayal of it.

My friends, I have broken bread with you this night, and have talked with you as a fellow American, neighbor, and friend. But in this matter I voice no mere personal opinion, but with the consecrated authority of my holy office, as a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, and priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek, I declare to you that no Catholic can despise a fellow man and remain a true follower of his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and an obedient son of his church. Any Catholic who reviles or wrongs a brother because of the color of his skin, because of race or religion, or who condemns any racial or religious group, because of the mistakes or sins of a few individuals in that racial or religious group, ceases to be a Catholic and an American. He becomes a disobedient son of mother church and a disloyal citizen of these United States. The Catholic who fails to take a stand against racial or religious persecution is at once a slacker in the army of the church militant and a deserter from the battle of Christian democracy; turning his back to a brother of different color, race, or religion, wittingly or not, he turns his back to the flag and to the cross of Mount Calvary.

In all this anxious, war-weary, confused, and care-burdened world are there any men more futile and stupid than those who clamor for world peace and whisper for discrimination and discord in their own neighborhoods? The road to world peace is the street where we ourselves live. The first steps to world peace are steps to the stranger in need or the sorrowful next door, be his race or religion what it may.

There is a pathetic story of an unemployed Negro wearily filling out still another application for employment. When he came to the question, "What is your race?" with unconscious irony he wrote down, "Human." We have all of us heard—and some of us preached—hour-long sermons that said less. For there is one word in the heart of the matter. Since our beginning is in God and our end; since in love He created all men and nations—to hate any person or people or nation is to hate God their Father, and our Father.

Three centuries ago Samuel Laniado, great spiritual writer of Judaism, wrote: "Love your neighbor just as you do yourself. And this means that just as a man who has hurt himself with his hand, will not hurt in return the hand that has hurt him; so it is, if a neighbor inflicts pain or the like on him, he will not seek vengeance, because he regards his neighbor as himself, as his very self. Since God created his soul and the soul of his neighbor, he knows both alike—each an infinitesimal part of God's creation."

All the "anti" movements that lead to discord, and strife, that have led to the mass murders we call wars, have their roots in the rejection of the commandment of Christ. "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." He, the Son of God made man, understood how difficult it is to wipe out national, racial and religious enmities; nevertheless He refused to appease or compromise in this. He would accept no coexistence with hatreds or discriminations, but proclaimed, "You have heard that it was said: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you."

PEACE MISSILE

That is the one answer. We must learn it and soon, lest in blasting atoms the world commit suicide—

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart.
Still stands Thy ancient sacrifice,
A humble and a contrite heart."

A humble and a loving heart—God's guided missile for the winning of peace. Men with such hearts, with God's help, will yet save the world. Paratroopers of the Lord and captains for Christ. The history of your people, my Jewish friends, and mine, of your religion and mine is beautiful with the records, the words, and the deeds of such men. Conquerors, though defeated; forgiving their enemies, they have no enemies; but they make of the conquerors captives of God.

Such a man was gentle St. Francis of Assisi. Such is that great priest whose parish is the world, because he loves the world, our Holy Father, Pius XII. Such a man was St. Stephen the Levite, who stoned to death, with his last breath begged forgiveness for his murderers, and in the beautiful scripture phrase, "fell asleep in the Lord."

Such men serve my Church in many lands, and are praying this hour for their Communist jailers. Nor need we go to the distant past, or far lands, for examples of the courage born of love. Such a man is Harry Melcher, of North Adams, Mass., of whom I read in the Boston papers of February 3, when for the second time in 25 years, mindless of self, he braved a fiery death to save the sacred scrolls of his synagogue, nobly proving again that as hatred is weakness, fear in action; courage is love in action. As St. John, the beloved disciple, proved in life and death, and in these deathless words: "There is no fear in love, but perfect love, casteth out fear." And thus casting out fear will bring peace to men; in their hearts and their homes, in their communities and countries—throughout the whole world.

For centuries now we've tried everything else; the powers of wealth, of mighty armies and navies, and combinations of nations, machinations of diplomats. All have failed. Before it's too late, and time is running out, let us turn from trust in the chain reactions of exploding atoms to faith in the chain reaction of God's love. Love—love of God

and fellow men—that is God's formula for peace. Peace and earth to men of good will.

This night, here assembled, you have lit a beacon for peace, a spark which could with God's help start a fire of enthusiasm to God who alone is peace in time and eternity. This night you are doing just that. You have kindled a flame of divine fire which might indeed, with God's help, start a chain reaction for brotherhood, a spreading conflagration of love withering to ashes all bigotries and fears, making bright the path to our loving Father in whom alone is peace in this world and the next, today and forever.

A half century ago when the British Empire was first among nations, as we are now, Kipling warned his people, and warns us now:

"Far called, our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks the fire:
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Lord God of Hosts be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

You have not forgotten, nor will He forget you, nor I in my prayers—but one gift I would rejoice in more than your magnanimous award, a prayer, though it be but a mumbled phrase—that all men may love God and love one another. Every day and frequently throughout every day, let each one say—Oh, my God I love you and I love my neighbor as myself. That is God's guided missile to peace.

The Kelley Flood Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, following the disastrous east-coast floods of last August, it struck me that, in addition to more effective flood-control protection, homeowners and businessmen in areas subject to floods also needed a reasonable-cost flood insurance system. This is a field private enterprise has never felt it could enter, because the premiums would have to be so tremendously high in order to protect the insurance company against loss and also return a profit that few customers could afford to buy such a policy.

Consequently, I suggested a Federal national flood insurance program, in which the Federal Government would either reinsure the private companies or else issue the policies directly to the public. Other Members of Congress also got interested in this idea, particularly those from the flooded New England areas, and the House Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings on the various proposals.

After suggesting enactment of flood-insurance legislation last summer, I looked into the matter further and found that President Truman in 1952 actually had a proposed bill drafted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this very purpose. With necessary changes to bring it up to date, I introduced that bill early this year.

In urging the House Banking Committee to adopt my proposal, I pointed out the inability of private firms to sell such insurance on their own, citing the position of the National Board of Fire Underwriters that—

Because of the virtual certainty of the loss, its catastrophic nature, and the impossibility of making this line of insurance self-supporting * * * companies could not prudently engage in this field of underwriting.

My bill therefore has as its purpose:

To promote the national welfare by alleviating the widespread economic distress suffered from time to time within the United States * * * as a result of floods, and the attendant impairment of the free flow of interstate and foreign trade and commerce, by providing direct governmental insurance of certain flood risks or by making insurance of such risks available through private insurance companies by means of governmental reinsurance.

PROVISIONS OF KELLEY FLOOD INSURANCE BILL

My bill, H. R. 8142, provides for a maximum amount of insurance for any one person or business of $250,000, which would not cover the losses of a really big firm but which would certainly cover the homeowner and small-business man who need this protection most—who in the past in Westmoreland County and elsewhere, have seen their properties—on which they may have owed substantial debts—washed away and wiped out—but with the debt still to pay. It is hard enough to pay a mortgage off under any circumstances. To pay it on a house which no longer exists, which has been destroyed, is an intolerable burden.

Also provided is a limitation of 90 percent on the amount of any loss which would be covered, thus assuring that each policyholder would have an incentive to help keep down his own losses.

The bill requires that the program be operated without loss to the Government, which means that premiums would have to be realistic. But to assure that, some experience would be necessary, so the bill calls for a maximum of $500 million of insurance in effect in the first year, doubling at the end of the second year, and tripling to $1,500,000,000 at the end of the third year. This would enable the Government to amass reliable cost figures.

Private insurance facilities would be used to the greatest extent possible. The Government would issue policies directly only if private companies did not participate.

Further, other Government agencies operating loan or loan-guaranty programs, like FHA and VA home mortgage insurance, and so on, could require that flood insurance be carried by the purchaser just as they now require that fire insurance be carried. This is predicated on the assumption that the flood insurance would be available at reasonable cost.

Such a program, going hand-in-hand with better flood control, would protect people who have, in the past, seen everything they owned wiped out by rampaging flood waters, terrible disasters to all who ever experienced them.

Editorials in Los Angeles Examiner for February 16, 1956, Reveal That Los Angeles County Exceeds Cook County, Ill. (Chicago Area), and New York in Retail Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention and the attention of my other colleagues two editorials appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner on February 16, 1956:

GIANT STEP UP

Officially confirming what had long been previously indicated, the 1954 business census of the Department of Commerce reveals that Los Angeles County has become the Nation's greatest retail sales center.

In the 6 years since 1948, the county has made a phenomenal gain of 49.5 percent, or $2 billion, to forge far ahead of Chicago (Cook County, Ill.) and New York's Manhattan Borough.

Chicago, the leader in 1948, recorded a 22.9 percent increase in 1954. New York, third in 1948, retained that position in 1954 with a gain of 6.7 percent.

In dollar valuation Los Angeles' increase in retail sales exceeded New York's increase by more than eight times.

Another startling fact disclosed by the census is that in dollar totals Los Angeles sales far exceeded the combined totals of the Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Boston areas—three of the most populous counties in the Nation.

All this is immensely gratifying, not only to Los Angeles County but to the metropolitan area and the whole community of southern California.

It reflects, obviously, another leap forward in the Southland's prosperity, a confident leap from the solid ground of a balanced economy.

It bespeaks, not a transitory condition of feverish boom but one of varied and general enterprise, the many sources from which production and earning derive.

And it testifies to the creative spirit which is the taproot of all prosperity, which gives impulse for leaps ahead and renews the incentive and power to leap again.

Gratification with growth, of course, inevitably presents a challenge.

We must build for the future with imaginative daring.

Today we lead in buying. Tomorrow we shall have more people here than in any other spot in the Nation.

But every facility of our greater community is now taxed to the utmost, or far short in capacity. Schools, roads, airports, sewers, and recreational areas come uppermost to mind.

We are committed to an era of expansion in which greater growth and prosperity are ours, if we give them the houseroom they need to live and perpetuate themselves.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY LEADS THE UNITED STATES IN RETAIL STORE SALES

Los Angeles County has officially passed Cook (Chicago) County, Ill., to become the Nation's top-ranking county in retail store

sales, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce announced yesterday.

Results of the 1954 Federal Census of Business disclosed that Los Angeles County recorded a phenomenal 49.5 percent gain in retail store sales to pass its closest competitor by almost $500 million.

The 1948 business census listed Los Angeles County second behind Cook County with total store sales of $4,512,261,000, compared to $5,085,557,000.

A countywide sales growth of $2,231,435,000 in the past 6 years, however, has boosted Los Angeles County to the top with total store sales of $6,743,696,000, compared to $6,252,260,000 for Illinois' largest county area.

UPSWING

New York's Manhattan borough remained in third place, according to the business census report, showing only a 6.7 percent gain in the 6-year period of the study. Los Angeles County's gain was nearly eight times that of Manhattan.

Los Angeles County's gain even surpassed the total store sales of three of the country's most populous counties—Cuyahoga (Cleveland) County, Ohio; Allegheny (Pittsburgh) County, Pa., and Suffolk (Boston) County, Mass.

In explaining the retail store sales upswing, George B. Gose, chamber vice president, commented:

"An increase of this nature tends to snowball and keep going. It should result in an increase of manufacturing within the county plus additional distribution centers. The dominance of this county as the Nation's No. 1 retail sales center will have far-reaching effects on national advertising and sales promotion programs."

Official figures from the census report showed that Los Angeles County ranks first in the sales of general merchandise, furniture, home furnishings and appliances, automotive, service stations, drugstores, lumber, building materials, and hardware.

The chamber's business census report was prepared by Wilbur M. McGann, manager of the research department. He was assisted by William Dover, director, business research department, Los Angeles Examiner, who is a member of the chamber's research committee.

She Wants To Outlaw Hunger in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article relating to our able colleague from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] written by Virginia Irwin, and appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 20, 1956.

The article relates to a bill introduced by Mrs. SULLIVAN, one that is humanitarian and at the same time, if enacted, would go a long way toward solving surplus perishable agricultural products.

The within article shows that the newspaper and public response is most favorable to this bill introduced by Mrs. SULLIVAN and her able and courageous fight to have it enacted into law.

As Mrs. SULLIVAN well said to me, "When people are not getting enough of the right food, and the food itself is piling up unused in warehouses, what difference does it make whether the modest cost of a food-stamp distribution setup be allocated to the Department of Agriculture or some other department? We are already spending many hundreds of millions to give this food away overseas."

I agree with my colleague.

The people of the district represented by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] are justified in feeling proud of her outstanding service in the Congress. This type of legislation typifies the high and idealistic character of service she represents and renders, so sincerely following in the pathway of her late distinguished husband whom she succeeded in the Congress.

The article of Virginia Irwin follows:

SHE WANTS TO OUTLAW HUNGER IN UNITED STATES—ST. LOUIS CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR SULLIVAN PRESSING BILL FOR FOOD STAMP PLAN TO AID THE NEEDY

(By Virginia Irwin)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN, the first and only woman ever elected to the United States Congress from Missouri, is as stubborn as the famed mule of her native State when it comes to fighting for legislation in which she is particularly interested.

One of Mrs. SULLIVAN'S most persistent battles ever since she arrived on Capitol Hill in January 1953 to begin her first term as the Representative from Missouri's Third Congressional District, has been over the passage of her bill to outlaw hunger in the United States. The bill provides for a stamp plan under which the Nation's billions of dollars in surplus foods could be drawn upon to feed needy Americans.

Recently former President Harry S. Truman criticized President Eisenhower's program to reduce price-depressing farm surpluses by paying American farmers to withdraw millions of acres of land from production, and suggested, among other things, that our country use the surpluses to improve the diet of the underprivileged here at home. This is what Representative SULLIVAN has been advocating in a bill she introduced first in the 83d Congress and in revised form in the House again last session.

"My bill to get some of our surplus food into the stomachs of hungry people would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute a portion—I would estimate that portion to be about $1 billion a year—of our surplus food stocks to our country's needy families under a stamp plan," the lady legislator from St. Louis explained in her office on Capitol Hill. "This bill is no overall solution for surpluses accumulating under the price-support program and it doesn't pretend to be. But it is an attempt to put part of this tremendous food surplus to humane use and to get some of it—a small portion of it—to kids who aren't getting enough milk, eggs, and meat, and to families who just simply aren't getting enough to eat."

Now attempting to get the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee to bring her food stamp bill out of committee, Mrs. SULLIVAN believes that the bill will, if passed, not only channel food to those in need but also be of great aid to the farmer in thus helping to reduce the price-depressing surpluses.

Various departments of Government, Mrs. SULLIVAN says, have been cool to her stamp plan because no Government department wants the cost of distribution of the surplus food included in its budget. Testifying before the House Agriculture Committee she said:

"Millions of Americans who need this surplus food are not getting any of it. I want to see some of them get some of it on a planned, intelligent, smoothly-run, regularly operating program of the Government." And, she added that the committee "may feel, as the Department of Agriculture seems to feel, that the problem of feeding hungry people in the United States should not be mixed up with the price support program."

Mrs. SULLIVAN believes that the stamp plan's economic effect on this country would more than offset the cost of her program for distributing surplus food to America's needy. Families on relief, while receiving surplus eggs, milk products and other foods of which this Nation has too much, she says, would have the dollars represented by these foods to buy other family needs and thus benefit their local merchants.

"The food stamp plan is aimed primarily at persons and families on relief, on public assistance, or in need of such assistance but ineligible because of legal technicalities," Mrs. SULLIVAN said. "Figures show that more than three-fourths of all the people on the welfare lists are small children and old folks over 70. Surplus foods would give them food which they are now not able to have because even the maximum amount of relief they now receive doesn't permit them to buy the right foods for an adequate diet."

Mrs. SULLIVAN suggests that standards of eligibility for receiving food from our surplus stocks be determined by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. She would provide these "blessings of surplus food" not only to people on welfare rolls but the needy whose unemployment compensation has terminated or who are on a waiting period to get unemployment compensation. It would also apply to those who are not eligible for unemployment compensation and have no way of procuring the necessary food for themselves and their families except through private charities.

Mrs. SULLIVAN emphasizes that a key provision of her bill provides that surplus food allotments made under her stamp plan would be in addition to—and not in place of—any public assistance grants recipients might already be getting. She also emphasizes that the bill would in no way interfere with programs now in operation, such as school lunches, foreign aid, assistance to hospitals, and other successful plans already under way.

"Think what it would mean to folks who are now going hungry to find themselves in possession each week of a few stamps calling for, say, a pound of butter, a certain amount of dry eggs or whatever," Mrs. SULLIVAN said. "I think this food-stamp plan might bring not only new hope but new strength and new health to millions of needy Americans."

A dynamic woman, "say past 40," LEONOR SULLIVAN, now in her second term in Congress, is getting ready to run for a third term. Completely absorbed in her work, she calls her job "wonderful and now my whole life."

The widow of John B. Sullivan, who was serving his fourth term in the House at the time of his death in January 1951, Mrs. SULLIVAN was born and reared in St. Louis, the daughter of the late Frederick W. Kretzer and the late Nora Jostrand Kretzer. Educated in public and private schools in St. Louis, she attended Washington University at night, taking special training in vocational psychology. She taught business arithmetic and accounting and then served as director of the St. Louis Business Training School prior to her marriage in 1941.

In Washington, Mrs. SULLIVAN worked in her husband's office and campaigned at his side during his congressional career. Immediately following her husband's death she served briefly as administrative assistant to Representative Irving of Missouri. In 1952, she won the Democratic nomination for Congress in St. Louis's Third District over seven other candidates and in the general election in November defeated Claude I. Bakewell, the

Republican Congressman, who had succeeded her husband the previous year.

Because of her interest in housing legislation, and particularly in the advancement of urban redevelopment and slum clearance, Mrs. SULLIVAN was selected by the House Democratic leadership in 1955 for a seat on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles all housing legislation. In addition, she is one of the senior ranking Democratic members on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Most of the bills introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN have been directly related to the work of her own committees in the House or have dealt with the problems of her own St. Louis district. But she has also taken a leading part in a number of broad policy issues dealing particularly with the health and welfare of the individual citizen.

One of her most important bills which she introduced, in company with other Members of Congress from St. Louis and Missouri's two Senators, was one to authorize a flood-control program for the protection of St. Louis. The bill passed the House last July and Mrs. SULLIVAN is now working for appropriations necessary to get the project underway.

Since the beginning of her first term in Congress, she has favored more adequate appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. She has also taken a crusading interest in the new housing law and was sponsor of an amendment to provide additional public housing for elderly persons. The amendment was lost in a last-minute conference committee compromise, but Mrs. SULLIVAN intends to fight for it again during the present session of Congress.

After her husband's death, Mrs. SULLIVAN shared a Washington apartment with another Congresswoman, Vera Buchanan, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. Since Congresswoman Buchanan died last year, Mrs. SULLIVAN has lived alone. She cares little for strictly social life and most of her evenings are taken up with official functions.

"Being a Congresswoman is a type of work to which you have to give everything you have," she said. "Actually you have no such thing as a private life. There are responsibilities but there are also great rewards.

"I get my greatest satisfaction out of my job when I go back home to St. Louis and get around my district and hear the expressions of gratitude from people for the little things I may have been able to accomplish for them—things done through legislation to make their life a little easier."

Closest to LEONOR SULLIVAN's heart on the list of things she wants to do is her bill for the stamp plan.

"It's time," says Mrs. SULLIVAN, "that the Department of Agriculture began to take a different attitude and treat the food surplus as a blessing that can be used to aid our needy, instead of just wanting to get rid of it as soon as possible, and preferably overnight, overseas, behind the Iron Curtain or some other handy place."

Housing for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis.

The resolution urges that Congress give early and favorable consideration to the possibility of amending our housing laws so as to provide adequate, low-rent housing facilities for our elder citizens who are unable to secure decent living quarters within their limited incomes.

I believe that this is one area which requires attention. In the past, the Congress has enacted housing legislation intended to aid in meeting a pressing need: The need for adequate housing facilities for low-income families. The principle that such aid should be extended to families whose children could be expected to carry the benefits to future generations was embodied in this legislation. Cognizant of the evils and the terrible social cost of juvenile delinquency, both in its immediate and in its long-range effects, Congress so directed Federal housing aid that it would help to combat this problem.

Because of its primary stress on family welfare, the housing legislation in the past made no provision for those elder citizens who, because of nonmarriage, death of a spouse, or other reasons, found themselves alone. Neither did our housing laws give adequate attention to elder couples, living alone on limited incomes.

I believe that the problems faced by many of our elder citizens deserve prompt and close consideration. I earnestly hope that the Congress will consider these problems in conjunction with the forthcoming action on housing and related measures.

"RESOLUTION RELATING TO URGING CONGRESS TO INCLUDE IN THE PUBLIC HOUSING LEGISLATION FOR ADEQUATE LOW RENT HOUSING FOR AGED PERSONS

"Whereas there is a definite and growing need for low rent housing for aged people, so that such persons may find comfortable and adequate housing at rentals which they can afford to pay; and

"Whereas present housing programs do not adequately reflect the needs of such aged people to secure convenient and comfortable housing; and

"Whereas Congress should be urged to specifically provide adequate housing for aged people by including in Federal housing programs now being planned or which may be planned, plans directed towards providing adequate housing for aged people at adequate rentals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee and it hereby declares its policy to be, That adequate housing for aged persons be provided at reasonable rental rates; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress be requested to include as part of its Federal housing program a plan of providing adequate and comfortable housing for aged persons at reasonable rentals, either as to single persons who are aged or as to aged persons forming a family unit; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution urging such a program be forwarded to each Representative from this State in the House of Representatives and to the two Wisconsin United States Senators; and be it further

"Resolved, That the housing authority of the city of Milwaukee, city attorney's office, and such alderman or aldermen as may be selected by the president of the common council be authorized and requested to confer with Members of Congress and housing officials of the Federal Government for the purpose of urging a housing program for aged persons, as is more fully set forth in this resolution, and that they be further authorized and requested to appear at congressional hearings of either the House or Senate committees dealing with legislation pertaining to housing, for the purpose of explaining the position of the city of Milwaukee and for recommending a program consistent with the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the persons herein authorized so to do take whatever steps may be required in order to urge the Federal Government to enact appropriate legislation which would permit the local housing authority to make available its present housing to aged persons, either single or in family units, on a preferential basis."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Milwaukee on February 7, 1956.

STANLEY J. WITKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

New Mexico Governor Wrong, Wrong, Wrong on Upper Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from the Governor of New Mexico soliciting support for the monstrous upper Colorado proposal. The inaccuracies contained in the letter were appalling.

Had the letter been originated by anyone other than a governor of one of our 48 States, and had its inaccuracies not been apparently broadcast to all Members of Congress, I would have ignored it. Under the circumstances, I have written the governor, taking up his letter point by point, and am having my reply reproduced below so that my colleagues may have the correct information:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1956.

Hon. JOHN F. SIMMS, Jr.,
Governor of New Mexico,
State Capitol, Santa Fe., N. Mex.

MY DEAR SIR: I have in hand your February 11 letter concerning the proposed upper Colorado storage project which apparently was broadcast to all Members of Congress.

It is inaccurate both in substance and detail. You are therefore requested promptly to advise all the letter's addressees to disregard it.

As Governor of the State of New Mexico, you certainly must be aware that H. R. 3383 provides not one single drop of water for the Atomic Energy Commission's Los Alamos atomic laboratory or its Sandia special weapons center. As a former employee at Los Alamos, I am completely familiar with the situation. I am at a loss to understand why you, the Governor of the State in which these installations are located, would say otherwise.

Taking the conclusions of your letter in their order, let me say this: Simple justice demands defeat of the project.

Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only part of its bulk to view. Beneath the surface are, amongst other things: destruction of Rainbow Natural Bridge; billions of dollars of increased burdens on the United States taxpayers to pay the interest on construction costs alone and 98 percent of this would be borne by the taxpayers of 44 States in which the project is not located; more agricultural land at a time when the Government proposes to spend billions of dollars to put land in soil banks; eventual invasion of Dinosaur National Monument with Echo Park Dam; a possible "billion dollar mud puddle" at Glen Canyon, etc., etc.

The same engineer-scientist, Raymond A. Hill, employed by the State of Colorado to assess its water resources, says that construction of the project would leave southern California's Metropolitan Water District, serving 67 cities and 6 million southern Californians, with only half the Colorado River water to which it has rights. Hill says this would be disastrous. Is that justice?

The project will not be self-liquidating.

The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound. None of the irrigation reclamation projects are financially sound. The irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay only about 12 percent of the irrigation investment, which, including storage costs, would range from $750 to $900 per acre varying with the number of projects included. The power dams are supposed to provide the revenues to pay for themselves as well as 88 percent of the irrigation investment.

The project repayment provisions contemplate an overall repayment period of at least 100 years. This is unrealistic and economically indefensible. The hearings make it clear that the repayment plan might work for only a minimum number of projects and that with additional projects there would be no possibility of payment within 100 years unless the power rate were increased substantially above the 6-mill rate contemplated in the Bureau of Reclamation's report. Furthermore, it is extremely doubtful that a market for the power even at the 6-mill rate would continue for 100 years. The approaching availability of atomic electric power will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete. In fact, the market area is not now in need of the power which would be provided. The power dams are in the bill because they are the only hope of making the overall project appear feasible. The project is not self-liquidating as you claim. Studies show that simple interest alone on the investment would be greater than the estimated net revenues.

Furthermore, the ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least $5 billion (probably a low figure because based on the Bureau of Reclamation cost estimates which have proved notoriously short of actual construction costs).

Even if the original construction cost were to be repaid as claimed in a repayment period of 100 years, the cost to the Federal Government in the form of a hidden subsidy in interest charges on the funds borrowed and advanced for construction of the projects named in the bill would amount to at least $4 billion. This would be some $5,000 per acre on the total area to be serviced. In comparison the irrigated lands when fully developed would have an average sale value of about $150 an acre.

No defense requirements, urgent or otherwise, would be met by the project.

As set forth above, H. R. 3383 provides not one drop of water for Sandia or Los Alamos.

The Navahos receive nothing from H. R. 3383, and the only direct benefits that could be added would benefit only 1,100 Navaho families at a cost of $200,000 each.

This bill would not assist the Navaho Indians. It provides for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, but not for the present construction of the Navaho project. However, the construction of the dam would have the effect of committing Congress to constructing the irrigation project works. The cost of the dam is estimated at $36,500,000; the irrigation project an additional $175 million. There are some 1,100 Navaho families involved, meaning a construction cost of close to $200,000 for each Navaho farm. This is just to bring water to the land and does not account for assistance which will undoubtedly be necessary for equipment to get the land in production. This astounding cost should be most carefully considered before Congress acts, particularly since H. R. 3383 as recently amended now provides that costs allocated to Indian lands which such lands cannot repay shall be nonreimbursable (sec. 6). This amendment was advertised as a gift to the Indians by newspapers reporting on recent upper-basin conferences which led to the amending of H. R. 3383. It is a gift Congress might well inspect closely. Certainly some more realistic and more economic method of providing for the Indians can be considered. By this gift the upper basin shows its unwillingness to have the costs of Navaho project paid for by the power revenues, as all the other costs are supposed to be. Instead, this money will go into the funds to be apportioned among these States, leaving the taxpayers in the rest of the country to carry the load.

Therefore, sir, since your previous letter was wrong, wrong, wrong, I reiterate my reiterate my request that you advise its addressees to disregard it.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

Domestic Point 4 Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation before this Congress is the domestic point 4 bill principally sponsored by the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS.

It is designed to focus the attention of Government on, and bring the resources of appropriate Federal agencies to the aid of, depressed areas left out of the "prosperity" which is being claimed for this Nation.

Cosponsors of S. 2663 are the senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator KILGORE; the senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator KEFAUVER; the junior Senator from Michigan, Senator MCNAMARA; the junior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY; the junior Senator from West Virginia, Senator NEELY; the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY; and the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY.

Two weeks ago, the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, and I wrote the senior Senator from Illinois. We suggested that his S. 2663 be amended to include Indian reservations, many of which have been depressed areas since the day they were established, others having comparatively recently come into that category.

Our letter and his reply follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1956.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: For many years we have been deeply concerned over the numerous complex problems facing American Indians, including, in particular, their acute poverty and lack of opportunity for advancement. As we see the situation, the economies of most reservations now are strained to the breaking point and simply cannot support our rapidly growing Indian population.

Our observations recently were corroborated by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which stated in an interim report that as a cause of juvenile delinquency among Indians "the importance of the economic factors can scarcely be overemphasized."

The subcommittee recommended that an effort be made to improve economic conditions for Indians through a plan of relocation as well as a program of assistance to those who continue to reside on reservations. With regard to the latter, it was recommended, among other proposals, that a comprehensive loan program and a program to locate Federal and State work projects near Indian reservations be developed. In addition, Senators KEFAUVER and LANGER have introduced a bill, S. 2632, providing that the Secretary of Commerce conduct surveys to determine the feasibility of locating manufacturing plants near Indian reservations.

Upon studying your bill for the relief of depressed areas, S. 2663, we find that this measure proposes to extend to depressed areas generally the very types of assistance which have been suggested for Indian reservations. We find further that only two minor changes would have to be made in the text of S. 2663 in order to make certain that Indian reservations can qualify for its benefits.

The first change concerns section 7 of the bill, which deals with local industrial development committees. We are afraid that on many Indian reservations it will be difficult to find a group of citizens who could do the work envisaged for these committees without some assistance and guidance. It would seem to us, therefore, that a small group of experts could be attached to the staff of the Administrator who could pay periodic visits to Indian reservations to help the local committees. It may very well be that other depressed areas would be in need of similar assistance. It could, of course, be made clear that such expert help would be given only on request.

The second change which we would propose is in section 9 (b), on page 6, line 8. Following "(including municipalities)," we would add "Indian tribes."

Equally as important as making these minor changes in the bill, however, would be an effort to make the Bureau of Indian Affairs aware of the opportunities which S. 2663 offers. During recent years the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs has spoken a good deal about the possibilities of attracting industry to reservation areas. Thus far his efforts have been unsuccessful. Here, however, would be a chance to translate his words into action. We hope, therefore, that the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be asked by your committee to testify on S. 2663 and to make suggestions on how the benefits of the bill can be extended to Indian reservations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 14, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Hon. LEE METCALF.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: May I thank you for your good letter of February 9, suggesting that the pending legislation to provide Federal assistance to depressed areas, S. 2663, might be amended to include Indian reservations among areas entitled to receive such assistance.

I believe your suggestions have definite merit and will discuss the question with the Subcommittee on Labor which is considering the bill.

We will, of course, be happy to invite the Bureau of Indian Affairs to present testimony on the bill with relation to possible aid for Indian reservations. At such a hearing, I would like to invite all of you to appear personally, or to present statements for the record. I am sure that the subcommittee would welcome the testimony of spokesmen of Indian interests, including, of course, members of particular tribes.

I appreciate deeply your interest in this problem and assure you of my desire to cooperate in every possible way in securing information to support the need for the amendments you have jointly proposed.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor.

So-called New Upper Colorado Bill Contains All Vices of the Original Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in a rather unusual step, a majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considered and approved amendments to H. R. 3383 on February 8, 1956, some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none.

A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before your committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House. It should not be permitted.

The new H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil bank proposal is now before the Congress. It will require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses. H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops (some of which may well be placed in soil bank reserve) to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

Funeral of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a significant article by Russell Maguire, a patriotic citizen, the publisher and editor of the American Mercury, in the issue of that magazine for February 1956.

The article, entitled "Funeral of the Constitution," presents in strong and eloquent words the worth of our Constitution and the freedom that has flourished under its protection. I commend the article to the thoughtful students of the Constitution everywhere.

The article follows:

FUNERAL OF THE CONSTITUTION
(By Russell Maguire)

Friends, Americans, countrymen, lend me your ears; I come to bury the Constitution, not to praise it. The evil that men and documents do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones. So be it with the Constitution.

The cunning one-world conspirators, the internationalist schemers, the war promoters have told you that the Constitution is an old-fashioned document and too ambitious. If it were so, it was a grievous fault. And grievously hath the Constitution paid for it.

Here under leave of the controlled international press, the invisible government, and the rest—come I to speak at the Constitution's funeral.

It was our oldest friend, faithful and just to us. It hath brought many rights and safeguards to our people. Under its protection our general coffers were filled. Did this in the Constitution seem ambitious?

When the poor have cried or been in need, the Constitution hath fed and protected them and their children. Ambition should be made of sterner stuff. Yet the selected Supreme Court has said, the Constitution is ambitious—and are they honorable men?

You all did know that our wise and patriotic ancestors had opportunities to give someone a kingly crown, which he did thrice refuse. Was this ambition?

I speak not to disprove what the un-American United Nations plotters have spoken. But I am here to speak what I do know. You all did love this Constitution once, not without cause; what cause withholds you then to mourn for it

O, judgment; thou art fled to bruitsh beasts. And men have lost their reason. Bear with me, my heart is in the coffin there with the Constitution, and I must pause till it come back to me.

But yesteryear, the Constitution's word might have stood against the world, now lies it there. And none so poor to do it reverence. O, citizens of these United States; if I were disposed to stir your hearts and minds to rage, I should do the internationalist tax-exempt organizations and the one-world foundations wrong, who, you all know, say they are honorable men. I rather choose to wrong the murdered Constitution.

Than wrong such honorable men? But here's the world's greatest document—the Constitution—with the seal and love of our wise and courageous God-fearing Founding Fathers. Let but the people hear this testament and you would go and kiss the Constitution's wounds. Yes, beg a part of it for memory, mentioning it to your children and passing it on as a rich legacy unto their issue.

It is not meet that you know how much the Constitution loved and protected you. For it will inflame you and make you mad. 'Tis good you know not that you are the heirs and owners of this great country—that the so-called powerful men and their stooges are but your servants.

Make a ring about the coffin holding the Constitution and I shall read its message to you. And if you have tears, prepare to shed them now.

You all do know this heritage, where all the rights and power were reserved to you. And with loving hands the founders of this country covered it with our flag of red, white and blue. Look in this place ran the United Nations dagger through; see what a rent Supreme Court decisions have made. Through these openings the well-publicized "advisers" stabbed, and as they plucked their cursed steel away, mark how the blood of the Constitution and the hopes of freedom flowed.

These stabs of treasonable people, admitted to our country as "citizens," were the most unkindest cuts of all. For ingratitude, more strong than Americans' arms, quite vanquished the Constitution. They burst its mighty heart, and bloody treason now flourishes over us.

Stay, countrymen. Good friends, patriotic friends, let me not stir you up to such a sudden flood of mutiny. They that have done this deed say they are "honorable"; what private international plots they have, alas, I know not. They are cunning and clever, and will, no doubt, try to answer you.

I am no orator, as our enemies are; but as all you know me, a plain, blunt man, that loves my country, I humbly ask to speak my thoughts. For I have neither wit, nor words, nor worth, nor action, nor utterance, to stir men's blood; I only speak right out to tell you that which you yourselves do know.

I show you the Constitution's wounds, poor dumb mouths, and bid them speak for me. But were I otherwise, I would ruffle up your spirits, and point to every wound in the Constitution. And then, at last, this should move the people of America to rise and mutiny against the conspirators who are planning to take over our country, and thus avenge the Constitution's death.

Eisenhower in Milwaukee—Let's Have the Complete Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of this House have been favored

by several insertions in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of substantial portions of the memorable speech made by General Eisenhower in Milwaukee, Wis., on October 3, 1952. This was the time when the Republican presidential candidate expressed so eloquently his views on the problem of communism and freedom in the United States.

I am glad that these remarks by Mr. Eisenhower have again been brought to public attention. I am glad, not only as a proud citizen of Milwaukee, but as one who believes it is sound and instructive, as a new presidential campaign gets under way, to have everything which has been said on this vital subject spread again upon the public record.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would serve us all best if the complete record of the remarks which Mr. Eisenhower prepared for that important address were brought to light. I am thinking of the paragraph concerning Gen. George C. Marshall which, according to press accounts, Mr. Eisenhower omitted when he actually delivered the speech.

It is a distinct loss to the public, and a disservice to the President, it seems to me, to omit that brief paragraph. I have never been so fortunate as to learn its exact words, but I have heard that it was a heartening defense of a gallant fellow soldier against the incredible charges made on the Senate floor that General Marshall had led a conspiracy to let the United States fall victim to Soviet intrigue.

Mr. Eisenhower apparently found it necessary to omit this passage when he spoke in Milwaukee, yet it is an integral and important part of his views as he originally composed them. In the interest of a complete record and a full presentation of Mr. Eisenhower's statement, it should be restored to its original place. I hope, therefore, that one of my colleagues who is fortunate enough to have secured the text of this tribute will wish to insert it in the Appendix.

For the record, too, it would be helpful also, I think, if we could be enlightened as to just why these sentences were removed from the Milwaukee text. In looking over the press reports, I found the New York Herald Tribune reporting as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 11, 1952]

During his talk with the reporters, General Eisenhower also sought to explain why he had deleted from his Milwaukee speech a four-line defense of General of the Army George C. Marshall, denounced by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, as the unwitting dupe of a great Soviet conspiracy.

The General frankly admitted that he had cut the Marshall tribute from his speech after talking to Senator MCCARTHY in a hotel room in Peoria, Ill., the night before. However, he said he had not "censored" his own speech at the request of Senator MCCARTHY.

THOUGHT IT OUT OF PLACE

He did it, he said, because, first, he was guest of Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr., of Wisconsin, a MCCARTHY backer, and he thought it would be out of place to belabor Senator MCCARTHY in Wisconsin, and, second, he already had defended General Marshall. General Marshall knew exactly where General Eisenhower stood and had even sent him a note of gratitude, he added.

This seemed to be clear enough but then I found a different account. In the Washington Post and Times Herald, I read:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 12, 1954]

BOLTON LANDING, N. Y., July 11.—The real story of what happened in Wisconsin in the 1952 presidential campaign—how General Eisenhower agreed to delete from his prepared speech a eulogy of Gen. George C. Marshall—was told here today.

It has often been said that Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, persuaded General Eisenhower to drop what he proposed to say about General Marshall.

However, Gov. Walter J. Kohler told reporters today that it was he who was responsible, not MCCARTHY. He told how he argued for elimination of the Marshall passage, first with Sherman Adams, and then in a meeting with General Eisenhower, Adams, and Maj. Gen. Wilton B. "Slick" Persons. This took place on the Eisenhower special train en route from Green Bay to Milwaukee, where the speech was to be delivered.

Governor Kohler, who is here attending the annual governors' conference, reminded newsmen that at the time General Eisenhower was in Wisconsin (early October) the outcome of the 1952 election was very much in doubt.

"So far as I was concerned," he said, "the most important thing in the world right then was the election of a Republican President. I had been shown a draft of General Eisenhower's speech. It was a defense of General Marshall against the charge of treason.

"I felt that General Eisenhower was a guest in our State, and that if he said what he planned to say it would be construed as an overt attack on MCCARTHY. That wouldn't be good.

"I remember saying to Sherman Adams, 'When a man calls on the Pope, he doesn't tell him what a fine fellow Martin Luther was.' "

Obviously, these two versions are inconsistent with each other. Can they not be promptly explained? Let us get the complete record straight for posterity.

Address by the Honorable George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, Before a Joint Meeting of the Association of School Boards and Association of School Administrators at Dreher High School, Columbia, S. C., November 3, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a copy of a speech our Governor of South Carolina delivered to the Association of School Boards and the Association of School Administrators at Dreher High School on November 3, 1955.

I am certain that if the Members of Congress will take time to read this speech, they will learn a great deal about the conditions existing in our State and all other southern States.

The speech is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to appear before you who have the primary job of operating the public schools of South Carolina.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five has been a critical year for public education, but the confidence of every South Carolinian has been strengthened by the sensible approach of our school officials and by the calm attitude of our people.

The calm attitude of our people should not be interpreted by others as the silence of consent. We are determined to resist integration.

I think it now appropriate for us to reevaluate our school situation and by thinking together to seek a clear perspective.

The unconstitutional opinion of the Supreme Court in the school segregation cases has accomplished no worthwhile purpose.

It has created more unrest and brought more unfavorable publicity to our Nation than all the agitation by those who would undermine our national security. It is not based upon the written law or the written Constitution. It is based in part upon the writings of a Swedish Socialist, prepared in collaboration with others who have been cited numerous times as members of Communist-front organizations. Even the integrationist must admit that the Supreme Court has attempted to change the law.

There is one current misunderstanding about the Supreme Court opinion that we should clarify in our minds.

The Court did not say that school children must attend racially mixed schools. It did not say that all public schools must be racially mixed.

Where no white child seeks to enter a school for Negro children, it may continue to operate within the opinion as a school for Negro children.

Where no Negro child seeks to enter a school for white children, it too may continue to operate within the opinion as a school for white children.

In South Carolina, since the opinion of the Court, no child has applied to enter a school for the other race.

There are many other States that are continuing to maintain separate schools within the opinion.

Examples are found in New York, Michigan, and Illinois. The same is true in Pennsylvania, and in Maryland, and even in the District of Columbia.

In fact, schools with only white children number in the thousands, while many of the bragged-about mixed schools have only a smattering of different races.

In most instances, mixed schools have been established only where substantially equal schools are not provided.

What the Court has said, and all that it has said, in this respect, is that no child can be denied admittance to a school of his choice because of race.

Even where a child chooses to enroll in a school for another race, admittance may be denied within the opinion for any other valid reason.

In South Carolina, there is a valid reason why no child should be transferred to a school for another race.

The General Assembly of South Carolina has not provided money for any school from which or to which a child may be transferred because of court action for so long as the child attends the school to which he was transferred.

In addition, many of the county supply bills do not provide money for schools in that category.

If the school trustees of a district were to attempt to implement the opinion of the Court by transferring Negro children from a Negro school to a white school, there would be insufficient funds to operate either the mixed school or the Negro school.

Without sufficient funds, no school can operate. The transfer would not implement the opinion. It would prevent the implementation of the opinion. It would force both the mixed school and the Negro school to close. Negro teachers in the district would be without pay for their work. Negro parents in the district would be without free schools for their children.

Under these circumstances, the practical question for the Negro is to choose between separate but equal schools or no free schools.

The Court cannot provide money for the operation of mixed schools. The public will not provide money for schools of which it does not approve. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is not going to provide money for any schools.

The sensible choice for the Negro is to support separate but equal schools.

The integrationist has launched a juggernaut of propaganda to force acceptance of racial mixing. Almost all news media outside of the South, and some within the South, have been mobilized in the most gigantic hard-sell campaign of our age. Millions of dollars in time, effort, and abuse of truth have been expended. But so far the effort has been a flop. And it is not likely that the public will ever be brainwashed.

Many people are coming to realize that integration, politics, and sociology are poor substitutes for Christianity.

Everywhere there is growing resistance, and contempt for racial mixing.

Washington was to be a model of integration but most of the parents, who could afford to move, transferred their residences to Virginia or Maryland, where they continue to send their children to separate schools.

One community in Delaware experienced difficulty in convincing some of the authorities that integration was not acceptable. But the problem has been solved. They elected a new school board and continue to send their children to separate schools.

The integrationist knows this. Paradoxically, he now pleads with these words: "Eventually, why not now?" That plaintive cry does not appeal to reason. It is the chant of weakness and the admission of defeat.

I am convinced the great majority of our Negro people oppose racial mixing. Negro parents love their children and want them to have good schools and good teachers, a normal desire of any parent. But they want their own schools and their own teachers. They want good churches and good preachers. But they want their own churches and their own preachers. There are few southern Negroes who would give up "big meeting" for any other form of worship.

What the alien white leadership of the NAACP fails to understand is that the southern Negro finds comfort in his own race. Agitation for integration and racial mixing is an insult to him.

The thinking, outspoken Negroes outnumber the agitators.

Earl McKnight, a Negro of Sumter County, recently wrote: "So long as the colored children have good schools to go to, I think it best for the races to go to separate schools."

Elleraree Ford wrote: "We have the best school in Pinewood in Sumter County and I want my children to go to it." Elleraree Ford is a southern Negro and Pinewood is a Negro school.

John Sanders of Sumter County wrote: "I think it best for both races that the schools be kept separate as they have always been." John Sanders is a southern Negro.

Lewis L. Scott of Savannah wrote that he was "openly, avowedly, and unalterably opposed to desegregation."

He is a southern lawyer and a Negro.

Roosevelt Barr and the Reverend Webster McClary of Kingstree recently and publicly renounced racial mixing. Both are southern Negroes.

Lilly M. Capers of Orangeburg in an open letter to all Negro parents urged them to join her in opposing the mixing of the races. She is a southern Negro.

The Reverend James Vanwright of Moncks Corner recently wrote that integration would cause the Negro to lose his identification as a race and would increase and confuse race problems instead of presenting a solution. The Reverend Vanwright is a respected southern Negro, who enjoys the confidence of both races in his community.

Nora Zeal Hurston described the integration decision of the Supreme Court as an insult to the Negro race. She is a prominent Negro author.

There are many others who have publicly deplored integration.

I do not know these people personally, but I do know they are interested in sound leadership for their people and they have the courage to speak for them. They are not afraid of the NAACP.

The colored officers of the NAACP are professional agitators and the movement to mix the races is largely sponsored and financed by white people who are professional southern haters and alien to the South.

United States Attorney General Herbert Brownell, a midwestern Republican, was recently quoted as saying that the Supreme Court decision was "the greatest single step forward" against discrimination. Herbert Brownell is a white man. His life is isolated from the Negro except for an occasional political association for propaganda purposes. He sends his four children to private schools which have few, if any, Negroes on their rolls, although he could send them to mixed public schools. Brownell is using the integration issue to promote his Republican politics.

Vice President NIXON, a California Republican, told the NAACP convention at Atlantic City that complete public-school integration is the country's most important civil rights objective.

A few days before NIXON spoke, W. R. Farley, a southern Negro, wrote that the effort to destroy the whole pattern of segregation and to establish an integrated social order will set the Negro back 50 years.

NIXON, like Brownell, is a white man. His life is also isolated from the Negro. He attended a segregated southern college. He lives in exclusive Spring Valley, a subdivision which has no Negroes. His children attend public schools that have few, if any, Negro students, although he too could arrange to send them to racially mixed schools.

Like Brownell, NIXON is using the integration issue to promote his Republic politics.

The NAACP is a foreign corporation chartered in the State of New York in 1911. It has been active in South Carolina for many years.

It has come to my attention that this organization may have failed to comply with statutory requirements for foreign corporations in South Carolina.

I have requested the Attorney General to investigate. If he determines that the NAACP has violated our law, I have directed him to institute appropriate action.

The NAACP lists among its board of directors no person from the South who has the respect of both races. The board includes Senator Herbert H. Lehman, a national Democrat, of New York City; Senator Wayne Morse, a national Democrat, of Oregon; Eleanor Roosevelt, a national Democrat and One-Worlder, of New York State; and Walter Reuther, a national Democrat and CIO president, of Detroit. All of these are known to be all white, with a purple passion against the South.

The character of the NAACP has been exposed by the Emmitt Till case. There was nothing in the case to warrant the notorious publicity. It was given notoriety only because it happened in Mississippi.

The alleged body of Till was taken to Chicago, but not for immediate burial. It was placed on public exhibition in one of the most uncivilized displays of desecration in modern times. Grotesque pictures were taken and distributed. The character of all the people of Mississippi was maliciously attacked. There was a full cry for immediate punishment of two suspects, contrary to the presumption of innocence to which every citizen—white or Negro—is entitled.

These activities are even more peculiar when you consider the NAACP's indifference toward other crimes.

Almost at the time of the Till incident, at least seven persons were seriously injured and three were killed without provocation by Napoleon Green, a Chicago Negro airman. The multiple slaying occurred in England in the presence of witnesses, thereby removing all doubt as to the identity of the guilty party. But there was no condemnation from the NAACP.

During the annual spring visit of school children to Washington this year, three teen-age Mississippi school boys were knifed near their hotel by a group of Negro men, but there was no condemnation from the NAACP.

In Chicago, during the National Governors' Conference, in August, a teen-age Chicago white girl was assaulted and killed by a Negro soldier. Even for this atrocious crime there was no condemnation from the NAACP.

More recently, three teen-age Chicago white boys were brutally murdered in the Chicago area. For this multiple crime too there was no condemnation from the NAACP.

There have been many crimes of violence involving white victims. Nowhere have they occurred more frequently than in Chicago, Washington, and New York City, where the NAACP maintains headquarters. And nowhere have they occurred more infrequently than in the South; including Mississippi.

It is revealing that the NAACP should pick out the death of one Chicago Negro in Mississippi, while ignoring so many other crimes, and in particular those crimes in Chicago, Washington, and New York City, where it maintains headquarters.

I mention these cases, not to minimize the death of any person, but to point up the racial bias, the discrimination, and the inflammatory character of those who decry justice in the South. The NAACP is not interested in justice. It is only interested in exploiting the Mississippi case in the interest of its fund raising campaigns. Anything for a dollar including the desecration of a human body.

No one can justly condone violence, and I am sure the people of Mississippi, with their good record of law enforcement, do not condone any crime.

The great majority of the American people, white and Negro, wherever they reside, are law abiding.

Out of some 15 to 20 million American Negroes, the NAACP can boast only of a polychrome membership of 250 thousand white and colored people. That is less than one-third of our State's Negro population. To me, this organization is not a National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It is an association for the advancement of certain people.

It is not a representative organization. It has clearly demonstrated that it serves no constructive purpose in our State. It seeks to tear down, not to build up. Its leaders have openly attacked the South and responsible public officials who believe in racial integrity.

By contrast, there is nothing inflammatory in what the South Carolina citizen's councils have said. They have not concealed their identities behind a cloak of secrecy. They are attempting to furnish sound leadership in their communities.

I have, however, one word of caution. Any organization, if left to run itself, can quickly lose its good purpose by falling into the hands of the wrong people who would use it for selfish gain.

I do not belong to a citizen's council. I do not believe that the Governor of South Carolina should. I do not believe that the councils should become involved in personal politics.

The Gressette Committee merits the support of our citizens. It deserves your patience and understanding. It has worked untiringly to secure information and to formulate plans for the preservation of our separate but equal public-school system, within the framework of the law.

Because of the nature of its work, the committee has refrained from publishing its plans until it became necessary. No useful purpose can be served by the premature disclosure of information to those who would sabotage our separate but equal public-school system.

Until the Congress discharges its responsibility to curb the power of the United States courts to tamper with our public schools, we will have to live with the annoyance of the self-styled do-gooder and the professional agitator.

So long as we can continue to maintain our separate schools, as we are now doing, within the purview of the opinion, there is no point in taking some other action prematurely.

I strongly recommend that we continue our equalization program in good faith. In no better way can we preserve good schools with peace and friendly relations. The hope of the integrationist is for South Carolina to abandon its equalization program. In in other way can the integrationist hope to succeed.

A failure to provide equal facilities could prove more damaging, and more difficult and costly to overcome, than the opinion of the Supreme Court itself.

Much of the responsibility for maintaining our equalization program rests upon the local school authorities.

Requests for State funds for school facilities originate with them.

If we are to preserve our separate public-school system, we must in good faith preserve equal schools.

Today, our people, white and Negro, have more job opportunities, and enjoy a higher standard of living, and have better schools for their children, than ever before. With good education for our people, we can continue to move forward, both white and Negro, under our system of segregation, to an even better standard of living for all.

On the other hand, there is no room in South Carolina for anyone seeking to take the law into his own hands. We will not tolerate lawlessness in our State.

It is the duty of every responsible white person to see that no harm comes to innocent southern Negroes. The effort to mix the races is not sponsored by the Southern Negro.

It is also the duty of every responsible Negro to repudiate the false leadership of the NAACP and it alien white sponsors and to supply sound and sensible leadership for their people.

Our common task is one of patience, understanding, and unyielding determination. In this way we can minimize some of the tragedy which the Supreme Court would impose upon us all.

With the knowledge that right, justice, and truth are our allies, we will not fail. There shall be no compulsory racial mixing in our State.

Address of Hon. Carmine De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the address made on February 19, 1956, by the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, New York's Secretary of State, before the Kings Highway Democratic Club, Inc., on the occasion of the celebration of its 40th anniversary at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn. His remarks follow:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Whitty, Congressman MULTER, distinguished guests and friends, it is a very great pleasure for me to join you this evening and to visit with so many of my friends in Brooklyn. This remarkable dinner is a tribute both to the leadership of the Kings Highway Democratic Club, and to the dedication and spirit of our party's members and supporters in the second assembly district. It is a prelude, too, to the determination of Democrats here—and everywhere else in our country—to stand united and strong and to undertake with vigor and enthusiasm the challenge which lies before us during the coming months.

I would like to paraphrase a popular television commentator, and ask what kind of week has this been? It was a week in which the sinister pattern of world events drove the free people closer to the realization of the need for preparedness and leadership, as Russia's rulers spewed new venom and hate.

It was a week in which was brought to light the fact that America was shipping tanks and arms to Saudi Arabia to be used in letting the agonized blood of the Israelis.

It was a week in which the Vice President of the United States defiled the memory of Abraham Lincoln and derided our constitutional form of government by characterizing what he called, a great Republican Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, as he sought to make reckless political capital of racial prejudice.

It was also Brotherhood Week.

It was Brotherhood Week all over America—in the movies, on television, in our newspapers and schools—and in meettings, in speeches all over our country we talked of brotherhood and of understanding and of achieving justice through compassion and love.

And this annual observance which was brought into being so that we might reaffirm our respect for our neighbors, and our concern for their well-being, found itself frustrated and mocked by the actions of men who have the responsibility for governing our Nation.

And I say to you, my friends, that unless an end is put to partisan artifice; to political hypocrisy; to politics as usual, the ideals upon which our Nation was founded and the justice which America is supposed to represent, will be drowned in the mire of venom, and suffocated in the smog of hate.

The world is the stage of a drama whose final curtain may well ring down upon the destruction of all mankind. And the part that each of us plays in this drama will determine the nature of the lives of future generations of our children * * * if, indeed, there will be future generations.

For if ever freedom was in a struggle for survival, it is now * * * in the age of the atom.

And as the tug of war between tyranny and liberty continues with unrelenting desperation, both sides seek new support from those who, by circumstances and need, remain undecided as to which course to choose.

That is why we spend so much money all over the world, trying to win friends and influence supporters for democracy. That, too, is why there exists all over the world a mad race for hydrogen might; for muscular superiority; for numerical supremacy. And that is why there is such an urgent need for bringing home to the people, everywhere, an understanding of principles, of ideals, of integrity, of morality; and yes, of political decency.

And we ask, what can the people of the world think of a government whose answer to the Russian threat of coexistence or war, this past week, was to help Russia to destroy the only bulwark for democracy in the Middle East?

What can the world think of an America which pompously reprimands satellite Czechoslovakia for sending arms to Egypt, at the same time that it sends weapons of war and destruction to a country, equally determined with Egypt, to destroy Israel?

What can the world think of our vacillation; of our double-talk in the face of Israel's urgent need for help—of our solemn proclamations of sympathetic neutrality—at the very moment that we send to her enemies the means for her annihilation.

Have we capitulated to Russia's ultimatum? Are we coexisting with Russia by helping her to destroy democracy, by helping her to prevert morality and decency and by sacrificing, to her lust for world domination, a country with whose people we have so very much in common? Was the sudden, belated lifting of the embargo, yesterday, a reaction to protest, or an effort toward justice?

The answer to these questions cannot be found in the utterances of the Secretary of State, because with painful consistency he says one thing, and inevitably does the other.

The answer cannot be found in the declarations of the national administration, because its record of performance, and the history of its philosophy, are at total odds with its pious expressions of sweetness and light.

The answer can be found only in the hearts and the wills of the American people, and it will be given to the world with resounding clarity and with neither compromise nor irresolution next election day next November.

Brotherhood Week, indeed.

Brotherhood Week for reasons of obvious symbolism commences each year on the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. And it was on this occasion that RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON—the Vice President who wants to be President—visited our city to tell the world about his concept of brotherhood; about his understanding of its meaning, and force.

Of course, we would expect his comments to be shaded by partisanship. He would not be RICHARD NIXON if they weren't.

Of course, we would expect his statements to be characterized by falsehood. He would not be RICHARD NIXON if they weren't.

Of course, we would expect his talk to be arrogant and deceitful. He would not be RICHARD NIXON if it weren't.

But he had no right—even RICHARD NIXON had no right—to impose upon the people of the world, the ugly suggestion that our Supreme Court is controlled by a "Republican" Chief Justice, and that therefore segragation was outlawed in our schools.

And although the wrath of aroused public opinion was quick to descend upon his shoulders, the scars he left across the heart and the face of the world remain vivid and ugly, grim reminders of the shocking truth that the Vice President of the United States is completely devoid of understanding and compassion, and bears an unholy veneration for votes—votes at any cost.

We may take great comfort in the almost unanimous excoriation of his tainted—of his

stained remarks—by the press of our city, and elsewhere throughout the country. But we must also remember that similar attacks—even by Republican editors—haven't in the past, silenced this important public official who had the temerity to suggest that President Truman is a traitor, and who had the unconscionable gall to characterize the Democratic Party as a party of treason.

So bad is this man's taste, so evil is his concept of politics, that Walter Lippmann in the Herald Tribune—3 days ago—summed up the outrage of the editorials and the people when he said, and I quote: "RICHARD NIXON is a ruthless partisan. He is a politician who divides and embitters the people. A man who will exploit for partisan purposes a decision of the Supreme Court, does not have within his conscience those scruples which the country has the right to expect in the President of the United States."

But you may well ask Walter Lippmann if Dwight Eisenhower is not in fact the President of the United States. And the answer must be that the President and the Vice President are bound together, elected together; and are separated only by the single beat of a human heart.

But there is more to RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON than divisiveness and embitterment—and the love for his dog. This man is the very symbol of what was once known as the Republican Party.

We can no longer discuss the differences between the two major parties because the painful and awful truth is that there no longer is a Republican Party. They depend upon one man to carry them through * * * the one man who RICHARD NIXON himself said is the only Republican who could win the election * * * a man who, himself, incidentally, called RICHARD NIXON the greatest Vice President in history.

And in this helpless dependence upon one man, the Republicans have abdicated party principle and have forfeited party philosophy. They pretend to be all things to all people, as they are, in fact, everything to a small clique of privileged monopolists.

This man—this Vice President who wants to be President—typifies the arrogant disregard of his administration for the well-being of the common man; the flagrant disavowal of his administration's articulate promises so glibly made to the farmers, the wage earners, and the consumers of our Nation.

He typifies the bungling in our international affairs, generally, and the treacherous doubledealing in our affairs with Israel, particularly.

And he thereby vitiates everything which the people understand to be the brotherhood to which the Nation has pledged itself during this week.

But as the free world despairs at what RICHARD NIXON says and at what his administration does, it becomes increasingly incumbent upon the American people to put an end—once and for all—to his kind of moral chicanery and spiritual bankruptcy.

This is the responsibility of every American citizen. This is the challenge which faces every Democrat.

When we hear the Republican national chairman admit his dependence upon Democratic votes to return the administration to office next November, let us ask him if he really—it he honestly—expects Democratic votes to send NIXON and Dulles back to Washington.

When we hear Senator BARRY GOLDWATER talk of labor's conspiracy, let us ask him if he expects labor to send the administration back to office.

When the Secretary of Agriculture endorses the castigation of farmers and pooh-poohs the farm depression, let us ask him if he expects the farmers to send his administration back to office.

Let us ask the mothers of America if, in the light of their heartbreaking experience with the Salk vaccine fiasco, they will send this administration back to office.

Let us ask the slum dwellers if, in the face of the completion and willful breakdown in the housing program, they intend to send this administration back to office.

Let us ask the young people in our Armies, our Navy, and our Air Force if, in view of the deliberate scuttling of our armed strength, they propose to send this administration back to office.

Let us ask the small-business man who, in greater numbers each day, is forced into bankruptcy or swallowed up in large corporate mergers, if he expects to send the administration back to office.

My good friends, no matter whom we ask, the answer will be the same.

For the people know that the time has come to restore America to greatness; to strength; to principle, and to Democratic leadership.

This is not only the determination of Americans; it is also the hope of the entire free world.

And it is the opportunity and the challenge for everyone who believes in the Democratic Party's tradition of Government with a heart, of Government with a conscience, of Government in the true meaning of brotherhood.

Thank you very much.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*...3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....The Brandywine
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1956, Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., acting in the capacity as national chairman for Brotherhood Week, addressed the National Conference of Christians and Jews held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

I believe you will agree with me after reading Mr. Firestone's speech that he has grasped the true meaning of brotherhood.

The gold medal brotherhood award was to be presented to President Eisenhower. Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, received the award on behalf of the President, and read his remarks.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, our colleague, attended the brotherhood dinner and has included her observations in today's RECORD:

THE SPIRIT OF BROTHERHOOD—TALK BY HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, JR.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to be with you this evening and to talk with you about brotherhood in our Nation's Capital which possesses a rich heritage of our country's past and people whose leadership encompasses the high hopes for the future of the free world. In a world where disarmament is a dream of the future, and frightening weapons are the realities of the moment, it is comforting to know that there are enough men of good will to sustain and to develop continuously the idea of brotherhood.

For without brotherhood among men, both in word and in deed, our way of life loses much of its substance and much of its strength. Brotherhood is the firm foundation of the personal liberty we so strongly cherish.

If there is one seed from which our way of life may be said to have grown, it is the seed of personal liberty. And at the root of this liberty is a profound respect for the rights of others, as individuals, without regard to their race, their color, or their creed.

Brotherhood does not mean that every man is the captain of the team. But it does mean that there is a team, and that every man, if properly qualified, has a right to be its captain.

The concept of teamwork is fundamental in the development of America's greatness. We have discovered that one secret of success is working together as a team in running our businesses, in conducting our civic endeavors, in participating in our government and in giving our leadership to the world. We, of course, are well aware that teamwork does not mean complete uniformity of opinion. That's the kind of so-called teamwork found behind the Iron Curtain.

Our kind of teamwork is based on the recognition of the right of men to choose freely to work together for the accomplishment of a common aim. Each individual is not forced to join with others. But when he does, he helps accomplish the objective by working for it with other individuals. In other words, our kind of teamwork carries with it explicitly the roots of personal and individual freedom.

Every freedom brings with it a duty and an obligation. If we want to be free, we must see to it that others are free. If we want our rights respected, we must see to it that the rights of others are respected. In the last analysis, we can defend our own rights and freedoms best by defending the rights and freedoms of others. That concept, of course, is a fundamental one of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Although the National Conference of Christians and Jews was founded only 72 years ago, its objectives are centuries old. They are woven into the very fabric of American tradition. Indeed, the spirit of brotherhood is the spirit of our American way of life, just as the concept of free private enterprise is its body. To recognize the truth of that statement, we have only to recall the motives which impelled people to come to this country.

Among the first settlers in America were the Pilgrims who landed on historic Plymouth Rock 335 years ago. This small group of courageous pioneers left their homes across the sea to escape religious persecution. Rather than sacrifice the principles in which they so deeply believed, they risked their lives and their fortunes in a frail ship buffeted by winter winds and waves. They faced the danger of savage enemies to carve out with gun and sword, and scythe and plow, a new home in the New World.

As the years went by, they were followed by many other groups who sought over here the freedom which they were denied at home. And, ever since, America has been the refuge of all who thirst for liberty and justice, whether they be Protestants, Catholics or Jews.

In 1776, when the Liberty Bell pealed forth its message of freedom, men of all faiths became united, as never before, in the common cause of independence. They fought side by side in bloody defeat and in glorious victory.

In later years, during both World Wars, in Korea and other places where Americans have had to fight, they have fought together, not as Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, but as brothers all in a crusade for freedom.

The cold war in the tense world today is fundamentally a war of ideas that is being waged in the minds and hearts of men everywhere. There is only one way to defeat a bad idea, and that is with a good idea.

Fortunately, in this country we have that good idea. Freedom will always be more attractive than bondage. But we must be sure that our own house is in order. We must stand together on behalf of human rights. By so doing, we can strengthen the spiritual foundation upon which our society is based. We can defend the dignity of man as an individual and thereby take from our enemy one of his important weapons, which is the exploitation he makes of every crisis in human relations and of every denial of human rights.

America stands before the world today as a living example of the power of freemen. Never before has there been such an opportunity for us to demonstrate what freedom means and how vital it is to the peace and security of the world. And there is one thing we know: We must do more than merely preach freedom. We must practice it.

Freedom is priceless because it endows each individual with personal rights and privileges. Brotherhood is equally important because it is opposed to any violation of these personal prerogatives.

Naturally, most Americans are aware that America was settled by people who fled from religious persecution. They recall that this issue was so important that generations later, when the United States became an independent nation, freedom of religion was incorporated into the Constitution and became a basic law of the land. They recognize that no man should be judged by the color of his skin, the land of his origin, or the precepts of his faith. They realize it is the individual, the man himself, who counts.

They know that only by working in harmony in the bonds of brotherhood have generations of Americans been able to make the United States the most powerful, the most prosperous, and the most successful nation on earth. They know that the spirit of brotherhood has been the irresistible force which has made it possible for our country to grow, in the relatively short space of 180 years, from a small, impoverished group of independent colonies to the position of world leadership which it occupies today.

And yet, there are some people with prejudices so deeply rooted in their minds and hearts that they deny the reality of these facts. By word and by deed they practice persecution here in the land which owes its very existence to those who fled from persecution. There are others who are merely thoughtless. Unintentionally, they say and do things which would and offend.

The real danger in both prejudice and thoughtlessness lies not only in the resentment which they create, but also in the grist which they feed the mills of our enemies. For example, Communists and their fellow travelers pick up cases of religious prejudice, magnify them all out of their true proportion, and shout them from the housetops. They fan the sparks of resentment into the flames of vengeance. Then, with lying tongues, they paint a picture of life under communism in which they claim that no such discriminations exist.

Many forget that conditions in countries behind the Iron Curtain belie this claim. They do not remember that in Russia, and in her satellite countries, religion is condemned and that those who try to practice it are shipped off to labor camps, persecuted, starved, tortured and murdered. Under communism there can be on freedom of religion, no freedom of thought, no freedom of speech. Any departure from the party line is punishable as treason. Yet these wily subversives have the bold effrontery to criticize our way of life and our treatment of our fellow men.

Therefore, it is important that we strive to eliminate baseless prejudice and thoughtless criticism not only because of the individual resentment which they cause, but also because of the individual resentment which

they cause, but also because the add fuel to the fire with which our enemies are trying to destroy the American way of life.

You are all aware, I am sure, of the ways in which the National Conference of Christians and Jews carries on its positive program. But perhaps it will bear some brief repetition just to show how complete and how realistic it is.

The basic concept of the conference program is participation of people of all religious and racial groups. It calls upon educators to work with it through the schools and colleges of which they are a part. It seeks the cooperation of religious leaders to work in their churches and synagogues to make brotherhood a living reality. It asks leaders of all civic organizations to take its methods and materials into every civic organization in the community. It calls for the help of labor and management to put across its program in industry. And it asks the professionals of radio, theater, press and advertising to make the brotherhood concept a part of their every-day work.

Many thousands of Americans take part in conference programs as leaders, reaching millions of their fellow citizens seven days a week 52 weeks in the year, with a message of goodwill, harmony and understanding among men, a message of brotherhood that is realistic, down-to-earth and of immense importance to the survival of freedom in the world.

To my mind, a word which is often overrated is the word "tolerance." To me, it implies a mental reservation. It is negative. It connotes a grudging acceptance of a person who is not really regarded as an equal.

Brotherhood, on the other hand, implies no limitations. It is positive in every respect. It connotes recognition of every man as the brother of every other man and, therefore, an equal.

Let us realize the simple fact that Christians and Jews alike acknowledge God to be their Heavenly Father. Obviously, therefore, they must all be brothers. How, then, can any thinking person whose fundamental faith includes the Fatherhood of God ignore the brotherhood of man?

When a child first comes into the world, he arrives completely free from conscious dislikes of people. It is only in the days and years of growing up that he may come down with the disease of prejudice, and the principal carriers of the germ are apt to be the adults who mold his life.

Contemplating the innocence of a baby, we can realize the awesome power that parents, teachers, and adults in general have in shaping the world of tomororw through the children of today.

Because children are naturally without prejudice, we should make a conscious effort to instill in their hearts the positive worth of brotherhood as a way of life. Brotherhood is not a cure-all for the ills and disturbances of a grownup world, but it is a medicine that can do nothing but good provided it is prescribed early enough and taken consistently.

The idea of brotherhood suggests to former children the better world this might have been if we had been able to hold on tightly and completely to the mutual kindness and love for each other that is our birthright and our natural heritage as children of the one God.

Brotherhood does not mean we have to open our hearts and our homes to everyone we meet. We have the right to select our friends because we like them or our associates because we have interests in common. Nobody wants to spend his time with a bore or open his home to a thief. Brotherhood does not say that we should or we must. It asks only that we look upon others on the basis of their individual worth rather than on the basis of the accidental factors of their race, their color, or their creed. In short, it asks that we observe the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

The cornerstone of brotherhood is the individual. By its very nature it must be personal. Like charity, it begins at home. It begins with you and with me. Unless we recognize that personal level of brotherhood, we shall weaken and dilute the effectiveness of our efforts.

While brotherhood is personal, it can have a profound effect on the international, interracial, and interreligious misunderstandings which exist in the world today. Brotherhood is like ripples in a lake, starting at one place but spreading gradually to the far edges of the water. We never know how widespread are the effects of a good act.

Brotherhood Week gives to us as Americans an opportunity to reaffirm our belief in the individual freedom of our fellow men. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that Brotherhood Week is only 1 week out of 52. It is important as a symbol, as a spotlight to focus attention on the day-to-day year-round operations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Brotherhood Week does not mean that we start loving our fellow men with great intensity on 1 day in February, keep it up for 7 days straight, and then stop.

No; Brotherhood Week simply is a means of rising to a peak and obtaining widespread public rededication to the week-in and week-out work with which we are all concerned. The year-round work is what counts.

If the freedom we cherish is to survive in the world, we must find ways to eliminate the frictions, the tensions and the distrusts that turn man against man and nation against nation. We must first eliminate these irritations at home if we are to have hope of eliminating them throughout the world.

As a nation, we owe our position of leadership in the world today to the achievements of people of many racial and religious backgrounds who believe in brotherhood. Brotherhood is the belief of men and women who are confident of our country's continuing greatness. It is the belief of those who face the future with fearless hearts and abiding faith.

In Brotherhood we have an atomic idea whose chain reaction can spread to the hearts and minds of people everywhere. Let us use this powerful force widely and wisely. Let us believe in it. Let us live it. Let us support it.

By so doing, we can bring greater personal happiness to ourselves and our loved ones and help to achieve the goal of all men of good will: The brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.

And now it is a very great honor and a real pleasure for me to present a well-deserved award to an outstanding American.

He believes there is "no alternative to peace" and has dedicated himself to that belief before the world. He has exercised the great moral force of his leadership to bring about notable progress in human relationse and increased personal dignity for all men throughout our land. His leadership has served as an inspiration to those dedicated to the cause of greater understanding among people who differ in race, in color or in creed.

He has translated the words of his beliefs into the deeds of his leadership. In his personal and in his public life, he has truly enlarged the areas of our human understanding of each other.

This 1956 Gold Metal Brotherhood Award, the highest honor given by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is being bestowed upon President Eisenhower for his outstanding contributions to better understanding; to the improvement of human relations internationally, nationally and in the Nation's Capital; and for advancing the objectives of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, namely, the promotion of justice, amity, understanding and cooperation in all human relationships.

I would like to read to you the text of the citation accompanying this award:

"The National Conference of Christians and Jews World Brotherhood. The National Conference of Christians and Jews acclaims for his devotion to increased human understanding and his service to human need, Dwight D. Eisenhower. He has been ever ready to render that service be it at the call of the Government of the United States, the world community, or its humblest citizen. His sympathetic understanding of the spiritual as well as the economic needs of his fellow man is making an outstanding contribution to the survival of freedom.

"EVERETT R. CLINCHY,
"President.
"BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS,
"National Cochairman.
"ROGER W. STRAUS,
"National Cochairman.
"JAMES F. TWOHY,
"National Cochairman.
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 20, 1956.*"

It is my privilege to present to you this gold medal brotherhood award on which is inscribed: "To Dwight D. Eisenhower, February 20, 1956. For outstanding contributions to the cause of brotherhood."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and in inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood, is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication, we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective, and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give "to bigotry no sanction—to persecution no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEBRUARY 15, 1956.

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Permission was granted to extend my remarks immediately after the remarks from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. I was greatly privileged to attend the brotherhood dinner and to hear the very fine speech of Mr. Firestone and the splendid statement of the President of the United States, and Secretary Wilson's moving remarks.

The President's statement and the remarks of Hon. Charles E. Wilson follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews:

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor, indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication, we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give, "to bigotry, no sanction, to persecution, no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again I express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, AT BROTHERHOOD DINNER, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

Mr. Riley, Mr. Firestone, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here this evening and have a part in your program in celebration of Brotherhood Week. I am doubly honored to represent our President and accept for him the gold medal brotherhood award. I know he regrets that he could not be here this evening and bring a personal message to you under the inspiration of the occasion and of this wonderful audience.

I did not have in mind to say anything myself but I have a few things in my heart and on my mind that perhaps would be in order for me to say. President Eisenhower is a living example—a symbol of good will and brotherhood. Not only is that recognized in our country but it is recognized throughout the world.

I thought I might tell you about a little incident that happened when he first started to improve on the road to health.

Admiral Radford and I went to Denver to see him for just a few minutes. He had been out on the sun porch. They brought him back in and he was reclining there in bed. The only thing he had on his mind that he wanted to talk about was whether he was going to recover to the degree that he could carry out the responsibility that he feels he has, not only to our country but in the whole world—perhaps a unique opportunity to personally contribute to peace and good will in the world and all he wanted to talk about was that and whether even if he didn't recover to the point of where he could carry on his duties as President, that he would at least recover to a point where, in some other capacity, he could still fulfill that opportunity, and I'm frank to confess to you, ladies and gentlemen, that had I been a woman I would have broken out in tears and cried.

Of course, I don't know any more than the rest of you do—whether he's going to run again or not. We have an express in the military business of "need to know" and I don't quite "need to know" up to now, but the time is getting a little short.

My particular assignment as Secretary of Defense is to make certain that our country is strong in a military sense and I would like to say that there is a fine group of dedicated men—military and civilian—in what is commonly called the Pentagon that are working diligently at that. We call it the defense team and in spite of what you may read in your papers from time to time we're making some progress with the job.

The purpose of our country in maintaining great military strength is in the hope that thus we will maintain peace in the world. Our military strength is not for aggression. Science, technology, and the mechanical production has been so phenomenally successful in the last few decades that science now has the clear promise of being able to raise the standard of living and the well-being of all the peoples in the world.

The progress in this area has been phenomenal and we all hope and pray that through strength we can maintain peace in the world until men and women of good will—men and women who recognize the responsibility of brotherhood have time to catch up in the sense of establishing better understanding among all human beings throughout the world so that the world will avoid another great catastrophe of war and that's why I'm so pleased and honored to be here this evening and accept for the Presiden this award.

Washington at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the birth anniversary of the first President of our great United States it is well for all of us to reflect a few minutes on the hardships, sacrifices, and abounding faith in God indulged in by our forebears in laying the foundation for the great Government and wide prosperity which we enjoy today.

I received a few days ago some verse from the pen of Mr. W. A. Roper, of Gainesville, Ga., describing his feelings about George Washington and the sacrifices made by him and his men. I believe you will enjoy these simple expressions from a man who has grown from humble circumstances into one of the most valued and respected citizens of his country.

The matter follows:

WASHINGTON AT VALLEY FORGE

General was having his ups and downs,
And every day was losing ground.
With battles raging far and wide,
His trusted soldiers bled and died.

Some from hunger, some from cold,
But many died from being bold.
The wind was cold, the snow was deep,
Beneath the stars they had to sleep.

Some fell aside and ceased to go,
With bleeding imprints on the snow.
The day was gone, they lost the fight,
And souls of men were taking flight.

The cold north winds with anger o'er,
Were beating hard on General's door.
And battles raged from sun till sun,
But General George lost every one.

When all the world had seemed but lost,
A little dell this good man crossed.
And there alone on bended knee,
He sent to God a mighty plea.

And when he got his wires uncrossed,
The British ran till they got lost.
Then round the world went George's fame,
He prayed and prayed till victory came.

And may we like our George of old,
Keep pressing on to reach the goal,
And in the end we all may see,
A brighter world in which to be.

Gamma Sigma Fraternity—Workshop in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago a group of students at Rutgers University organized a fraternity in which persons of all colors, creeds, and nationalities were eligible for membership. This was an experiment in social living, designed to test the principle of broad fraternity participation.

The nonsectarian fraternity, Gamma Sigma, began at the university in the fall of 1947 when 12 undergraduates, 9 of whom were ex-service men, decided that the existing fraternities were not in keeping with the democratic traditions of our Founding Fathers. They wanted a fraternity that did not have arbitrary restrictions concerning race, creed, or color. So they organized their own fraternal group without any restrictions whatsoever, except character and the appreciation of one individual for another.

During the 1947–48 college term, when universities were bulging with veterans,

national fraternities sought new chapters all over the Nation. Several sent representatives to Rutgers, where Gamma Sigma was one of three new fraternal groups in the process of organization. When the fraternity pledged two Negro boys, the national fraternity representatives immediately lost interest.

When classes began in September 1949, it was discovered that the new fraternity had achieved the highest academic average of any fraternity chapter on the campus. The following year Gamma Sigma rented from the university the yellow house in fraternity row which it now occupies. It became evident that the organization was on the campus to stay. The heterogeneous group was welded into a strong unit.

Membership is pretty evenly divided among members of the three major faiths. The evening bull sessions are often equivalent to many courses aimed at explaining the religious beliefs subscribed throughout the world. Many nationalities are in the fraternity—Chinese, a Japanese student, the son of a Cuban educator, a Greek, and a Dutch boy.

The fraternity president, Richard Cogan, a history student, feels that Gamma Sigma has shown that all sorts of people can live together.

On Saturday evening, February 11, 1956, the young men of Gamma Sigma gave a testimonial dinner at the Somerville Inn, Somerville, N. J., to Mrs. Elin Johnson, the fraternity housemother. Mrs. Johnson, who came to the United States from Sweden 32 years ago, typifies the spirit of brotherhood of the group. She has by her devotion to the principle of the brotherhood of man inspired all those around her.

On the ninth birthday of Gamma Sigma Fraternity I wish to salute them and commend them for exemplifying the American tradition of equality. It is my hope that this workshop in democracy will have many years of continued success.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD various messages, a letter from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and a newspaper editorial concerning Gamma Sigma.

The messages are as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, September 30, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: May I congratulate your fraternity, Gamma Sigma, on its 9th anniversary. The objectives with which your group was organized are certainly commendable. I wish you future success.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: I wish to commend the men of Gamma Sigma Fraternity for their fine efforts on behalf of the true spirit of democracy at one of our leading universities. Fraternities should be founded in the belief of the brotherhood of man. Unfortunately, on some of our college campuses, the fraternity system has been perverted by policies of discrimination and exclusion.

Gamma Sigma, by its example, upholds that most fundamental precept of our Nation that all men are equal without regard to race, religion, or national origin. My own experience while mayor of Minneapolis in working to solve these problems of human relations has convinced me that much more can be done to level the barriers of prejudice and hate than we sometimes think when confronted with them in all their ugliness. It can be done through just such forthright action as yours.

The practice of toleration and good will as exemplified by Gamma Sigma has its influence far beyond your own fraternity. As you begin your ninth year of democratic living together, I hope you will be encouraged by the knowledge that others look to your example with respect and hope. Keep up the good work, I pray you.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 30, 1955.

Mr. RICHARD COGAN,
President, Gamma Sigma Fraternity,
Rutgers University,
New Brunswick, N. J.:

Would you extend my congratulations to the members of the Gamma Sigma Fraternity of Rutgers University upon the opportunities that await them during the current academic year.

It is my understanding through mutual friends that this particular fraternity came into being 9 years ago because of a need felt upon your own campus for a fraternity into which persons of all colors, creeds, and nationalities could come and share in the common life and benefits of associating one with another. You who are members of this fraternity today inherit the high purposes with which this organization was founded and the current year offers you an opportunity to add to that history.

I again congratulate you on the opportunity and wish you a challenging and eventful year.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, October 4, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: I have recently heard of your experiment in democratic living which is now past the experiment stage, having reached the 8-year mark.

As Gamma Sigma enters its ninth season, I wish for it good fortune and long life.

Sincerely,
RICHARD NIXON.

FEBRUARY 4, 1956.

DEAR MR. KRUGER: I am happy to send my good wishes to the Gamma Sigma Fraternity on the occasion of their annual alumni dinner. I think it is nice that you have this independent, nonsectarian fraternity and it must add greatly to the democratic way of life on your campus.

My best wishes to Mrs. Johnson for her good work with the fraternity members.

With all good wishes.

Very sincerely yours,
ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

MESSAGE FROM CONGRESSMAN HUGH J. ADDONIZIO TO GAMMA SIGMA FRATERNITY

As Gamma Sigma gathers for its second annual alumni dinner, I wish to take this opportunity to extend, both to its members and to Mrs. Elin Johnson, who is being especially honored on this occasion, my most sincere congratulations and best wishes.

It has been 9 years now since a group of young men at Rutgers determined to enter upon an experiment in democratic living. The fraternity they organized has lived up to the finest traditions of American life. Nonsectarian, nondiscriminatory, Gamma Sigma has been a living demonstration that democracy can thrive on a college campus. Too often college fraternities are charged, and often rightly so, with raising discriminatory barriers. Yet college years are the time when such barriers should be broken down, when students should learn to know the peoples of all nations, all creeds, all races with which we share this land and this shrinking world. What better way to do this than by sharing the experiences of everyday living, by working together, or by long talks over that last cup of coffee at dinner? The fraternal spirit can and should do much to lift the barriers of discrimination and prejudice. For this is the spirit of brotherhood in its truest sense.

It is most fitting that Mrs. Johnson should be your honored guest. Her position as housemother to your fraterinty is one that requires tolerance and wisdom and discretion, as well as a firm belief in the principles for which you stand. On her depends some measure of the success of your undertaking.

It is my sincere hope that Gamma Sigma's crusade will meet with ever-increasing success, so that one day, the fraternal spirit having conquered, discrimination will have vanished.

May Gamma Sigma enjoy many long years of success.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of April 22, 1952]

If all fraternities operated on the same basis as Gamma Sigma at New Jersey's Rutgers University, there would be far less room for criticism of the fraternity system on the grounds that it produces unwholesome social byproducts in the form of snobbery, race, and religious prejudice.

In 1947, 12 Rutgers undergraduates, of whom 9 were ex-servicemen, organized Gamma Sigma without any membership restrictions whatever on race, creed, or color. The only criteria were character and individual appreciation. Its members today include a Chinese who came to the United States from Indonesia with his family, a Japanese student from Tokyo, an Albanian, a German youth who arrived here via England, and the son of a Cuban educator.

The fraternity has achieved a high scholastic average. It is permanently established in a house on the university's fraternity row. * * *

One suspects that Gamma Sigma's members have received an education from one another as valuable as anything they have been taught in the classroom. They are certainly far better equipped to live in a world in which, if it is to survive, whole nations must revise their concept of fraternity.

A Planner's Philosophy for the National Capital Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following address by Prof. John T. Howard entitled "A Planner's Philosophy for the National Capital Region," which he delivered to the annual meeting of the American Planning & Civic Association in Washington, D. C., on February 7:

A Planner's Philosophy for the National Capital Region

(By John T. Howard, consultant on the regional plan of Washington, American Planning and Civic Association, 52d annual meeting, Washington, D. C., February 1956)

The previous speakers have reviewed the development of planning policies for the National Capital in this century, and the emerging forces that are now reshaping policy. It is my part to try to set before you the planner's view of what our future policies may be, or ought to be, in guiding the growth and development of the National Capital region toward the 21st century.

Let us start by adding to the background already presented, an atempt to gage the scope and dimensions of the planning problems with which new policies must cope. In terms of area, what will be the extent of the Washington metropolitan region a few decades hence? If we take the present jurisdiction of the National Capital Regional Planning Council and add to it a bit, we come up with an area of about 2,000 square miles, composed of the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties and perhaps part of Charles County, in Maryland, and Alexandria, Falls Church, Arlington, Fairfax, and parts of Loudon and Prince Williams Counties in Virginia. This is equivalent to a circle of 25-mile radius, but it runs only 20 miles—about halfway—toward Baltimore, and about 30 miles to the northwest, west, and south. This 2,000 square miles is a perhaps conservative estimate of the territory that will be directly tributary to, and geographically a part of the National Capital region before the year 2000.

What will be the population of this area? It is now over a million eight hundred thousand. A number of forecasts have recently been made, which indicate a total of close to 4 million people by about the year 2000. If we accept the forecast of 300 million for the United States as a whole for that date, this is not an unreasonable ceiling. Our own studies are still in progress, but let us say, an increase of perhaps as many as 2 million people in the National Capital region during the next 30 or 40 years.

What happens when we put these two figures together? Our present population is using about 200 square miles for urban purposes, at a rough estimate. This counts the houselots, the stores and offices, the warehouses and factories, schools, institutions, Government buildings, parks, cemeteries, golf courses, railroads, waterworks, airports, and streets—all the uses of land that directly serve the urban population; it leaves out farms, woods, swamps, vacant land and water areas. It assumes about 75 acres of urban use per 1,000 population. But for the future, all trends point to a rate much higher than that; house lots are bigger, school sites and airports are bigger, factories are single-story with much parking, highways are wider—for nearly a century, new urban areas have been built at progressively lower densities than before. It seems reasonable that in the years ahead we will use up for urban purposes about a 140 acres—nearly twice as much—for each 1,000 of new population.

Two million new people, then would require about 400 more square miles of new urban land—land that is now rural. Added to the 200 we are now using, that means a maximum of about 600 square miles of land put to urban use by the year 2000. But note that this is less than a third of the 2,000 square miles that comprise the region.

The problem of our planning is to guide the development of about 400 square miles of land—the locations of all of the activities of the new 2 million people—in addition to whatever redevelopment needs to be done within the 200 square miles already urbanized. Where, within the 2,000-square-mile area, should this growth be encouraged? How should it be organized in space—what patterns should be sought? What should be the criteria and the standards for our planning?

Obviously we need a whole battery of criteria and standards, to apply to each of the manifold elements of an urban environment for four million people. These are the matters on which we need policy decisions. And it is vital that these policies should be consistent, each with the others, or no comprehensive plan can be devised that will give force and effect to them all. I am going to try to outline my view of the shape that some of these policies should take, in regard to some of the more significant aspects of the National Capital region of the future. My suggestions are not official; they have not been cleared with anyone, and represent merely personal opinions. I lay them before you for your judgments, as to whether they are valid policies for this area.

Let us take first the feature of the National Capital region that is its reason for being: the seat of government of the United States, the place of business of the national legislature and the chief executive, and the nerve center of government administration. An obvious criterion is the housing of these governmental activities on sites, and in relation to each other, in such a way as to maximize the efficiency of all their operations. Equally obviously, efficiency requires interaccessibility among key people and key agencies. Even more obviously, our national Government has become so complex, and its personnel so numerous, that there is a practical limit to the number of key people to whom interaccessibility can be provided. A corollary criterion, then, is that the National Capital region, or at least its core, should house only those parts of the National Government among which frequent face-to-face contracts are essential; and all others should be located—or relocated—somewhere else.

But the "seat of government" has another function, beyond mere functioning. It is a symbol of the ability of freemen to govern themselves. In the language of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission's 1950 report on the comprehensive plan, "the monuments (of national significance) have a true and leading place, to inspire the citizen and visitor with the national Capital's function as the setting for the spirit as well as the operation of democracy". Here is a policy to guide our planning, to be coupled with another also in the words of the same report: "Now 'working' buildings will probably work better, if their efficiency is not subordinated to magnificence."

The second significant aspect of the region is to shelter its inhabitants, a function shared by every metropolitan area. It should surely be a planning policy to make the residential parts of the region places for good living—not merely healthful, but convenient and pleasant. The goal of our American society is the fulfillment of the growth capacities and potentials of each individual within it, and as a feature of that goal to provide opportunity for a range of choice to match the range of kinds of individuals that we are. Our capital city should express this goal in its planning, not only to the extent that every city should, but even more.

This means residential areas that are varied, offering housing types to meet the needs of all our kinds of family and all our income groups, from the single worker and young working couple to the many-childed and the retired; from the nightclubber to the gardener, the solitary to the gregarious, the quiet to the noisy. It means schools and local institutions that meet standards of site size and neighborhood location. It means shopping and consumer services and entertainment that are convenient and varied, accessible but not intrusive—the bright lights are fun, but also it should be possible to walk or ride without flashing neon shouting from every corner to buy or eat or watch something. It means facilities for culture and education and religion, housed and sited with a dignity that conveys more than lipservice to the respect we claim for them.

And, lastly, it means opportunities for recreation of all kinds, both local and regional—the playground and the quiet little park; the athletic grounds for players and for watchers; the picnic place, the boating and riding and swimming places; the woods and streams; the natural reservation big enough to get lost in. There should be enough of all of these and so placed that everybody can get at them. And beyond the measurable requirements for specific recreational activities, natural open spaces are very much needed to break the monotony that has become so typical of our suburban sprawl, not only for visual pleasure, but to divide what would otherwise be frighteningly big urban areas into communities to which people can feel that they belong, in scale with human dimensions.

These criteria are no more than the accepted policies for the planning of residential areas and services that have been crystallized during the last generation. I have repeated them, not because they are new, but because they are important.

A third aspect of the region is as a workplace. If good living is the goal of cities, making a living is the first essential. Though the Federal Government is and will be the prime employer, the majority of the population is and will be supported by other economic activities—most of them serving the Government-employed or located in Washington because the Government is here, others independent of Government and located by another regional orientation. It must be a planning policy to foster the prosperity of all these economic activities, by assuring sufficient space for efficient operation, in locations accessible to labor supply, markets, and the other essential factors. This means attention to the differing requirements of different kinds of retail business center; and to the requirements of administrative offices, professional services, and the manifold operations involved in the processing, shipping, and storage of goods of many kinds, for local and nonlocal markets. And this brings me, without attempting to define the varying criteria for these many forms of economic activity, to a fourth aspect of the metropolitan region.

Let us look at it now as a complex structure of many functioning parts—the many different land uses, each a place where people do something—live, learn, play, make, buy, sell, legislate, administer, and so on—all knitted together by systems of utilities, communication, and circulation, whose functioning makes it possible for people to do these things in these places. Planning technique is concerned with the designing of this complex structure, or rather of its future growth and change. Planning policy is concerned with the objectives of the design. A number of these objectives have already been outlined, but decisions in regard to the design of the service systems are so influential in achieving—or thwarting—these objectives, that they partake of the nature of policy.

The two utilities for which this is especially true are water supply and sewerage. The over-riding characteristic of water supply is that it is limited; so it must be a regional planning policy to so dispose the various urban uses of land as to conserve that supply, and to conserve also all possible fu-

ture opportunities to utilize it. The limits of water supply may turn out to be the ultimate controls on the future population of the region, and thus the determinant of all other planning policies.

But water supply and sewerage have another characteristic, in that urban development cannot take place without them—except at such low densities as to be in effect rural rather than urban—but where water and sewer are provided, urban development is almost inevitable. Therefore, since we are projecting a total quantity of urban development that will occupy less than a third of our regional area, decisions as to where or whether to provide water and sewer service are tremendously influential in determining where that growth will occur, and should not be undertaken lightly. The policy that stems from this is that these decisions should be coordinate with community planning policy, as expressed through whatever plans for patterns of land use and nonuse that may be finally arrived at.

In the same category are many elements of the region's circulation system. The airports and the railway and highway routes that connect the region to the outside world not only feed into and out of it the people and the goods that keep the metropolitan area alive, thus making their efficient design and location a matter of major regional planning concern. They, as well as the intra-regional net of highways and transit lines, also exert great influence upon the future location of land uses and distribution of population. Those who decide where new highways are to go will also be deciding where new subdivisions and new outlying industries will go. It is the interaccessibility of all of the working parts of the region that makes the region work, as an economic and sociological unit. It is accessibility that makes land useful for urban purposes; so the providing or withholding of access is tantamount to deciding whether or not the land shall be used. From this I draw the same policy for the utilities, that major highway and transit decisions must be coordinated with land use planning policy.

There are other obvious ways in which the planning of transport facilities need to be coordinated with the planning of land use and population distribution. An overloaded transport route may be relieved by increasing capacity or providing an alternate route between the origin and the destination; it may also be relieved by moving some part of the destination to a place nearer or to, or in another direction from, the origin. It is a matter of planning policy to decide which course of action will ultimately best serve the future goals of the region. The policy I propose is at least to be aware of these two alternatives; which I would choose, I will say something about later.

But before leaving the subject of circulation, I would like to suggest some subordinate policies, which are perhaps more in the nature of standards. The journey to work, which is the single largest burden on the circulation system, should be so provided for that most workers spend no more than half an hour, and few more than 45 minutes, on this journey. At the same time, the system of facilities should make it possible for every worker's home to be within this range, not of all workplaces in the region, but of all kinds of workplaces, including the center of the city. Something like this same standard should apply, and would automatically, to the journey to shop. And the measure of interaccessibility among the Government agencies (and Government-oriented private offices) that need it, should probably be under half an hour. But it is relevant to point out that, either by modern express highway or by modern rapid transit, only half an hour separates two points that are 25 miles apart if the facilities are not overloaded—plus, of course, time to and from the express facility. This suggests that, given the facilities properly routed, there is hardly any part of our 2,000-square-mile region that could not be made sufficiently accessible to the center and the other parts to meet these standards, and thus qualify for urban development as an integral part of the National Capital Region.

The next aspect of the region that I want to mention looks at this territory as a not insignificant geographical segment of our country. As such, it has natural resources which it is our responsibility not to squander. These are not alone places of scenic beauty, nor the water that the region itself needs. There are agricultural resources of soil for pasture or tillage, which, if not irreplaceable in the sense that they cannot be substituted for by farming in other regions, are at least irreplaceable here; if once converted to urban uses, they cannot be converted back at a later time. Agriculture has a place in this regional economy, and it should be a planning policy to conserve this resource wherever there is a reasonable alternative location for urban use.

Finally, I suggest that we look at the National Capital region on yet another light, as the beleaguered headquarters of the free world in a conflict that we have been told may continue for a generation or more. Is there not a planning responsibility here, and therefore a reason for a planning policy?

If there is a risk of active war—and the national budget suggests that there is—can the kind of planning that is done for the physical development of this metropolitan area—and others—help to allay that risk? It seems to me that it can. An article by Hans J. Morgenthau in the January Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists states: "The present atomic stalemate is composed of four main factors: the, for all practical purposes, evenly matched atomic capabilities; the similarly matched capabilities for defense; the similarly matched availability of vital targets; and the monopoly, vested in the United States and the Soviet Union, of the capability to wage all-out atomic war." Alongside this quotation let me put one from last Friday's Christian Science Monitor: "Soviet industry under this—current 5-year—plan is to continue its trek eastward beyond the Urals into the heart of Siberia. * * * By 1961, if everything goes well, the country will be less vuluerable to attack. * * * Few parts of the sixth 5-year plan are more likely to be carried out." You all know what has happened to this country's vital targets during the last 10 years; they have become increasingly attractive, especially the National Capital region. Several hundred thousand more Americans, some of them quite important to the working of our country, are now within the destructive range of a bomb dropped on the Capital.

There are three phases to a consideration or urban vulnerability. The first, and, we hope, the only one ever tested is the efficient performance of a city's functions during peacetime—in this case, National Government and international affairs. This falls within the scope of the planning policies already described. The second is minimization of destruction under attack; and, the third, ability to quickly recover after attack and resume the vital function. Can the future growth and change of this National Capital region be so planned as to achieve these objectives? I believe that it can, and in such a way as to strengthen rather than weaken every one of the proposed planning policies that I have presented. And if this can be done, the present precarious balance may be prevented from shifting against us, and the risk or war not grow greater.

But the inevitable conclusion of this reasoning is the framing of a proposed planning policy that would surely be highly controversial. It involves doing everything possible to check the present trend of growth all around the fringes of the metropolitan urbanized area, and seeking to channelize as much new growth as possible into the outer parts of the region as I have described it. It means adoption of a policy by the Federal Government of relocating agencies to far outlying sites; and by utility, highway, and transit agencies of deliberately withholding extensions of service to the areas that are now considered to be next, in line for development, and deliberately providing services and creating accessibility in areas that are at a safe distance from the District core. It means adoption of a zoning policy by local jurisdictions that is equally revolutionary. It means discouraging higher densities in the District of Columbia, whether for apartment houses or for office buildings; in fact, discouraging the location of new economic activities with a radius of many miles from the Capital.

But what about the positive aspects? Is such a policy consistent with reasonable peacetime goals? Let us review quickly the other policies I have suggested. First, geometry confirms that there are the 400 square miles of land needed by our 2 million additional people, within the region but beyond a 20-mile radius. Second, given a new circulation system—which is engineeringwise perfectly feasible—the necessary accessibility could be created, to enable new functions or relocated functions, and people, to perform as integral parts of the metropolitan region in such outlying locations, without impairing the efficiency of intercommunications. Third, the ceremonial and symbolic functions of the Capital would be enhanced rather than impaired, by removing the temporary buildings—and relocating an equivalent number of Federal employees. Fourth, many of the desiderata of a good residential environment could be better provided for in new and planned centers of population, than in a continuation of the gradual accretion at the edges that is progressively depriving the present central population of access to rural areas; and the preservation of accessible public and private natural open space would be made possible. Given the utilities, the work places and the circulation system, houses and schools and churches and supermarkets can be built and well-planned, anywhere. Fifthly, then, new economic activity—and especially industry activity of a kind not tied to the presence of the Federal Government—can also flourish, on spacious sites, with new labor markets and new interregional transport lines.

The final advantage that I offer for this policy is that it would preserve a future freedom of choice and action. The one thing we know is that we cannot predict the future accurately, and may therefore want to change our minds later. Regional development at low density makes possible a future increase of density; should world situations and planning technologies change, the open spaces can be filled in and low buildings replaced by skyscrapers. But if we plan and build at high densities now, we are committed; the laws of land economies and inertia make reductions of density practically impossible.

The National Capital region has a choice of alternatives. In very general terms, I have described one. It seems to me that it would be a good policy to adopt—good for the efficiency of the Federal Government, good for the people now living here, good for the new people to come, good for the country as a whole—perhaps contributing to the good of the world. I submit it for your judgment.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation Looks Back on Decade of Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include something of the accomplishments of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation as reviewed over the past 10 years. This bureau prepares the handicapped for employment and aids in the field of job placement:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOOKS BACK ON DECADE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

(By the Information Service, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

The United States was slow in coming to the realization that, like its natural resources, its human resources must be both conserved and utilized to the utmost. Since 1920, however, this realization has grown steadily.

Unfortunately, it was not until the critical manpower shortage of World War II made it imperative to utilize handicapped individuals in the labor force that the country really learned that, when properly prepared and placed, disabled men and women make good workers. During the past 10 years, 556,000 disabled men and women have been restored to productive jobs through the nationwide State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation. This number represents 65 percent of all rehabilitations by the State vocational rehabilitation agencies since the national public program was established by Congress 35 years ago.

Experience over the years has demonstrated that the range of occupations that handicapped persons are qualified for is almost unlimited. In growing numbers, disabled individuals have succeeded in the professions, in agriculture, in all phases of commerce and industry, in communications, and in their own business endeavors.

The accomplishments of the past decade can be accounted for in a number of ways. First of all, in 1943 the Barden-La Follette amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act paved the way for State agencies to supplement their training and counseling services with physical restoration. Previously, they had been obliged to train around the disabilities. The full effect of these measures was felt only after 1945 when the physicians, physical therapists, and other medical people were able to turn from their wartime tasks to civilian rehabilitation.

Another factor was the increased recognition and acceptance of the fact that rehabilitation is the only method of overcoming disability until medical science finds the cure for all disabling diseases. This has resulted in a heartening increase in cooperation among the various public and voluntary agencies concerned with disability.

The value of scientific advances in methods of reducing the handicapping effects of disability has been increasingly demonstrated. And with these advances came a steady improvement in the quality of rehabilitations, despite the fact that more difficult cases were being attempted. The restoration of more and more paraplegics probably has done more than anything else to convince the Nation that most disabled people can attain the happiness and dignity of productive life.

Then there was the recognition and appreciation of the size of the disability problem—an estimated 2 million disabled individuals who could profit by vocational rehabilitation. This has had a tremendous impact upon the social and economic strength of our country since disability has become a major cause of public and family dependency. Yet it has also been demonstrated that the rehabilitation of the disabled more than pays for itself in dollars and cents.

Looking at the cumulative record of earnings and taxpayments, we see truly amazing results. For example, in one decade the earnings of rehabilitants increased nearly $3 billion, and their Federal income taxes for the period were estimated at $298 million. Yet, the total expenditures for the public program of vocational rehabilitation were just $227 million for that period. It is, then, a demonstrable fact that vocational rehabilitation not only pays its way, it also returns a profit on the investment.

All of the factors cited above influenced the enactment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954—the most important legislative advance in the history of the program. Public Law 565, with its authorization of increased funds for expanding both public and private rehabilitation operations and facilities, is expected to result in an even more significant increase in the number of rehabilitations in the next 10 years.

It is clear that several factors have combined to give the handicapped of today a better chance than those of the past and to provide much greater hope for the handicapped of the future. All technical advances, however, and all financial and legislative support would have failed without the dedicated and tireless effort of the skilled men and women in the State programs of rehabilitation. This is especially true of the work of the individual counselors. They have helped to make the efforts of all others more effective.

Upper Colorado Scheme Tramples Water Rights in California, Arizona, and Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the upper Colorado River storage project:

THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT WOULD SERIOUSLY IMPAIR WATER RIGHTS IN THE LOWER BASIN OF THE COLORADO RIVER COMPRISING THE STATES OF CALIFORNIA, ARIZONA, AND NEVADA

H. R. 3383 is planned on interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are the exact opposite of those involved in the planning and operation of Hoover Dam. These interpretations are at issue in *Arizona* v. *California*, now before the Supreme Court. Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and the United States are parties to this litigation and will be bound by the result. The Court recently denied a motion to join the upper basin States as such, at this stage of the proceedings, by a 5 to 3 vote, without opinion. The important thing, however, is that the United States will be bound by the final decision and will be required to operate its projects, whether in the upper States or the lower, in accordance with that decision. That decision will determine which set of assumptions, those on which lower-basin projects have been built and are operating or those on which the upper-basin project is planned, is correct. Both cannot be.

Evidence of the impact of the upper-basin project upon the southern California area is found in a report submitted to the San Diego County Water Authority in September 1955 by a board of engineers composed of Raymond Hill, John Longwell, and Carl Rankin (Mr. Hill was retained by Colorado in 1953 to report to that State on the water resources of the Colorado River available to it. See S. Doc. No. 23, 84th Cong., 1st sess.). Conclusions in the report to the San Diego County Water Authority pertinent here are (see report, p. 20):

"16. When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the River below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the metropolitan water district, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

"17. In order to obtain its full right in the Colorado of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum, it will be necessary for the metropolitan water district to make other arrangements to replace the deficiency resulting from the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project.

"18. Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous."

Thus these California agencies which have had firm contracts with the United States since the early 1930's for the delivery of fixed amounts of water and which have constructed works costing hundreds of millions of dollars to carry this water to the coastal plain, face a loss of half of their water right through this project. As the report notes, the effect would be disastrous.

While this litigation is pending and while the water rights remain in doubt Congress should not authorize H. R. 3383.

Its Record the Republican Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Its Record the Republican Platform" as it appeared in the Enid Daily Eagle, Tuesday, February 7, 1956:

ITS RECORD THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

With Democrats running around wildly seeking an issue or issues from which to build a campaign platform for next fall's election, what will the Republicans offer? According to Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, who spoke in Enid, Saturday, the answer is simple: It will run on its record of accomplishments in its 3 years of administration.

Firstly, the Senator points out that the Eisenhower regime has kept the country at peace, after wiping up a Truman so-called police action which cost us 130,000 casualties in Korea. It has tried to correct the evils

left from the Yalta Conference. It has sought and found new alliances and new treaties, strengthened our Armed Forces throughout the world, built up stockpiles of arms and strategic materials, yet has been ever ready to discuss any reasonable suggestions for peaceful solution of international difficulties.

Domestically, the administration has reestablished honor and integrity in Government; it has reestablished public confidence in the conduct of national affairs. It started out by cutting the Truman budget by $10 billion, a budget Mr. Truman had said couldn't "be cut 15 cents with safety." This year, it will balance the budget, with perhaps a surplus.

The GOP followed this with a tax cut of more than $7 billion, 62 percent of which went to individuals, with a large percentage in the lower income brackets benefiting. It reestablished the stability of the dollar, which had fallen to a value of only 52 cents under its predecessor regimes; and has held the value steadily at that figure, this without either deflation or inflation.

Under the Republicans during the past 3 years, wages have reached the highest average in the Nation's history and working conditions have been brought to the highest level ever. During its regime, the value of the national production has reached an all-time peak; and employment at above 62,000,000, a record, has been achieved, without a war to bolster it. The previous administration had worried because it said 60 million jobs would be needed by now, and the Republicans wouldn't be able to supply them. They have, and more.

Farming remains the one weak point in the economy but vigorous steps are being taken to remedy this, and already one bill in the President's nine-point farm program has been passed. Others are rapidly advancing in committee. Farm exports have been increased and the farm export program put in the Department of Agriculture, where it belongs. When it is considered that most of the loss in farm income in the past 5 years occurred under the previous administration, and later under continuing laws passed by that administration, it will be seen that the Republican effort at agricultural improvement has been hampered long by inherited difficulties and inherited legislation, which, due to future commitments, could not be changed overnight.

All in all, the record is one of progress and achievement. It is one of peace and prosperity. It is one just getting fully rolling and which offers the best possible hope for the country through the continuance of the party in power. Why shouldn't it run on its record?

San Francisco's Need for Great Circle Airline Connections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Francisco is rapidly assuming its logical position as a leading world air transport center. The city's geographic location and excellent airport facilities as well as its historic position in the world of trade are some of the many reasons why its citizens feel justified in seeking more and better airline service, both domestic and international.

The city is a natural terminal location for the increased great circle traffic which is bound to develop. Therefore, we were particularly heartened by President Eisenhower's request to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a reopening of Pan American Airlines' application for approval of its great circle proposal for service to the Orient. With the coming advent of jet transport, the economies and convenience of the great circle route will add even greater emphasis to the present necessity for the establishment of such service to and from San Francisco.

Four of our city's leading newspapers have recently discussed this matter in editorial comments. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring these editorials to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of January 19, 1956]

HOLD IT HERE

The Civil Aeronautics Board owes San Francisco an opportunity to make its best possible case for a great circle air route to Europe with San Francisco as the Pacific coast terminus. That means a hearing should be scheduled by the CAB in San Francisco.

A big expansion of great circle flying is in the offing. Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines have both applied for Pacific coast to Europe routes with San Francisco among their desired terminals. British BOAC, German Lufthansa and more lately Dutch KLM are all interested in competing, though KLM apparently proposes to bypass San Francisco for Los Angeles as Scandinavian Airlines System presently does.

Last year, when direct service from San Francisco to Central and South America was up for consideration by the CAB, a local hearing enabled the city to make an impressive and winning case. It is entitled to the same opportunity now, for inclusion on great circle routes both to Europe and the Orient is vital to San Francisco's commercial future.

[From the San Francisco News of January 20, 1956]

FIGHT FOR AIR ROUTES

It becomes increasingly manifest that San Francisco will have to fight every step of the way to maintain its position as a world air transport center.

In the terrific competitive fight among the airlines for routes all around the globe this city must insist upon being counted in as a major terminal. Scandinavian airlines passed us up in favor of Los Angeles a short time ago. Now the Dutch KLM line proposes to do the same thing.

A new opportunity to win better trans-Pacific service is opened by President Eisenhower's request of this week that the Civil Aeronautics Board review its decision upon Pan American Airways' application for right to fly the great circle route to the Orient.

The President said "new circumstances and new developments" warrant reexamination of the request. He did not specify what they are, but there is a possibility he was thinking about inauguration within 3 years of jet commercial transport service.

Pan Am, with the high speed jets it has ordered, would be able to fly from San Francisco to Tokyo in 9 hours and 27 minutes over the great circle route. The advantage this would afford business here and in Tokyo needs no elaboration.

The CAB, in reviewing the case, must certainly take that into consideration.

San Francisco must insist upon having airline services equal to or better than any other city on the Pacific coast. Awarding Pan Am permission to fly the great circle route would be an important step in fulfillment of that purpose.

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of January 21, 1956]

NORTH POLE-VAULTING

As the advent of intercontinental jet passenger flights approaches, San Francisco's need for great circle airline connections grows correspondingly greater. And the need is more than somewhat urgent right now.

The omens are auspicious. A Civil Aeronautics Board examiner has recommended that the public interest requires a San Francisco terminal point on British Overseas Airways Corp. London flights. And, as Call-Bulletin Aviator Writer George Rhodes reported from Washington Wednesday, the CAB examiner's cognizance of "the growing potential of the west coast" provides a possible basis for licensing Pan American and TWA to fly in and out of San Francisco over the region of the North Pole. There'll be a conference Monday which may clear the way for formal hearings in San Francisco. Meanwhile, President Eisenhower has asked the CAB to review its thumbs-down decision last year on Pan Am's application.

Certainly, if both British and the Dutch KLM lines put down here, United States carriers should have a chance to get into the pole-vaulting act, too. Inasmuch as our carriers fly into Europe, it's own fair reciprocity to let theirs into this country. But in so reciprocating, let's not discriminate against the United States operators.

San Francisco, to maintain its place as the aerial crossroads of the Pacific, will need all of the service it can get, and should get all that it needs. What's more, the city's International Airport is better equipped than most others to handle the vastly bigger, faster jet planes which will be in service within a few years. Meanwhile, what about that third transcontinental route which our city so far lacks, and which Los Angeles has? The CAB should do something about that.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of January 23, 1956]

JET TRANSPORT PROSPECT FORCES NEW FLIGHT PLAN

In calling for review of the decision that keeps Pan American World Airways from flying a direct, great circle route from San Francisco to the Orient, President Eisenhower opens the way to remedy a grave injustice.

The existing restrictions compel Pan American to adhere to dog-leg route—San Francisco, Hawaii, Wake, Tokyo—that adds 1,200 unnecessary miles to the flight and is wasteful of fuel, operating costs, and passengers' time alike.

San Francisco is an injured party in that the decision operates directly against the city's status as an international airport. As noted by Tom Gray, manager of the Down Town Association, the President's request that the Civil Aeronautics Board reopen the case is a victory for San Francisco.

The President's request was based on "new circumstances and new developments." It is a likely assumption that he had in mind the imminence of jet transports that will make nonstop transpacific flights commonplace—and essential to economic operation. The new planes, which will carry 145 passengers at 575 miles an hour, cannot be used profitably on short hops, air transport authorities say.

If the CAB now approves the Pan American application and those of other lines seeking to fly the great circle course from San Francisco to Scandinavia, London, and Paris, this city will come into its rightful heritage as one of the world's great aviation centers.

Russia Invokes Help of Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, well, anything can happen. Russia now warns that the United States and Great Britain will have to notify them of any move we make in the Far East. They say our intended plan of liberating countries is a direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and that before we can make any move we shall have to get a permit from the Security Council of the United Nations. What has happened? All at once the Russians have an urge to bring the power and authority of the United Nations to the front. They did not take this attitude while stirring up their underlings to start in on aggression. We have such positive evidence of this that simply to state the situation is proof enough.

We agreed with Russia that we would pull out of Korea, with the provision that she would do likewise. We kept our promise and did pull out. Knowing the dictators of Russia as we must have known them, we never should have taken their word for anything. We got out, but the Russians, through the Red Chinese, came in and started a huge aggressive movement that would have swept the South Koreans into the seas. We intervened and went through all the expense in lives and property necessary to get back in to stop their aggression. Did Russia then think of the terms of the Charter of the United Nations that they now say we are violating? No; she did not. She carried out the principal of the manifesto of Karl Marx that any agreement with capitalistic nations is all right as long as it helps the Kremlin; but when the agreement bars the path to its further aggression, scrap it. That is what Russia did in Korea, but now when we merely talk about aiding helpless people, Russia points her finger at us and shouts, "You are violating the terms of the United Nations Charter. We will attend to peace in the Far East. That is our orbit."

For outright duplicity, deceit, perfidy, and degraded diplomacy, this is the worst history has ever recorded. The Russians know what the Charter of the United Nations is; they were instrumental in writing it. It is for them to use when they want it, when it complacently submits to the dictates of Russia, but to be in all things rejected when its terms may conflict with the program of the Kremlin for world domination.

After this recent blast of the Soviets are we going to play country dog, and with our tail between our legs streak for home? Or shall we finally make a stand so that these intriguing propagandists will have something to chew over before they take it upon themselves to run our business before we ask for it?

Since Russia now complains that we are making moves not authorized by the Security Council of the United Nations, we should ask just what authority this Council has bestowed upon them to take charge of the peace in the Far East. The Security Council has not yet spoken on this subject. Is Russia so sure of having the support of that Council that they can act with impunity, while demanding that we conform to their interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations? They may be right, for they were openly active in framing that charter, and they would not approve anything that would not accrue to their advantage.

Address of United States Representative James C. Davis, of Georgia, to Joint Session of the General Assembly of Georgia, January 24, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 24, 1956, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, a Representative in the Congress from the State of Georgia, delivered a masterful address before a joint session of the General Assembly of Georgia in the capitol at Atlanta. The invitation extended to Judge DAVIS to speak in that forum is evidence of the high esteem in which he is held by the people of Georgia. It constitutes an appropriate recognition of his integrity, character, and ability by the citizens of his own State, a compliment which he richly merits and deserves.

I have read, studied, and considered the address carefully. It is a dignified, yet forceful, and able discussion of a subject very close to the heart of every true American. The fundamental principles upon which our country was established and which we cherish are being threatened and jeopardized by flagitious influences. At such a time as this we are fortunate to have Judge DAVIS and others like him in the public life of America. He has talent and courage. He is unafraid to express his convictions and to inveigh against these evils whether speaking to the General Assembly of Georgia or the Congress of the United States.

I am proud to have the privilege of knowing the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS. Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I am glad to include in the RECORD his address hereinbefore referred to. I commend it to every thoughtful American who appreciates and prizes our liberty and freedom.

The address is as follows:

Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Speaker Moate, and members of the house and senate, I deeply appreciate the high privilege and great honor which you bestowed upon me in extending the invitation to address this honorable assembly.

This is the 10th year I have represented my district and State in Congress. There I have been duly impressed with the magnificence of our Capitol city and with the greatness of our Government. Yet I have never lost sight of the fundamental truth that the strength of our great Government lies not in the size of its buildings, the hugeness of its appropriations, or the pomp and ceremony with which its affairs are conducted.

Rather the strength of our Government lies in the individuality of the citizenry all across this broad land of ours who maintain this Government; in our love of liberty, our devotion to freedom, our capacity for self-government and self-support, and the maintenance of strong State and local governments, the principle upon which this Nation was founded, and upon which it has become great.

In the resolution extending the invitation to my colleague, Congressman FLYNT, and to me, you have expressed your concern regarding pending legislation in the United States Congress on the subject of Federal aid to education. Your concern is justified. This is a subject which needs and deserves the prayerful thought and study, not only of the Congress, but of all the people, especially those officials who, like yourselves, administer the affairs of our State and local governments.

On the one hand we see the rapidly growing population of our country, having increased from 150½ million in 1950 to 165½ million in 1955 with an increase in children of school age during that same period of 6,158,000. This has brought to many sections overcrowded schools, and a great need for more school construction. The Federal Government has in some degree, where increased school population has resulted from operation of Federal Government agencies, contributed to the cost of school construction, and in small measure to maintenance and operation expense. In those areas with which I am familiar, however, this Federal contribution has been inadequate. Because of the smallness of these contributions no great voice in the control of our school systems has been sought by the Federal Government.

Now, however, the President has proposed the sizable contribution of $1¼ billion for school construction and the bill reported out by the committee calls for $1.6 billion. As the time draws near for consideration of this legislation, and its passage or rejection, threats are being made by those who traditionally have displayed hostility to our section who traditionally have sought to meddle in the conduct of our affairs, that they will attach conditions to the use of this money which we in Georgia could under no circumstances accept or tolerate. There is not a scintilla of doubt in my mind as to what will be the proper course of action if acceptance of Federal money means also acceptance of Federal control. If the only way we can obtain Federal school funds is to accept them with strings attached, then I say with no hesitation whatsoever, the answer is "No." That would be my answer and my vote in the Congress, and I am confident that would be your answer and your vote here in the Georgia Legislature upon this resolution now pending before you.

We face a very serious question in this respect: If the bill is voted, and either now or next year a condition is imposed that none of this money will be allotted to a State where segregated schools are maintained, the taxpayers of Georgia will be in the unfortunate position of having to pay our part of the taxes to raise the money, without getting a dollar of it for our own use. It would go to States willing to accept it with conditions attached, and be denied to us because we will not accept it with conditions attached, which to us are repulsive, unacceptable, and intolerable.

The conditions placed in the pending bill by the committee call for too much Federal control. Our Georgia member on the com-

mittee, Congressman PHIL LANDRUM, voted against the bill in the committee. As the bill now stands, I believe a majority of the Georgia delegation in the House will vote against it because of too much Federal control. In approving or disapproving the State plans for spending the money, the Federal Commissioner of Education, under the bill, has almost unlimited discretion. How would that discretion be exercised?

As we seek the answer to this and other questions involved, what are the facts? What is the attitude of the Federal Government toward this question, the legislative department, the executive department, and the judicial department? We must be realistic as we answer these questions.

Our present dilemma and the threat to our public school system is not the result of Federal legislative action. The United States Congress has consistently refused to join in the unconstitutional illegal efforts which have been made to take away from the States control of our own local affairs.

But the executive department, headed by the President, and the judicial department headed by the Supreme Court, have joined hands to bypass Congress, and to bring about changes in our Constitution and laws through irregular and unconstitutional means—changes which they have not been able to induce Congress to make through regular and constitutional legislative action. The Supreme Court in the past few years has been usurping the power to make laws and to amend the Constitution. The Court does not possess either of those powers.

The United States Attorney General, of course with the approval of the President, filed a brief in the Supreme Court, urging that segregation be declared unconstitutional.

The people and the States are being made the victims of a conspiracy of radical-thinking individuals and organizations, many of whom are subversive. The spearhead of this conspiracy is the radical organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, many of whose officers have had long records of association with subversive and Communist-front groups, which has been thoroughly exposed through material from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This radical group has been aided and abetted by other loud, noise-making minority pressure groups.

While the great majority of the right-thinking, right-living men and women of the United States have been carrying on the necessary daily functions of paying the taxes which support all of the governments of this Nation, cities, counties, States, and Federal, supporting our schools, growing the crops which must feed and clothe our population, operating our factories, financing our banks, and carrying on the myriad tasks necessary for our great Nation to maintain its rightful place in the world, this radical organization, conniving with other radical groups such as the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and allied radical pressure groups have been pushing that conspiracy to bypass Congress and amend our Constitution and change our laws through fraudulent court decisions and dictatorial Executive orders from the White House.

Political blackmail is the chosen method through which these radical groups have sought and are with great success seeking to impose their will upon a protesting, unwilling people.

All over this country vigorous protests are being made by white people who intend to remain white, and to keep our white institutions free from forced intermingling with other races.

It is shameful to note the extent to which those who seek political power in this country are willing to pander and capitulate to noisy minority pressure groups, whose political influence actually has been magnified far beyond its actual strength.

It is shameful that the President of the United States for political expediency, has permitted these radical pressure groups to influence him to issue orders creating a new FEPC Commission, and other similar orders to destroy and tear down wise customs and practices which are as old as civilization itself, and which in fact, do not represent the real attitude of the President himself.

In his present efforts to pander to the Negro voters of this country, he now boasts that he has eliminated the last vestige of segregation in all of the branches and departments of our Armed Forces. Yet in 1948 when he was a General in the Army, and not a candidate for any elective public office he testified before a congressional committee that he was in favor of keeping the Negro soldiers in small units of their own; that they could not compete successfully with white soldiers for promotions and that "if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get into trouble." (P. 996, Senate UMT hearings, Apr. 2, 1948.)

The President boasts that he and the Republican Party have been instrumental in turning the vast hordes of Negro pupils in upon the white children in the classrooms of Washington, D. C., where the Negroes constitute two-thirds of the school population of that city. Yet at the very moment he makes this boast that he has imposed this radical change upon the white children of our Nation's Capital, his own grandson is carried by automobile to an Episcopal school in Alexandria, Va., where tuition must be paid for his schooling, although his son, Maj. John Eisenhower, resides upon the post at Fort Belvoir, Va., where his son is in easy walking distance of a nonsegregated school, attended by both whites and blacks, and which the Eisenhower child could also attend without the necessity of transportation, and without paying any tuition whatever.

Yet the President is using his great power as the Chief Executive of this country to force our boys and girls in the various branches of our Armed Forces to live, eat, and sleep with Negroes, and to force our children into integrated schools with them, a practice in which he does not believe, and which his own flesh and blood do not follow. There are mothers and fathers in Georgia today who know their sons are being forced to live with Negroes against their will in the armed services. There is no wonder that the armed services are having a hard time getting men to enlist and reenlist.

The apostles of integration and mongrelization, the Communist Party, the NAACP, the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, and other radical organizations and individuals of the same stripe and odor are busy endeavoring to create the impression that segregation is being voluntarily abandoned, and that integration is being voluntarily accepted.

Nothing is further from the truth. Integration of the races is not voluntary. On the contrary segregation is voluntary. Wherever integration has taken place, it has been forced upon the people. Wherever segregation has been abolished, it has been over the vigorous protest of those affected. It is not voluntary in the Army. It was put into effect by Executive order, and men have to render at least 2 years military service. It is not voluntary in our political primaries. That came by a court order.

Time and time again where people in various States have had the opportunity to vote upon FEPC proposals, FEPC laws have been rejected.

Throughout this Nation for generations property owners have protected themselves and their communities against invasion by colored hordes through restrictive clauses in their deeds to real estate. The Supreme Court struck down those clauses. Where there have been any sizable groups of Negroes, it has been the almost unvarying custom for whites to live in white sections and Negroes to live in Negro sections. White people have maintained white schools and white colleges and universities. White people have also maintained Negro schools and Negro colleges and universities. The contributions of Negroes to their own institutions of learning and their own public schools have been negligible. In 1950 I obtained from the records of DeKalb County the cost of operating the Negro schools in that county and the amount of taxes paid for school purposes by the Negroes of that county. The figures showed that the property-owning Negroes of DeKalb County paid a total amount of schools taxes of $1,925.35, or less than $1 per school year for the 2,042 Negro children who attended the county public schools. Yet DeKalb County spent that year an average of $85.33 per pupil. DeKalb County paid $2,000 each to operate four Negro school buses to haul Negro children to the county public schools, a total school bus expense for them of $8,000. The amount of school taxes paid by the Negroes was not enough to haul even one-fourth of their children to the schoolhouse door, and nothing for operating the schools themselves.

The white people have carried this burden, and have carried it uncomplainingly. It has been well known that the Negroes could not and would not provide educational facilities through their own efforts. Had their school opportunities and facilities been limited to such as they would have provided for themselves, it is doubtful if provision would have been made for Negro children, as a whole, to finish the first grade.

Over half the States of this Union have laws upon their statute books preventing the intermarriage of whites and blacks. In many of the States of this Union our political systems were built upon a system of white primaries, in which the white people of the States, the counties, and the cities could express their choice as white Democrats. The bar associations, the medical societies, and the professions have generally followed a policy of segregating themselves according to races. This is the custom which has been followed in schools, in politics, in residential developments, in industry, religion, and society in general. As far back as history goes, this has been the recorded pattern upon which civilization has been based. America grew to be the greatest country following this pattern. Under it our churches have grown and prospered, and we now have missionaries in practically every land on this globe which is populated by a colored race or a mongrel race trying to keep alive a spark of the Christian religion in those lands where colored and mongrel populations have demonstrated that they do not have the stamina to perpetuate and keep alive the Christian religion and it has lived through the centuries only by the efforts of the white race.

Yet these noisy advocates of integration and mongrelization have within the past 20 years successfully organized a conspiracy to thwart the will of the great majority of the people in this country through bypassing the legislative department of our Government, the Congress, and through the connivance of the executive department and the Supreme Court, have step by step, through so-called judicial decisions and Executive orders endeavored to destroy the accepted practices of our people and to force this repulsive pattern upon an unwilling people.

The people in Chicago, Ill., do not want to live among Negroes any more than the people in Atlanta, Ga., and proved it by staging a riot which lasted for more than a year when radicals behind the integration movement there arranged for a Negro to move into an all-white residential section. In Los Angeles, Calif., which boasts that it is broad-

minded, a long-standing custom was broken and a few Negro firemen were moved into white firehouses. This was so repulsive and disagreeable to the white firemen, who were unwilling to sleep and eat with the Negro firemen, that the fire chief of Los Angeles reestablished the all-white firehouses, and told the mayor and council they could fire him if they saw fit, but he would not order the Negroes back into the white firehouses.

President Eisenhower, in his efforts to make a second Harlem out of Washington, D. C., has, through his three appointed City Commissioners ordered a few Negro firemen into some of the white firehouses there. It is meeting with the same protest and resistance.

So diligent have the integrationists and mongrelizers become in Washington that an announcement has been made by officials of the Federal and city governments that the doors of all federally owned property will be closed to the boys' clubs of the Nation's Capital if they continue to operate as white boys' clubs and Negro boys' clubs. These clubs have been financed to the extent of $330,000 principally by white people through voluntary contributions, although there are 14,000 Negroes enrolled in the boys' clubs and only 8,000 whites. The clubs have taken boys off the streets with recreational activities in winter, and camps in summer. Yet one church in Washington has already closed the doors of a meeting place formerly used by a white boys' club, and thus deprived a group of fine white children the benefit of the wholesome influences of the boys' club program because the club and its board of governors refused to have this unacceptable intermingling forced upon them. What a fine demonstration of Christianity.

In Delaware where a school board announced mixed schools would be ordered another near riot occurred and separate schools were restored. In Washington, D. C., the mixed school order is deeply resented. White people are moving out of Washington into nearby Virginia in great numbers. In June 1955, the exodus of white people from Washington had resulted in a public school system composed of 61-percent Negro pupils and 39-percent white. These figures were reported in the U. S. News & World Report of June 10. The same article reported that white people who could afford it were moving out of predominantly Negro school districts. There is still another deplorable consequence. The article also reported, and I quote verbatim from it:

"Washington educators expressed shock at learning how far the general educational level of the Capital's Negroes is below that of the whites.

"The result, many school principals say, has been that the learning pace within most of the mixed schools has been slowed down to keep step with the general run of Negro pupils."

Thus one of the immediate and obvious results of mixing the schools in Washington is that white children will be held back because the Negro children have shown they cannot keep the pace.

This exodus of white people from Washington to avoid the mixed schools reported in June last year was not a temporary flare-up. It has not only continued; it has increased. The U. S. News & World Report 6 months later, in its November 25 issue reported as follows, and I quote verbatim from the article entitled "Mixed Schools—Second Year," as follows:

"More and more white pupils leave Washington.

"Negroes are pouring into Washington, white families leaving in droves. Result: A basic change in the population in the Nation's Capital.

"In schools 64 percent of students now are Negroes. In some residential areas, Negroes take over.

"Twenty years ago, 64 percent of the pupils in the city's public schools were white, 36 percent Negroes. Today this is reversed—64 percent Negroes, 36 percent whites. These figures are disclosed by new official count.

"Washington now has a greater proportion of Negroes in the public schools than any other large United States city."

This article also pointed out what everyone familiar with Washington knows, that the rush of white people to get out of Washington has been stepping up since 1948 when the Supreme Court, as a part of its program of usurping legislative functions, changed the law to invalidate restrictive covenants in deeds to real estate. This permitted Negroes to move into white neighborhoods, making them less desirable, and running down the value of the property.

Proof that white people do not intend to mix with Negroes, and cannot be forced to do so, is the manner in which the white people of Washington treated the order of the Federal Government abolishing segregation in federally owned swimming pools. Washington is a hot city in the summertime, and prior to the issuing of this order by the Federal Government, the white swimming pools have been crowded. When the order was issued in 1949 and 1950, it did not result in whites and Negroes swimming together, it simply resulted in the previously white swimming pools becoming Negro swimming pools, as the white people abandoned them to the Negroes.

Resentment of white people manifests itself in every section of our country—north, east, and west, as well as south over these efforts to force the unnatural practice of mixing the races. In Chicago, in many sections, a determined white population has successfully resisted forcible efforts to destroy their residential segregation pattern. This has been done although Illinois has had a governor, and Chicago has had a mayor who have sought by forcible means to ram this integration policy down their unwilling throats.

In Chicago on August 11, 1953, 1,500 persons rioted in protest over a Negro family being moved into Trumbull Park Homes in the South Deering section of the city.

The police commissioner had to send 3 shifts of 250 policemen, or 750 per day to keep down the violent rioting. On one occasion 1,250 policemen were called out.

The commissioner was quoted 16 days later, on August 27 as saying that racial disturbances had required the service of 12 percent of his 6,889 man force—in other words 826 policemen spent all of their time working with racial trouble.

Under these circumstances the battle was carried on in Trumbull Park Homes for more than a year. The Negro family was finally moved out, and then brought a damage suit against the Chicago Housing Authority. In 1 year there was more racial trouble in Chicago than in the whole South put together, and it resulted from efforts to force intermingling between whites and blacks.

Thank Almighty God that we do not have that kind of governor in Georgia willing to join hands with a packed Supreme Court and an appeasement-minded Chief Executive in destroying our Constitution. I thank Him that we have in Georgia a governor who has said:

"I speak for the people of Georgia when I say that we accept this challenge. We accept it with the firm assertion that we shall not surrender to this Court the inalienable rights of our sovereign State. We shall not surrender our right to conduct and regulate our own educational institutions. The State created them. The State built them. The State finances them. The State shall run them."

I am thankful that we have a lieutenant governor who is holding up the hands of the Governor in this crisis.

I am grateful that we have in Georgia filling the high office of attorney general an official who has the intelligence and ability to recognize this fraudulent scheme for the sorry thing it is, and the energy and courage to expose it and its backers not only to our people here at home, but in areas where hotbeds of radicalism exist in other sections of the country. I am grateful for the determined attitude of Georgia people who voted by a substantial majority to amend our Constitution so that if worst comes to worst, and the public schools in Georgia could only be operated as nonsegregated and mixed schools, this intolerable thing can be avoided by elimination of public schools entirely and the teaching of our children in private schools.

I am grateful for this legislature and its officials who are resolutely and determinedly enacting a program of legislation to keep within our own hands the conduct of our own affairs.

I am grateful for the chief justice of the Georgia Supreme Court, who wrote the opinion, and for the six associate justices who joined with him in a unanimous opinion by that court in the case of *Williams* v. *State of Georgia* in which the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia said to the Supreme Court of the United States:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. * * * (Constitution of the United States, 10th amendment). Even though executives and legislators, not being constitutional lawyers, might often overstep the foregoing unambigous constitutional prohibition of Federal invasion of State jurisdiction, there can never be an acceptable excuse for judicial failure to strictly observe it. This court bows to the Supreme Court on all Federal questions of law but we will not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State."

This was a courageous declaration by the highest Court of our State warning the United States Supreme Court to stay out of our State affairs—a declaration to one and all that the State of Georgia knows her rights, and will have them. It was a stinging and merited rebuke.

This same group of sociologists on the Federal Supreme Court, of whom only 2 out of the 9 ever had judicial experience before going on the Supreme Court bench, are throwing up some trial balloons to test public opinion upon the important question of invalidating State marriage laws, as they threw up trial balloons to test public opinion upon the segregated school issue, and to acclimatize public opinion to it before the blow was finally struck.

In Virginia the law prohibits interracial marriages, which is the case in 28 of the States of this Union. The Virginia Supreme Court pursuant to that law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman, and annulled the marriage. The Chinaman appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, and asked that Virginia's marriage law be declared in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and 27 other States if these sociologist experts felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision. They know that public opinion will not accept it, and they want to kick the case back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond to give the Communist Daily Worker, the so-called liberal press, the NAACP, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a judicial decision striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the path of mongrelization. The Supreme Court en-

tered an order vacating the judgment, and sending the case back to the State Court, for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's Courts had jurisdiction in the case.

In rejecting this further attempt of the Federal Supreme Court to meddle in affairs belonging exclusively to the State, the Supreme Court of Virginia joined the Supreme Court of Georgia in refusing to recognize the right of the Federal tribunal to remand cases to the State courts "for further action" where no ground for reversal is shown in the record. The Virginia Supreme Court on January 18, last Wednesday notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action.

It is a deplorable thing that the highest Court in our land, charged more than any other agency of our Government with the duty of preserving our Constitution, has so departed from its proper function that it now must be rebuked by State courts resisting its illegal efforts to guide them into wrong channels.

So repugnant are its sociological theories becoming that when a Federal court of appeals, following the Supreme Court's school opinion, ordered a United States district judge in Ohio to issue an order ending segregation in the grade schools at Hillsboro, Ohio, the district judge refused to issue the order, and demanded that he himself be given a hearing before the Supreme Court, and that the case be carried there in his own name.

It is a deplorable situation indeed when our people and our State courts must fight for the preservation of constitutional rights with the very agency of Government to whom we should be able to look with confidence as the ultimate guardian and protector of those rights.

But such is the situation.

As we survey the situation today we see that we in Georgia do not stand alone. We have led in this fight, and I believe the bold and courageous stand which we have taken in Georgia has been an inspiration to those in other States to brand this unconstitutional decision as an unwarranted invasion of the rights of States and of the people, and to take steps to effectively resist it.

We know that the Constitution is not, as some would have us believe, what the judges say it is. It has no such unstable or uncertain meaning. The Constitution, and all of its amendments, is the compact of the sovereign States who consented to its operation. It is the document under which we live—which we understand, and which the courts have understood for years and generations. Its meaning has been proclaimed again and gain. It is the document which every public official is sworn to uphold, and to which the loyalty of every public official is due. And let us never lose sight of this fact—that our loyalty is to the Constitution itself—not to a perverted opinion of nine men who happen for the moment to be occupying seats in the Supreme Court, and who seek because of that fact to change the true meaning, the established and accepted meaning of our Constitution. That authority does not belong to these nine men. It belongs to two-thirds of the membership of Congress and to three-fourths of the States, joining in concurrent action.

As we assert our position in this fight for our rights, determined people of other States are standing shoulder to shoulder with us.

In May of 1954 the Louisiana Legislature adopted a resolution by a vote of 84 to 3 in the house and 32 to 1 in the senate calling the Supreme Court action an unwarranted and unprecedented abuse of power, and declaring among other things that racial integration in schools is "clearly intolerable, impractical, and in the ultimate sense of the word, unenforceable upon the free people of the sovereign State." They followed that up in July 1954 by the passage of three bills by an overwhelming vote enabling Louisiana to use its inherent police power to continue public-school segregation despite the United States Supreme Court's decision. The people of that State have just elected a governor pledged to continue segregation of schools in the State.

The Legislature of Florida in July 1955 adopted a resolution proclaiming that the end of segregation in its schools would jeopardize the public health and safety; that it would tend to encourage the abhorrent, execrable, and revolting practice of miscegenation which is a criminal offense in Florida; that it would create a mongrel breed. The resolution asserted the aim of the Florida Legislature to provide equal facilities for maintaining the system of segregation in Florida's public schools and deplored any effort of the United States or any agency thereof to invade and usurp the rightful powers of the State of Florida by fostering integration of the two races in the public-school system.

The people of Virginia have voted 2 to 1 for the Gray Commission plan to retain segregated schools in Virginia. South Carolina and Mississippi have taken affirmative steps to join the increasing list of States determined to resist the unconstitutional usurpation of authority by the Supreme Court.

There is another matter which your honorable body may consider during the present session, and that is whether the Georgia Legislature wishes to adopt a resolution similar to the one which 34 of Virginia's 40 senators sponsored and introduced in that body last Thursday. The resolution provides that Virginia for its part asserts it has never surrendered its powers to maintain racially segregated schools. Secondly, Virginia challenges "the usurped authority that would inflict incalculable harm to the public schools," and would disrupt the education of her children. Thirdly, Virginia appeals to her sister States to join in applying to Congress to call a constitutional convention to oppose an amendment "designed to settle the issue of contested power here asserted."

The resolution further provides that until the question is settled "by clear constitutional amendment, we pledge our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally, and constitutionally available to us to resist this illegal encroachment on our sovereign powers."

This is a fight in which there is no halfway ground and no middle course. Halfway measures will not win this fight. Vigorous, aggressive, and continuing action is required. There are suits pending now in Savannah asking that Negroes be admitted to white public-housing projects. Federal courts have already admitted them in other jurisdictions. Suits are pending to admit them to the university and grammar and high schools. But this school segregation issue is only a part of the problem. The ultimate aim of the NAACP and its allied radical organizations is not merely to abolish segregation in the schools of the Nation. The ultimate aim is to pressure the Supreme Court into declaring our marriage laws unconstitutional, and require all States to recognize intermarriage between the races as legal.

One of the Negroes who claims to represent the views of the NAACP stated in a magazine article as long ago as 1952 that the aim of the Negro is intermarriage with white people. It is a blind person indeed who is not now aware of that purpose. Unless we reject this school decision in toto, another Supreme Court decision holding that our marriage laws violate the 14th amendment is as certain to follow as night follows the day.

In conclusion let me say to you with all the sincerity and earnestness of which I am capable that the answer to this monstrous threat we face is organization. Too long we have permitted those who plot our downfall aided by some of our own false leaders, to deceive us and lull us to sleep with assurances that Negroes only wanted equal facilities and fair treatment. They have advised the white people against taking organized action to prevent destruction of our institutions and our way of life. Events of the past few years have shown the wrongness of that attitude. The time is here now to view the situation with realism. The time is here now to organize—not for violence—not for lawlessness, but to organize to combine into one strong, unified, determined group to retain our State sovereignty which we have never surrendered; to unite with other States, their officials, and their people; to keep within our own hands the right to conduct our own affairs; and to resist vigorously, aggressively, and successfully this and any other attempt on the part of a perverted court to take from us these sacred rights which are ours—the right to conduct our own affairs in the manner we choose and the right to protect and preserve our own ways—rights which were given to us by our own parents and forebears, and which we are dutybound to hand to our children and our descendants.

Colorado River Big Steal Up in Congress Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am calling the attention of my colleagues within the House of Representatives to the keen insight and convincing argument against the upper Colorado River project expressed in the following brilliant editorial printed in the Waukegan News-Sun, of Waukegan, Ill., on Monday, January 30, 1956:

COLORADO RIVER BIG STEAL UP IN CONGRESS AGAIN

Unless you want to help pay, at the rate of $5,000 an acre, to make arid land in the Upper Colorado River Basin a crop-producing area which will cost you more money when the Federal Government has the additional crops on which to support prices, you had better write your United States Senators and Congresswoman and tell them you oppose this huge project.

The matter of the upper Colorado River development is again threatening passage in Congress. It has the blessing of President Eisenhower, but here are some of the facts about the project that vitally concern every resident of Lake County, Ill.

The project will cost about $4 billion and the taxpayers of Illinois will pay 7.5 percent of that amount. The benefits to be derived include adding 570,000 acres of arable land to the United States farming acreage to produce more crops, most of which will be added to the present surplus of crops that are such a headache to farmers and taxpayers who must pay to support the prices.

Adding 570,000 acres of farm land simply does not figure when you consider that in Illinois alone there are 621,000 acres of good farm land lying idle because of crop surpluses, and more will be made idle if the land bank agricultural program is put into operation. At present there are 20,937,155

acres of idle farmland in the United States for that same reason. Adding 570,000 more acres is not going to help the situation.

Great waves of propaganda are coming out of the four arid States in the upper Colorado River Basin. It looks like a bananza to the people there who will have the rest of the country finance their efforts to gain farm land from the deserts and boom that area for business and industry.

The greatest rub comes in the fact that the 4 States that will benefit from this golden avalanche out of the United States Treasury will pay only 2 percent of the entire bill, while the remaining 44 States in the United States will pay 98 percent of the bill. Illinois alone will contribute $276 million in tax money to build the project.

The fact that this "big dip" into the United States Treasury originally including building the much discussed Echo Park Dam and flooding part of the Dinosaur National Monument, which is now a national park, is only a minor fraction of the objection that should be voiced all across the Nation. The major objection is that taxpayers in Lake County will be called upon to help promote a big business boom in four Northwestern States at a cost that staggers the imagination.

Senator Langer Spent $2,400 Government Funds Making Trips Back to North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the reporter who took out after Senator LANGER for charging up an expense of $2,400 for trips to North Dakota really started something. LANGER is the luckiest politician I know of. He gets more publicity than anyone here, and invariably the charges against him are trivial. Several of his trips I know about, and each time he was doing a service to the people of North Dakota. His trip out in the mud to view the mistakes of the Army engineers who flooded 60,000 acres of the best land in Ramsey County unnecessarily was one trip, and all the others had to do with performing a service for the people of North Dakota. What about the other Senators and Representatives who traveled all over the known face of the earth this last summer and several summers before to view foreign countries to see what aid they could bring to people in Africa, India, Tasmania, Timbuktu, Greece, Italy, and the rest of Europe? These trips cost the Government for each Member many times LANGER's bill for attending to the people of North Dakota. Probably half of the Congress made these foreign trips, and I haven't seen any statement of what it cost the people. But let a Senator spend his time at home looking after the people of this country and the newspapers have a spasm and go into a fit of apoplexy.

While we are in this frenzy over LANGER's expense account, I am going to attempt to place before the people all the bills of the Members of the Senate and House who thought it necessary to look after the people of foreign countries. If I can do this LANGER's expense account will look like a flyspeck on the map of North Dakota.

A Bill To Amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill, a companion measure to H. R. 9065 originally introduced by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes. The increased cost of living requires an adjustment in the retirement payments of this program.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association has prepared an excellent analysis of these amendments which I wish to offer as my own statement of the bill's provisions:

[Railway Labor Executives' Association: G. E. Leighty, chairman, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Mo.; A. E. Lyon, executive secretary-treasurer, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Michael Fox, vice chairman, Suite, 1212, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill. Affiliated organizations: American Train Dispatchers' Association, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forges and Helpers, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers, International Organization Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO, Railroad Yardmasters of America, Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Switchmen's Union of North America]

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 9065 "TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937 TO PROVIDE INCREASES IN BENEFITS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

The overall purpose of the bill is to provide a 15-percent increase in benefits (with limitations hereinafter noted); to raise additional funds in the amount of 2 percent of payroll to cover the cost of the increased benefits; and to offset the burden on employees of the increased contribution by excluding the employee contribution from income for income tax purposes. It is not proposed, however, to increases the overall social security minimum or to increase the present maximum on spouses' annuities which is equal to the maximum spouse's annuity payable under the Social Security Act; consequently, annuities being paid under the social security minimum and spouse's annuities may not be increased at all or may be increased less than 15 percent.

Section 1 (a) of the bill increases the several percentages of monthly compensation used in computing employee annuities by 15 percent each. The total effect is to increase these annuities so computed by 15 percent.

Section 1 (b) revises two elecents in the minimum employee annuity formula by increasing them 15 percent. This, too, would have the effect of increasing annuities computed under the minimum annuity formula by 15 percent, with the exception that no increase is provided with respect to those annuities which under the formula are equal to the average monthly compensation that the employee earned while in active service. It should also be noted that these changes affect only the minima computed under the Railroad Retirement Act formula itself and do not affect the general minimum provision providing benefits at least equal to the benefits that would have been received if railroad employment had been covered by the Social Security Act.

Section 2 (a) of the bill relates to the residual lump sum guaranty which assures to all employees that they will either draw in benefits while living or that there will be paid to surviving beneficiaries an amount at least equal to the employees' contributions, together with an allowance in lieu of interest. This amount is computed at 7 percent of the compensation on which taxes are paid at the rate of 6¼ percent. The amendment would provide for computing this amount at the rate of 8 percent of the compensation on which it is proposed that taxes will be paid at the rate of 7¼ percent.

Section 2 (b) relates to maximum and minimum survivor annuity totals and again adjusts both maxima and minima by an upwards revision of 15 percent.

Survivor annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act formula are computed from a so-called basic amount which is defined in section 5 (1) (10) of the act. Section 2 (c) of the bill proposes an upward revision of 15 percent in the elements going into the computation of the basic amount; thus the basic amount will be 15 percent higher with the consequence that survivor annuities computed therefrom will be 15 percent higher.

Section 3 of the bill provides a flat increase of 15 percent in pensions (i. e., those taken over from the railroad voluntary pension systems), in joint and survivor annuities (i. e., those under the former option provisions) awarded before the effective date of the bill, and in annuities awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935. The preceding sections of the bill do not apply to these classes of benefits.

Section 4 of the bill amends the Railroad Retirement Taxing Act provisions of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide an increase of 1 percent in both the employer and employee contributions and an increase of 2 percent in the employee representative contributions (who now pay the equivalent of both the employee and employer contributions).

Section 5 of the bill excludes employee and employee representative contributions under the Railroad Retirement Taxing Act from gross income for income-tax purposes and from wages for the purposes of the withholding of income tax at the source. The result would be that any employees who have taxable income in an amount equal to or in excess of their railroad retirement contributions would realize an income-tax saving of at least 20 percent of such contributions; in such cases although the gross contribution under the bill would be 7.25 percent the net after income-tax savings would be 5.8 percent.

Section 6 of the bill fixes the dates on which the changes made in other sections become effective. Section 6 (a) makes the

increases in annuities (whether employee, spouse, or survivor) effective with respect to all accruals after June 1956 irrespective of whether the annuities have been therefore or thereafter awarded. The increase in lump-sum survivor benefits is made effective with respect to deaths occurring after June 1956. The increase in pension payments would be reflected in the August 1 payment to correspond with the date on which the first increased annuity payments would be made.

Section 6 (b) makes the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Taxing Act effective July 1, 1956, and specifies that the new rates shall apply to taxes on compensation for services rendered after June 1956.

Political Court?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two important and timely editorials from the Augusta Chronicle-Herald of Sunday, February 19, entitled "Political Court?" and "No Interference":

POLITICAL COURT?

The press everywhere—and the politicians also—are quite upset over the fact that Vice President NIXON has placed the United States Supreme Court squarely in the middle of the political sideshow called the presidential campaign.

While one agrees with the obvious principle that the Court should steer clear of all political affiliations and devote itself to the job of interpreting law according to the Constitution of the United States, one cannot understand why so much surprise and indignation are now rife about labeling the Court as being politically inclined.

The South found out some time ago that the Court was functioning in a role other than that of unbiased interpreter of law according to the United States Constitution.

Mr. NIXON has taken the Court into the fold of the Republican Party in claiming credit for the nonconstitutional acts of the Court in connection with civil-rights decisions.

Maybe the Vice President was a little bit too hasty in trying to win glory for the Republican Party in that way because a good many of the States, outside of the South even, are beginning to appreciate the inherent danger of a court that functions according to political and personal opinions.

NO INTERFERENCE

The action of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in launching an investigation of the jury lists in Cobb County, Ga., has had interesting repercussions in the State of Alabama.

In the Cobb County case, which was brought on by the Supreme Court's reversal of the rape conviction of a Negro man on the basis that no Negro had served on a Cobb County jury for 18 years, the FBI investigation disclosed that Negroes are permitted to serve on Cobb County juries.

At Union Springs, Ala., Circuit Judge George Wallace issued last week a strong charge to the Bullock County grand jury in the course of which he declared that the FBI investigation in Cobb County was "an unwarranted and deliberate invasion of State sovereignty by the Federal police" and "a direct insult to the people of that county and to State sovereignty."

He declared that if any similar move is ever made in any of the three counties comprising his circuit he as judge will take "such action as necessary to protect the integrity of our State courts from illegal, unwarranted, unjustified, and deliberate interference by the United States Department of Justice through the Federal Bureau of Investigation." He would, he said, order the arrest of every member of the FBI or other Federal police involved in any such investigation.

The Alabama judge pointed out that Federal agents have no more right to investigate grand juries of the State courts than Alabama has to investigate Federal grand juries.

"Unless we assert ourselves," he warned, "and if we continue to allow such Gestapo methods in local affairs, then surely local government in America will be dead forever."

This is but another instance of the stiffening of resistance to efforts of the Federal Government and the Federal courts to destroy the rights of the States.

The Alabama judge is to be commended for the courage shown in his public avowal of opposition to such tactics.

It is to be hoped that both the Federal Government and the Supreme Court will pay attention to the signals of opposition that are being hoisted throughout the land, and that the people at large will be guided by reason as well as courage in their efforts to defend their constitutional rights.

Upper Colorado River Bill Before Congress Not Approved by Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project bill now before the House does not represent the bill approved by the administration. The bill's projects are different—the administration recommended authorization of 2 storage units, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating reclamation projects, at an estimated construction cost of $930 million.

The House bill authorizes 4 storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho—and 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also in section 2 provides what is tantamount to an advance commitment of the Congress to authorize 23 additional reclamation projects.

The Bureau of the Budget definitely recommended against authorization at this time of Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. In addition, the administration recommended that the legislation provide that authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditioned on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements, with reports submitted to the Congress on each project; and that new studies of direct agricultural benefits be made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

The bill contains no provision whatever for the reevaluation so specified by the administration and hence ignores this important requirement set forth as a condition precedent to administration approval.

Financial repayment features are basically contrary to those approved and recommended by the administration. The administration set up as a requirement that all reimbursable costs of the project should be repaid in 50 years, together with interest on the unamortized balance of the investments in power and municipal water supply features.

The bill departs materially from the specified repayment criteria. It would attempt to adhere to repayment of the irrigation investment in 50 years, but would do so by the device of extending the repayment period for the power investment to not exceed 100 years, or twice the 50-year repayment period specified by the administration.

Atomic Energy and the Solid Gold Cadillac Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, production of electric power by atomic energy is not a dream of the future. The age of nuclear power is here.

Today the United States is engaged in a vital contest with the Soviets to maintain its nuclear leadership not only in weapons, but equally in economic uses of the atom's secrets. If we fail in this, then we will fail to stem the tide of ruthless, aggressive, dictatorial communism. Such a failure would not be America's alone, but would be shared by people everywhere who look to us to preserve the peace and maintain the freedom and dignity of mankind.

Yet in the midst of this deadly struggle, Congress is being asked to waste hundreds of millions of dollars worth of our resources to build hydroelectric plants as "cash registers" for irrigating arid land at high altitudes in Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. This is a project so infeasible that its water revenues could repay less than 15 percent of its cost. It is a project that could only add to the Nation's bulging agricultural surpluses.

I refer, of course, to the "solid gold Cadillac," multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage boondoggle.

If political pressures are so great in an election year that Congress cannot resist this greatest stunt since P. T. Barnum invented the "egress," at least it should be carried off in a manner minimizing its drag on the Nation's vital strength in the great battle against the Communist evil.

If Congress should insist on spending billions of dollars to put arid new land

under cultivation and at the same time enact a $1 billion a year program to deposit 40 million acres of farm land in "soil banks," then at least in the process it should provide something of national benefit to salve the welts on United States taxpayer's backs.

This can be done if Congress firmly and courageously yanks out of the bill every cent of the $504,212,000 provided for "horse and buggy" hydroelectric plants and directs this amount of money be used to build nuclear-electric facilities.

Such a substitution has a greater value merely than giving the United States nuclear-electric program a half billion dollar shot in the arm to spur it toward supremacy over the Reds. The idea may well save from ruin the already shaky financial structure of the upper Colorado scheme. It is presently based on selling 6-mill power for the next hundred years. Obviously, 6-mill power will be rendered competitively obsolete in a fraction of that time by nuclear-electric developments. Starting out with nuclear power plants, they could from time to time be modernized and bring power production costs down. Starting out with hydro plants, nothing could be done to stop them from being turned into history's most monumental white elephants by swiftly unfolding technological developments.

In short, not only do common sense tactics vis-a-vis Soviet developments demand this nuclear for hydroelectric substitution, but dollars and horse sense as well demands it.

This is particularly true because there is no need for water storage behind power dams to enable the upper basin to make the new uses of 600,000 acre-feet of water annually contemplated in the bill. Over a million acre-feet of new uses can be made without such storage. The unnecessary storage provided for hydroelectric uses would permit evaporation from extensive lakes surfaces of over 300,000 acre-feet of precious water annually—125 percent of the amount put to beneficial use.

In the water short West this is an additional and compelling reason to pull out the hydro plants and put in nuclear ones.

There is no justification for building great hydroelectric dams when atomic power can be more effectively utilized. Circumstances in these trying time do not warrant foisting this solid gold-Cadillac reclamation plan on the already overburdened United States taxpayer.

Our Mental Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the ninth of a series of articles from the Amarillo Globe-Times on the national problem of mental health:

[From the Amarillo Globe-Times of January 16, 1956]

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—HOW ABOUT TEXAS?

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

What of the other 1,047?

Texas mental hospital population took its first downturn in 30 years when the books were closed on the fiscal year of 1954–55 in August.

The overall population dropped last year by 108, just about the number of mentally ill that are sent each year from Potter County to the Wichita Falls Hospital.

But what of the other 1,047, because if Texas had reached the 7 percent decrease in hospital population that Kansas achieved in the past 5 years, 1,155 other Texans would be out of the State hospitals for the insane.

And countless thousands of others, who are on waiting lists through the State, would have been treated, as would have been thousands who hide their illness rather than be committed under a cruel and senseless law. They hide it now, perhaps, but when it is too late they will become lifelong charges of the State as they reach chronic illness, just as the physically ill, without treatment, become chronically ill.

BLUEPRINTS ARE UNUSED

In 1949 Texas and Kansas stood at exactly the same point, both had appointed special boards to act on a problem that had explosive qualities, the ricocheting advance in population of State mental hospitals.

On the minutes of the October 16, 1950, meeting of the Board of Texas State Hospitals and Special Schools is a 14-point program that is identical with that carried out by the Kansas State hospital system.

This year when the Texas Research League finished its long study of the Texas institutions, it found that only 5 of these 14 programs of reform in a perfect blueprint for care of the mentally ill have been used, even partially. One of the five was a simple modernizing of safety and fire programs.

In the care and treatment of the mentally ill, Texas is like a production superintendent who has the blueprints for a jet passenger plane—and an assembly line for single-motored trainers.

If a normally intelligent man were faced with taking over a business concern that does $20 million dollars annually found:

That he had only 16 percent of the key men needed to run the business.

That turnover of employees reached as high as 130 percent annually because there is no integrated policy for its 6,000 personnel.

That capital funds could be spent for warehousing inventory but none for hiring salesmen to sell the product.

That no one knew exactly where the merchandise was, and that a tiny bolt and an oversize tractor were stored side by side in a disorderly pile.

That the plant sprawls in isolated units over an area equal to Western Europe and the parts needed in one building may be stored 600 miles away.

That 35 percent of the plant, worth $150 million, should be immediately replaced and within 10 years will lose its total effectiveness unless more maintenance work is done.

That the plant is another $150 million short on storage space.

That he is to be faced with as much as 120 percent of new business and had no material on hand to fill the orders.

That he had no control over the source of his supply, and equally none over his sales territory.

What would he do?

He would look at his hole card. And that is just what Texans must do if they escape spending $235 million by 1975 to house the mentally ill.

You buy buildings only once. But have you thought of the fantastic cost of staffing and maintaining so many buildings in annual operating costs?

TWO BIG QUESTIONS

Texans are going to have to think through two important question:

1. What is the State's responsibility in caring for the mentally ill?

2. What plans are we going to make for an aging population?

Let us take the latter question first because we can't answer the first until we know some facts surrounding the second:

We have told you of the Massachusetts study, where comparison of hospital population showed that in the past 100 years there has been no appreciable change in the ratio per 1,000 population of patients between 20 and 50 years of age. The big increase in mental institutions today comes from those above 50 years of age. Already nationally about 30 percent of the State hospital populations are above 65.

If you think the crowded conditions in Texas hospitals are scandalous, be glad you live in Texas. This State has a relatively young population. Our percentage of over-65 citizens is much lower than the national average. Consequently only 22 percent of our hospital population is in that age group. Add the national average on older folk to our hospital population and we'd have to pitch some tents for housing.

But because we will follow the national trend toward an aging population, and with an accelerated rate since we will reach the national rate as well as increase our population, we can expect 1,132,000 Texans in the 65-and-over group by 1975, say population experts. Our State population will grow by 50 percent (to 12 million) but our aged will increase by 120 percent.

Actually, there will be an even nearer reckoning date for this problem of the aging population. It is estimated that at least 250,000—and possibly more—of aged Texans now on the public assistance and social security rolls will have no place to go for terminal illness except the State hospitals. They either have no children or their relatives cannot afford the support.

Consider a minimum cost of construction for a mental hospital bed of $9,000 and the cost of a nursing care bed at about $3,000 and you see it's good business to divert the aged senile from the hospitals and into nursing care homes.

As of now, there is no known cure of senility, any more than there is for old age. Expensive psychiatric care in the truest sense is not needed for these senile. On the other hand, no elderly person should be required to spend his last days in a psychotic ward of a mental hospital, frightened further by the knowledge from time to time of where he is.

There is no use to attempt to evade this question—unless Texans are ready to retreat to some primitive culture in which the older citizens are pushed off on an ice raft or left to starve in the jungle, we are faced with the care of an increasing number of aged.

The State hospitals for the insane are a poor answer to the question: "What plans are we making for our older population.

SENTENCE IS LIFE

The other question is "What is the State's responsibility in caring for the mentally ill?"

Fundamentally, a person of unsound mind can become as dangerous to a community as an intentioned criminal. It is upon this basis that care of the insane became the responsibility of the State.

The person who becomes mentally ill—sometimes only slightly sick, relatively speaking—is likely to become a person of permanently unsound mind unless he is treated. By every index, including that of

costly experience, the mentally ill who are shoved off in institutions lacking intensive treatment accept a sentence of lifetime illness. They retreat mighty fast from the reality of the "madhouse"—much faster than they would from their ordinary life, complex as it might have been. (In the case of the aged, Texas can depend on the greater number dying within a year after "commitment.")

The amazing success in Kansas and in other States which have tackled the problem of treatment rather than custody of the mentally ill has proved the dollar-and-cents value of a creative program of mental care.

We know the population is aging and that there must be provision for them. We might as well face the fact that untreated mentally ill Texans are going to end up in the insane wards or prisons of Texas. Economy demands a treatment program instead of costly, custodial and unending care.

But today no person can enter the State hospitals for treatment of more than 90 days without a jury trial. A jury trial to those who are mentally ill, as noted before, frequently can be the final blow that brings on chronic mental illness, just as chronic physical illness can result from repeated blows or untreated symptoms.

(If you don't think we need legislative reform, read the laws, the many, many laws in the Texas constitution surrounding the care of the mentally ill. A juror who tried to follow those laws exactly couldn't avoid sending a perfectly sane Texan to the State Hospital for the Insane. Conversely, read another way to meet all the necessary requirements of the conflicting laws, he couldn't send a frothing madman there. Since "insane," like "murder" is a legal term, better let the doctors choose who is mentally ill, and requiring treatment or custody of the State.)

LEGISLATION NEEDED

The Texas Research League on completion of its survey listed some of the legislation that must be built after the compulsory "jury trial" is eliminated by constitutional amendment.

The league drew on the talents of such men as Dr. George Stevenson, medical director of the National Association of Mental Health; Dr. Ivan Belknap, of the Department of Sociology of the University of Texas; Dr. Malcolm T. McEachern, of Chicago, universally recognized as one of the world's great authorities on hospital administration; and 14 Texas leaders in the field of mental health, including Dr. Titus Harris, chairman of the Department of Neurology and Psychiatry, University of Texas, and Dr. Robert Sutherland, director of the Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene.

The following major pieces of legislation were recommended:

Giving the board authority to operate foster home care programs, outpatient clinics, and rehabilitation programs.

Setting up a program for mentally ill children. (The league recommended the establishment, near a medical center, of a psychiatric residential treatment center for children who are mentally ill.)

Placing the nonpsychotic mentally retarded persons now in State mental hospitals in the proper facilities or discharging them.

Establishing the responsibility of adults, if economically capable, to pay costs of maintaining their parents in State hosptials and special schools.

Setting up a study commission on aging to make a thorough investigation of all of the problems of aging citizens.

Establishing legal methods whereby the cooperation of the Texas prison system and the State hospital system can be most effective in securing and caring for the criminally insane.

Transferring the State orphans' home to the State Department of Public Welfare, and the Blind, Deaf, and Orphans' Home to the Texas Education Agency.

Converting the Abilene State Hospital, where 95 percent of the population is mentally retarded, to a special school facility for the mentally retarded. (The 54th legislature passed one long-needed piece of legislation—the mentally retarded persons act.)

The league's recommendations on the handling of the criminally insane reflect the recent court decisions on insanity at the time of committing crime as opposed to true mental illness. The league suggests that the 380 criminally insane in the State prison system and the 400 to 500 in the mental hospitals be reevaluated. The psychopathic personality cannot be treated at the present time, and has no place in a mental hospital. Likewise there are insane in the prison system that can be treated and after recovery returned to the court of original jurisdiction or to the prison to serve out his sentence.

Additional legislation will be required in this field, of course.

REEVALUATION VITAL

A conspicuous omission in any legislation so far proposed in the field of the Texas mentally ill is that for the sex offender—even the one who commits only a misdemeanor.

In Kansas any sex offender may be sent to the State hospital for observation and treatment by the trial judge or on application of the defense or prosecuting attorneys.

Texas parents would rest a little easier if such treatment were enforced on the person who shows sexual aberration on first offense. The horrible crimes against our children are committed, for the most part, by those whom the authorities have had in court on earlier minor offenses.

THESE TEXANS SERVE ON HOSPITAL BOARDS

The Texas State program for the mentally ill is administered by the Board for Texas State Hospitals and Special Schools. Appointed first in 1949, members served overlapping terms of 6 years. By law, only three members can be members of the medical profession. Membership is:

Durwood Manford Smiley, former speaker of the house, chairman.

John G. Dudley, Houston, administrator of Memorial Hospital, vice chairman.

Dr. James H. Wooten, Columbus.

Rufus F. Higgs, editor and publisher, the Stephenville Empire.

Dr. Raleigh R. Ross, Austin.

James M. Windham, Livingston, contractor and former member of the house.

Mrs. Howard E. Butt,[1] Corpus Christi director of the Nueces County Tuberculosis Hospital.

Tom Tellepsen,[1] Houston, Tellepsen Construction Co.

Dr. H. R. Martin,[1] Mexia.

They control 6 mental hospitals, 4 tuberculosis hospitals, not including a new unit under construction at Harlingen, 1 hospital for epileptics, 3 geriatric homes, 3 schools for the mentally retarded, 1 school for cerebral palsied children, 1 school for blind, deaf and orphan children, the Corsicana State Home, the Texas Confederate Home for Women, the Alabama-Coushatti Indian Reservation, the State dairy and hog farm.

FOURTEEN-POINT PROGRAM FOR TEXAS STATE HOSPITALS AND SPECIAL SCHOOLS

1. Keep records that can be used for future planning.[2]

2. Start a stable employment program so that all departments in the hospital can be adequately staffed.

3. Start intraining programs to overcome present (and future) shortages in trained help.

4. Improve diagnosis, care, and treatment of patients.

5. Start research programs to find new methods of treatment.

6. Renovate and modernize buildings.[2]

7. Build a rehabilitation program that can be used for the care and treatment of patients from the time they enter institutions until they are reabsorbed in home community life.

8. Bring hospital standards to approval rating by American College of Surgeons, the American Psychiatric Association and other professional approving agencies.

9. Resurvey all patients and see that proper followup studies are made on each chronic and acute patient.[2]

10. Install a modern fire and safety program.[2]

11. Develop efficient and effective hospital administration through better administration and business methods.

12. As all citizens are actually stockholders in State institutions, programs of educational information to them should be started.

13. Develop a program for the best care of aged patients.[2]

14. Start outpatient clinics and day hospitals for use of mentally ill who do not yet need hospital care.

---

[1] New members.

[2] Only five programs even partially started in December 1954, according to Texas Research League survey. The 14-point program is on the minutes of a board meeting of October 16, 1950.

Cut Expenses, Reduce Debt, Lower Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial comment from the Steuben Republican, Angola, Ind. It expresses some sound views with respect to our national fiscal situation:

CUT EXPENSES, REDUCE DEBT, LOWER TAXES

With the prospect of the present Federal fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, with a balanced budget and a litle more to the good, the question arises whether to reduce taxes, increase expenditures, or pay a token amount upon the national debt now at an all-time high of $288 billion. At some time or other promises to do all of these things have been made by the present administration in its campaign propaganda, but obviously some choice must be made of the relative importance of these demands.

Candidates for office will urge most strenuously to reduce taxes. Second, to increase expenditures and, perhaps, if necessary, let the payment on the debt go hang. It is well to consider the impact of these various proposals upon our national economy. Reduction of tax rates will be greeted briefly with hearty approval and lowered taxes will leave more money for the private owner to expand in the development of his business and ultimately an enlargement of his income so that the remaining tax burden will be more easily met.

A token payment on the national debt has advantages in stabilizing the credit of the Government and making easier the sale of refunding bonds. The recognition of the fact that the national debt could only be paid now if every dollar of privately owned property were turned in for that purpose and the fact that debt doesn't seem to worry people nowadays tend to discourage any payment whatever. Nevertheless, acknowledgment of the fact that sometime the debt must be paid and that every possible effort to that end should be made when the country is in a prosperous condition, would have a wholesome effect on the confidence of the

people in their Government. The example would be a wholesome one to apply in private finances.

If the tenor of the people in this area can be used as a guide, increased expenditures would be the least desirable method of disposing of the modest surpluses we are about to enjoy. On the contrary, present expenditures should be drastically reduced. People do not enjoy being taxed to send money to nations around the world while the financial problems at home are becoming almost unbearable.

We believe the following program would be generally approved: Reduce expenses, reduce the debt in a token amount, and lower taxes proportionately.

With the prospect of a balanced budget and an election in the offing it will be well for voters to remember that our national budget has been balanced only twice in the past 20 years, and on both occasions it was done by a Republican Congress.

Tanks for Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body the following editorial Tanks for Middle East, which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) News on February 20. I believe a congressional investigation of this Middle East fiasco is very much in order.

The editorial reads:

TANKS FOR MIDDLE EAST

The episode of the 18 American tanks for Saudi Arabia indicates that the State Department's handling of the entire Middle East crisis leaves a lot to be desired. It may well warrant investigation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, although the Senate at the moment has a first-class domestic crisis on its hands in the aftermath of the natural gas bill.

First the Saudi Arab shipment had to be embargoed by the White House so that the State Department could explain to President Eisenhower how such first-class heavy equipment happened to be en route to the explosive Middle East. This was at the very time the United States was withholding weapons from Israel to avoid encouraging an arms race in the area.

Finally—and within 48 hours—the White House lifted the embargo when it was convinced by the State Department that the Saudi Arabia transaction had been approved prior to Egypt's arms deal with Czechoslovakia. It was this deal that prompted Israel to make its own urgent request for some 50 million dollars worth of American arms.

Obviously the lifting of the embargo as well as the initial sale to oil-rich Saudi Arabia also took into consideration that in June an agreement must be renegotiated for the United States Air Force to remain at its Dhahran air base, which is within striking distance of the Soviet Baku oilfields.

However legitimate the shipment and whether or not it leads to more favorable action on Israel's request, the matter was badly handled by the State Department. The situation in the Middle East is critical enough without this obvious confusion among those who administer our policy.

Upper Colorado Storage Scheme Cries for Additional Hearings Before Presentation to House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River storage scheme should have much more study by the House Interior Committee on testimony of witnesses, and upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget before it ever comes before the House.

The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects thereof have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget.

On the contrary, the reports received from those agencies recommended authorization of only 2 storage units, Glen and Echo—1 of which, Echo, has been excluded from the pending bill, H. R. 3383, although it is included for authorization in the bill, S. 500, passed by the Senate—and 11 reclamation projects. However, with respect to the 11 reclamation projects, the draft of legislation recommended by the Secretary of the Interior specified that their economic justification should be reexamined before construction should proceed. This request is ignored and omitted from H. R. 3383.

The bill proposes authorization of three storage units, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, Curecanti, which were not approved for authorization by the Secretary and the Budget Bureau.

Moreover, the Secretary and the Budget Bureau have never reported upon or approved the proposed repayment provisions of H. R. 3383, particularly the 100-year repayment period proposed for power features of the project. On the contrary, a 50-year repayment of the power investments was specified by these agencies, with interest on the unamortized investment.

In the recent report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy transmitted to the Congress by the President, it was concluded and recommended that the economic life of reclamation projects should not be considered to exceed 50 years for evaluation purposes. Of course, the proposal in the pending bill of 100 years repayment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. Even in the case of the major storage unit proposed for authorization, Glen Canyon, which is estimated to produce some 85 percent of the prospective power revenues, the evidence available indicates that there are serious questions with respect to the geologic formations of the reservoir affecting the functioning of this unit which demand further investigation before authorization. Moreover, the plans for the dam itself and its probable cost have not been adequately determined, lending uncertainty to the financial soundness of this unit which is set up to be the cash register of the upper basin development.

All these unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in H. R. 3383 should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project, with its intricate web of engineering and financial arrangements, cries out for such a review.

International Labor Organization: A Conspiracy for the Propagation of World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, America's continued participation in the International Labor Organization has been questioned. A report on ILO was prepared at the direction of the fourth district Americanism chairman of the American Legion, Department of Ohio. The resolution resulting from such report was unanimously adopted by Madeira Post, No. 412, the American Legion, Department of Ohio, on January 18, 1956.

Both the report and the resolution throw considerable light on the issues involved and I am, therefore, requesting that they be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may have the benefit of the study made by this agency of the American Legion.

The report and resolution follow:

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION: A CONSPIRACY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF WORLD COMMUNISM

How many of you have even a remote knowledge of the International Labor Organization (ILO)? Are you aware of the extent to which it can control our daily lives? Unfortunately, few citizens realize the depths of communistic socialism that will engulf them if this agency continues to receive support from our Government.

During the current session, Congress will be asked to increase our financial support of the ILO from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year. This would amount to the United States furnishing over 25 percent of operating capital for the International Labor Organization. The appropriation provision of Senate Joint Resolution 97, if approved, will be one more example of American taxpayers' money supporting a little-known organization that is rapidly being dominated by Soviet Russia.

One of the greatest threats to our American way of life is contained in the provisions

of the ILO charter. This particular section states that any convention drafted by the ILO, and ratified by a member nation, becomes treaty law. This treaty law would then become the supreme law of our land. It would be in force over our Constitution. Article VI of our Constitution supports this contention that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land.

There is a very real belief among the delegates to the ILO that this body does in fact represent a world parliament. Under the "Declaration of Philadelphia" the ILO is empowered to consider any subject that in any way directly or indirectly may have any possible bearing upon the welfare of the workingman. Under this broad analogy it may presume to enact proposed international laws on any subject under the sun irrespective of the fact that the peoples of the United States of America have always fought for their inherent and God-given rights under our Constitution, to have the laws of this Nation written by our own elected representatives and not by the representatives of foreign nations.

Let us now review a few of the provisions that have come under consideration during the recent ILO conventions. Bear in mind if these conventions are ratified by our Government representatives, they will be the law by which we are irrevocably bound.

The subject of codetermination was considered by the ILO. This term defined, means that one-half of the board of directors of a company are to be chosen by management, and the other half of the board of directors are to be chosen by the union. Both would have equal voice in the management of a company. Under this combined directorship issues resulting in deadlock would be resolved by a third party. The third party, under the proposed system, would be Government. This was the Socialists' thinking to destroy free collective bargaining.

In 1951 the ILO passed a recommendation on collective bargaining agreements. This gives government the power to negotiate, conclude, revise and renew collective bargaining agreements. Under this, a union would present its terms to government, and government would decide the contract to be put in force. This convention also gives government the power to impose closed-shop conditions throughout entire industries.

In 1952, the ILO produced a convention on minimum standards for social security. If ratified, this would destroy all private insurance companies in the United States. Government would be obligated to pay all benefits. You, the taxpayer, would pay the Government.

Also in 1952 there resulted a maternity convention. Upon ratification, our Government would be campelled to guarantee avery expectant mother (even though she be unwed) 12 weeks off from work to have her baby. In addition, the Government would have to pay her hospital and medical bills plus two-thirds of her regular salary. When the mother returned to work her baby would be kept in Government-operated nurseries at her place of employment and she would be given time off each day to nurse the baby. A Government bonus would be paid every mother who nursed her baby with her own milk. If the infant receives a bottle instead, the Government pays for the milk.

During this particular convention an entire half day was spent debating whether or not international law should contain a provision that a mother should nurse her baby for a 1-hour period or 2 half-hour periods during the day. France held out for 2 half hours, and Israel for 1 full hour. As a result no conclusion was reached on this particular subject.

Representation in the ILO is supposed to be tripartite. This means there are three representative classes from each nation; namely, labor, management, and government. Russia's admittance in 1954 is in direct violation to the original concept of the ILO constitution. Since there are no free associations of workers and employers in Russia, she could not possibly qualify and should have been refused admittance. Yet, Russia has been seated with her satellite nations, and ironically holds a voting majority of 32 votes for the Iron Curtain countries to 4 votes for the United States.

The vote to seat the Soviet Union and her followers was 93 to 83. One tricky maneuver of the Russians to achieve this voting majority lies in the fact that Russia did not gain admittance to the ILO as an individual country with 4 votes, but was accepted as 3 separate countries, Russia, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine, with a total voting strength of 12 votes for actually a single representation. The Soviets, however, did not accord the United Sattes 48 independent representations with 4 votes for each of her States even though this would carry the identical logic.

Following the 37th International Labor Conference of the ILO, a Russian version was released. It was headed "The Agitators at the Conference Rostrum." Its caustic condensation of slanderous accusations is sufficient proof of Russia's intentions to dominate and control all conferences of the ILO. The following quote is in its entirety taken from the Russian release:

"The presence of delegates from the U. S. S. R., Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the democratic people's republics at the conference was undoubtedly a source of anxiety for the representatives of Wall Street and for the reactionary leaders of the American trade union organizations. Fearful of being unmasked in the eyes of the work people as enemies of peace and international cooperation, in common agreement they sought to slander the people's democracies and to deprive them of their right to take part in the work of the conference, making them the target of inflammatory speeches and organized attacks.

"The signal for the attack was given by Mr. McGrath, American employer delegate, together with a United States Government delegate. Both uttered cries of alarm, as if the ILO was threatened in its very existence by the reentry of the U. S. S. R. into the organization and both levelled calumnious abuse against the representatives of directors of Soviet undertakings and against the Soviet trade unions."

"Once the signal for anti-Soviet attack had been given, little time was lost by Delaney, one of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor who considers himself as a representative of the American workers.

"From the conference rostrum, Mr. Delaney, a fomenter of war and servant of the American monopolists, voiced his extreme dislike of the Soviet Union's return to the ILO, fearing cooperation with the peoples of the democratic countries. He slandered them with the old false accusations, long since disproved, of the forced labor practiced in these countries and of the absence of free trade unions in the U. S. S. R. and the people's democracies.

"Delaney's inflammatory attack has once again shown the trade union agents of America imperialism for what they really are. Not by oversight but with full intention, Delaney concealed the fact, known to all, that real forced labor exists in the United States and in its hangers-on. The delegates of the democratic countries were quick to take the floor and recall these truths to Delaney's mind."

No comment of the above is necessary other than this statement appears in a report under the heading "Organisation Internationale Des Employeurs, Secretariat General" datelined "Brussels, September 21, 1954, 33, rue Ducale."

Cincinnati can well be proud of the fact that William L. McGrath is a dissenting member of the governing body of the International Labor Organization. He has been waging a one man battle to protect our country from the Communist-dominated socialistic objectives of this treacherous organization. McGrath's basis for such action is contained in his statement before the 1954 conference. He asked:

"What will remain of the tripartite nature of this body, if we admit a solid block of 28 votes none of which represent free workers or employers, and all of which are under the direct dictation of the Kremlin?

"I charge that the purpose of the attempted reentry of Russia into the ILO is that of disrupting this organization and using it as a springboard for Communist propaganda.

"Unless steps are immediately taken to preserve the status of the tripartite structure of this organization as originally conceived and practiced for so many years, it is my intention to recommend to my Government, to my nominees and to the employers of the United States that they refrain from sending future employer delegations to this conference."

William L. McGrath has personally recommended to the President of the United States that under present conditions the United States withdraw from the International Labor Organization and grant it no further financial support.

EARL W. BARR,
Chairman, Americanism Committee, Fourth District, Department of Ohio, The American Legion; Member, National Counter-Subversive Activities Commission.

NEIL E. WETTERMAN,
Research Director, Americanism, Committee, Fourth District, Department of Ohio, The American Legion.

As a result of the preceding report on the International Labor Organization, American Legion Post, No. 412, Madeira, Ohio, passed the attached resolution with unanimous approval on January 18, 1956. In addition, appropriate remarks together with the resolution were made a matter of record at the fourth district conference, department of Ohio, on January 22, 1956.

RESOLUTION—INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Whereas World War I was officially concluded by the Treaty of Versailles, and part XIII of that treaty created the International Labor Organization. The ILO was officially established at Basel, Switzerland, as an agency of the League of Nations in 1919; and

Whereas as early as 1919, many loyal Americans suspected that the ILO was a clever effort to promote international socialism and as such the Senate of the United States refused to ratify part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles; and the United States could not, therefore, participate officially in the International Labor Organization; and

Whereas in 1934, the then President of the United States of America sponsored a joint congressional resolution which authorized our participation, and we have been an active member ever since; and

Whereas the original objective of the ILO has been completely subverted. Instead of trying to promote better conditions for the workingman, the ILO is now chiefly concerned with trying to gain more power for government. In recent years, the great majority of its proposals have had to do with government regimentation, government control, government regulation, and government dictation. It has sought to inject detailed government control into collective bargaining, insurance, medicine, employment agen-

cies, the nursing of babies, factory canteens and cafeterias, the upbringing and schooling of young people on the farms, determination of wages, migration of workers, etc., thereby invading internal domestic affairs which properly belong within the realm of self-government, and setting up a pattern for the socialist state. The ILO has ceased to be an International Labor Organization and has become an international government organization; and

Whereas the ILO has set up what it calls a technical assistance program, under which it sends out experts all over the world, presumably to show people, particularly in underdeveloped countries, how to improve productivity, but, as a matter of actual fact, devoting their efforts largely to propagandizing on behalf of the ILO socialistic concepts and helping government set up social security systems, labor departments, statistical services, cooperatives, insurance schemes, etc. Here again the emphasis is not upon the welfare of the workingman, but upon showing government how they can get more control over the lives of men. It is therefore not surprising that the Russians offered to supply the ILO with all the experts required to man its technical assistance program. By this device, Communist agents could be planted in every country in the world; and

Whereas the welfare of labor has long since ceased to be the main topic of discussion at the plenary sessions of the ILO Conferences. The subject of labor is used chiefly as an excuse to argue political ideologies. In recent years the ILO has become in fact an international debating society at which the advocates of socialism and the advocates of communism compete with each other for the followers among the nations of the world, with the American free competitive system disregarded and actually labeled as "long since outmoded and still lingering" by some quirk of fate. The re-entry of the Russians, abetted by their satellites, has stepped up the tempo of this ideological debate to such a point that the ILO has become to all intents and purposes merely an international forum for Communist propaganda, with many hours of speeches devoted to damning the United States and our free competitive system. Meanwhile the underdeveloped nations of the Far East, just emerging into industrialism, resentful of American prosperity and European colonialism, have attempted to form an Asian bloc against the United States position. In short, the original purpose of the ILO, that of helping the workingman, has now become hopelessly lost in a welter of conflicting political considerations and social and economic ideologies; and

Whereas the question of nationalization of industry is ever present in the ILO considerations. All Communist industry is nationalized. Many of the Far Eastern countries, such as Burma, have what they term a "mixed" economy with about half of the nations' industry nationalized and the other half under private ownership. Government and labor representatives from such countries lean toward nationalization. In England the coal mines are nationalized. Much ILO thinking and planning, therefore, is done on the assumption that worldwide nationalization of all industry is inevitable. The promotion of nationalization, therefore, has assumed much greater importance in the ILO than the welfare or freedom of the individual workingman. This is just another instance of the way in which the ILO has subverted its original intent to campaign on behalf of more power and control by government; and

Whereas there is apparently a very real belief upon the part of many of the delegates to the ILO that this body does in fact represent a world parliament. In fact, its director general made a statement to this effect. Under the declaration of Philadelphia, the ILO is empowered to consider any subject that in any way directly or indirectly may have any possible bearing upon the welfare of the workingman. On this assumption it map resume to enact international laws on any subject under the sun. This it is proceeding to do, even though the provisions of such laws have to do with the internal domestic affairs of member nations. The idea of doing something to help the workingman has been lost sight of in the light of the possibility that the ILO has actually within it the making of a world government whereby the ILO delegates, on their supreme wisdom, can plan Socialist legislation for the entire world, on a uniform basis, so that government could take over everything and dictate the minute affairs of every individual citizen; and

Whereas since the admission of the U. S. S. R. to the International Labor Organization in May of 1954, the Communist ideology has become a dominating and alarming factor. This danger is increased to the extent that ratification of any ILO Conference by the United States results in a mandated treaty by which we are irrevocably bound; and

Whereas the Communist countries have actually obtained ILO membership in violation of the original concept of its constitution which is based upon a tripartite system. This is verified by the fact that free associations of workers and management are nonexistent in Russia and her satellite nations. In addition we are in the minority at the ILO Conferences by a voting ration of 32 Communist representatives to 4 American representatives, and yet we finance this organization to the tune of over 25 percent of its international appropriation; and

Whereas this illegal entry into the ILO by Russia, puts Russia and her satellite nations in a strong position to gain voting control of the ILO and dictating to the working peoples of the United States of America; and

Whereas we of the American Legion and the peoples of the United States of America, have always fought for the inherent and God-given rights under our Constitution, to have the laws of this Nation written by our own representatives and not by the representatives of foreign countries; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Madeira Post, No. 412, Department of Ohio, American Legion, meeting in duly constituted session this 18th day of January 1956, That the members of the National American Legion and its national commander, call upon the Congress and the President of the United States of America to withdraw financial and legal support of the International Labor Organization; and be it further

Resolved, That we of the National American Legion will fight unto death if necessary, the right of government by the people, of the people, and for the people of the United States of America.

Copies of this resolution shall be promptly forwarded to the fourth district commander, the department executive committee, department of Ohio, and to the national executive committee, the American Legion for consideration and action. Further, copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to our proper congressional Representatives, urging them to support this resolution fully and to be guided accordingly when the matter of the ILO comes before the House of Representatives, or the Senate of the United States.

CHARLES JOHNSON,
Commander, Post No. 412, the American Legion, Department of Ohio.
THOMAS FLICK,
Adjutant, Post No. 412, the American Legion, Department of Ohio.

Executive Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial entitled "Executive Vice President," which appeared in the February 19, 1956, edition of the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital.

I call this editorial to the attention of Congress because I feel it is an excellent analysis of a problem with which we are all concerned. It also illustrates the great interest of the public at large in new measures which will strengthen the operation of our Federal Government. And I might add that it serves as still another reminder that the American newspaper plays an important role in keeping the Nation well informed.

The editorial follows:

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

While the world awaits President Eisenhower's historic decision on a second term in the White House, there is considerable concern regarding the burdens of the Presidency in these times .

Perhaps the complexities and responsibilities of the high office are too great for any one man to carry alone, whether he be Mr. Eisenhower or some other statesman.

With today's shrinking world and the United States firmly entrenched in the role of world leader, the Presidency of the United States is more than that—it actually is the leadership of the free world.

Even the far-sighted founders of this great country could not have envisioned today's complex world or the added responsibilities it has brought to the office of President.

We believe the time has come, whether or not Mr. Eisenhower is a candidate, to give the Vice President a greater share of the routine duties now handled by the President. The President, of course, would remain the Chief Executive. The Vice President would be elevated to Executive Vice President.

It is interesting to note that the founders of our country believed the Vice President should be a leading statesman. They believed he should be the person who received the second highest number of votes for the Presidency. But in 1800 the struggle for the Presidency which took place between Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr brought about a change.

Today the Vice President's principal duty is to preside over the Senate, but this simple duty has brought little importance to the office. And in that position he has little influence. He casts the deciding vote in case of a tie, but as presiding officer he is hedged in with rules to prevent him from influencing the deliberations.

Yet, the Constitution provides that if the President dies or becomes disqualified for holding office he shall be succeeded by the Vice President. This has occurred seven times, each time through death of the President.

We think it's good reasoning that since the Vice President may at any time be called upon to assume the Presidency that he be given more responsibilities and be better informed on the important problems at hand.

Some authorities on Government have held that the office of Vice President is too weak. They say any congressional committee chairman can exercise more power, and

as a result men of high ability usually do not seek the office. Even such great statesmen as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson have failed to make the Vice Presidency a very important job.

The trend to add importance to the position was started by Warren G. Harding. He was the first President to invite the Vice President to hold a seat in the Presidential Cabinet. Calvin Coolidge, however, attended irregularly. Vice President Dawes refused to sit in Coolidge's Cabinet, believing it unwise to function both in the legislative and executive branches.

Herbert Hoover invited Topeka's Charles Curtis to attend Cabinet meetings "in order to acquaint him with what was going on." Franklin D. Roosevelt repeated this policy during his administration.

Another step to provide more duties for the Vice President came in 1949 during the Truman administration when the Vice President became a member of the National Security Council.

And from the day he became President, Mr. Eisenhower has used Vice President NIXON more than any President used a Vice President.

It would seem that these recent Presidents, aware of the increasing physical and mental strain of the office, thought it wise to include the Vice President in activities even beyond his normal duties as outlined in the Constitution. Such action gave the Vice President a greater share in Government administration.

During the present administration, Mr. NIXON has presided over the Security Council meetings in the absence of the President.

Because the office of Vice President has little importance under our present system, only three since Thomas Jefferson have been elected President.

The Vice President must have the same qualifications for office as the President, since he may succeed him. But it seems we are doing little to prepare him for that important task.

We believe this matter is so important that Congress should give serious thought to a program that would relieve the President of routine responsibilities, and at the same time give the Vice President a greater share of these responsibilities.

Big Brother and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two logical editorial which appeared on successive days in the Palestine Herald-Press, Palestine, Tex. The first is entitled "Big Brother" and it was followed the next day by "The Record of Foreign Aid."

The editorials follow:

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press of December 29, 1955]

BIG BROTHER

Let a bully threaten a little boy, and the little one will run for his big brother.

But if big brother takes on the job of constantly protecting the little one, little brother won't even try to protect himself, and little brother, instead of being helped, is actually weakened by his big brother's solicitation. For there'll be the inevitable time when little brother will get in trouble and big brother won't be able to get there fast enough.

Now expand on that fact a little.

Children are only miniature people. The psychology of children is the psychology of adults.

And nations are like people. The psychology of people is the psychology of nations.

Right now, in the psychology of people and nations, the United States is acting the part of an overzealous big brother to a whole passel of smaller tykes among nations who have long since passed the stage of hoping we'll take care of them. They now believe our protection is their right.

The result of this attitude is sadly obvious. In years of trying to build up "joint" defense, with United States troops scattered throughout the world to back up local forces, this country has succeeded nowhere. The simple reason other countries have not built their defenses is that they, like little brother, prefer to let us do their spending, and their defending, and, if necessary, their fighting for them.

For proof of this, take a look at Turkey, the only bright star in the dark sky of anti-Communist defenses. Turkey is not a "Western" nation, and, therefore, has gotten little of the bounty the United States has passed around so generously elsewhere. The Turks, uncomfortably close to the Russian giant, have maintained stout defenses all along. They haven't waited for big brother.

It is possible, of course, that if the United States hadn't committed itself to defend smaller Western nations, some of them might have been gobbled up by Russia before now. But it is also likely that if the United States had not been so lavish in its protections and promises and handouts to our so-called allies, that the small Western nations long before now would have built creditable defenses of their own and united them.

In other words, it may be proper for the United States to act as a big brother to threatened free nations, but perhaps we are actually weakening the defenses of the free world by carrying our big brother act too far.

If these are facts, they have not impressed themselves on our national leadership in either political party.

We threw away billions in foreign-aid giveaways through the tenure of President Truman. And under the leadership of the Republican Party we have continued the process.

Now it is reported that the Eisenhower administration plans to ask Congress for power to commit the United States to a 10-year program of economic aid to friendly nations. Tht is carrying the giveaway to a new extreme. Until now Congress has been willing to extend foreign aid on a year-to-year basis.

A 10-year promise of protection by big brother would delay by that length of time any serious effort by our smaller allies to build their own defense to full potential.

We should be talking reduction of foreign commitments, not expanding them. And we should tell our little brothers very bluntly we are no longer willing to take up their fights unless they are willing to do some of their fighting for themselves.

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press of December 30, 1955]

THE RECORD OF FOREIGN AID

As President Eisenhower is reported planning to ask Congress for a 10-year executive authority to pass out American billions in foreign economic aid, the logical question is: What good will it accomplish?

On the record of past performance, it won't accomplish much, if anything.

Foreign economic aid is referred to by a variety of complimentary names by those internationalists among Americans who support the aid on the basis of charity. But the average American taxpayer, preparing right now to stage another battle with his annual income-tax papers, thinks of foreign aid on only one basis—defense of the United States against Russian aggression.

This average taxpayer realizes tht this country must have allies, that American bases must be maintained in other parts of the world, to attempt to stop an attack on this country before enemy planes reach our shores. He knows that we can retain these bases, now ringed around the perimeters of Russia and her satellites, only if we make them profitable to nations where they are located.

He is convinced, then, that a certain amount of spending of his money overseas is necessary. But he has a right to wonder if the excessive spending by this country into the coffers of foreign nations—some of them extremely doubtful as allies—has bought us anything worthwhile.

For the record, 10 years of foreign aid by the United States in which we have given away $51 billion has certainly not stopped Russian aggressions and expansions.

Since 1945, communism, at the dictation of the Kremlin, has conquered between 700 and 800 million people by force, including the European satellites of Russia, Yugoslavia, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Outer Mongolia.

The Communists, with Russian advisers liberally sprinkled among their Chinese brothers, didn't hesitate to launch war in Korea. They are threatening a new war now, against Formosa, the remnant of Free China we are pledged to protect.

There has not been a single instance in these past 10 years in which this country or its allies have been able to shove communism out of an area it has seized. We have not been able to restore Germany as a sovereign nation, although Russia, our former ally, was committed to a joint program of occupation and restoration.

In other words, the record of the past 10 years has been one of Communist gains and free world losses.

Our great outpouring of funds, our attempt to offset the Iron Curtain with a curtain of American gold, has not accomplished protection for free nations.

In many cases, our aid program has actively helped the enemy. Our money and military goods, poured into threatened areas, frequently have fallen intact into the hands of the Communist invaders.

It is extremely doubtful that American economic aid will prevent future Communist aggressions.

Congress should look long and critically at all plans for foreign aid. Concrete plans for bolstering actual defense are worthwhile and should be approved. But foreign aid on the basis of charity or one-worldism should be denied.

We have to be realistic about handing over American wealth to foreign friends, particularly the doubtful ones who make up the majority. For we do nothing whatever to bloster the defense of the free world by weakening its one great power—the taxpaying ability of the people of the United States of America.

With Malice Toward None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

Hon. James A. Farley at the annual dinner of the Peekskill Lincoln Society, held at the Bear Mountain Inn, Bear Mountain, N. Y., on February 11, 1956:

WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the annual dinner, Peekskill Lincoln Society, Bear Mountain Inn, Bear Mountain, N. Y., February 11, 1956)

To any American, the opportunity to talk to his fellow citizens about Lincoln is an honor, and also an exercise in humility. I am not going to presume on the opportunity. Many men have spent their whole lives studying and writing about Lincoln. I know very well that I could not add to their efforts. So I hope instead you will let me talk for a few minutes about a very great man, who for years has been a guiding star in many of the problems with which I have been confronted.

One of the proofs of Lincoln's greatness is that he does have something to say to everyone, high and low, rich and poor, no matter what his occupation. Most of us who have briefly emerged in national affairs will swiftly pass. Great men do not pass; and Lincoln was one of these.

I am very glad that his old associate and friend, William Henry Herndon, who was angry at seeing Lincoln made into a legend, decided to try to collect the material which would paint a picture of the man. Herndon, you remember, had known him as a country lawyer, a neighbor, a politician, a district worker, a job seeker, and a friend. It was his simple faith that the more people knew about the real Lincoln the greater he would be.

For this reason, Herndon spent the latter years of his life in bringing together everything he could find about Lincoln, good or bad, big or little. As a result, we have not a picture of an angel in a church window but a knowledge of the man, great enough to give inspiration to every American; a Lincoln so human that everyone of us feels he has had him for a friend. Not many men in history could pass that test.

A famous New York newspaperman, Don Seitz, used to spend much of his time outside his job in studying Lincoln. At the close of many years' work of this kind, he made this statement, "I would have Lincoln freed from all the sentimentality that has enmeshed him, from the embraces of the sob sisters of fiction and those who try to tie him to romance and religion, to stand forth coldly and clearly in his highest form as an American politician of the first rank".

I do not know that Lincoln's principal significance is as a politician but that was certainly one of his great contributions and it is worth thinking about a little in these times.

There is a striking contrast between the view which was held about Lincoln while he was alive and the personality which has emerged since his death. It is not easy for us today to believe that Lincoln was pictured in his lifetime as a weak man. It was said that he did not follow a clear line of policy; that he wavered; and that he was dominated by stronger men around him. It has taken a good many years for the history books to make us realize that none of these judgments, which were freely passed by his contemporaries, was even remotely true.

Being a first-class political leader, Lincoln had the wisdom to call in and consult all sorts and kinds of men. Again with fine political instinct he frequently allowed his visitors to believe that they were really initiating the policy of the country. More than one man of the period published his diary or papers and showed that he was laboring under the delusion that he, and not Lincoln, carried off many of Mr. Lincoln's best strokes. Only later, as the whole truth comes out, have we discovered that it was Mr. Lincoln who made the policy, though he was humble enough and adroit enough to allow lesser men to believe that they were running the Government.

Somewhat the same thing is true of his alleged indecision. We know today that he was constantly calculating the political support needed to bring the Union together. He was constantly trying to bridge the wide gaps between all sorts of groups. Each one of these groups thought they had the only method of saving the country; yet Mr. Lincoln knew that if the country was to be saved he needed to get them all working together.

This, I think, explains a good deal of the misunderstanding of the time. What seemed like hesitation then we now know was really a long and carefully thought-out campaign to bring group after group nearer to common ground, and on that common ground to build the political structure which enables a democratic government to function. It was politics, if you please. It was cruel to the President but it saved the country.

And today, 91 years after his death, we honor the man who was great enough to think out that political structure, humble enough to permit other men to take the credit for it, and brave enough to stand, without complaint, the endless amount of criticism and abuse which it aroused.

This is a model worth following and it is worth remembering when loose tongues are raised against the people on whom falls the burden of carrying the country through difficult times.

Mr. Lincoln is frequently thought of as a war President. Yet the policy which has made him great in American history was his persistent use of political methods. He was convinced that wherever political measures could be used force might be avoided. He stuck to this both before and in the middle and at the end of the Civil War.

Politics, as he practiced it, was a means by which people are brought to agree on a line of action; brought to agree in numbers great enough so that the policy can be carried out. He was no stranger to all of the means that were used at the time. They were, in fact, much the same means as those which are used today. Politics has not changed in the past 91 years except that, I really believe, it is cleaner and less devious today than it was then.

So we find Lincoln endeavoring to make political compromises, rather than to force the issue which led to the Civil War. He differed on the point from many of his colleagues and rivals. Seward, a capable New York politician, had taken a position which represented the opinion of New York but did not give enough common ground on which the entire country could stand.

Lincoln's antislavery sympathies were certainly as strong as Seward's. But when he made his famous campaign in 1860 he was careful to emphasize those elements which would hold the country together, rather than those which would split it in two. Let me be bold enough to risk a theory of my own as to the history of that period.

It seems to me at least possible that if Lincoln had taken office immediately upon his election in November 1860, instead of having to wait until March of 1861, the Civil War might possibly have been avoided. The reason I think so is this:

Passions were running high in 1860 and the only chance of avoiding the Civil War lay in bringing together, by political methods, the moderates, both of the North and of the South.

But during the months between election and the inauguration, a President-elect cannot do very much to guide political movements. He is obliged to leave the holdover President as free as he can, and President Buchanan seemed obviously unable to handle the situation.

Lincoln was doing his best to see that the extremists in the North did not force matters to an impossible point and he was trying, so far as he could, to establish contact with the more thoughtful Southerners who realized the dangers which would come from forcible uprising. Actually, the moderates in both the North and South probably were a majority.

Yet the people who were making the most noise were the extremists. On both sides of the Mason and Dixon line they were building up hatred, at a time when Lincoln's policy was to build up understanding. Until he actually reached the White House there was not a great deal he could do and during that fatal period emotions were being aroused all along the line. If ever we needed Lincoln, the politician, it was then.

No one can prove an historical "might have been," but having had some contact with politics, I really wonder whether Lincoln's very great gifts in handling politics and politicians might not have been able to bring about a solution by political methods instead of by war.

There is a lesson to be learned from this. Today we can go over the history of that period and we can see that the extremists on both sides were probably wrong. We know that Lincoln was not the uncouth and brutal figure which some southern hotheads made him out. The southern group who felt so bitterly, obviously were sincere and thought they knew what they were talking about, and yet they were dead wrong and history proves it.

Those northern extremists who thought Lincoln was a floundering weakling were equally mistaken. Because he did not press for immediate reform they believed him a failure. On one occasion the New York Times actually proposed to replace him with a dictator. Today history has shown that they were as wrong as their southern counterparts.

Perhaps we, all of us, will be a little more humble and a little better advised if we take the lesson to ourselves. Bitter feelings are not unkown in politics today. We do not have to go back to the Civil War to find people who feel strongly about national affairs, indulge in personalities and very sincerely believe evil of men, without reason.

Intolerance, as a political weapon, has been used in connection with issues other than that of slavery. If we remember the lesson of the Civil War, a lesson which is better taught by the life of Lincoln than in any other way, all of us may be protected a little against our natural inclination to feel violently and talk violently.

All of us may realize that we do not always know the whole truth and that sometimes it is wise to suspend judgment. All of us, in time, may even learn to feel that the men who are trying for a common agreement are usually safer guides than the men who are trying to make divisions or stir up hostility.

As a man, I think the use of hatred and of intolerance and of evil stories is plain wrong. As a man who has been active in politics, I had an added dislike of that kind of tactics. The reason is simple. These weapons make it impossible for men ultimately to agree; while it was my job in politics to try to find ways by which they could agree.

Lincoln's doctrine was that democracy would be impossible if nobody ever agreed, and particularly if a minority felt that it could break ranks and go its own way when political decisions had been reached. This is as true now as it was in his time.

Consequently, I know that if issues are not discussed on their merits but on personality; if any political group tries to stir up hatred and of course thereby provokes hatred on the other side, or if resort is had to the tactics of abuse, it becomes extremely difficult for these groups ever to agree again.

Men tend to repay hatred with hatred, or insult with insult, and if that process is

allowed to go on it becomes impossible for them finally to cooperate in carrying out any course of action. And yet, in a democracy like our own, our entire national life is a vast cooperative scheme. To the technical politician, extremism is not only a crime, it is a blunder.

I think Lincoln taught us this and though from time to time some may forget the country as a whole has learned its lesson. It cost us the life of our ablest and noblest statesman. But I think that if he were to come back today he would say that the sacrifice was not in vain.

In this year of 1956, we see a world where group still fights group, doctrine clashes with doctrine and nations engaged in cold wars. Nevertheless, even in this mad disorder and strife, the United States has steadily preserved the ideal of good will, of moderation, of justice. Even in our internal political conflicts today we do usually remember that there is something to be said for the other fellow's point of view. Even when we are engaged in the terrible rage of war we do have the tradition of justice to opponents, as we demand it for ourselves, our allies and the victims of aggression.

We are able to attack social problems which are often bitter in the extreme and still find the way of moderate commonsense toward an ultimate goal of progress.

Without trying to usurp the place of the historian, I think I may say that we owe this in great measure to Abraham Lincoln. Indeed, I think it is not impossible that Lincoln himself hoped that this might be one result of his life's work. His second inaugural address, which contains, as you remember, the famous words, "With malice toward none; with charity for all," was itself a plea for greater understanding.

Thurlow Weed, a politician of the time, wrote him a note of praise. Mr. Lincoln's answer is not as well known as is the second inaugural address, but what he said was this: "Thank you for yours on the notification speech and on the recent inaugural address. I expect the latter to wear as well as, perhaps better, than anything I have produced; but I believe it is not immediately popular. Men are not flattered by being shown that there has been a difference of purpose between the Almighty and them. To deny it, however, in this case is to deny that there is a God governing the world. It is a truth which I thought needed to be told and, as whatever of humiliation there is in it falls most directly on myself I thought others might afford me to tell it."

This was Lincoln anticipating the coming peace, and trying to bring back the state of mind and the political attitude which would make real peace possible. He was engaged in his last and greatest attempt to bring this about and to reunite the country, almost to the hour of his death.

Time after time, since then, this country has had its problems and its troubles. Time after time wild tongues have again been loosed. Yet the lesson of a great spirit and a great man has remained with us to make of this country a union so firm that even the forces of today which are tearing Europe and Asia apart beat harmlessly against our coasts.

The Union was saved, with God's help, for all time. But the real authors of its salvation were the great spirits, north and south, who followed Lincoln's plan, who cast hatreds aside and in Lincoln's sympathetic spirit attempted to make the Government a means by which this Republic binds all Americans in common brotherhood.

The bond was forged faithfully and well. In its time it has overcome the peril from within, and now we see that it is no less staunch and true against the peril from abroad. That is our legacy from Lincoln and out blessing from God.

Speech Prepared for Delivery by Hon. J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, Before a Lincoln Day Dinner of Pinellas County Republicans in Clearwater, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech prepared for delivery by Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, before a Lincoln Day dinner of Pinellas County Republicans in Clearwater, Fla.

The speech follows:

Abraham Lincoln died 91 years too soon.

Unfortunately, he never had the opportunity to see how effective and able the women of this great Nation can be when they take a direct part in politics.

Men have always suspected, of course, that women would be a wonderful adornment to the political scene. But now they have found that you women are much more than that. You women have shown without question that your active participation in politics is essential to good government. And we men need you.

We need you as loyal and understanding wives, and that is especially true on those many occasions when dinner gets cold while we are out politicking.

We need some of you as candidates, for a government without a direct voice from women can get to be like a symphony orchestra without a violin section.

And finally, we need millions of you as volunteer workers, for there is always that very practical matter of winning elections.

As you probably realize, there is one major, and all-important point which we have in our favor in this business of winning elections.

We have popular opinion on our side.

I realize the limitations of statistics, but I'd like to quote some fairly overwhelming figures which, I think, show just how strong we really are.

These results were announced by the American Institute of Public Opinion (which is better known as the Gallup Poll) several months ago.

First of all, citizens of this country were asked point blank: "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Eisenhower is handling his job as President?"

A tremendous 73 percent of the people said "Approve."

Only 14 percent said that they disapprove.

The other 13 percent indicated they had no opinion on the matter.

Now let's take a look at a breakdown of those figures in regard to the South.

When the poll takers reported their findings on a regional basis we found that in the South, 68 percent of the people said they approve of the way Mr. Eisenhower is doing his work;

A mere 18 percent disapproved, and 14 percent said they had no opinion.

Here's another point which I found extremely interesting.

The question this time was: "If the President's doctors say it is all right, and if he decides he wants to run in 1956, would you vote for him?"

The answers were: 56 percent, "Yes:" 31 percent, "No;" and 13 percent undecided.

Comparing that survey with another one which was taken prior to the President's attack, the Gallup men discovered that the drop in the ranks of those who said they would cast their ballots for reelection was only 5 percent.

As I said, we definitely do have popular opinion on our side.

Here are some of the reasons why that is true.

At the national level of government, officials of the Eisenhower administration have faced up to the grave issues and the problems of these years with faith and with courage—and success has attended our labors.

We can also point with equal pride to many men and women of the administration who serve the public in official capacities in various localities of our Nation.

Since the glorious birth of this Nation, many fine men of outstanding character, unusual wisdom and unquestioned devotion to the great principles of our heritage, have served in the highest office that our free people can bestow, the Presidency of the United States.

But until the present time two have towered above the others on heights rarely reached by others in the entire history of the world.

George Washington strode with giant steps to the stage of great events in the crisis of the colonial rebellion against the tyranny of a distant monarch.

With ragged volunteers from the 13 colonies he welded together an Army which helped forge the greatest Nation on earth.

The other was Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor this weekend.

Although many persons were in honest disagreement with the policies of Lincoln, they never had the slightest thought that his actions were ever marred by cowardice or greed or pettiness.

Now, at last, another man has attained the stature of those other forthright Americans.

As history brings these troubled and dangerous times into the perspective of the whole, literate people in all of the civilized world will associate with Washington and Lincoln, as representatives of all the timeless greatness of America, the name of their new, great partner, the incumbent leader of the people, the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Yes, Dwight Eisenhower, born to our magnificent traditions of freedom and human dignity, trained in love and respect for God and for his fellow men, and tested in the terrible trials of massive war, was drawn to the full height of his great stature, like Washington and Lincoln, in time of crisis—crisis for this Nation and for the world.

He came to the Presidency in the midst of a stalemate in a cruel and costly war, a stalemate which his opponents said could not be broken—a war which they said could not be ended.

He moved with dispatch.

He acted with decision.

He brought into play the skills of the great soldier that he is, and the intellect of the great statesman that he is.

The stalemate was ended at the conference table.

The shouting, suffering, and slaughter were stopped in the hills and across the plains of Korea.

Dwight Eisenhower moved into the White House while the tyrants, the would-be conquerors of the world, were rattling their sabers with new vigor, when the initiative was all on their side, when confidence was lacking among our allies and those who should be our allies in the event of war.

Under the wise leadership of Dwight Eisenhower, our Nation has taken the initiative, not the boastful, blustering initiative of war-

mongers, not the threatening initiative of those who would enrich themselves through the conquest of the lands and goods of others, but the calm, courageous, directional initiative of enlightened, civilized people who are as proud in their pursuit of a permanent peace as they were courageous in conflict.

Our policies and our purposes have been stated clearly by President Eisenhower.

The mist of doubt has been removed.

The confidence of allies has been strengthened, and the power of our defenses and of our weapons of offense, if necessary, has grown in mighty steps.

Our internal economy never was basically better.

The calm that has replaced near-hysteria within the Government has been transmitted to the people.

The fear that seemed normal prior to the Eisenhower administration has disappeared.

The economic recession which men of little faith had called inevitable never developed.

Make no mistake * * * the troubles and the dangers of the world have not yet been brought to an end.

They never could have been brought to an end under the directionless course we have known in the recent past.

They can, and I am confident will, be brought to an end with the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower.

"To protect our nations and our people from the catastrophe of nuclear holocaust," said this great President of ours, "free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of seeking to advance their ends through aggression.

"If Communist rulers understand that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith, they will be powerfully deterred."

Yes; these are the words of Dwight Eisenhower, and the Communists have been powerfully deterred.

But the grand results—the final victory of peace—cannot be accomplished overnight, or even in the short period of 4 years.

We have found in Dwight Eisenhower, I believe with all my heart, the master of the crisis in the world.

We must, in the name of humanity, in the cause of decency, for the generations of today and for the sake of the generations to come keep Dwight David Eisenhower in his great job through a second term if he chooses to run.

I can understand his yearning for the quiet of his home in Gettysburg.

I can sympathize with him, too.

But I know his great love for his country and for humanity.

I know of his great faith in God and of his conviction that the search for a just and lasting peace is far from hopeless.

I feel that if he is convinced that he is needed, he will yield to the wishes of the people.

If the prayers of the people are answered, and Dwight Eisenhower heeds their rising call for him to continue his great crusade for peace and justice, he cannot be defeated.

Let the disciples of doubt raise their cries of fear and confusion.

When the chips are down and the sovereignty of the citizens is exercised again at the voting machines and ballot boxes across the land, the decision again will be, more overwhelming than before, that Dwight D. Eisenhower continue as President of the United States.

It could not be otherwise, because no other man since Washington and Lincoln has earned so well and kept so completely the confidence and faith of his fellow citizens.

I've been dwelling at length on the President himself.

Now let's consider the administration in general.

It has gained its strength, not only from the regular members of the GOP, but also from the many thousands of Americans who have become disgusted with Trumanism and its heir, Stevensonism.

Take my own Free State of Maryland, for instance.

In Maryland, as in Florida, the members of the President's party are in the minority.

Yet, today, because of the profound beliefs of the people of Maryland in individual liberty and the principles of the Eisenhower administration, Maryland has a Republican Governor, Theodore R. McKeldin, who had the honor of placing President Eisenhower's name in nomination at our national convention in 1952.

Maryland is also represented by two Republican Senators of which I have the honor to be one, together with Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.

In addition, Maryland is represented by 3 GOP Representatives out of 7 for the State.

How is this possible?

Because the people of Maryland have voted their convictions that they are better represented by the ideals and principles of this administration.

These convictions were not lightly arrived at, just as they were not in the case of the voters of Florida.

But knowing that when the philosophies of the two parties are brought home to the people they will vote for truly liberal government, I look forward to even greater gains in Florida this fall.

You have already gained national recognition by electing such a worthy Representative as BILL CRAMER, and now you will be expected to live up to the great promise you have shown.

I've done quite a bit of talking about BILL CRAMER since I arrived in your State, and I'm going to keep it up.

In the first place, BILL CRAMER has the bigwigs of the opposition plenty worried.

Personally, I don't blame them.

I'm just very glad that he's on our side.

On Capitol Hill, BILL CRAMER has made a reputation for fighting for what he wants.

Furthermore, he gets what he wants—and that is a real trick.

Just look at the $11 million harbor project he got for the Tampa area, and the appropriations he has gotten for your post offices, sponge industry, fish business and other activities.

It isn't easy getting things like that in Washington—I know.

I was in the House of Representatives for 10 years myself, but perhaps I could still take lessons from BILL CRAMER.

If anybody ever wants to know about a two-party system in the South, just point to BILL.

Florida can be proud of him, as we all are.

One of BILL's biggest jobs as part of the Eisenhower administration is to give the United States a liberal, representative government.

Liberalism is a word that is being lightly tossed around these days.

The New Deal-Fair Deal Party and its supporters have claimed to be liberals.

But what is the true meaning of liberalism?

Does it mean excessive taxation, a flagrant spending of the resources of the American people for brazen political purposes—the placing of more and more controls and restrictions on the lives and economy of the Nation?

If that is true liberalism, then the New Deal-Fair Deal Party has been liberal.

But that is not true liberalism. It is liberality, liberality with the American people's money, freedom, initiative, and heritage.

The Eisenhower administration does not confuse liberalism with liberality.

Our true liberalism has respect for tradition, and it has vision of the progress in the future.

Our liberalism is based on the principle of individual freedom and liberty which permits each man and woman to be the maker of his or her own destiny.

It is a liberalism which stands by to aid in times of distress but exacts no tribute in the form of control over the people's economy or pocketbooks.

President Eisenhower himself has said, "This administration is committed to a program of progressive moderation, liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals, constructively dynamic and optimistic in its appraisal of the future.

"This program, I firmly believe, merits the endorsement and support of thinking, confident, forward-looking Americans.

"For our national economy, we seek a dependable stability in our present assets, a vigorous expansion in our future growth.

"These can be best achieved, we believe, by giving the private citizen the greatest possible opportunity—consistent with the rights of others—to contribute to the development of the economy and to share in its abundance."

Since this present administration has been in power, we have made the following key policy changes:

1. In place of a stalemate war in Korea—a truce.
2. In place of reaction in foreign affairs—action.
3. In place of peak target dates in defense—the long pull.
4. In place of softness toward Communism—firmness.
5. In place of planned deficits in finance—a balanced budget.
6. In place of increases in taxation—reductions.
7. In place of a shrinking buying power of the dollar—stability.
8. In place of unchangeability in agriculture—flexibility and adaptability.
9. In place of misguided favoritism in labor—fairness.
10. In place of antagonism to business—encouragement.
11. In place of Government paternalism in natural resources—partnership.
12. In place of promises on housing—better housing.
13. In place of wardships in social security—a cushion against shock.
14. In place of socializing medicine—improving private care.
15. In place of corruption—integrity.
16. In place of monopoly in atomic development—sharing.

Today there are more than 65 million persons at work at the highest wages in history.

Construction has set a record at $42 billion in 1955.

American businessmen sold $14 billion worth of goods abroad.

Inflation has been halted.

Government spending has been reduced, taxes cut, and we are approaching a balanced budget.

These accomplishments are but a prelude of those to come in the dynamic program which the Eisenhower administration has presented to the American people.

Confident of the integrity, the honesty, and the belief in the American people and constitutional government, which this administration represents, the Nation can go forward to even greater heights in the future.

For the first time after two decades of New Deal-Fair Deal administrations, the American people now have the Federal Government back in their own hands—a Government which represents them—not a Government of a chosen few who would direct and regiment this American Nation.

Don't forget how long it has been that the South has had to fight against becoming stagnant under one-party rule.

It reminds me of the story of the young wife who nagged her husband with the following:

"What's the matter with you?" she asked.

"Monday you liked baloney.

"Tuesday you liked baloney.

"Wednesday you liked baloney.

"Now, Thursday, all of a sudden, you don't like baloney."

Well, now, all of a sudden, the South is fed up with baloney, too.

I'm sure you will keep doing something about it.

Thank you.

Text of the Speech Delivered by Dr. Francisco Urrutia, Colombian Ambassador to the United States, at the World Trade Luncheon Held at Tampa, Fla., on February 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at the World Trade Luncheon held in Tampa, Fla., on February 9, the Honorable Francisco Urrutia, Colombian Ambassador to the United States, delivered an address of importance to the United States and our international trade relations with South America. It is doubly important because he has quite capably pointed out the problems faced by the Americas today and at the same time has offered the basis of a solution to many of these problems.

Beyond the interest his address held for students of trade and economy, I was particularly concerned with the references made to the First District of Florida by the Ambassador that were not included in his prepared address. Dr. Urrutia pointed out that the port of Tampa was one of the major gateways to Latin American trade being the largest and busiest port of the southeast United States from Norfolk to Mobile. It is the logical recipient of Latin American shipping and because of its advantageous location an important point of origin for cargoes directed there.

The large and active Latin population in the First District of Florida has led to the development of many cultural and national ties between the areas that have resulted in advantageous trade relations for all and a common ground of friendship that tends to see this growth develope between these logical terminals of trade. I feel certain because of these factors that a means of increasing these trade activities will be found in the future. The economy and well-being of our respective nations will benefit from such understanding and mutual effort. The words of Dr. Urrutia will benefit both the first district and the United States in their clear statement of today's conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include these remarks and the address of the Ambassador of the Colombian nation in the RECORD.

When Mr. Thomas Wilson told you last year that world trade was vitally important to the United States economy, he pointed out the indisputable fact that every man, woman, and child in this country is directly affected by foreign trade. He explained thoroughly the trade problems of the United States with Canada and Western Europe, but he did not have enough time to concentrate on the particular problems of international trade between the United States and Latin America. This is why I would like to give you this year some additional information which, I am sure, will help you to understand better the reasons why Latin America has not been able to develop its trade more intensively with the United States.

Mr. Thomas Wilson pointed out last year that United States trade with Canada had reached, in 1953, an all-time high of $5,660 million. "This exceeded," Mr. Wilson added, "the total trade of this country with South America and, after excluding military aid, the United States total trade with the Continent of Europe."

Why is it that Latin America has not been able to have as large a volume of trade as one country alone—Canada—has with the United States? My answer is that trade is the natural result of economic development and it is because we have not been able to achieve it that trade with all of the Latin American countries represents for the United States less volume than its trade with Canada.

It is impossible to understand these problems without realizing first the fundamental differences between the economic organization of North and South America.

We must realize that North and South America were organized under quite different circumstances:

The British, German, Irish, and other European people, who came to North America in search of a new life in a new world, were fed up with the religious and political wars in Europe.

They were only interested in organizing a new state where different religions would cooperate with each other and freedom for private enterprise would prevail.

The opposite happened in Latin America.

In the eighth century, the Moslems and the Moorish, as you know, were able to conquer the entire Spanish peninsula with the exception of Asturias and the Basque country. It was only after seven centuries of wars that the Christian kings were able to get rid of the Moslems and Moorish, after they defeated them in Granada the same year Columbus sailed for the first time to America (1492).

To drive the Moslems and Arabs out of Spain, the Spanish kings had led a war, supported mainly by the religious enthusiasm of the Catholic Church. It was a total war and as a result, all powers, including religious power, was kept by the king. When a few years later Spanish officers came to organize our countries, they only understood and believed in the form of government that had enabled them to win their religious and civil wars in Spain.

While the European settlers, coming to North America intended to stay in their new country and to organize all the necessary industries they needed for their new life, in South America Spanish and Portuguese adventurers were only interested in mining gold or in discovering hidden Indian treasures, always hoping to go back home to enjoy the fortunes they had found or would find.

When the Latin-American countries achieved their independence (a) their economic system was based on mining and in the production of a few tropical products they could export to Europe; and (b) their political systems, although organized in a republican and democratic way, as a normal reaction against their former rulers, kept most of the laws, ideas, and organization of the old ones.

Latin-American countries lost the opportunity of the great economic and industrial prosperity enjoyed by the rest of the Western civilization in the last century and thus the 20th century found them almost as underdeveloped as at the beginning of the 19th.

Some progress has been attained, but we are still much behind the Western civilization standards.

I wish to point out a few facts which will help you to understand it better.

1. For each 100 miles of roads in the United States we only have 7 miles of roads in Latin America.

2. Our workers are paid US$1 a day, whereas in the United States workers are paid US$1 an hour.

3. Sixty-two percent of the rural housing of Latin America is far below the hygiene and human standards prevailing in the United States.

4. We have only 3 percent of the total number of automobiles and trucks that are in use in the United States.

5. The total electric power of Latin America is only 8 percent of the United States output.

6. The total production output of Latin America is only 10 percent that of the United States.

7. The Latin Americans have an average yearly per capita income of US$211.45, against the average yearly per capita income of US$1,900 of the American.

8. There is a difference of more than 1,000 calories per day in the food consumed by the American worker in contrast to that of the Latin-American laborer.

The Latin-American countries realized that they must make up for the time lost during the last century and are changing their economics accordingly.

Unfortunately progress has been slow because in the 20th century underdeveloped countries cannot find the capital and fair trade responsible for the development of those who underwent the same process of industrialization during the last century.

Let us study how the lack of capital and the lack of fair prices have been responsible for the slow development in Latin America's economy, and as a consequence for the insufficient trade between North and South America.

A. As far as capital is concerned, you all know that the United States could not have developed its industries without the European capital brought in during the last century.

In the last century, European capital came to this country with the incentive of bigger returns on investments.

With a population increasing at the rate of 2½ percent per year, in order to maintain the present inadequate standard of living, we must be able to increase national production by the same 2½ percent. To do so, Latin America would need $7.5 billion a year of new capital investments. Latin Americans are reinvesting their earnings at a rate of $6 billion a year. Thus, $1½ billion more are needed.

Because of taxation laws in their countries, private capital is not interested in investments in Latin America. A return of 15 or 20 percent a year on a foreign investment is of no interest to those who must pay in taxes 50 or 60 percent of this excess benefit and can only net 1, 2, or 3 percent more than what they should have received for investments at home.

As a result of this peculiar situation, returns on investments in Latin America average 15 percent a year and, in spite of

this fact, the United States for instance, receives each year in dividends and income from Latin America much more than it invests.

From 1946 to 1951 the United States received $3 billion in income from Latin America and invested only $1,600,000,000 in new capital.

According to the latest United Nations statistics, in 1954 the inflow of capital from the United States to Latin America was:

	(*Millions*)
1. Direct investment	93
2. Loans from the Export-Import Bank	100
3. Loans from the International Bank	69
4. United States grants (Bolivia and Guatemala)	38
Total	300

But the outflow of captal from the Latin-American countries to the United States, without taking into consideration private Latin American investments in the United States, was:

	(*Millions*)
(a) For debt repatriation	35
(b) For amortization of loans	49
(c) Dividends and financial services on private capital	630
(d) Financial services on official loans	43
Total	757

Thus, the outflow of capital was $450 million larger than the inflow, and this proves that it is certainly not with private investments alone that Latin America shall be able to close the gap of $1½ billion needed every year in new capital investments just to keep up with the present inadequate standard of living.

On January 26, 1956, Mr. Hollister, Director of International Cooperation Administration, said that since 1934 the United States had "provided some $3.342 million in loans and grants for Latin America" and he broke this figure into these categories:

	(*Millions*)
Export-Import Bank loans	2,400
World Bank loans	600
Economic and technical aid	242
Agricultural surpluses	100

I wish it were true. Unfortunately, these figures correspond to the authorized loans but not to the loans actually made and failed to take into account the loans already paid.

According to the November 30, 1955, figures, $1,100 million have already been repaid to the Export-Import Bank of the $2,400 million mentioned by Mr. Hollister, and only about 70 percent of the loans approved by the International Bank have until now actually been executed.

The total outstanding loans of both Export-Import Bank and International Bank represent less than $2 billion for all of Latin America.

As for economic and technical aid and agricultural surpluses, Mr. Hollister gives a total of $342 million for Latin America; that is, less than one-half of 1 percent of the total grants given to the rest of the world by the United States.

The rest of the world has received direct aid, not to be reimbursed. If only a part of all this money had gone to Latin America our governments would have been spared many internal troubles.

B. As far as fair prices are concerned, Latin American goods are only 8½ percent higher than in 1947, and we get this figure only because of coffee and crude oil. If we do not take into consideration these 2 products, we find that Latin American goods are sold today 7 percent below the 1947 prices and 25 percent below the prices obtained during the Korean war in 1951.

Studies have been made by the United Nations and the International Bank to compare the average prices of the goods exported with the goods imported by Latin America. These averages are called index prices, and the comparison between the index prices of imports and the index prices of exports in each country are called terms of trade.

In terms of trade, in 1922 Latin America could only buy 84 percent of the goods bought in 1900 with the same amount of export goods, and only 60 to 70 percent in the years 1930 to 1935.

Only during the 2 wars could Latin America buy more than in 1900 with the same amount of goods exported.

In 1953 the terms of trade were only 5 percent better than in 1900, ond only because in 1953 the coffee prices were higher. With the present coffee prices the terms of trade will again be below the level of 50 years ago.

Minerals, for instance, in terms of trade buy today 30 percent less of the same goods than in 1900.

The two problems I have explained, that is, the lack of capital required to develop our countries and the inadequate prices for our products, have an immediate and direct effect on our trade. In 1927 exports and imports trade represented 27 percent of the gross income of Latin America, while now it only represents 16 percent.

Although Latin America's population is increasing at the rate of 2½ percent per year, its imports today, as it was the case 10 years ago, only represent $6 billion a year. This means that in 1947 Latin America exported $45 per capita and imported $43 a year. In 1953 Latin America could only buy $40 of foreign goods per capita, and, as it could only sell $37 per capita, we were, and are still today, $3 short per capita each year in our trade balance.

Latin America is being criticized for not having been able to meet all its commitments and also for not having increased her trade with the United States. The fact is that in 1954, on the one hand, Latin America received from the United States only $3,289 million for its exports, but on the other, it had to pay $3,371 million for the goods bought from this country, plus $450 million for the balance between the outflow and inflow of capital. This meant that Latin America had to pay a total of $3,821 million to the United States, although it only received $3,289 million.

It is a great pity that these problems are misunderstood or ignored in the United States because:

1. Latin America is by far the best of the United States clients. Of $11 billion sold last year by the United States, 26.6 percent went to Latin America and of $10 billion imported, 33.6 percent came from Latin America.

2. Latin America pays the United States with the moneys received for its goods while other continents pay this country with the same dollars received as grants or aid.

3. In the event of war, Latin America must be in a condition to continue to provide strategic materials. Of a list of 77 items considered as strategical by the United States, 30 came from Latin America. In the last war, 75 percent of the food supplies and 40 percent of the raw materials imported by the United States came from Latin America. We must be in a position to defend the maritime supply lines, provide for maritime and airbases and send troops to the battlefronts as did Brazil in the last war and Colombia in Korea.

4. We have 170 million inhabitants (more than the United States) and are the biggest market this country can ever dream of.

5. Our population is increasing at the unbelievable rate of 2½ percent per years and this means that we shall have 30 percent more population than the United States 25 years from now and twice the population of the United States 50 years from now, with the potential buying power this means.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on February 16, 1956, before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE OPENING DINNER OF THE WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 16, 1956

It is a great honor and a real inspiration for me to be here this evening. The women's patriotic organizations represented in this important conference have earned the gratitude of every loyal American.

They exemplify devotion to the ideals of our free Republic. They work for a strong America—a God-fearing, righteous America—a Republic of spiritual and cultural power, dedicated to the highest standards of honor and justice.

I am proud to salute the members of this conference and its participating organizations as loyal and courageous soldiers in the battle to defend and preserve the American system of government.

In the gracious invitation for me to address you this evening it was suggested that I discuss the Bricker amendment and the dangers that arise from what has come to be known as treaty law.

In that connection I think it is appropriate to review the nature of the American plan of government and the reasons for our greatness as a nation.

First, let me point out that we Americans are a peace loving people. It is our proud boast that we are the most powerful Nation in all history—yet we have never imposed tyranny upon any people of the earth. We have never fought a war of conquest. We have never sought territorial gain by force of arms.

Whenever we have been forced into armed conflict we have fought on the side of honor, justice, and freedom. We have made terrific sacrifices in blood and treasure to liberate oppressed and persecuted people. American heroes have suffered and died to repel aggression that would rob free people of their liberty and would enslave them under savage cruelty.

Our sole objective in war has been to uphold the integrity of free nations, to preserve the principle of individual freedom and to protect the right of free people to live under the form of government chosen by their own free will.

For 150 years we have been able to keep our shores free from armed invaders. Of all the world's great nations we are the only one that has escaped the desolation and destruction of war.

In two world wars we gained great military victories. Our fighting men covered themselves with everlasting glory. But the peace for which they offered their lives was not achieved. Secret deals at the conference table sabotaged American power for peace

and opened the way for Communist dictatorship over one-third of the world.

As we look back to the reasons for our national greatness we must turn to the foundations upon which the Founding Fathers erected the structure of American freedom.

First, and most important, we have the ideals of Americanism so eloquently expressed in the Declaration of Independence:

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Those rights are the essence of our individual freedom. They are not granted by government. They come from God.

Government that attempts to restrict or curtail them, or to take them away, transgresses against the divine law, to which the Founding Fathers gave their firm allegiance.

Next we turn to the Constitution of the United States, the charter of our liberties, which has been described as the greatest state document ever produced by the hand and brain of man.

Under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights there was created a government that has demonstrated its capacity and fitness to serve the people for generations far into the future.

For the first time in world history it gave recognition to the individual. For the first time in world history there was brought forth a new concept of government which derived its just powers from the consent of the governed. Never before had there been a government whose powers were specifically defined as grants from the people and limited within the bounds of a written Constitution.

And it is important to remember that in adopting the Bill of Rights the Founding Fathers did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly, religion, or to protect the rights of property. They recognized these rights as God-given rights, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creater of the universe. They set forth in language of biblical simplicity, the areas of human dignity and individual freedom upon which government was forbidden to encroach.

Under that plan in less than 200 years, Americans, living in freedom, have built the richest, the soundest, and the strongest nation in all history.

We hold the Constitution in the greatest reverence but that great State document, within itself, provides the method by which it can be amended to conform with changing conditions. I need not stress the point that proposed amendments should be approached with utmost caution. I think every good American will agree that the test of any proposed change is whether it will strengthen the fundamental principles of free government laid down by those whose vision and wisdom gave us the Constitution.

I submit, my fellow Americans, that the Bricker amendment meets that test.

I believe it to be one of the most important pieces of legislation now before Congress. Its importance, as you know, grows out of the various interpretations that have been given regarding article 6 of the Constitution which reads, in part, as follows:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

We who support the Bricker amendment regard it as most unfortunate that there is so much difference of opinion, even in the courts, regarding the meaning of this article. For that reason we believe it should be amended and spelled out in the same simple language that we find in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights.

It should be amended so as to give added force to article 1, section 1, which provides:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Please note the words "all legislative powers herein granted." They make no exception. They confer no legislative powers upon the executive branch of government and certainly none on any foreign government.

Furthermore, in support of this exclusive grant of legislative power the 10th amendment states:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In the 2d session of the 83d Congress the Bricker amendment was debated in the Senate at great length. Every word was examined with extreme care. A great many decisions of the Supreme Court were quoted. Legal technicalities were brought forth and ably expounded with force and eloquence by proponents of the proposed amendment and by those who were opposed. Substitute proposals were offered and on the final vote the proposed amendment failed to pass by the margin of 1 vote less than the required two-thirds.

I shall not attempt to go into further detail of the legislative record. But to my mind one thing is very clear. We are confronted with one of the most fundamental principles that has to do with the stability, if not the permanence, of the American form of government. Unless legislation is limited by the Constitution we destroy one of the mightiest safeguards for the preservation of liberty. We place in danger every sacred right for which brave men have fought, suffered and died in their striving for freedom.

The Founding Fathers were strong in their determination to restrict the powers of Government. I cannot accept the conclusion that they would make a grant of unlimited power over foreign and domestic affairs.

I am opposed to the ues of international treaties for making domestic laws for the people of the United States. I am opposed to overriding the Constitution without the consent of the people.

For many years of our history the dangers of treaty law did not become apparent. Treaties between the United States and foreign countries dealt with international subjects such as alliances, war and peace, boundaries, trade agreements and so forth. It never occurred to the average American that a treaty could interfere in the domestic life of our Nation. It did not seem conceivable that a treaty could in any way infringe upon our individual rights as American citizens.

The Bricker amendment is needed to safeguard the right of the American people to make their own laws within the framework of the Constitution through their elected Representatives in Congress. It is needed to protect the American people from the will of a super-government to which they have not given their consent. It is needed to preserve the system of checks and balances which have served us so well in separating the functions and powers of the three branches of our Government. It is needed to prevent the unwarranted encroachment of executive authority upon the legislative branch of Government.

I do not question the high integrity or sincere purpose of President Eisenhower in his opposition to the Bricker amendment. I do not fear that he will lead us into national peril.

But I can look back to the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam which were conceived in secrecy and withheld from Congress and the American people. I need not remind you that by these agreements we committed our country to make tremendous concessions to Russia and helped extend the power of the Communist conspiracy.

I can look forward with apprehension to the future when unprincipled men, ambitious for power, may seek to enlarge Federal authority over the American people by means of treaties and executive agreements.

If treaty law can override the Constitution it can deprive people of the rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the sentiment expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], when he introduced his proposed amendment in the 83d Congress.

Addressing his colleagues, Senator BRICKER said, and I quote:

"The fight for the protection against treaty law has only just begun. This fight to prevent the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States from being undermined by treaties and executive agreements will be carried on in elections, in national organizations, and in Congresses until it is settled to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the American people. That majority would rather live without fear under a government of constitutional restraints than live in jeopardy under a government of men."

Therefore I say to you that the responsibility for freedom rests not in Washington but in the hearts of the people.

It is a responsibility so grave that it must not be assumed without solemn rededication to freedom of the individual as the keystone of our national faith.

The fight for the Bricker amendment can be won if we can reach the hearts of the people. It can be won if organizations like yours take leadership in old fashioned patriotism.

Love of country and loyalty to its ideals are the great and indispensable virtues of American citizenship.

Just a few days ago we celebrated the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of all Americans, Abraham Lincoln.

Let us, in his immortal words, here highly resolve "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Veto by the President of the Natural-Gas Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States performed a great public service in vetoing the natural-gas bill. This particular bill engaged the attention of the entire Nation. I, for one, could see no public interest in the measure—either from the standpoint of the gas-producing States or let alone from the gas-consuming States.

The entire country, I am sure, is grateful for President Eisenhower's wise decision in this matter. It is difficult for me to understand those arguments that are now being advanced, and in poor taste, that the veto message is an attack upon the Congress. The President of the United States was merely echoing the sentiments of the entire Nation when

he made reference to the brazen sponsors of this legislation, and when I say "sponsors" I mean those outside the Congress.

If and when this measure comes before the House in an attempt to override the President's veto, you may be assured that I will vote to sustain the President's action. If, therefore, there are those who feel that the President's veto was an attack upon the Congress, they are at liberty to test such sentiment by bringing the measure up in an attempt to override the veto, but I am certain, Mr. Speaker, they will not dare do this.

The Mideast South Asia Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely interesting and informative article by Mr. John Cowles, the distinguished president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, which appeared in the Herald Tribune of New York on February 15. Mr. Cowles has just returned from a month in Asia and the Middle East, during which, through personal observation and many interviews, he was able to secure information and some impressions which I believe are of vital interest and importance to the American people regarding the present situation. I hope that this article will have wide circulation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDEAST SOUTH ASIA CRISIS CALLED VITAL PROBLEM FOR UNITED STATES IN COLD WAR

(By John Cowles)

After a month of concentrated question-asking and observation in South Asia and the Middle East, I am convinced most Americans are unaware of the gravity of current developments in that part of the world.

First, the Israeli-Arab situation is imminently critical. If war breaks out—and some responsible, informed authorities believe there is a 50–50 chance of that happening within 90 days—no one can foretell where it might spread.

If such a war is not averted, most of the Middle East might quickly be lost to the free world. Even if such a conflict did not rapidly develop into world war III, as it might, the loss to Great Britain of its Middle East oil reserves, if that happened, would be a catastrophe of incalculable dimensions.

COULD MAKE BRITAIN SECOND-RATE POWER

Not only would the Communist world's warmaking potential be enormously increased, but economically Great Britain would be reduced to the position of a second-rate power.

If an Israeli-Arab conflict is to be avoided, real concessions will have to be made by both sides. Since the Arabs will not negotiate directly with the Israelis, either the United States or Britain, or both, must act promptly as go-between.

No matter how sympathetic most Americans are with Israel, we must realize that all justice is not on one side. Moreover, not only Israel but conceivably the whole free world might face disaster if a settlement, which can only be attained through mutual compromise, is not speedily reached.

Second, the Bulganin-Khrushchev tour of India, Burma, and Afghanistan was a major success for the Russians. The Communists are clearly gaining throughout much of Asia. Communist propaganda is diabolically clever and effective. Unless the United States adopts a much more imaginative and understanding psychological approach toward Asia and enlarges the scope of its economic aid, the probability is that much, if not most, of Asia will gradually slip into the Communist orbit.

Third, most Americans have no comprehension of the psychological importance throughout Asia of the phrase "western colonialism." It is of supreme importance that the American Government try in every possible way to dissociate itself from all aspects of colonialism.

For example, official statements that can be interpreted, no matter how erroneously, as implying American approval of continued Portuguese occupation of Goa and other enclaves on the Indian subcontinent do the free world incalculable harm.

ECONOMIC AID FOR INDIA CALLED URGENT

Fourth, our paramount concern in Asia should be to try to prevent the presently "neutral" or uncommitted nations from slipping into the Communist orbit. India, with its 370 million people, is overwhelmingly the most important country in this category, and Nehru the most influential Asian leader.

Nehru believes deeply in the principles of democracy. He is sincerely convinced that the course he is following is the most likely way of averting world war III.

Americans who criticize Nehru for being a Socialist and for not giving at least lip service to the American principles of free enterprise overlook the stark fact that the average Indian has an income of only about $55 a year.

India must be developed industrially, but there are no pools of private savings, as there are in the United States, for this purpose. The Indian Government must, therefore, either get foreign loans or "go totalitarian," as Russia and China have done, and depress an already unbelievably low standard of living to extract from its miserable people the funds necessary for national development.

In my opinion, the United States in the interests of its own national security cannot afford not to give India substantial financial aid.

I favor our giving India a line of credit of a billion dollars, payable at the rate of about $200 million annually, to help India with its new 5-year plan. Withdrawals on this loan should be made with the approval of the American ambassador as the 5-year plan progressed.

The granting of such a loan would not of course guarantee that India might not slip into the Communist orbit, but it would greatly reduce that likelihood.

WARNS OF STRINGS ON ECONOMIC AID

In proposing such a loan, we should neither ask for nor expect any shift in India's present political alignment of neutrality. We should make the loan for two reasons:

Because of a sincere desire to try to help India develop itself and raise the almost incredibly low standard of living of its people without India being forced to abandon democratic processes to accomplish it.

Because our own national security would be gravely jeopardized if India were forced into the totalitarian orbit in order to satisfy the material aspirations of its people.

Fifth. We should put less emphasis on our military pacts in Asia. Certainly we should continue to supply arms to those friendly nations desiring and needing them to prevent possible Communist infiltration and subversion.

Some of our Asia military pacts, however, wholly in addition to providing effective propaganda material for the Communists are causing discord in two other ways. On the one hand, the recipient nation doesn't get the amount of military equipment it, perhaps naively, assumed it would get; on the other hand, a neighboring nation frequently fears that the arms that we have provided may be used against it.

In addition, there is ground for the belief that some of our military pacts with Asian countries may have tended to induce the recipient nation to spend a larger proportion of its own national income and manpower on its armed forces than it can afford.

If the recipient nation is thus economically weakened, its government may be more susceptible to being overthrown than would have been the case had we given it a smaller amount of military aid.

Sixth. Some Congressmen have expressed the view that our foreign economic aid should be greatly reduced or eliminated.

Unless we are willing to reconcile ourselves to letting all Asia slide under Communist rule, which to me would be sheer insanity, we should recognize that our foreign economic aid is going to cost us large amounts for many years to come. I am not suggesting billions more than the present level, but perhaps a few hundred million more for economic aid. Possibly such an increase can be fully offset by reduced foreign military aid.

While we should plan our overall economic aid on a long-term basis, the bulk of it should not be earmarked for specific countries in specific amounts at specific times, so that those recipient nations get the feeling that they have a right to it regardless of their own government's actions.

Perhaps half of our total economic aid appropriations should be given to the President to spend where, when and how he thinks wisest. Our Ambassadors would then have authority to increase, reduce, delay or withhold aid depending on how effectively the recipient government was making use of the aid, and whether the recipient government was genuinely endeavoring to do the things it might have committed itself to do, such as tighten tax collections, eliminate graft in connection with the distribution of our aid, reduce fiscal deficits, carry out agreed-upon land-reform programs, etc.

Our foreign-aid dollars could be far more effectively and productively spent on such a flexible basis, and in addition the President would have the greatly needed authority to divert dollars from one country to another as relative needs changed.

MOST ASIANS WANT RED CHINA IN U. N.

Seventh. The American people should realize that an overwhelming proportion of the Asian countries, including even those like Pakistan with which we have military pacts, want Red China admitted to the United Nations. Leaders throughout Asia say that since the Red government is securely in control of China's 600 million people (one-fourth of the world's population) and since Russia is accepted as a member of the U. N. they can see no valid reason why Red China should not also be seated.

Some argue that if Red China is seated in the United Nations Peiping might become more reasonable. Some argue that if Red China were made a member of the United Nations, that would tend to increase the likelihood of China and Russia taking divergent lines on some matters of foreign policy.

Some definitely non-Communist Asian leaders even express the view that the admission of Red China to the United Nations would tend to accelerate the possibility of an eventual split between China and Russia.

Asians who argue for Red China's admission to the United Nations largely agree that it would be proper to continue Nationalist

China's (Formosa's) membership in the United Nations as an independent nation. Several Asian leaders told me emphatically, however, that Red China would not publicly accept this as a solution, but that if the Nationalist Chinese withdraw from Quemoy and Matsu, they doubted that Red China would go to war with the United States in order to try to regain Formosa.

Americans should realize that within a year the pressure for Red China's seating in the United Nations will probably become so overwhelming that only a United States veto, if a veto is legally appropriate in such a proceeding, could prevent it.

Eighth. The American people should realize that historians a century hence, if there are historians then, will probably record that a new chapter in the conflict between the Communist and free worlds began in the year 1956.

The hundreds of millions of uncommitted peoples of Latin South America, have become determined to develop their natural resources and industrialize their economies in an effort to raise their standards of living.

The Russians are encouraging them, and offering help. Perhaps the Russians will not deliver on their promises, but it would be folly for us to risk our own future security in certain of the strategically critical areas of the world on the assumption that the Russians will not deliver.

Unless the United States demonstrates its genuine interest in helping these underdeveloped nations, and is able to devise mechanisms for accomplishing it, probably the governments in most of those areas will ultimately tend to follow the Russian method.

RED CHINA PARALLELS SOVIET INDUSTRIALIZATION

Russia proved during the twenties and thirties that a backward, illiterate, underdeveloped country could successfully force industrialization. Ruthless repression was required, and savings were forced from a people with an already extremely low living standard, but the goal of industrialization was achieved. China is apparently moving along this same path.

Now for the first time in human history it is at least theoretically possible to abolish poverty throughout the globe, and in the space of only a couple of generations.

Whether the people of the United States will come to appreciate quickly enough what is now happening in the underdeveloped areas of the world, or whether we will wait passively until the backward countries begin to accept Moscow's political and economic philosophies as their model, is the overriding political question of the period immediately ahead. Compared with it, most of our other problems shrink into insignificance.

Many Americans have exaggerated ideas of what we are now spending for foreign economic aid. The bulk of our foreign aid is for military purposes. Most of what we are currently paying out under the name of economic aid is going to Formosa, South Korea, South Indochina, and other areas directly affected by military operations, or for the direct or indirect support of military forces. Only a tiny fraction of the funds of the International Cooperation Administration (formerly called the Foreign Operations Administration; previously to that called point 4 or the ECA or the Marshall plan) are going to the economic development of militarily uncommitted nations, even though these areas may be of great strategic importance.

It is not necessary for us to spend additional billions for foreign economic aid; but a very few hundred additional millions, plus some changes in our methods and psychological approach, might make a decisive difference.

While nothing should deter us from accelerating the development of our military strength and intensifying the scientific research on which our national security may depend, military weapons alone in the period ahead may well prove insufficient to insure the permanent maintenance of our freedom.

The World Health Organization and Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the outstanding organizations working throughout the globe is the World Health Organization.

When the history of this era is written, when the substantial developments have been separated from the trivial items of our times, when the wheat has been separated from the chaff, it will be found that the World Health Organization has written one of the finest chapters of this era.

For the first time in the history of mankind, the human community, acting on the basis of its collective conscience, and its humanitarian instinct for its fellow human beings, has conducted a global assault against mankind's age-old scourges.

I send to the desk a further statement which I have prepared on this subject, along with supplementary material regarding the "heroines in white"—the nurses of the world—who are helping to spearhead this effort. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

In the February 1956 issue of the World Health Organization Newsletter there is a great amount of inspiring information concerning the fight by organized medicine under the banner of the United Nations and, in particular, the WHO, to improve mankind's health.

The overall report of the issue concerns WHO activities in the Western Pacific region in 1954–55.

There is an article concerning the battle against malaria on Taiwan. It reports, for example, how 5½ million people in Taiwan's malarious areas have been protected by DDT spraying.

There is a review of a new book, Mankind Against Killers, by James Hemmings, published by Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. As Dr. Brock Chrisholm, former Director-General of WHO states, "It is the first time, to my belief, that a book dealing with health on a world scale has been attempted with the aim of interesting young people."

Continuing with the battle against disease in the Western Pacific, there is a report, on the efforts for maternal and child health, for environmental sanitation, against communicable diseases, against tuberculosis, yaws, and for education and training.

One of the phases which inevitably comes up is the matter of necessarily expanding the reservoir of nurses in the area. Indeed, almost any discussion of the improvement of mankind's health brings up the question of increasing the availability of the heroines in white, the tireless women who devote years of their lives, indeed often their entire lives, to the healing of men, women, and children.

ARTICLE ON MEETING AT TEACHERS COLLEGE

Coincidentally enough, I noted in last Sunday's New York Times a report concerning a veritable international meeting at the spring session of the Division of Nursing Education of Teachers College, Columbia University. It brought out clearly the continued serious shortage of nurses throughout the world, a shortage which our own Govenment and our own private nursing schools have been deligently trying to help relieve.

The need is acute. Thus, for example, it was noted that in our sister Republic of Brazil, a great and promising land, there are unfortunately fewer than 5,000 nurses, for the country's vast and increasing population of 60 million. In our sister Republic of Haiti, which has been making laudable progress in many fields, it was reported that nurses unfortunately still are so scarce that a new hospital, built by American philanthropy, could not be opened because it lacked qualified nurses to staff it.

Other instances of shortages, especially in what has come to be known as underdeveloped areas, could be cited. But these should not proved discouraging to us. On the contrary, we have a right to be proud of the wonderful progress which has been made toward relieving the shortages. Thus, the republics of Latin America have become increasingly aware of this problem. Despite often meager financial resources, they are exerting ever larger efforts to meet the problem, by attracting their finest young woman-power into this magnificent profession and training them in modern scientific ways.

Lest we ourselves in North America take too superior an attitude, let us realize that even in our own country, with its great wealth and resources, we have faced a shortage of nurses. This situation has given deep concern to our medical profession, to Members of Congress, like the ever active Congressman FRANCES BOLTON, as well as to many laymen throughout the land. Of course, with our tremendously high American standard of living, we have come to expect and to receive the finest and most abundant medical and nursing care in the world.

But we know that to reach the still higher standards which we desire for ourselves, we must have still more nursing schools, more modern facilities for them, higher enrollments, more financial assistance and more inducements to our women to enter and remain in this esteemed career, particularly specialized phases of it, where shortages are especially severe, as in the instance of psychiatric nursing.

Of course, by comparison, the shortage elsewhere in the world is infinitely more serious, because there, the fight is to reach not top standards but the most minimal health standards with at least a minimal number of qualified nurses.

And so, I wish the best of good luck to the World Health Organization and to all the individuals and groups associated with it, including of course UNICEF, in the fight to make available the blessing of nursing and medical care to ill peoples throughout the world.

THE WORLD NEEDS MORE NURSES

Fifty-one nurses from 20 different countries and territories of the western Pacific attended the second nursing education seminar of WHO held in Suva, Fiji Islands. They had come to study and discuss the many problems connected with the training and education of nurses for whose services there exists still a desperate need in many parts of the world

For instance, it has been estimated that while in New Zealand there is 1 professionally trained nurse to 400 of the population and in Japan 4 to 530, the figure for the Philippines is 1 to 5,400, while for India it is 1 to 55,000.

Commenting on the seminar, Miss Alice Reid, regional nursing adviser to the WHO Western Pacific Regional Office writes:

"Living and working together in close proximity and sharing opportunities for leisure time enjoyment made it possible for nurses from many different countries to come to know one another really well, to realize that people in any country are very much alike and that the nurses everywhere have similar jobs to do and similar problems to resolve.

"The task of problem-solving went on, not only in organized study groups, but in informal and earnest groups of people sitting on mats, on bedroom floors, or gathered in corners of the recreation room.

"In the beginning, differences in terminology and methods were a source of irritation: later they became a subject of good-natured banter and finally, with the development of greater understanding, were replaced by feelings of real respect and a desire to learn from one another.

"A Filipino nurse wrote in her report, 'Truly, there is much to learn from the British system of nursing,' and at least two British nurses expressed their intention of studying in the United States."

During the seminar the real problems faced in carrying on the training of nurses and staffing of medical and health services were brought out of the experience of the participants. Groups then took up specific areas to study and to plan for ways to develop methods of solving these problems.

Group 1 worked together on the training of the community nurse, including her services to the public as a health worker and midwife.

Group 2 worked on the problems of carrying on general public health education, infant welfare, and teaching better ways of nutrition by using local materials and local foods.

Group 3 had the large field of the basic-nursing curriculum and set up 3 smaller groups to study clinical teaching, the need of helping to prepare nurses in the art of teaching, and the teaching of public health throughout the student nurses' learning experience.

Group 4 studied problems of postgraduate nursing education and gave particular attention to programs for international students.

The notes on this page, contributed by some of those attending the seminar, give a picture of nursing life and conditions in various countries of the western Pacific region.

(By Mrs. Felicidad D. Elegado, principal, School of Nursing, North General Hospital, Manila, P. I.)

The Philippines has an area of 114,000 square miles with a population of about 22 million. A study of nursing resources done by Filipino Nurses' Association, Department of Health, and other agencies, revealed that there are 8,857 people able to do nursing, but how many are actually in practice we do not know, for there is as yet no effective system of registration.

Every province has graduate nurses, but many provinces do not have enough to meet the health needs of the people.

Nursing is actually rendered in hospitals, health departments, and homes by the graduate nurses, licensed midwives, and attendants, with little distinction between them.

There is a marked difference in preparation of these workers. Some have no training, some have several years of nursing education, yet all these persons give general bedside nursing care.

One of the serious problems facing nursing education in the Philippines is the increasing number of students who finished 1 year liberal arts courses (being a requirement for entrance to a school or college of nursing) who seek accommodation in schools and colleges of nursing that have no room for them.

Because of lack of faculty, clinical and physical facilities, many hundreds of young girls cannot be accommodated even after spending money and time in college.

In this seminar we have exchanged ideas and experiences and our minds have been opened to various possible solutions of our nursing problems.

(By Mrs. Laura Yergan, nursing education consultant for Vietnam, U. S. International Cooperation Administration)

My job, as one of the American nursing education consultants for Vietnam, is carried out in Saigon at the main branch of the National School of Nursing.

Before the division of Vietnam my work was chiefly at Hanoi, where the North Vietnam branch of the school was situated. After July 1953, however, all American technical assistance had to be withdrawn from that area.

When I left North Vietnam some of the nursing students also evacuated to South Vietnam and continued their studies at the Saigon School, so we had the consolation that all of our previous work was not entirely lost.

In Saigon the nursing education consultants all have Vietnamese counterparts who are being trained to take over the teaching positions as soon as they are qualified.

Since there are no schools in Vietnam for university-level study to prepare nurses for positions as educators and administrators, the United States Operations Mission to Vietnam, for whom we work, gives scholarships to Vietnamese nurses of outstanding ability for training outside Vietnam, usually in America.

One such nurse has just completed her studies at Syracuse University in New York and is returning as nursing director of the National School of Nursing. In 1956 we hope to send 3 or 4 more nurses who are now teaching under my supervision for advanced study abroad.

It is my belief that the standards of nursing education, professional nursing and health service to the people of Vietnam will eventually achieve a level of which any country might well be proud.

(By Miss Doris Cowsill, acting matron, General Hospital, Singapore)

Singapore is a rapidly expanding colony heading toward self-government. Expansion in the medical services program is taking place to meet the ever-increasing demands of the population of Singapore, which now has 1,165,000 people over an area of 217 square miles.

To serve this population there is only 1 general hospital of 900 beds. There is a maternity hospital of 240 beds, with an average of 60 births a day, and there are also tuberculosis, mental, leprosy, infectious diseases, and children's hospitals.

As regards nurse training, we have 464 student nurses, of whom 43 are men, 110 student assistant nurses, and 72 student midwives.

The 10-year medical plan which was devised in 1950 has gone ahead with great success. This year has seen the opening of a surgical block consisting of 10 theaters and 50 postoperative beds. Also nearing completion is a pediatric unit of 200 cots.

The next stage of the building program includes the building of a new 1,000-bed general hospital, district hospitals, health clinics, accommodation for staff, and a nursing school.

(By Miss M. H. Paton, principal, Central Nursing School, Tamavua, Suva, Fiji)

There are two nursing schools in Fiji, 1 at Tamavua and 1 at Lautoka. At the end of the preliminary period of a month's training time, 8 nurses are sent to Labasa Hospital from the Central Nursing School for 1 year.

I am stationed at the Central Nursing School, Tamavua, but my duties include supervision of the Lautoka School and regular visits to Labasa Hospital, at which places discussions on education and student supervision take place.

At present there are 207 student nurses in the schools, both Fijian and Indian, and a comprehensive curriculum is presented.

At the completion of 3 years and 3 months' training students sit for the qualifying examination under the Nurses' and Midwives' Board of Fiji.

After registration, an endeavor is made to keep qualified nurses in the hospitals for 1 year's postbasic experience before being transferred as district health nurses, or to staff rural hospitals.

At regular intervals I visit schools in the Suva area to aid recruitment, also in the Lautoka area, where I am assisted by the Lautoka tutor sister.

(By John Waterer, WHO nurse educator, Penang, Malaya)

I am a male nurse, a nurse-educator in the ranks of the nurses of the World Health Organization. I trained in England just before the last war. I served in the war in the ranks, and as an officer of the Royal Army Medical Corps.

After the war, I attended the University of Manchester and obtained a diploma qualifying me as a nurse tutor. After a period of service in that capacity in London, I entered the service of the World Health Organization as their first male nurse-educator.

The program in which I am working is in Penang, Malaya. At the end of hostilities the Government of Malaya established schools of nursing and young Malayan men and women are admitted for a period of 3 years and 4 months nurse training.

These young Malayans are anxious to serve their people in the true spirit of service.

Today the Malayan hospital and health services are expanding with the ever-increasing number of available trained workers. The World Health Organization has been assisting in this education program since 1950.

At the moment, in Penang, we have a team leader who specializes in postgraduate training and comes from Canada, an educator specializing in Public Health nursing who comes from New Zealand, and myself.

I assist the Government's education staff lecturing and demonstrating to both male and female nurses. In addition, I, of course, take an especial interest in the male nurses and their training.

The nurses represent all the peoples of Malaya: Malay, Indian, Chinese and Eurasian. It is a wonderful experience to work with these enthusiastic young people and alongside trained nurses from different parts of the world.

(By Miss Wilhelmina Visscher, WHO nursing education consultant in Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos)

In December 1951, two nurses of the World Health Organization went to Cambodia as the first members of a nursing education team to help the Government establish modern nursing and midwifery educational programs.

Cambodia is situated between Thailand and Vietnam and has a population of 4 million people of whom 600,000 live in Phnom-Penh, the capital.

Life is peaceful for the Cambodians and nature is good to them. The normal temperature varies from 30° to 33° centrigrade and the provision of clothing for children is

not a problem. Rice is a staple food and the Mekong River provides enough fish.

Most of the education in the past has been given by the bonses, who are the Buddhist priests, and formerly only boys were allowed to attend classes. Education for girls was not thought to be very necessary. Some changes have taken place: Girls are now attending the public schools and, under the leadership of a few educated ones, women have begun to take part in a very small measure in community affairs.

The infant mortality rate is very high and it is not unusual to have a mother tell you that from the 10 or 12 children she has had, only a few are alive.

Two Cambodian nurses, 1 man and 1 woman, were assigned as national counterparts to the World Health Organization nurses. We started to work with them in an informal way and slowly introduced them to the concept of modern nursing. A health center called a dispensaire, which gives outpatient service, was made available by the Government to be used as a demonstration center for all public-health activities.

Well-baby and prenatal clinics were started. The nurses were given a special course in public health and home visits were started.

The giving away and adoption of babies are common practices and are treated very casually by all concerned. A mother will tell us that the baby is not growing too well. After we have heard that she does not nurse her baby, the value of breast feeding is explained. She listens very patiently.

After the explanation has gone on for 10 minutes, we then discover that the baby is not her own baby but has been adopted from one of her neighbors.

In the hospital we helped with the opening of a children's ward and the nurses had to be trained to care for the babies.

Nursing as it is known in most countries has been unknown in Cambodia in the past. Treatment as prescribed by the doctor would be given, but the actual bedside nursing care was left to the relatives.

The patient was taken to the hospital as a last resort. Many "cures," such as drinks compounded of different herbs, were first given, so that by the time the patient was admitted he was often in a critical condition.

Slowly the people have begun to realize that the hospital is there to help them get better.

The nurses have been taught how to care for babies, how to bathe them, how to prepare the feeds and how to feed them. They have learned that milk should be given to a baby after being heated, and that a hot water bottle should be placed next to the premature baby rather than on top of the child. The mothers have been encouraged to stay with the babies they have brought to the hospital and this has helped to increase their confidence in the hospital staff. It has also given excellent opportunities for them to learn how better to care for their babies.

The World Health Organization nursing team has grown and now consists of four nursing and midwifery educators. Each of us has a national counterpart working with us, who will gradually take over more and more responsibility for the program.

At present prefabricated buildings are serving as school buildings and a basic nursing course is being given to 13 selected students.

With the help of American funds, a nursing school is being built. Teaching materials have already arrived. We hope that the status of nursing in Cambodia will be raised and that better-educated girls and boys will be attracted to take up nursing.

(By Miss Aya Maeda, professor, St. Luke's Junior College of Nursing, Tokoyo, Japan)

I completed my basic training and postgraduate course in the College of Nursing in Tokyo, and took advanced study at the Teachers' College, Columbia University and at the University of Toronto in Canada. I have worked as a public health nurse for many years.

After World War II, with the help of the American nurses, the status of the Japanese nurse improved remarkably. Nursing education has also improved a great deal.

Our problem at present is that there are not enough qualified people to take teaching positions. There are 160 schools of nursing in Japan where candidates must be high-school graduates. There is only one school of nursing which has a women nurse director.

The Japanese Nursing Association is one of the strongest women's groups in Japan. It has about 50,000 members including midwives, clinical nurses, and public health nurses.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 12 many thousands of American citizens, many of them of Lithuanian descent, gathered at Maria High School in Chicago to commemorate the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

It was truly an inspiring occasion, in the course of which a number of notable addresses were delivered. Among these was the address by the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania, who serves in Chicago. His observations are eminently worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA, AT THE LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMEMORATION, FEBRUARY 12, 1956, MARIA HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, CHICAGO

We are observing the anniversary of Lithuania's independence this year on the birthday of two heroes of freedom: Thaddeus Kosciusko and Abraham Lincoln. This adds significance to our commemoration—it binds Lithuania's history more closely with that of America. Kosciusko ties ancient Lithuania to young America. Lincoln symbolizes unity and freedom. And unity and freedom bring into the picture Grand Duke (King) Mindaugas of Lithuania.

In a Lincolnian manner, the State of Lithuania was established and united by Mindaugas over 700 years ago. Mindaugas met the same fate as Lincoln. Both these great men died at the hands of enemies of their states.

Thaddeus Kosciusko defended Lithuania from Russian invasion and occupation, and fought for America's independence. After America had won her independence, Kosciusko returned to his homeland for his final struggle against the Russian attackers of Lithuania-Poland. During this struggle he was wounded and taken prisoner by the Russians. They released him only the following year (1796) after the seizure and occupation of Lithuania. Kosciusko never returned to Lithuania. He went to Western Europe and became the first DP. While living abroad he kept up the struggle for Lithuania's independence. During the Vienna Congress of 1815 he wrote to Russia's Czar Alexander requesting him to restore Lithuania's and Poland's independence. The Czar did not satisfy Kosciuskos' request. Lithuania was made into a Russian province. The present occupants of Lithuania are doing the same—converting Lithuania into a Russian colony.

Dedicated to liberty and human rights, and having been a colony, America is opposed to colonialism and slavery. Her Declaration of Independence is based on supreme human rights and freedom. Lincoln effectuated these rights and freedoms. He unified the country and formulated many of its national ideals. His Gettysburg address and other statements epitomize America's national philosophy and aims. For example:

"Let us have faith that right makes might * * *.

"With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Lincoln left these words as a sort of testament which his successors are carrying out to this day. Guided by justice and humaneness, his successors (Woodrow Wilson) proclaimed the principle of self-determination of nations after World War I. In consequence of this credo and with its own national determination, Lithuania regained its independence. This principle is incorporated in the Declaration of Restoration of Independence of Lithuania.

When the aggressors began rampaging and seizing foreign lands, America proclaimed the doctrine of nonrecognition of the spoils of aggression. This doctrine became international law. Lithuania and other victims of Soviet aggression have availed and are availing themselves of this law and doctrine. America and other nations do not legalize the Soviet perfidy and continue to recognize Lithuania as an independent state.

In contrast to the aggressor's disregard for law and violation of obligations—their throttling of the occupied states and enslaved nations—the United States proclaimed the declaration for liberation of enslaved nations, and made it a part of American policy. (Eventually this declaration will become reality.) All of these principles, declared and being carried out by the United States, became principles of international law. They are incorporated in the United Nations declaration of 1942, the United Nations Charter, and other appropriate international pacts and undertakings. These principles are firmly and clearly reiterated and stated in the Washington declaration recently made by United States President Eisenhower and Great Britain's Premier Eden. This declaration, among other things, states:

"We have dedicated ourselves to the goal of self-government and independence of all countries whose people desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence.

"During the past 10 years, 600 million people in nearly a score of lands have, with our support and assistance, attained nationhood. Many millions more are being helped surely and steadily toward self-government.

"During this period, the Soviets, who assert the supremacy of the state and deny the inherent rights of man, have also been active.

"Millions of people of different blood, religious and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union, and many millions more have in fact, although not always in form, been absorbed into the Soviet Union bloc. In Europe alone, some 100 million people, in what were once 10 independent nations, are compelled, against their will, to work for the glorification and aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist state."

The first part of the last paragraph refers to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This is important and significant. The Lithuanian people are grateful for this to the Governments and peoples of the United States and Great Britain.

Grateful for the significant statements and for the nonrecognition of the treacherous incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, Lithuanians await the day when the Soviets will be told to get out of Lithuania, to match their actions with their words about "equal rights, respect for state sovereignty and noninterference in internal affairs of other states" (quoting Premier Bulganin's note to President Eisenhower). In his most recent note, Bulganin also stated: "The Soviet Union has always maintained, and maintains at the present time the principle that the internal system in any state is the domestic concern of its own people."

The plight of Lithuania and its people forcefully and undeniably points up the Soviet hypocrisy and belies their boasting. The Soviets violated all treaties with Lithuania, seized and occupied Lithuania by force and deceit, not only interfered in Lithuania's internal affairs, but wrecked them. They disenfranchised and robbed her people, forced them into Soviet slavery and deported many thousands of them from Lithuania. Is this what the Soviets mean by noninterference in the internal affairs of other states?

The Lithuanians protest against the Soviet aggression against Lithuania and their violence in Lithuania. They demand that the Soviets get out of Lithuania with their army, police, agents, and colonists. They demand that the Soviets return the Lithuanians deported to Siberia, Vorkuta and other desolate areas of Russia. They demand that the Soviets observe the treaties of peace and nonaggression whereby they undertook to respect the independence of Lithuania and the integrity and inviolability of its territory.

Use of Radiant Heat on Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Derald F. Cox, a junior at South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. Dak., won the annual scholarship contest sponsored by East River Electric Power Cooperative, which has its headquarters at Madison, S. Dak., for a student studying agricultural engineering at the college.

His winning essay entitled "Using Radiant Heat on Farms," discusses the many uses of radiant heat on the farm and how radiant heating is becoming more widespread.

Cox, 26, is the son of William Cox, former publisher of the Bristol (S. Dak.) New Era. The scholarship winner has two sons. He is a veteran, having spent 4 years in the Navy.

The widespread interest in radiant heating, and especially farm uses for this type of heating, makes his essay demand reading. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USING RADIANT HEAT ON FARMS

(By Derald F. Cox)

If one were to tour American farms he would see modern and up-to-date machinery, but in most of the same farm homes he would find old-fashioned coal, oil, and wood-burning heating units. At the watering tank he would likely find a smoking coal- or oil-burning tank heater. In the brooder house there would likely be a gaseous smell from the old brooder stove, which was probably the cause of many losses among the chicks. Such a stove may even explode and burn down the brooder house taking with it the entire chick crop.

As one continues his tours he will find that some of our more progressive farmers have learned to make electric radiant heat work for them.

These farmers find that radiant heat waves go through the air without heating the air and turn into heat when they strike a solid. Ultimately the air comes up to the desired temperature because the surface and objects in the path of the rays have become saturated with heat and they in turn will warm the air by convection.

By raising the temperature of the room surfaces, radiant loss from the body is slowed down and convective body loss can be increased by dropping the air temperature. Thus the farmer may be more comfortable at lower temperatures under radiant rays than he is at the same temperatures of other heating systems.

Temperature distribution throughout the room is very uniform in radiant heating. This is especially noticeable in constancy of the air temperature at various heights above the floor. Often the temperatures from floor to ceiling remain within 2 degrees, while in other systems they often vary 10 to 15 degrees with cold floors and hot ceilings.

Farmers are enjoying many advantages of electric radiant heating systems. They do not need a furnace, or a basement, or utility room in which to hide the contraption. No pipes, no chimney, no open flame, and no delivery or storage problems are a few of the advantages of a radiant heating unit on the farm. Dirt, noise, and the danger of explosion are also eliminated.

There are no moving parts to cause wear which would result in unnecessary expense and maintenance. Electric radiant heating systems can have a very fine degree of control. A thermostat can be placed in each room or an on-off switch by each door. If both are employed the heat can be flipped on as one enters the room, then the thermostat keeps the room at the proper temperature.

Farmers can and do find many applications for electric radiant heaters:

1. They often heat their entire farm home by radiant heating systems.

2. Often a farmer may build an addition to his home and find that his present heating system cannot be adequately employed to take care of this added load. Radiant heaters will do a wonderful job of heating this extra space with just a simple installation.

3. Very often a farmer might find that he has cold areas in his home. Electric radiant heaters can quickly relieve this problem.

4. Radiant heaters are a health guard over the child's crib or in the children's nursery.

5. Radiant heat brings comfort to reading and sewing areas.

6. Potatoes and other food can be saved from freezing in coldest weather in the basement by electric radiant rays.

7. There are radiant panels on the market designed as wall panels. These can be converted into a portable tray which can fry eggs, warm baby's bottle, and handle shop jobs such as glue thinning and paint drying.

8. Radiant rays are a whiz at barbeques.

9. Farmers have found that radiant heat rays work very nicely for keeping livestock watering tanks from freezing; although for continuous use the resistant elements and insulated tanks are preferred.

10. Bedding under cows could probably be kept reasonably dry by the use of electric radiant heat.

11. A permanent radiant heating panel in the garage under the car will insure starting in the coldest weather. Farmers will find that radiant heat under the car has an advantage over the head bolt heater because the crankcase oil will become viscous in a matter of minutes. With the head bolt heater, the engine block must become quite hot before the oil in the crankcase begins to flow easily.

12. Farmers are finding that one of the finest means of keeping their milkhouse temperatures above freezing is through electric radiant heating systems. While the radiant rays keep the temperature between 35 and 40 degrees Fahrenheit the farmer works in comfort under the infrared rays just as the sun's rays keep skiers in bathing suits comfortable at Sun Valley, Idaho, during the winter months.

13. That it is clean, odorless, fire safe, automatically controlled, and that its heat source can also provide light are some of its advantages for brooding. Radiant heaters should be installed according to approved methods.

14. Pumps and waterlines in wellhouses are kept free of ice in coldest weather by electric radiant heaters.

15. Milking parlors are kept comfortable during milking time by radiant heat.

16. Farmers are finding that they can have a warm stall in their barns for sick and chilled animals without the expense of partitioning off a separate room. "The quantity of energy transferred by convection between the panel and its surroundings is usually so small with respect to the needs for ambient-air heating that it can be neglected and regarded solely as a loss due to inability to achieve complete energy dissipation by radiant means."

17. Local or spot pane radiant heaters can be employed to transfer energy directly to or from a farmer whose activities are localized within a restricted area. A farmer can repair his machinery during the coldest months in his shed with the light and comfort of infrared rays.

18. Radiant rays warm both rooms.

There are a number of means of bringing about radiant heat. When one means of radiant heat will heat nicely in one place another kind will do a better job in some other place.

Infrared ray lamps are probably the most popular radiant heat source on farms today. Infrared ray heat lamps can easily be set up and taken down in most farm buildings. They provide light as well as heat. Infrared rays are excellent for brooding. Most farmers find it to their advantage to use the splash-proof lamps, which are specially treated to withstand water splashing on them when they are in operation. Farmers who are using infrared lamps for the first time should check with their local rural electric cooperative for the approved methods of installation and operating procedure.

It is generally believed that it is not economically feasible to heat with radiant heating systems in the northern part of North America, but this is not necessarily true. If an electric radiant system is well planned, installed properly, and in an area where electricity is not unreasonably expensive, it can compete economically with oil burning systems. Electric heating costs much less to install than other systems, has a heat loss of only 5 percent compared with 25 percent to 50 percent in conventional methods and requires no maintenance.

During Canada's coldest March in 11 years, Arthur B. Johnson, Montreal engineer, tested a new radiant glass heating system in an eight-room cottage in the Laurentians. He reports that the house was warm at −30° F. The cost of heating the house for the month was $29.60 as compared to a similar house with 80 percent as much living space, heated by an oil-fired hot-water system, which cost $53.20 to heat for the month. After reading Johnson's report, one wonders why anyone would install anything but an

electric radiant heating system. His system was evidently well designed. Every successful heating system must be carefully planned.

John E. Fritz, manager, Codington-Clark Electric, Watertown, reports that a milking parlor 12 feet by 14 feet by 9 feet near Watertown, was heated for 6 weeks during some of the coldest weather for the winter, from the middle of January to the end of February, at a total consumption of 280 kilowatt-hours and cost of $5.60. Hundreds of dollars can also be saved by the elimination of the basement and chimney needed in conventional homes.

The above examples would seem to indicate that electric radiant heating can be economically used on farms everywhere. Without proper insulation electric radiant heating on the farm can be very expensive. An electrical engineer should be consulted before installing a large electric radiant heating system. Local electric power cooperatives will usually render every assistance in planning an electric heating system.

Bethlehem Steel and Maryland History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, steelmaking is rooted deep in the industrial history of the State of Maryland, and in large measure, this great industry has paced the economic growth of our State. Important in this constant development have been the activities of the Bethlehem Steel Co., whose plant at Sparrows Point, Md., is to be expanded once again.

In this regard, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bethlehem Steel and Maryland History," which appeared on the editorial page of the Baltimore Sun on February 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHLEHEM STEEL AND MARYLAND HISTORY

For some few years Bethlehem's steel plant at Sparrows Point has been the world's biggest steel plant on tidewater. Now, according to the company's announcement of a $200 million expansion program, Sparrows Point will become the biggest steel plant on or away from tidewater.

Here indeed is a milestone in the economic progress of our State. It is one that is not without coincidental color in the matter of timing. It was 40 years ago that the Bethlehem Steel Co. acquired Sparrows Point from the old Maryland Steel Co. and the Pennsylvania Steel Co.

The plant at the time was 29 years old, having been started in 1887 with four blast furnaces. Those who had started it had chosen Sparrows Point for its location for three reasons: (1) Imported ores were to be used and the site was on tidewater, (2) coal for producing coke was readily available in Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia, and (3) there was a "favorable labor supply."

The vision of these early planners has paid off and continues to pay off. Operations at Sparrows Point are still based on the importation of foreign ore, mostly from the company's own developed mines in Venezuela. Coal is still coming in from the same planned sources. And the labor market has remained favorable. Of course, there has never been any question about the ready market for Sparrows Point products.

Whether Sparrows Point, once it has become the biggest steel plant in the world, can retain that title, poses a question. Other companies are also expanding their plants; the title of "biggest" could be a passing fame.

On this point Maryland can offer a little history of its own. Maryland was one of the earliest colonial producers of iron. Probably the earliest smelter in the colony was Principio furnace in Cecil County. The second furnace of record was on John Moale's land at the mouth of Gwynn Falls. It was built in 1723.

Maryland production of iron ore remained high throughout the colonial period and well into the 19th century. Then came the opening and development of the big ore deposits in the Lake Superior region and, to a lesser extent, in Alabama.

This ore was of a better grade than the Maryland product. Mining in Maryland dwindled to nothing. Worse still, the old furnaces were closed one after the other—all giving way to the huge developments in the Middle West and South.

Then came the revival with the opening of Sparrows Point and the turning to foreign ores. In the last several years, with the threatened exhaustion of high-grade ores around Lake Superior, the turning to imported ores has been rapid. It has brought the big development of United States Steel on the Delaware River above Philadelphia.

But our immediate interest, and all of Maryland's too, is in the expansion at Sparrows Point—an expansion which speaks well for the economic future of the State.

Tribute to Morton Tompkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, February 16, 1956, in tribute to the late Morton Tompkins, of Yamhill, Oreg., who died last week after a notable and outstanding career as master of the Oregon State grange and, later, as a leader in the fight for public development of the great river systems of the Pacific Northwest.

The editorial is entitled "A Fighter for His Convictions."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FIGHTER FOR HIS CONVICTIONS

The death of Morton Tompkins at 71 removes from the Oregon scene one of the stout fellows of the State grange and of the public power movement of the Pacific Northwest.

In fact, for many years Mort Tompkins' militant advocacy of the PUD movement, CVA and all-Federal development of our rivers made his name synonymous with those programs. He was a controversial figure.

The fact remains that Mort Tompkins was willing to fight for his convictions, regardless of cost. He had courage. He was untiring. He made a name for himself in Oregon agriculture and in Oregon politics. He was a frontline fighter for the things in which he believed.

For that he will be remembered and admired.

United States Aid To Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have already asked consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John Cowles, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune on February 15, regarding the crisis in south Asia. On the 16th of February there appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune also an article by Mr. Cowles entitled "United States Is Urged To Rush Aid to Burma To Keep Russia From Taking Over." This also is an exceedingly interesting and timely article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IS URGED TO RUSH AID TO BURMA TO KEEP RUSSIA FROM TAKING OVER

(By John Cowles)

In Rangoon, Burma, a few weeks ago, I had the feeling that tragedy impended, that unless the United States rapidly finds means of getting American dollars and American technicians into Burma, then rubles and Russian technicians might soon take over one more important Southeast Asian country.

Burma is a weak, neutral, politically adolescent, geographically exposed but strategically important nation of nearly 20 million people to which the United States is currently giving no financial support.

An expenditure of perhaps $15 million a year for 4 or 5 years by the United States for economic aid might prevent the Bamboo Curtain of Asian communism from enclosing it and sealing it off from a continued exchange with the free world of people, products and ideas.

Burma has hundreds of miles of common frontier with Red China, and Burma wants both from philosophical conviction and from expediency to keep neutral as between the United States and Red China.

BURMA WANTS TO KEEP INDEPENDENCE

Burma does not want to go Communist. She wants to retain her independence. She fears, however, that if she should sign any kind of military pact with the United States, which she has no intention of doing, China might use that as a pretext for invasion and occupation.

Burma does not want even to accept dollar gifts from the United States for fear that that might jeopardize her position of neutrality. Burma wants to sell rice, her principal article of export, to get the foreign exchange she needs to develop her economy.

But the United States, which has huge surpluses of wheat and rice of its own, not only is uninterested in buying Burmese rice but has actually been depriving Burma of its

normal markets by selling, or dumping, American rice and wheat in Japan, India, South Korea, Indochina, etc.

Burma wants American technicians. She wants to improve the docks at Rangoon; she wants new locomotives and freight cars for the railroad that runs to Mandalay; she wants more diesel engines, a cement plant, a small tire factory to use the rubber she grows, and a small paper mill in which she can convert her bamboo pulp.

But Burma does not want to accept "charity" from America, or aline herself with "western capitalism." She wants to keep independent and scrupulously neutral in the cold war.

RUSSIANS OFFER TO BUY BURMESE RICE

Russia has now offered to buy all of Burma's rice surplus at world market prices and supply the industrial machinery that Burma wants. Of course, the Russians add, that would involve their sending Russian technicians to Burma to maintain the equipment and train Burmese workers.

Currently, the only important American assistance to Burma stems from the Ford Foundation. It finances, among other things, a technological school near Rangoon where young Burmese are trained in carpentry and mechanics and engineering and electronics. It is operated by a handful of Americans, selected by the Dunwoody Institute of Minneapolis, who inconspicuously guide Burmese teachers in the training of the students.

The Russians are now offering to build a much larger technological school in Rangoon.

One member of the Burmese Cabinet told me he deeply feared that this would really be a training school for Communists and a center for revolutionary subversion.

"If we could only sell the United States some rice," he said passionately, "we wouldn't need to sell Russia our rice and take Russian industrial equipment and Russian technicians in payment."

Burma's situation illustrates the bankruptcy of the political philosophy of those Americans who take the position that "those who are not with us are against us; therefore we should help only those nations that are our military allies."

GOVERNMENT NOT YET IN FIRM CONTROL

The important thing for us to do in Asia is not to press solely for more military pacts, or to make threats against the Russians and the Chinese, but to try to prevent presently neutralist nations from being surreptitiously taken over by the Communists.

Burma has many problems. The central government is not yet in firm control of the whole nation. Rebels and bandits hide in the jungles and hills and periodically emerge to pillage villagers and disrupt economic life.

Half a dozen separate bands of armed groups, numbering in the thousands, still defy the central government. They are so-called "White Flag" or Stalinist Communists; "Red Flag" or Trotskyite Communists; Karen Christians, who dislike Buddhist rule and want their part of Burma made a separate nation; two different hill tribes, the Shans and the Kachins, who want their independence, or use it as an excuse for robbery and lawlessness; and lastly some remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Chinese forces which fled to Burma when Chiang left the mainland, who have refused offers to be transported to Formosa, and who live largely by pillage.

The situation is, however, better than a year ago. The rebels, including Communists, are surrendering in increasing numbers.

I saw many inmates of a rehabilitation camp doing construction work. After they have been taught a trade they are released.

As an illustration of Burma's neutrality between the Communist and free worlds, consider this:

At the ceremonial parade, which I was fortunate enough to witness, marking the eighth anniversary of Burma's independence from Great Britain, one of the honored guests, who received a high government decoration, was Sir Hubert Rance, the last British governor who ruled Burma as a colony.

(Incidentally, can any American imagine the United States giving the representative of King George III an American decoration of honor just 8 years after we won our independence from England?)

MME. SUN YAT-SEN ALSO IS HONORED GUEST

Also in the reviewing stand as an honored guest was Mme. Sun Yat-sen, widow of the Chinese revolutionary leader and herself now a member of an important government committee in Red China.

The President of Burma in his speech made it crystal clear that Burma was neutral between the two great power blocs whose representatives were seated near him.

That evening, I attended a dinner of the faculty of Rangoon University, where U Nu, the able, idealistic, and democratic Prime Minister of Burma, spoke.

A small, hard core of disciplined Communists in the student body at the university is urging other students not to study, telling them that a general strike will be called at the time the spring examinations are given and every student will be promoted without examination.

Although U Nu did not mention the word Communist, he exhorted the faculty not to promote students who refused to take their examinations and not to submit to what he called mobocracy.

Afterward, two faculty members who had received part of their education in America and who are pro-Western, told me they feared this impending student strike would be tied to a general strike planned for the time of the Burmese election, which will presumably be held in late March or April. They expressed apprehension that despite U. Nu, Rangoon University might be taken over by the Communists, just as has happened in Singapore, where the Communists control both the faculty and the student body.

AMERICA IS URGED TO SAVE COUNTRY

When one sees at first hand a country like Burma, a country of gay, friendly people, politically naive and pitifully unprepared for self-government, but equally determined to have it, teetering on the abyss of communism, one wonders: "Can't America try to save it?"

It is true that we already have more wheat and rice than Agriculture Secretary Benson knows what to do with.

But would it not be wise for us to buy $10 million worth of Burmese rice, or even teakwood, so that Burma could get American technicians and American machinery instead of Russian?

It is true that Burma sold supplies to Red China while the fighting was going on in southeast Asia. That technically makes Burma ineligible for American aid. (The Burmese viewed the Indochina war simply as an anticolonial uprising against the French. Their opinion on the Korean war is less clear.)

Perhaps Burma will slide under Communist rule whatever we do.

But, at least, if we gave Burma aid we would have the satisfaction of knowing that we were giving to a relatively honest government. Informed people, Americans, British, and Asians alike, say there is much less governmental corruption in Burma than in almost any country in the Far East, and our dollars would not go for the enrichment of a few dishonest officials. So, regardless of legal technicalities, regardless of mathematical odds, can America afford not to see that Burma gets some economic aid?

Our doing it might save 20 million more people from becoming Communist serfs.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions on the floor of the Senate I have pointed up the vital role of the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

It is my earnest hope that this year, as the Nation celebrates the 50th anniversary of the pure food and drug law, we will honor this agency and the memory of all those who contributed to its establishment and continuation, by appropriating sufficient funds for FDA to handle its tremendous and increasing responsibilities.

It was a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, who signed the Food and Drug Act into law.

It is my hope and belief that the present Republican administration, with the support of Republican and Democratic Members of Congress, will help fulfill the greatest potentialities of this law in the public service.

The question of shortage of funds for some Government enforcement agencies is almost a perennial one in any administration.

In the past, unfortunately, FDA has not been given sufficient appropriations by both Republican and Democratic administrations.

I am hoping now, however, that after its look-see, in its initial years of office, that the present administration will add to its laurels by continued fullest efforts in cooperation with the citizens committee on the FDA to support this agency.

I send to the desk the text of two editorials which tell the FDA story frankly and eloquently. The first is from the February 19 issue of the New York Times; the second is from the February 17 issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of both editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 19, 1956]

FOOD AND DRUGS

In 1906 President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Food and Drug Act, now a legislative monument to the late Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, a man who had the passionate indignation and zeal of the born crusader. The 50th anniversary of the passage of the act, his conception, is to be celebrated over a period of months by the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States and by the very food and drug industry that had so bitterly opposed Wiley.

When the crusading that culminated in the act began, the preparation of food was rapidly passing from the kitchen to the factory. The pioneers in the commercial preparation of food were no experts in bacteriology or even in food technology. Spoilage was costly and frequent. Hence preservatives

were used with little regard for their physiological effect. Factories were none too clean. All this Wiley changed by arousing public opinion through the press and his lectures. His pure food and drug law has been acclaimed as "the strongest national law on the subject." The law of caveat emptor no longer applies to food and drugs. The consumer reads the label and knows what he is getting, and the retailer knows what he is selling.

Farseeing though he was, Wiley probably did not foresee the full effect of his activities. His old opponents, the food processors, have long been stanch supporters of the Food and Drug Act. It has turned out that it is good business to prepare food in factories so clean that the public can be invited to inspect them, and that pure food sells itself. In fact, the food industry now maintains the Nutrition Foundation under the direction of Dr. Glenn C. King to carry on scientific research on food so that advantages may be taken of new scientific discoveries. We no longer have to worry about the quality of what is canned or packaged. Instead, we have to consider what is good and what is bad for us from the standpoint of the biochemist whose business it is to discover what happens to a forkful of peas or a piece of beefsteak after it is swallowed. Times have changed since Wiley was crusading up and down the land. Because they change, the Food and Drug Act will have to be amended occasionally, as it was amended in 1938, to keep pace with the new knowledge.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 17, 1956]

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SHOULD BE MUCH STRENGTHENED

One day soon, in the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, the question of a $1 million increase in the annual funds of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) will come up. If the Congressmen are properly concerned with the national health, they will grant the boost, possibly even increase it.

The FDA is one of the most important small agencies of the Federal Government. It is charged with protecting the public from poisonous materials in food, insanitary conditions in food manufacturing, food adulteration, false and misleading food claims, dangerous drugs, adulterated or misbranded cosmetics and deceptive packaging.

For years the FDA has not been able properly to carry out its assigned tasks. Why not? Because it didn't get enough money to hire necessary staff and purchase necessary equipment.

A top-level citizens' committee brought out the shocking story last summer. Here are a few findings:

There were fewer FDA enforcement agents in 1955 than in 1941, despite a 30 million growth in population. At the 1955 inspection rate, food establishments would be visited on an average of once every 60 years. Approximately 80 percent of the food, drug, and cosmetic imports coming through the New York International Airport were passed without examination because the FDA could afford to station an inspector there only 2 days each week.

Under the Eisenhower administration FDA appropriations dropped from $5.6 million in fiscal 1953 to $5.1 million in fiscal 1955 and $5.4 million in fiscal 1956. Now, spurred by the citizens' committee report, the President has asked $6.7 million for next year.

This sum, according to a recent speech by Bradshaw Mintener, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would enable FDA to increase the number of permanent employees from 891 to 1,025 and the number of inspectors from 250 to 300. It would make possible an increase in the number of inspections from 11,700 this year to 13,800 next year.

Such a program is encouraging, but hardly impressive. It makes only a dent in the problem. The citizens' committee outlined the true scope of the problem when it said a truly efficient FDA would have 1,000 inspectors, a modern building to house administration and research, money to sponsor a broad educational and information program, a threefold to fourfold budget increase.

The necessity of truly effective food and drug protection, at a time when volume and variety and character of products are constantly changing, should be obvious. Congress should seriously consider whether a greater strengthening of FDA than that proposed by the administration is not demanded.

Why Stop the Farmer at 90 Percent When Everybody Else Is Getting 110 Percent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Knox County is one of the great livestock counties of Missouri. Its farmers are among the most advanced and progressive of the State. I am including in my remarks in the RECORD a statement and recommendations adopted on February 8 by the Knox County NFO representing a membership of 750 farmers and businessmen, as follows:

A CONCENSUS OF THE KNOX COUNTY, MO., NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION PREPARED BY THEIR RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 8, 1956

We speak as farmers in Knox County, Mo., and members of the National Farmers Organization.

We declare that an agricultural emergency exists. We call on the Secretary of Agriculture to take emergency action to prevent disaster, and we request the Congress to work out a long-range program which will insure the farmer of his fair share of the national income.

We feel that a long-range, comprehensive program is the only answer to the farm problem, but one cannot help a drowning man by drawing blueprints for a boat. Our recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture are these: That he begin immediately the purchase of live hogs and cattle. For a 90-day period of time he should purchase hogs from 160 to 180 pounds, and fed cattle from 700 to 900 pounds at prices not less than 100 percent of parity. Purchases should not be made from the packers, as this would turn a farm program into a bonanza for the packers. These animals should be purchased from farmers at the stockyards, processed on contract with packinghouses, and used by the Government in feeding the military forces and in providing an adequate school lunch for children in the public schools.

Long-term credit must be made available at once on the basis of producing ability rather than usual collateral requirements.

Our further recommendation to the President of the United States is that if the present Secretary of Agriculture fails to do this, using powers and funds which already have been voted to him by the Congress, that the President remove him from office and replace him with a man who realizes the extent of the present emergency and is willing to take steps to remedy it.

Our recommendations to the Congress are the following.

We have a high conception of the purpose of government in a democracy. We feel its function is to control economic forces wherever necessary in the best interests of its citizens. As farmers we feel that we now live in a controlled economy, controlled by large business interests to their own advantage. We prefer control by an elected government.

We feel there is no free market for our products, and no free operation of the laws of supply and demand, so long as individual farmers are at the mercy of huge buying monopolies.

A few farmers resist the idea of controls. These are either men who feel no social responsibility, or those who hope to enlarge their own operations at the expense of small farmers who are crowded out of business. These individuals, and their lobbyists in Washington, do not represent us and do not express our views.

We realize that we have responsibility to society not to misuse our land, or to produce beyond consumption requirements. We feel that society has a responsibility to us to see that we receive a fair price for our products.

We are opposed to the Soil Bank Plan. We feel this plan will work to the advantage of large landowners and those who are misusing their soil, and to the disadvantage of small farmers. We see no sign that payments offered will be adequate to pay for fencing, seeding, soil treatments, and weed control on the acres affected.

If such a plan is put into effect, we feel there should be a distinct limit on the amount of payments made to any one farmer.

We feel that all acreage figures used should be fixed with reference to the needs and abilities of the individual farm and farm operator; crop histories used should be based on a longer term of years than at present, possibly 6 years. Tax records and actual measurements of crops should be employed to check doubtful crop histories.

It should never be made necessary to comply with acreage allotments in order to qualify for soil-building assistance.

Our recommendations for a long-term farm support program follows closely those of the Heinkel Plan. This is a simple, effective plan which would apply to farmers in all regions producing all sorts of crops and livestock. It would eliminate the need for controls. It would protect the family farm.

We ask the Congress to enact a law providing that every farm operator may market up to $10,000 worth of farm products at prices supported by the Government at 100 percent of parity. Beyond that figure, farmers would be free to raise and sell any quantity of produce on the open market.

We further recommend to the Congress that present surpluses be reduced in such amounts as deemed necessary by giving these foods to school lunch programs, old-age pensioners, and those of low-income groups in this country, and also for relieving famine conditions elsewhere in the world.

BOB WILSON, *Chairman*

Air Force Program for Fiscal Year 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the Air Force pro-

gram for fiscal year 1957 as presented by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, at a meeting of the Armed Services Committee.

It was a very important statement and one that I feel should be read by every Member of the Senate. I take this method of bringing it to the attention of the individual Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957—SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the questions "Are we still ahead in airpower?" "Are the Soviets overtaking us?" and "How do we stand in the race for new weapons like the ballistic missile?" have assumed the greater importance over the last year.

The Secretary of the Air Force and I gave you an estimate of the situation last June after we had received new intelligence including the Soviet flyovers in late April and early May. We presented you a revised evaluation of Soviet strength and also gave you our forecast of what we estimated the Soviets could do in the future.

Because we believe they can build strength faster than we originally predicted, we recommended to this committe a step-up of our aircraft production program.

We chose to speed up production of two of our newest and best fighters in order to have them in combat units by the time the Soviets get enough long-range bombers to be able to mount a large scale attack.

Because we believe the Communists can build strength faster than we originally predicted, we recommended a step-up of our aircraft production program to this committee.

We chose to speed up production of two of our newest and best fighters in order to have them in combat units by the time the Soviets get enough long-range jet bombers to be able to mount a large scale attack.

We also stepped up the planned production rate of our newest heavy bomber, the B–52. This was to maintain the margin of advantage we would need to penetrate improving defenses of a potential enemy and deliver our planned counterattacks, if war comes.

Despite these actions, the questions, "Are we still ahead in airpower?" and, "Are the Soviets overtaking us?" assume greater importance than ever before.

Here are estimates and facts that are the basis for answers to these questions.

If we are speaking about numbers of aircraft in combat units, we are not ahead, and have not been ahead for years. In Soviet combat units are now some 20,000 combat aircraft.

This compares to thousands less in the United States Air Force. Our counter to this quantity of force has been quality—better airplanes, better weapons, better airmen. It is in quality that we have been able to stay ahead. However, the Soviets are now closing the quality gap. This concerns us much more than comparisons of numbers.

Nevertheless, numbers are important. Let us look at a few comparisons which are indicative of relative effort and capability.

Let us first compare our striking forces.

The Soviet air force has more Bisons than we have B–52's right now and they can maintain this advantage for some time—if they keep on the production curve we are now predicting.

We have more B–36's than they have Bears—their turboprop heavy bomber, but they could pass us in this category in the next 2 years. This will be by default since we are phasing B–36's out and are not making turboprop bombers by choice. We believe that with the combination of tankers, jet bombers are far more effective.

We have many more B–47's than they have Badgers, their medium jet bombers.

They have thousands more light jet bombers, the Beagle, than we have B–57's.

They have thousands more new jet fighters than we have.

We have many more all-weather fighters than they have Flashlights—their newest all-weather fighter. But our estimates show that they could close this gap and outnumber us in the next 2 or 3 years.

To sum up, they either have overtaken us in quantity, or can overtake us, in all categories of warplanes except that of the medium jet bomber.

The figures I have given you are comparisons of the aircraft of the Soviet Air Force against those of our Air Force. It is true that aircraft from our other services would add to our air strength—a part but not all, of the combat aircraft in the United States Navy and Marines would conceivably be available to help out in the all-important air battle of any war.

However, most of them, as you understand, would be tied to tasks such as control of the sea, or support of surface forces, which have little effect on the air battle.

It is also true that our allies can make a worthwhile contribution to free world airpower. The British Air Force, particularly their bomber command, is improving. But if we include allies in any comparison, we must also include the satellites of the Communist bloc and we find the pattern of relative numbers is about the same.

You can see that any comparison of numbers is far from encouraging. However, as I said before, it is their push for quality that is of even greater concern.

Their new jet bombers, the Bison and the Badger, compare very favorably with our B–52 and B–47. We have retained a slight edge in performance.

The operating range of our jet bombers is further increased by the use of aerial refueling and overseas bases. These are two of our most important advantages—aerial refueling and bases.

It would be imprudent to assume that the Soviets cannot conduct aerial refueling operations. Nevertheless, I am convinced that we are far ahead of them in this technique. It is now routine in our Air Force.

Our advantage in bases is not so much in number but in location. We can hit the Soviets from many directions, and leave the target in any direction.

The Soviets, in comparison, are limited in the directions from which they can launch attacks. However, they are taking steps to correct this.

The quality and extent of their base system is improved.

They are modernizing and expanding their air facilities in eastern Europe and the Far East.

They have recently completed or have under construction many new airfields in the satellite areas. In the past year they completed several major airfields in China and they have started construction on several more.

In the Arctic, they are also continuing the development of bases.

This development of Arctic bases indicates a determined effort to further develop year-round capability to handle long-range aircraft all along this perimeter. From these Arctic bases alone, the Soviets could launch several hundred long-range bombers in a single attack.

These two items, air refueling and forward bases, are needed to give extra range to the jet bombers of both nations.

However, both nations also have a number of truly intercontinental bombers.

We estimate that their new turbo-jet bomber, the Bear, has intercontinental range. Two years ago they did not have a bomber with this range. We have the B–36 which has comparable performance.

Now, before I leave this comparison of offensive air forces, I should mention one more important USAF advantage. That is experience in long-range operations. In spite of greater Soviet production, we should be able to ready heavy jet-bomber organizations much more quickly than the Soviets.

The quality of Soviet air defenses is improving. They lagged in developing an all-weather fighter. They now have all-weather interceptors and they are capable of producing them at a fast rate.

We must plan on meeting increasing opposition. This could mean more severe losses to any attacking force we might have to push through their defenses.

Our newer interceptors, like the F–102, are just coming into the picture. These will be superior to anything the Soviets are known to have, both in speed and in hitting power.

Soviet day fighters, the Fresco and the Farmer, are superior to the MIG–15. But our F–100 is also superior to the F–86 which was better than the MIG–15. We feel that our F–101 and F–104 which will be in production in the future will put us into an even better position in defensive fighter performance.

Before leaving this comparison of airplane quality, I must touch on airlift. Here we enjoy a decided advantage, not in numbers, but in quality. Except for a few modern transports, the Soviets depend mostly upon the equivalent of our old C–47 or DC–3.

In contrast, we are now beginning to modernize our airlift and increase our capacity to fly cargo or troops. This capability will begin to get a considerable boost during the fiscal year 1957.

During the coming year we will begin to get C–130's to replace the C–119, Boxcar. The C–130 is our first turboprop transport. It is better than a hundred knots faster and can carry twice the payload of the C–119.

In fiscal year 1957 we will get the first models of a better turboprop transport, the C–133. This will go into the Military Air Transport Service. It will gradually replace C–54's and C–124's. This will be our first intercontinental transport. These planes will enable us to carry troops and supplies nonstop from the United States to Europe or North Africa.

As to Air Force capability to move Army forces, we can now lift an airborne division, without its heavy equipment. But to do this, we would have to divert aircraft from the Military Air Transport Service. And the Army would have to fight with light equipment, waiting for the shipment of heavier equipment. We do not have enough lift to do this job, and at the same time carry out the wartime priority task of moving air forces into striking position. However, the future increases in airlift capacity will mean more mobility for the Army as well as the Air Force.

In addition to the tactical airlift within the regular force, we have 13 troop carrier wings of the Air Reserve. These can be used in the early phases of war or other emergencies.

Now let us move from aircraft to nuclear weapons.

As you know, we have our biggest advantage here. Nevertheless, the Soviets are making impressive efforts.

So far in this discussion, for the sake of clarity, I have compared like items by quantity and quality.

These comparisons must be qualified. Except to indicate relative effort and progress, matching similar types is meaningless. More meaningful comparisons would be to match our bomber offensive capability against their

defenses, including their radar, their fighters, and their missiles. Similarly, we must compare Soviet bomber capabilities against our defenses.

Our own defenses and Soviet attack capabilities are both increasing. By the time the Soviets have a bomber force large enough and effective enough to wage a global war, our defenses will be formidable. Our present F–100 would be effective against the Soviet Bison, comparable to our B–52, but the Soviet Bison is available now only in limited numbers. By the time the Soviets get a sizable force of Bisons we will have the F–101, F–102, and F–104 in quantity, and this will provide us with an even more effective defensive weapon.

Comparing our attack strength with Soviet defensive strength reduces itself to the question: Can our bombers get through? The Soviets have thousands more jet fighters than we, but they also have an enormous area to defend. In my judgment the Strategic Air Command continues to have the ability to get through.

I cannot deny that the Soviets are narrowing our margin of superiority. They have long since passed us in quantity and they are making remarkable strides in quality.

As I said before, in our build-up of airpower we have retained a lead in quality.

The Soviets are attempting to close this gap by greatly increasing their research and development efforts. This is our real concern. It is apparent that they are putting more men and money into this battle of the laboratories than we are.

This greater effort could also result in the Soviets obtaining better missiles sooner than we.

They captured much data and equipment from the Germans and they gathered large numbers of German scientists. They have announced progress in the field, including ballistic missiles, and they have stated they expect to have ocean-spanning weapons in the near future.

Judging from their progress in aircraft, they could make good this combination of promises and boasts.

Here is our side of the missile picture.

For air defense, we have the surface-to-air weapons, the Nike. You are familiar with this missile. It has been in operational use for some time. New units are being continually added to the Continental Air Defense Command.

For use by our interceptor aircraft we are now getting the Falcon. This is a proven air-to-air missile of great accuracy.

Our first tactical missile is the Air Force Matador. It is already in operational use. Two squadrons are in position in Europe. Another is being added. This missile is subsonic. It can carry a nuclear warhead several hundred miles.

Under development we have the Snark and Navaho. These are longer range weapons.

In ballistic missiles—weapons with speeds that will exceed 10,000 miles per hour, the Air Force has two interrelated programs: the IRBM and the ICBM.

First, the Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile, or IRBM. We have had this weapon under development for some time. The Redstone IRBM is a back-up to this Air Force project already underway.

Of course, the big strategic development is the ICBM.

We are on schedule with this weapon now. But no one can guarantee at this time that our future schedules on these ballistic missiles will be met.

Finally, another new weapon of great strategic significance is the nuclear powered aircraft. Its almost limitless endurance and range will make it a priceless asset to our deterrent force, for it will enable us to keep more of our force in the air at all times. From this standpoint it represents a potent counterweapon even when ICBM's come on the scene.

This, gentlemen, is the basis for the answer to the questions of how we stand in the race for new weapons.

I have given you our estimates of their capability, compared with our development and production plans.

This winds up my discussion of comparative strengths.

Here are the Air Force programs and problems relevant to the budget now under consideration.

In fiscal year 1957 we will reach our goal of 137 wings. I will give you a report on this buildup by major combat commands.

First, the Strategic Air Command will get a big boost in offensive capability. Four heavy reconnaissance wings will have been converted to heavy bomb wings. Now these units are equipped with B–36's. Eventually they will get B–52's. This will give us more heavy bomb wings.

Our Tactical Air Command will also increase in capability. It will grow from 34 wings to 41 wings.

Tactical day fighter wings will be increased by seven wings. These units are capable of a very important mission—instantly reenforcing our air defenses in the event of war. And they will have the dual capability to perform ground attack missions.

The flexibility and range of our tactical air forces is being increased with aerial refueling. Nuclear weapons and global mobility make the Tactical Air Command part of our deterrent to general war as well as a potent, if not decisive, force to meet any peripheral challenge.

The Air Defense Command will continue to grow. Aiding the regular forces in air defenses are units of the Air National Guard. Pilots in planes from Air National Guard wings are standing alert at 17 locations throughout the United States. And we are now considering plans to increase this effort.

Our warning system is expanding in size, width, and depth as the speeds of Soviet bombers increase.

This is the overall composition and a report on the 137-wing force. However, 137 is just a number.

I emphasize again that numbers are no measure of effectiveness.

Our 137 wings must be good wings, not merely a force level. A number our wings are not at top effectiveness today.

To perform their missions, all of our units must be combat ready. The pace of the air battle in a modern war would be so swift and attacks would be so destructive that we could not depend on bringing units up to readiness after a war started.

However, our combat effectiveness is growing. We plan further increases in combat capability this year and next year.

But let me remind you that this increase in combat readiness is a goal we are aiming at—not a reality.

Achievement of this goal is dependent on two things—men and money.

Under the personnel ceilings imposed on the Air Force, we must have high-quality people. If we are to man the 137-wing Air Force under the present manpower ceilings, they must be good men. The Secretary has already outlined the vital significance of manpower so I will not discuss it further. However, I would add that the top-quality airmen are what we lack. We are getting the cook, baker, and the truckdriver in our increased reenlistments. We are still not getting enough topnotch maintenance and electronic technicians.

The second thing our readiness depends on is money—and I refer to a special kind of money—money to support the force we build.

During this year, achieving planned readiness may not be possible, handicapped as we are by limited operation and maintenance funds. We face a similar difficulty in fiscal year 1957 unless we get the funds requested.

The seriousness of this situation is felt throughout the Air Force. The question I hear from all my major commanders is, "When are we going to get some relief on operation and maintenance funds?"

I want to emphasize to you that operation and maintenance money can be the difference between an effective and noneffective combat force. There is no point in spending billions of dollars for air weapons systems and bases if we are not going to have enough money to maintain and operate them properly—money to pay operating costs, money to maintain our bases, money to buy the fuels, spares, and supplies we need to keep the Air Force operating.

Airplanes like the B–47 would be useless if restrictions in flying hours prevented the crews from maintaining proficiency. We must not only keep today's combat crews proficient, we must maintain the skill level in replacement crews. If we do not keep our pilots flying—repeatedly practicing their missions—they will not be ready when we need them.

Shortages in operation and maintenance funds are inevitably reflected in loss of future combat potential. I cannot overemphasize the importance of adequate operation and maintenance funds. One of our biggest stumbling blocks over the last year has been the lack of things that these funds can buy.

Operating costs are increasing. This is inevitable. We are building up. We are increasing the number of combat units and the number of new planes. These new jets cost more to operate. The increasing complexity of electronic and other technical mechanisms are all factors that cause our operating costs to climb. And every year the amount that a dollar will buy decreases.

Our growing force also calls for an expanding base system.

Nuclear weapons make dispersal and survival synonymous. Our striking force is now jammed on too few bases.

Our plan to reduce this vulnerability, and to decrease the reaction time of our striking force is to disperse our heavy bomber units one squadron, or one-third of a wing—to a base. We also plan to cut down the medium jet B–47's to one wing per base. We now have two wings on many bases.

Our present deficiency of facilities not only endangers our striking force, it slows our buildup. It cuts our combat capability. It reduces flying safety, and it cuts sharply into our efforts to keep our skilled men in the service.

Thus, this deficiency has the total effect of reducing the combat capability of the ready force. Let me warn you that, if war comes, our success in the decisive phase will depend on the force we have in being the day war starts.

Our future force effectiveness will depend more and more on new weapons. Overall we have had a head start.

But this margin must be modified by these two Communist advantages. They can start a war at a time of their own choosing. While I certainly agree with our policy of nonaggression. I must point out the military advantage of the initiative—of striking first—in any modern air war.

Their second advantage is that, having the ability to regulate the timetable, they can select weapons and put on crash programs whereas we in the United States must program a force capable of meeting all types of air attack. We must guard against the danger that they could select weapons and put on crash programs that could be decisive.

We must remember that our programs are dependent on getting the resources we need

to meet planned schedules. If these resources are not made available we could easily drop behind.

In the situation we face, we cannot afford to be complacent. It looks like the Communists could catch up. If they continue their rapid pace, it may be necessary for us to speed up.

The program I have outlined and the budget for fiscal year 1957 is austere. It meets only our most essential needs on a minimum basis. To keep this minimum program going and to reach and support 137 wings, will require an increased budget in 1953. On this basis, I urge support of this year's program.

Gentlemen, this concludes my prepared statement. I shall now attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Report on Operation of Alcoholics Anonymous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRICE DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report of Mr. Robert J. Conner, assistant director of probation, on the operation of alcoholics anonymous in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS IN OPERATION IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Robert J. Conner)

Forward. So efficiently and so faithfully Alcoholics Anonymous goes forth in the municipal court serving mankind. Such inspiring loyalty and helpfulness are not to be found from any other source.

Beginning January 1, 1955, a total of 149 probationers were referred to Alcoholics Anonymous. Of that number, 11 were revoked and 6 absconded. We accepted 12 individuals for voluntary supervision from various sources. Of that number, approximately 8 successfully made the Alcoholics Anonymous program, making a total of 140 successful cases.

All of the above people were individuals whose past had finally caught up wtih them. So what do men do when their past catches up with them? Some go to jail, some go insane, and others die. We have endeavored to help them by first persuading them to take a moral inventory, followed by a constructive plan of rehabilitation. To instigate a constructive program, one must by reason of necessity be brought face to face with his present situation. He also must be taught to recognize that he is following one or the other of two things, the convictions of his inner dwelling conscience or his inclinations. Then he must be brought to an understanding within himself to follow the dictates of his honest convictions rather than his inclinations.

We, the members of Alcoholics Anonymous, do not claim to have all the answers to all of mankind's problems. We do, however, definitely claim good judgment because good judgment comes from actual experience and experience comes from bad or poor judgment. In ordinary life, one is expected to practice what he advocates. In Alcoholics Anonymous we are taught to practice the principles of our program and thereby become known to ourselves and others for what we really are, rather than what we originally pretended to be. In Alcoholics Anonymous it matters little who we are, the important thing being what we are. The Alcoholics Anonymous program is predicated on the premise that by helping others to succeed, we help ourselves. The composite of Alcoholics Anonymous has been made better by suffering. We find great inspiration in the process of transformation and learn to respond sanely to the daily problems of life. After all, a smooth sea never made a good sailor and neither does an uninterrupted life produce a mature person.

Here in this court every Saturday morning is the truth personified and vindicated.

EXAMPLES

I. On December 24, 1945, Harry M., Jr., a white male 42 years old, stood before the late Judge McMahon after a conviction of intoxication. Harry was a decent-appearing person despite his present condition, namely, suffering from the effects of excessive use of alcohol. He very readily admitted that he had been drinking heavily for many years and that he had been in considerable trouble as a result of his drinking. It was also determined that he had been exposed to various types of treatment for alcoholism without any success. It was at this time that the court placed the defendant on probation and turned him over to the probation officer for whatever help we could give him. Harry was the first man that I ever referred to Alcoholics Anonymous for assistance with his alcoholic problem.

Immediately after he was placed on probation his employer, a rather fiery type of businessman, was contacted. He was advised of what had taken place in the court with respect to his employee, at which time the employer responded by saying, "You can just keep Harry as far as I am concerned. He has been one of the best employees I ever had, but he just won't stay sober, and therefore is of no value to me. I am through with him." At that time the employer was advised that we were going to put forth a concerted effort through the medium of AA, and we felt that our chances were better than average in effecting rehabilitation. After some hesitation on the part of the employer he stated, "All right; send him on back and I will put him to work. Maybe the two of us can keep him sober."

Immediately Harry accepted the AA program, became a part of it, and has made excellent progress in every direction. He is still an active member of AA, owns his own home, and today if you call the place of business that is still being operated by the same employer, you find Harry running the place. Periodically we have received direct communications from the present employer, stating that Harry is today the best employee he has. It is further noteworthy in this case that Harry is still active in AA and continually contributing something worth while for the benefit of those who still suffer from alcoholism.

II. On September 16, 1948, Mark R., a white male, 41 years old, stood before Judge Neilson and entered a plea of guilty to driving while drunk. A sentence of $100 or 30 days was imposed and an additional 30 days. The fine was paid, the 30 days straight time suspended, and defendant was placed on probation for a period of 1 year. This man had an arrest record going back about 5 years. He was an oil-burner mechanic, but working only part time, and what money he was earning was being spent in the realm of dissipation. His family was found to be destitute and the home in a great state of confusion. The day after he was placed on probation a field visit was made to his home in nearby Arlington and he was found paralyzed drunk. Directions were left for him to report to the probation office the following day, which he did. At that time an effort was made to indoctrinate him with some of the principles of AA, and very shortly thereafter he began to respond.

This man had been without a job and through my efforts he secured employment with the Post Office Department in Arlington during the Christmas season rush, where he earned approximately $200. He then obtained various jobs for a very nominal salary. All during this period he remained sober and participated in the meetings of AA. His probation was allowed to expire in September 1949 after a very successful period of probation and apparently a good degree of indoctrination into the AA plan of living.

Later on as a result of the previous Post Office work, he felt that he would like to become a letter carrier. He made application for that job, took the examination, and made an excellent passing grade. However, the Civil Service Commission made its investigation and declared him ineligible for the job because of his past record of arrests and convictions for drunk and driving while drunk. At this time Mark came to the Probation Office and in a very despondent state of mind, stated, "Well, my past record for drunkenness has barred me from this job." At this point, of my own volition, I wrote a letter to the Director of the Civil Service Commission, setting forth the history of this individual and outlining the progress which he had made through AA with respect to recovering from alcoholism. In detail and very frankly, a true picture was presented. The following day a personal call was received from the Civil Service Commission to verify the fact that I was the one who had sent the letter. A few questions were asked and the Commission requested that Mark return for another interview. He did that immediately, and very shortly thereafter the Civil Service Commission reversed itself and declared this man eligible. Not long after that, he was hired and went to work as a letter carrier. Today he is one of the best letter carriers in North Arlington, he is discharging his duties in an excellent manner, he owns a $20,000 home in Fairfax County on which he has already paid approximately $15,000, and he owns a 1956 automobile.

I personally contact this man about once a week and it is most gratifying to observe his serenity and the progress he has made in every direction. He attends his church regularly, and there is no state of mental confusion in his home but instead harmony and unity are there. Mark has consistently kept up his affiliations with AA. The final result of this case is typical of the progress and recovery of many alcoholics that I know personally who have had their beginning in the probation office in this court.

CONCLUSION

The plan of rehabilitation of alcoholics in operation in the municipal court through the probation office and with the cooperation of AA continues. It has been proved to be the most successful method. The total of individuals personally selected for rehabilitation through this plan numbers in the neighborhood of 800. Of that number, better than 60 percent have been rehabilitated. They are self-sustaining individuals. Many have returned to their families and are today living good normal lives, earning a good living and paying their fair share of taxes. All of this has been accomplished without any additional appropriation of the taxpayers' money for the rehabilitation of this segment of society.

We are forever reminded that none of this fine work could ever have been accomplished without the support of our program and excellent understanding of alcoholism by all of the judges of this, the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

Tribute to Wisconsin's 32d National Guard Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to see in last Sunday's issue of the Milwaukee Journal a fine roundup article concerning the National Guard Division of the Badger State, the 32d Infantry, the largest such division in the United States, and with one of the great records in our national annals.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. Jim Dan Hill, it is the pride of my State, and it will, I trust, reach still higher enlistment totals.

I send to the desk the text of the article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 9, 1956]

THIRTY-SECOND DIVISION AIMING TO INCREASE ITS MIGHT—LARGEST NATIONAL GUARD UNIT IN THE NATION TO RECRUIT NEW SOLDIERS THIS SATURDAY

Wisconsin's National Guard division, the 32d Infantry, is the largest in the United States, but only by a slim margin, the adjutant general's office learned last week. Efforts will be made this Saturday to make it by far the mightiest in the Nation.

On January 1 the division had 11,525 men in its ranks, including 773 officers, 131 warrant officers, and 10,621 noncommissioned officers and privates. The 51st Division, composed of Florida and South Carolina units, was second with 11,464. The 39th Division of Louisiana and Arkansas was third with 11,185.

STATEWIDE CAMPAIGN

Maj. Gen. Jim Dan Hill, Superior, division commander, and his troops hope to gain a more comfortable lead Saturday in a statewide enlistment campaign. Under recent orders the division was authorized to enlist 3,285 enlisted men and more than 100 officers for a total of 14,754—considered to be a full strength division.

The division's air arm, located in Milwaukee and Madison, will join the enlistment campaign, although it plans to add only 100 men to its ranks of 1,000 officers and men.

Open houses at armories and hangars from Beloit to Superior, Oconto to Hudson, will be the feature of the day in 80 State cities. Displays, drills, parades, and evening social events have been planned in some places.

PLANES WILL "BUZZ"

Wednesday will be the first National Guard day in the United States, but the Wisconsin troops decided that their recruiting campaign would be more effective on a Saturday. All of the troops will be activated to ring doorbells of homes of prospective guardsmen, act as hosts at the armories and stage drills and parades. All during the week other members will be speaking in schools throughout the State, explaining the guard to pupils.

The air guard planes will "buzz" Milwaukee and other towns and cities within a radius of 75 to 100 miles between 2 and 3 p. m. Saturday to attract attention to the recruiting drive.

Emphasis on the recruiting will be to inform prospects on how they can fulfill their military obligations by training with their neighbors in home town armories.

By joining the guard, a youth between 17 and 18½ years old can complete his military service without leaving home. If he prefers not to be deferred, he need serve only 6 months' active duty and have the time of his Reserve service reduced.

Guardsmen earn a full day's pay in grade for training once a week and also have an opportunity to get a higher rank.

TRAIN IN 31 ARMORIES

Although the 32d Division can trace its ancestry to before the Civil War, the current organization dates from November 8, 1946, when it was reorganized after World War II.

By January 1, 1950, the guard had grown to 8,289 men, including 613 officers. Four years later the strength was 9,012, with 712 officers.

One hundred years ago, the guardsmen—then called militiamen—had no uniforms, no weapons and no drill halls. Today a guard division the size of the 32d has equipment valued at approximately $14 million, its annual payroll for armory drill nights is more than $2 million and last year's payroll for 2 weeks' training at Camp McCoy totaled $981,260.

The guard trains in 31 armories. Seven 1-unit and 1 2-unit armories have been built since 1945. A 5 unit armory at Madison and a 2 unit armory at Racine are to be completed March 1 and July 1, respectively. Within the next 18 months, 8 or 9 more armories, now in the planning stage, are expected to be completed.

Wisconsin's guardsmen use 17 types of vehicles, ranging from quarter ton jeeps to 5 ton prime movers, used to carry bulldozers or to cart heavy artillery pieces. Their weapons range from .45 caliber pistols to bazookas, mortars and 155 millimeter howitzers. In the air, Wisconsin guardsmen fly F-89 Scorpions, 2-place fighter planes.

STRICTLY A STATE OUTFIT

The guard, formally organized in 1879 under that name, fought in both World Wars and also played a small part in the Spanish-American War of 1899 and the Mexican border incident of 1916.

From 1919 until the end of World War II, the organization comprised units in both Michigan and Wisconsin, but wartime reorganization of the Army enabled the post-World War II 32d Division to be reorganized as strictly a Wisconsin outfit, which it has been since.

In October, 1940, the 32d was mobilized for the last time as a Wisconsin-Michigan division. Reorganization of the Army from quadrangle to triangle divisions reduced it to 3, instead of 4, regiments and to fewer artillery units. One of the detached units went to the European theater of war.

At a training camp in Louisiana, the division's units, which then mobilized at about half strength, were filled up and in April 1942, the division was shipped to Adelaide, Australia. The division trained there and in Brisbane.

PRIED OUT ENEMY AT BUNA

Buna was the 32d's first World War II campaign. Some infantrymen hiked over the towering Owen Stanley mountains of New Guinea, others were flown to near the battle scene. Early in 1943, after fighting short rations, jungle fevers and the stifling, humid heat as well as the Japanese, the Yanks and Australians pried out the last of the enemy at Buna.

Refortified in Australia, the division went back into action on New Year's day, 1944, fighting up the New Guinea coast, then on to the Philippines. Saidor, Aitape, Morotai, Leyte and Luzon battles followed. When the Japanese tried to break through the division's lines at the Driniumor river, near Aitape, New Guinea, the Red Arrow men killed 9,300 of the enemy.

The division's final assignment was to clean Gen. Yamashita's troops off the Villa Verde trail north of Manila. That job alone required 119 days.

Demobilization took place on February 28, 1946, in Japan, 5½ years after the division was called to duty. Its records showed that 3,235 men were killed, 10,711 wounded in 654 days of combat. Few of the men who had sailed with the division from San Francisco were with it when it returned.

Federal Disaster Assistance to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include a report on Federal disaster assistance to Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Government has not overlooked the needs of Alaska in its effort to meet the needs of depressed areas and groups. The attached report on this subject, which follows, is illuminating, and I recommend its reading to my colleagues:

REPORT ON FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE TO ALASKA UNDER PUBLIC LAW 875 AND MEASURES BEING UNDERTAKEN TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

The need for emergency relief assistance in Alaska under Public Law 875 has arisen because of the near failure of the salmon runs in certain areas in the seasons of 1953, 1954, and 1955. Many communities, almost entirely dependent on the commercial salmon fishery, faced disastrous economic conditions.

THE FISHERY PROBLEM

The basic problem is not of recent origin. Wide variations in the fish runs from year to year have always been a problem to the industry and the communities dependent on them. A critical overall decline in most of the important areas coupled with a marked increase in the number of fishermen, has been taking place for many years. Drastic curtailment in the total fishing effort is required to bring the runs back. The Fish and Wildlife Service has initiated an intensive rehabilitation program. However, there is almost no prospect that this program can become effective to alleviate the poor condition of the salmon runs within the next year or two. Conditions which have developed over a period of many years cannot be remedied overnight. The drastic curtailment of fishing effort that is required necessarily involves an increased short-range burden on both the industry and the workers dependent on it. The situation will vary considerably from area to area. As an example, the Prince William Sound district will be opened to fishing on a limited basis in 1956 after being completely closed for the 1954 and 1955 seasons. This was the most drastic curtailment undertaken so far in the Territory. The economic burden was not as severe in this area as in Bristol Bay

or southeastern Alaska because of the shellfish industry and the relatively healthy Copper River salmon fishery which remained open.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has taken steps to increase employment opportunities by increased recruitment of local native labor for work in the Pribilof Island fur seal activity and by increased local employment of stream guards in its fishery protective program.

The Department has recommended to the Congress favorable action on legislation to eliminate fish traps over a 10-year period. If such action is taken it would spread employment in the industry but can hardly be considered a solution to the immediate problem.

THE FISHERMEN'S AID AND WORK PROGRAM

Under the leadership of Governor Heintzleman, a three-phase program was inaugurated during the winter of 1953–54 following the disastrous 1953 fishing season. It involved the following:

1. Emergency direct relief under the fishermen's aid program. This is the assistance made possible under Public Law 875 following Presidential declaration of the affected areas as "disaster areas." It was necessary to request this disaster assistance again after the 1954 and 1955 seasons. The direct financial contribution has been small and used entirely for costs of administration, travel and transportation of surplus food commodities to the affected communities. Expenditures amounted to approximately $10,000 out of a $40,000 allocation in 1953–54 which was supplemented by a $10,000 allocation from the American Red Cross; approximately $9,000 out of an allotment of $20,000 in 1954–55 which was supplemented by $5,500 out of a $10,000 Red Cross allotment; and an allocation of $25,000 for 1955–56. The major Federal contribution has been in the form of surplus food commodities.

2. An Emergency Public Works program with the participation of the Alaska Public Works Agency, the Territorial Highway Engineer, the Department of Aviation and local communities. This provided some assistance to the affected communities by providing work relief on useful local public projects such as roads, docks, schools, and airfields. An allotment of approximately $200,000 was made in 1953–54 out of Alaska Public Works funds, and an additional allotment of $100,000 has been made in 1955–56. However, the effectiveness of this program in providing employment has been largely limited to southeastern Alaska communities and other population centers where project sponsorship by the towns has been feasible. It has been of limited application in some of the areas of acute need such as the Bristol Bay and Bering seacoast regions.

3. Creation of new employment and income opportunities. With the active support of many Federal and Territorial agencies, it has been possible to encourage recruitment of workers for both governmental and industrial jobs from the affected localities.

Mr. Waino Hendrickson, secretary of Alaska, has headed and coordinated this overall program with the cooperation of all of the Federal and Territorial agencies involved.

TERRITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

It is quite generally agreed that the basic responsibility for emergency relief and welfare of its citizens falls on the Territorial Government. Federal assistance is appropriate in extraordinary circumstances, such as those permitting assistance under the disaster relief provisions of Public Law 875, or under the welfare program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which provides assistance to the Indian and Eskimo population on the same basis as in the States.

Territorial public-assistance programs financed jointly by Federal grants-in-aid from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Territory are provided to persons eligible without distinction as between natives and nonnatives. Beneficiaries of these programs (old age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind) are, in fact, preponderantly native ranging up to 85 to 90 percent of the total beneficiaries. Under Territorial law as presently interpreted, however, general assistance financed exclusively by Territorial funds is extended only to nonnatives.

Exclusion of the native population from general relief, financed entirely by the Territory, is based on interpretation of the law which defines as eligible "any needy resident of the Territory who has lived in the Territory for 1 year immediately preceding the date of application for relief assistance who is not eligible for aid from any other public agency or department providing similar services in the Territory."

Funds appropriated to the Territorial Department of Welfare by the 1955 legislature for the biennium ending March 31, 1957, amount to a total of $3,055,000. Of this amount $710,000 was earmarked for general relief. The balance was allocated to the following regular programs:

Administration	$345,000
Old-age assistance	450,000
Juvenile code	500,000
Aid for dependent children	1,000,000
Aid for the blind	50,000

Apart from the problem of eligibility of the native citizens for general relief the amount of the appropriation provides limited means with which to meet sudden large increases in general relief assistance. In the recent emergencies due to fishing failures, it has been thought to be impracticable to use the general-relief procedures for a group of fishing villages which, as estimated by the Governor in 1955, would total 3,600 persons.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS WELFARE ASSISTANCE

The Bureau of Indian Affairs provides welfare to those natives not presently eligible for public assistance under Territorial laws as interpreted, namely the disabled, handicapped, and unemployable, importantly including convalescent tuberculosis patients recently released from sanatoria. The amount expended by the Bureau for all welfare programs in Alaska in fiscal year 1955 amounted to $514,755, of which $272,315 was for general assistance. The fiscal year 1956 allocation is $715,656, of which $400,000 will be available for general assistance. The Bureau welfare programs are not predicated on meeting the general relief needs resulting from extraordinary changes in economic conditions.

COORDINATION OF WELFARE PROGRAMS

Although it is understood that there is no duplication of welfare assistance as between the programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Alaska Department of Welfare, the closest possible cooperation between the two agencies is required to insure that no twilight zone develops in which needy persons are not served by either agency. Although such cooperation is the practice, and all possible effort is made by both agencies to prevent duplication and to coordinate services, administration is very difficult, particularly in remote native villages. It is costly and it is generally agreed that integration through consolidation of the total programs in the Alaska Department of Welfare would be an important step in improving, simplifying and making the total operation more efficient.

THE ALASKA RURAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The 1955 legislature created an agency which is intended to coordinate efforts of the several Territorial agencies in seeking ways and means of improving the basic economic conditions in rural and remote areas. Without so stating, it appears that the purpose is to assist communities and regions of predominately native Indian, Eskimo or Aleut population. The Alaska Rural Development Board is composed of the heads of the departments of labor, public works, health, education, welfare and civil defense under the chairmanship of the Governor. Among the enumerated powers and duties of this board is responsibility for coordination of administration of emergency relief, surplus food distribution, or other public assistance programs other than the regular relief and assistance programs of the Territorial and Federal Governments.

The appropriation to this board for the biennium ending March 31, 1957, was $100,000.

EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

As indicated above, one phase of the Governor's Emergency Aid and Work Program has been to seek the cooperation of all Federal and Territorial agencies in providing additional employment opportunities for the native population which has suffered the most from the disastrous failures in the fish runs. In addition, the native population in many outlying areas has always been on a near-subsistence level with much deprivation and malnutrition accepted almost as a way of life.

The Office of Terirtories has met with representatives of the United States Air Force to broaden the policy relating to the employment of Eskimos in the construction and maintenance of the distant early warning line bordering the Arctic Ocean. In addition to prior approval authorizing contractors to employ Eskimos for construction of distant early warning line facilities, the Air Force during December 1955 approved the use of Eskimos on maintenance contracts. Meanwhile, a Department letter was addressed to the Secretary of Defense urging the establishment of an interdepartmental policy that would provide priority for employment of Alaska natives by all Defense and Interior agencies operating within the Territory. This would include both maintenance and construction performed by either force account or contracts. Agencies affected would include not only military installations but also Alaska Public Works, Alaska Road Commission, the Alaska Railroad, and others. The implementation of such a policy would materially aid the economy of the Territory and raise the living standard of the residents of Alaska.

In southeastern Alaska five salmon canneries are operated by Indians, four of which were acquired with loans from the United States through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They have also had the assistance of Government operating loans. These canneries suffered substantial losses in the disastrous 1953 fishing season. In order to protect the interests of the United States in its loans, reduce further Government financing to a minimum and still provide a market for the fish and labor of the Indians a great deal of analysis, planning and negotiations was required. In 1954, although only one cannery was financed by the United States, arrangements were worked out to protect the fish and labor income of the Indians. In 1955, the operations of two of the canneries were consolidated with Government financing. The sharp freeze unit of the idle plant was leased as in 1954 to a commercial operator to provide a market for Indian labor. One other cannery was financed and operated by the Government and arrangements were worked out with a commercial operator to finance and operate the remaining cannery on a share basis.

The problem in southeastern Alaska is expected to be further alleviated in the next few years by increased employment opportunities in the logging and pulp industry.

Our State Leads the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the real assets of our Nation is its forests. A comparatively few years ago this great asset was threatened by the profit motive and the ruthless methods of exploitation. But, today thanks to the foresight of many good citizens the trend toward the depletion of our forests has been stopped. Today more and more people throughout the country have become forest conscious. Among these people are the lumbermen and tree growers. The true value of our forests are finally recognized. Selective cutting and replanting are taking the place of the former practices of wanton destruction of our magnificent forests.

I am very happy that among the leaders in this noble and truly worthwhile movement are the citizens of my own State of Mississippi. In fact, Mississippi now leads the Nation in the number of certified tree farms as is reflected in the following editorial from a recent issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger:

OUR STATE LEADS THE NATION

One of the most significant developments in recent years has been Mississippi's rise to national leadership in the number of certified tree farms. We now lead every State in the Union in this important category with 826 tree farms. Texas is second with 779, with Alabama in third place with 578 such units. There are 1,500 certified tree farms in the Nation.

A. M. Dantzler, chairman of the Mississippi Forest Industries Committee and himself a tree farmer, points out that this industry-sponsored tree-farm program is bringing about maximum production of timber crops from our State's 16.5 million acres of commercial timberland. More than 1.8 million acres now are enrolled in Mississippi's tree-farm program, with one-third of this total coming into the program during the past year.

Technically defined, a tree farm is an area of privately owned, taxpaying, forest land dedicated to the growing of repeated forest crops for commercial purposes. The program is sponsored by the Mississippi Forest Industries in cooperation with public and private leadership in this field. Nationally the program is sponsored by the American Forest Products Industries in Washington, D. C.

Tree farming is valuable to our economy, especially to small farmers. It not only assures regular harvests through scientific management but also makes for better soil and water conservation. Tree farming results in cover and food for wildlife and better streams and pools for fishing. Growing trees help prevent soil erosion, muddy water, and loss of moisture. Most important, perhaps, tree farming affords cash income and helps pay off mortgages and finance other farm improvements.

Mississippi's national leadership in tree farming is all the more significant at this particular time, when the Nation's agricultural picture in general is growing steadily darker. This program offers an increasingly promising future for the small landowner and should be encouraged by every possible means. Much of our future prosperity lies in commercial forestry. Mississippi has the capacity and the opportunity to utilize this method of increasing our cash income and elevating our general standard of living.

Must Get Practical Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I am including a timely and pertinent article by Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association. It is an authoritative statement and offers a program based upon many years of observation and experience by a man who has rendered exceptional service to Missouri and American agriculture.

The article is as follows:

FARM PROGRAM NO HELP TO REGION
(By Fred V. Heinkel)

It is a far more simple matter to put ships in "moth balls" than it is farms.

The President has recommended a two-point soil bank program. The first part is designed to take crop land out of production with the idea that our grain surpluses might disappear. The second part is aimed at taking marginal land out of production, and is a long haul proposition. It would plant these marginal acres in trees or subject them to other conservation practices.

The President's message is encouraging in that he shows he realizes there is a farm depression and that the farmer's problems can be best solved by Government action. He stressed that "Government should accept the responsibility."

The primary fault of the President's proposal is its failure to recognize the real farm problem. That problem is low income—not surpluses. By law the surpluses are insulated from the market and cannot be sold in this country for less than 105 percent of the support price plus storage charges.

The idea that if support prices are abandoned, the surplus will vanish, has found its way into the thinking of persons who have not checked the records.

During the twenties when general prosperity was at a highlevel, farm products brought less than a living wage to their producers. There were no support prices then, yet the ruinous prices were attributed to overproduction.

Sliding supports have aggravated the situation. In a desperate effort to meet increased expenses, farmers have worked harder and produced more. You never did hear of a farmer not planting his full quota of wheat just because support prices had dropped and his wheat was worth less than before.

The Salina (Kans.) Journal in an editorial stated: "In proposing the soil-bank program, the administration in effect has scuttled the flexible support scheme—although it may not want to admit it. If the flexible scheme is not to be relied upon to reduce production, then the reason for lowering the loan price has ceased to exist. The immediate question is a subsidy for ailing agriculture. Considering the need, the subsidy might as well be adequate."

THE PRESIDENT'S SOIL BANK PLAN DOESN'T HELP THE OZARKS

Is the soil-bank proposal adequate to help Ozark farmers? A reduction in grain acres certainly will not help milk prices.

Our Ozark farms are not much of a factor in creating the grain surpluses. About all the grain that is grown in this area is fed to livestock—in fact, it is necessary to ship in additional grain each year for feed purposes.

Instead of selling cash grain, most Ozark farmers market their row crops when they sell their hogs, milk, butterfat, beef cattle, poultry, eggs, lambs, and wool. The livestock farmer is "left out" so far as the soil-bank proposal is concerned. In Missouri between 70 and 75 percent of income from farm marketing is from livestock.

Most Ozark farms are family size operations. If these small farmers are compelled to reduce present crop acres they will not be able fully to utilize their time or their equipment. Both the farmer and his equipment will become partially unemployed.

Many young men get started in farming by the renter route. They purchase machinery and rent additional land until they can save enough money to purchase more acres. It is likely that 100 percent of the Government soil-bank payment would be more attractive to the landlord than 50 percent of the crop he would receive as rent. What will happen to our young people? We don't want them all to move to the cities.

Most of our surplus grain in Missouri is grown in the river and creek bottoms. If this land is allowed to go unattended, the willows and cottonwoods will soon take over. In the Ozarks, brush would be a problem. The land would have to be reclaimed before it could ever again be planted in crops. You cannot put farm land in "moth balls" like you do tanks and battleships.

We agree with the President that the problems of our farmers are of the utmost urgency. Drought conditions of the last few years have left few Ozark farmers in financial shape to face the decline in farm prices. This winter has been drier than 1930, 1934, and 1936—the years we associate with the Dust Bowl. It is time to get some cash in the hands of these people.

It has been proposed that the farmer be paid in certificates good for grain now in storage to compensate him for keeping acres out of production. This would not cut down on the amount of grain on the market. It would not help the price of wheat. The Government would dump some grain but it would not help farm income.

I am convinced that the long-term conservation feature of the proposal has merit. But the marginal acres proposed to be taken out of production under this section are not much of a factor in creating our surpluses. Most farmers do have some land that would be suited for trees. Unfortunately, however, due to the advanced age of most of our farmers they will never see trees they plant converted to timber. It might be better for the Government to purchase some of these marginal acres and place them under the management of the United States Forest Service. I believe, however, that in the not too distant future pulp mills will be built in the Ozarks, which will utilize the lower grades of timber in this area.

Besides the soil bank plan, the President stressed eight other points dealing with the farm situation.

These are of less importance, to be discussed in the next issue.

The main point is that the program does not meet the basic problem of Ozark farmers, low income. If the farmer received parity prices for his milk, beef, hogs, wool, and grain crops there would be little need for any of these nine proposals advocated by the President.

Foreign Trade and Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, some members of the American community engaged in business overseas recently have been making an intensive effort to exempt in varying degrees foreign trade from compliance with antitrust principles. I am disturbed by any movement to curtail antitrust enforcement because I have maintained a firm belief in the benefits derived by the United States from its historical policy of maintaining both domestic and foreign trade free from artificial restraints.

The theme underlying demands for special antitrust privileges in the foreign field essentially is that American business is hampered or obstructed by strict application of our antitrust laws to trade and investments abroad. Numerous proposals have been advanced to remedy this condition. If accepted, these proposals would necessitate reversal of a primary policy of Congress embodied in numerous pieces of legislation and the overruling of a long series of key judicial decisions.

The recommendation of the American Chamber of Commerce in London, for example, would exempt from the antitrust laws acts performed outside the territorial limits of the United States. To accept this extreme proposal would upset a multitude of court decisions going back to 1911 when the Dupont powder trust, combining German, Britain and American explosives manufacturers, was held illegal.

Special treatment for foreign trade under the antitrust laws is urged because customs and laws abroad relating to business differ from those of the United States. This contention also has been examined and rejected by the courts. In the National Lead case against international titanium cartel in 1947, the court reviewed opposing European and United States philosophies and pointed out:

> The major premise of the Sherman Act is that the suppression of competition in international trade is in and of itself a public injury; or at any rate, that such suppression is a greater price than we want to pay for the benefits it sometimes secures. * * * The economic theory underlying the Sherman Act is that, in the long run, competition is a more effective prod to production and a more trustworthy regulator of prices than even an enlightened combination.

Indeed, the Sherman Act does represent a policy of a high order. It is now commonplace to speak of it, in the words of Chief Justice Hughes, as "a charter of economic freedom." Inherent in the statute are values of deep significance to economic and political democracy.

By prohibiting monopolies and restraints of trade, the Sherman Act undertook to provide one thing only, freedom. It does not have the negative purpose of regulating competition. Its single aim was to prevent artificial aggregations of economic power in private hands, by which others could be foreclosed from the free pursuit of callings which are the common right of all. To that end the statute sought to provide freedom of access to lawful callings, freedom of those in the market to exercise and develop their powers and freedom of consumers to choose among products and sellers.

These are the values to be weighed, when you consider conforming with customs and laws of other countries. A reinterpretation of the antitrust laws to permit American concerns to increase their foreign business by combination with their competitors would subordinate our basic policies to the policies of the foreign countries and would hamper the long continued efforts of the United States to encourage foreign nations in realizing the benefits from more competitive economic conditions.

Such interpretation would set the stage for a gradual fusion of the private enterprise system of the United States with the systems abroad, still largely feudal in basic values, in which cartels and cartel members are often instruments of government policy, and territories are divided in terms of national boundaries. Activities and investments abroad by American companies cannot be hermetically sealed off from their activities at home. There is a continuous and inseparable interrelationship and circulation of the capital, credit, technology and knowledge in world commerce. Participation by American firms in restrictive combinations abroad would produce a resulting comixture of the two systems which in the long run would dilute and weaken our own system of free private enterprise.

Although the extra territorial application of the antitrust laws to combinations restraining our domestic or foreign commerce has been clear since the Dupont powder case in 1911, the antitrust program against international cartels has been most active in the period following World War II. Most of the cartel cases have been in this period.

Enforcement of the antitrust laws in these cases to strike down restrictive international arrangements uniformly has had multiform benefits to the economy of the United States. From one industry to another can be found a lowering of prices, a broadening of markets and a growth of productive capacity.

Gains in size and strength have followed for those outside the combination and for the participants who come to enjoy a new birth of freedom. When in retrospect it is possible to see only improvement and growth following anticartel enforcement, it would be a strange kind of reasoning which would look ahead with expectation of deterioration.

Moreover, the presence of this very active program to enforce the antitrust laws against international cartels does not appear to have resulted in any harm to United States overseas operations.

Since 1946 direct investments by United States corporations have jumped from $8 billion to $17.7 billion. In 1954, alone, direct investments increased $1.4 billion.

Since 1946, profits on United States overseas operations of all kinds have nearly tripled, going from slightly over $1 billion in 1946 to $2.8 billion in 1954. In 1954, United States corporations earned profits of $2.3 billion on their direct investment of $17.7 billion, a 13-percent return. This profit is equal to 14 percent of the earnings after taxes of all United States corporations.

These statistics demonstrate the very active antitrust program since the war has not resulted in injury to our overseas commerce.

Another justification for special exemptions for overseas operations is that antitrust enforcement conflicts with and undermines the Government programs designed to assist friendly foreign nations by stimulating investments abroad. The above statistics demonstrate that it is both commercially feasible and that American companies have been able to make profitable investments abroad within the restrictions of the antitrust laws. Rapidly expanding volume of American investment abroad, shown by these statistics, discounts claims that our foreign assistance programs have been harmed by conflicts with our antitrust policies.

Further, the agencies of the Government responsible for implementing the foreign policies of the United States have advised that application of competitive principles to their programs has not resulted in any impairment to their programs. The Department of Defense, for example, advised the Attorney General's Committee:

> We find that in certain cases, adherence to the principles contained in the antitrust laws has inconvenienced and perhaps to some extent delayed Defense Department procurement activities abroad, particularly in areas where cartel arrangements are the rule rather than the exception. However, it is believed that the long-term benefit to be derived from opposing combinations in restraint of trade, a policy now expressed in the Mutual Security Act, counterbalances any advantages which this Department might derive from a less stringent application of antitrust principles to our foreign procurement.

Similarly the State Department summarized its views on relationship of the antitrust laws to promotion of foreign private investments as follows:

> The Department is keenly interested in encouraging American foreign investment. At the same time, it is recognized that investment surrounded by restrictions illegal under the antitrust laws would generally lack the benefits normally expected to flow from United States overseas investment and would be likely to create barriers to the accomplishment of other United States policy objectives. For example, one result could be the creation of restraints on the availability from foreign areas of raw materials important to United States industry. In addition, a United States policy of permiting foreign investment on this basis would hamper our efforts to encourage foreign countries in developing more competitive economic conditions since it would tend to give support to foreign justifications of cartels as instruments of internal and international trade.

In its administration of the Government's investment guaranty program, the Foreign Operations Administration has advised:

We do not feel that the application of the antitrust laws to foreign commerce has operated to the detriment of the FOA program in any significant way, and it may have contributed to these objectives in many instances.

Representation of FOA could cite only seven cases which had arisen in its guaranty program involving substantial conflicts between proposed technology licensing arrangements and the antitrust laws. In four of these cases the investor was able to modify his licensing agreements and qualify for guaranty assistance. In three instances, the applicant refused for various reasons, to alter the agreements proposed and so was not granted assistance. In these instances FOA did not know whether the proposed arrangements nevertheless were consummated.

It is clear that antitrust has been no substantial bar to Government programs designed to stimulate technical assistance and investments in foreign countries. In any event, to the extent that foreign investments cannot be made except by permitting territorial allocation and price-fixing arrangements now illegal, it is my firm view that the antitrust law should prevail.

Instead of weakening the principles of antitrust applicability to foreign commerce by permitting American firms to enter restrictive arrangements it would seem to be the better course to eliminate the few areas in which American firms now are permitted to combine. Repeal of the Webb-Pomerene exemptions, for example, would be an affirmative step in persuading other countries to abandon similar restrictive practices. That act is a clear negation of antitrust philosophy and was enacted as purely a defensive measure to counteract the economic power of European buying cartels. Times have changed, such protections are no longer necessary.

Further, intensive support should be given by our Government to establish international procedures to cope with restrictions on international trade. Our antitrust laws, in themselves, are not sufficient to eliminate restraints by foreign conspiracies upon the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States. Since many of the participants in such conspiracies are foreign, our courts cannot proceed against all of the parties involved. Some kind of international control of this problem seems to be the only way to protect the American economy against the damage caused by foreign cartel arrangements. Moreover, international control would be much more advantageous to American industry than the present unilateral antitrust enforcement against their foreign operations.

The remedy for this situation is not to admit that United States commerce is to continue to be artificially restrained. To protect our own economy we must lead other countries to recognize the value of antitrust and apply its principles to international commerce.

Cartels foster an economy of scarcity. A free economy provides abundance. Abundance is a powerful weapon for combating the appeal of totalitarianism to impoverished and discontented peoples. Modern competitive man must indeed become cooperative if he is to survive, but cooperation cannot be achieved by the powerlessness which monopoly and restriction inevitably produce. Cartel agreements do more than apply self-imposed restraints; they restrict those outside the group, both consumers and competitiors. As to these, the cartel is not a form of cooperation, but of oppression. Only measures chosen pursuant to law to promote the interest of all, by insuring freedom from monopolistic power, can provide the conditions for cooperation.

A Tribute to Frances Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, under the auspicies of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, services were held in Statuary Hall commemorating the date of the death of a great American woman, Frances Willard. I am including herewith a brief address I made on that occasion:

We meet here this afternoon at a hallowed spot in the Nation's Capitol to honor and pay tribute to the memory of a great soul. She has been likened to George Washington in that she was first in peace, not first in combat war, but moral war against the liquor traffic and kindred evils that were sapping the vitality of her country. Certainly she was first in the hearts of her countrywomen.

Frances Elizabeth Willard was born in Churchville, N. Y. She was reared in Janesville, Wis. She received her early education in Evanston, Ill., where she later became the first president of the first women's college in this country.

One of the foremost women of her day said at the time of her death: "The home-going of no other woman would have made so many women feel as though the sun had set."

Frances Willard was honored by the great and near great of two continents. A grateful people of the State of Illinois reared this statue in her memory. She is the only woman so honored in the Hall of Fame of the Nation's Capitol. Miss Willard requested that the date of her death, which is February 17, be celebrated as what she described as "her heavenly birthday."

I am honored in joining with you in this ceremony in paying tribute to the memory of a great character, a great soul.

I want at this moment to pay tribute to you, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and to the membership of your organization for your efforts in carrying on the work of the organization established and founded by Frances Willard. I wish there were sufficient time during which I could name some of the people who are gathered here this afternoon on this occasion. Each of you gathered here this afternoon is a distinguished person. Kansas, my home State, is proud to claim the president of your organization, Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, as one of the daughters of your union. Incidentally, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and its associates are extremely fortunate to be represented in Washington by Miss Elizabeth Smart. You have good reason to be proud of her and her work.

Frances Willard was not only the founder of your great institution. She was a leader in a continuous battle against the use of intoxicating liquors. She was also a great teacher. As an instructor in high school and college, she had opportunity of getting acquainted with the lives of people at first hand. At the age of 17 Frances Willard attended what was described as "the Milwaukee Female College." On examination day she was honored when she read her essay on the subject "Originality of Thought and Action."

Miss Willard was elected president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in 1879. She held this position during the years that followed. It would only be repetitious for me to recount the growth of the organization and its influence in this country and in Europe. The record, with which you are familiar, speaks for itself.

And so, we, who survive, are engaged in a great crusade, a greater and more important one than most of us realize or appreciate. Miss Willard has submitted a challenge to you and to the American people that we can't escape even if we choose to do so.

Of course, it is impossible to measure the cost in money and misery that has been caused by the use of intoxicating liquors. There are figures that are somewhat revealing. Reports of major crimes committed in the United States during the year 1954 indicated a new high of 2,267,000. Of these 1,690,000, or almost 60 percent of the total, were attributed either directly or indirectly to the use of alcoholic liquor. This is a report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The high cost of drunkenness is difficult to estimate. It should be observed, however, the liquor bill for last year in the United States amounted to $9,700,000,000. This amount, if applied on our Federal expenditures, would pay for all the employment in Government which means the salaries of more than 2 million employees during the year. As a matter of fact, it would pay one-sixth of the total amount of the Federal expenditures, including defense costs.

These are only cold figures. The number of deaths on our highways caused by drunken driving is mounting every year and the greatest cost of all, which cannot be measured, is the cost of broken homes, human misery, and poverty all because of the use of intoxicating drink.

My friends, you are facing one of the greatest challenges of our time dealing with a hydra-headed monster most difficult to destroy. If you and I are convinced that the thing is wrong, then we have a responsibility we cannot escape. It is to combat this thing to the best of our ability and strength.

Frances Willard has handed the torch to you and to me and to all thinking American citizens. May you hold it high. The battle has just begun. May it be said of Frances Willard, "She did the best she could. No one could do more." May we join in the great crusade so it will be said of us, "We too did the best we could."

Nothing for the Navahos in Upper Colorado River Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado storage project bill, H. R. 3383, would not assist the Navaho Indians.

It provides for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, but not for the present construction of the Navaho project. However, the construction of the dam would have the effect of committing Congress to constructing the irrigation project works. The cost of the dam is estimated at $36,500,000; the irrigation project an additional $175 million. There are some 1,100 Navaho families involved, meaning a construction cost of close to $200,000 for each Navaho farm. This is just to bring water to the land and does not account for assistance which will undoubtedly be necessary for equipment to get the lands in production. This astounding cost should be most carefully considered before Congress acts, particularly since H. R. 3383, as recently amended, now provides that costs allocated to Indian lands which such lands cannot repay shall be nonreimbursable—section 6. This amendment was advertised as a gift to the Indians by newspapers reporting on recent upper basin conferences which led to the amending of H. R. 3383. It is a gift Congress might well inspect closely. Certainly some more realistic and more economic method of providing for the Indians can be considered. By this gift, the upper basin shows its unwillingness to have the costs of the Navaho project paid for by the power revenues, as all the other costs are supposed to be. Instead, this money will go into the funds to be apportioned among these States, leaving the taxpayers in the rest of the country to carry the load.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and I take this opportunity to salute American citizens of Lithuanian decent. We join with them in their wishes—that their people, the freedom loving people of Lithuania, will again be free. In 1913, after 138 years of Russian rule, they achieved independence. During this period of independence they experienced a rebirth of their national culture and political freedom. Yet only 27 years later they found themselves helplessly within the Soviet orbit and today they suffer the severest form of Soviet occupation.

I think that today we all realize our commitment not only to the people of Lithuania but to those people in all areas of the globe under Soviet tyranny—a commitment to keep upermost in our minds the goal that they will again be free. Therefore, we resolve it to be our duty to see that political freedom again takes its proper place in the world scene.

Roy Tasco Davis, United States Ambassador to Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the international edition of Time magazine on December 5, 1955, concerning one of Maryland's leading citizens, Hon. Roy Tasco Davis, our Ambassador to Haiti. With his down-to-earth philosophy of life, Ambassador Davis has gained the respect and admiration of the people of Haiti, and this service in representing our Nation deserves the plaudits of all Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAITI

HOMESPUN AMBASSADOR

Near the tiny village of Bonneau, the United States Ambassador to Hait rolled up his trouser legs one day last week, trudged into a freshly plowed field. There he planted a cocoa-tree sapling, symbolic of thousands that will be grown in a new nursery set up by the United States and Haitian Governments. Later, he scraped some red dirt from his shoes, wrapped it in a banana leaf and crammed the muddy package into his coat pocket. "A souvenir of Bonneau," he explained with a friendly smile. The watching crowd laughed and cheered, and school kids sang in Creole:

"There is in our tongue a very little word—
And that little word says thanks."

CANE AND SPATS

Down-to-earth Ambassador Roy Tasco Davis is probably the best known, best loved United States Foreign Service officer between the Rio Grande and the Amazon—and he is not even a career diplomat. Born at Ewing, Mo., in 1889, he was a congressional page boy under House Speaker Joseph G. ("Uncle Joe") Cannon, then took his degree (bachelor of philisophy) at Brown University. Later he served as secretary and business manager at Missouri's Stephens College. In 1921, President Harding named loyal Republican Davis to be United States Minister to Guatemala. Determined to play the correct diplomat, Davis bought a cane and spats, and just as quickly abandoned both—the cane after a Boy Scout thoughtfully led him across a street, and the spats when he found they made his ankles sweat.

After that, Davis gave the back of his hand to protocol and concentrated on making friends. During Panama's 1931 revolution, he advised against United States armed intervention (then permissible by treaty); in gratitude, Panama named a local lake for him. In Costa Rica, he was pronounced the "best liked gringo," and villages named streets for him. During World War II he organized the State Department's Inter-American Schools Service which fought Nazi influence by sending United States teachers for 70,000 students in Latin American schools; Ecuador later named a school building for him.

PUZZLED PUNCTILIO

Haiti proved a different matter. With a small Negro nation's fierce pride in being correct, Haiti had taught tricks of punctilio even to veterans of Rome, Berlin, and the Court of St. James's. From its diplomatic corps it expected sartorial elegance, smooth address, and good taste in wines. So it was with considerable bewilderment that upper-crust Haitians made the acquaintance of Roy Tasco Davis.

He chucked babies under the chin at church bazaars. In the big white embassy residence, he presented visitors to motherly Mrs. Davis by saying: "Mama, shake hands with —." Once at a formal dinner he led the comely daughter of the chief of Haiti's armed forces up to her father and with a smile said: "General, I'd like you to meet the prettiest girl in Haiti." Top society and even palace aids, unaccustomed to homespun humor, for days debated the meaning of the Ambassador's presentation to the general of a member of his own family.

A WONDERFUL GUY

But—as President Paul Magloire was one of the first to note—Davis' disconcerting affability symbolized real warmth toward Haiti. Hurricane Hazel had hardly whirled away last year before Davis telephoned Washington for direly needed help. In this year's famine, he again called for United States food and medicines that doubtless saved hundreds of lives. He has traveled all over Haiti to promote the growing of cash crops—such as coffee and cocoa—that give promise of raising the overcrowded country's standard of living.

As a result, most Haitians have long since taken plain Roy Davis to heart. The Port-au-Prince taxi drivers greet him cryptically, but enthusiastically, with shouts of "Allo, Monsieur Tasco." A Haitian newsman once wrote in Le Nouvelliste: "One would like to tell him, patting him affectionately on the shoulder and using a common expression of his beautiful and great country, 'Roy, you're a wonderful guy.'"

Upper Colorado Project Means More Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, this means all of us, now has more than $8 billion in surplus farm products stored in warehouses around the Nation.

Storage costs alone are $1 million a day.

These surpluses are steadily increasing.

On the one hand, Congress is proposing to take 40 million acres of land out of production and put it in a so-called soil bank.

The Government would pay farmers $1 billion or more a year to remove this land from production to help decrease the huge surpluses.

But, on the other hand, there is an incredible proposal before Congress called the upper Colorado River storage project to irrigate 580,000 new acres of arid mountain land in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming at a cost to the Government, this means all of us, of $4 billion. And these lands would grow more surplus crops.

If you are confused, here is the answer: Defeat the upper Colorado project, which would create an additional $4 billion tax burden and also add to the huge pile of farm surpluses.

Tribute to Le Grand Skinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Le Grand Skinner, of the Skinner Engine Co., in Erie, Pa., and two articles entitled "Building Steam Engines Exclusively for 82 Years" and "Steam Engines and the Birth of the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, today the farsighted men of the American maritime industry are properly turning their thoughts to atomic-powered surface vessels for the American merchant marine. Already our maritime industry engineers and draftsmen have plans drawn for surface vessels that will carry the American flag to the four corners of the globe under the power of the atom. Also, such vessels can be used for our Great Lakes and the inland waterway system.

It is only fitting that the Congress pay tribute to Le Grand Skinner, of Skinner engine fame, whose ancestors, Commodore Matthew C. Perry, United States Navy, and Commodore Oliver H. Perry, United States Navy, commanded our Navy's first steam-driven war vessels and frigates—the *Fulton II*, the *Missouri*, and the *Mississippi*.

Le Grand Skinner was one of the foremost pioneers in American maritime history. His guiding genius was directly responsible for developing one of our Nation's most outstanding producers of marine engines. It was exactly 111 years ago that Le Grand Skinner was born, and 88 years have elapsed since he founded the Skinner Engine Co. in Erie, Pa. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the Skinner Engine Co. has produced the most efficient marine engines in the world, and for the past 30 years has held the distinction of having constructed the largest marine engines ever used in steam vessels, and continues to build the largest marine engines in the world.

The Skinner Engine Co. is a small-business enterprise that has served our Nation both in war and peace. Its outstanding service to the Nation was officially recognized on December 8, 1941, less than 24 hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor, when the War Department presented the first high production flag to the Skinner Engine Co. together with the famous gold standard of the Quartermaster Department.

In its 88th year of service, this famous American small-business enterprise is now on the threshold of engaging in industrial atomic developments and the marine reactor field, and this step forward is a challenge that the great small-business enterprises of our Nation shall survive and meet with success.

As we stand at the dawn of the new and glorious age of atomic propulsion, our Nation is indeed fortunate to have a producer of marine engines and component parts such as the Skinner Engine Co. upon whom America can depend to rank among the pioneers in production of atomic products, reactors, and engines powered by the atom.

As a further tribute to Le Grand Skinner and the Skinner Engine Co. that he founded, Mr. Speaker, I would like to here insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles that appeared in the April 1950 edition of Marine News. These articles attest to the great service rendered our Nation by the Skinner Engine Co. and its founder, Le Grand Skinner.

CITED FOR SERVICE—POSTHUMOUSLY

Our first posthumous citation is to one of the great pioneers of American industry—Le Grand Skinner, to be accepted by his grandson, the present head of the Skinner Engine Co., J. Le Grand Skinner. Not only for his achievements in the development of steam engines, which have contributed so much to the welfare of our country, and the world, but to do honor, as well, to two great United States naval officers, Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, who opened up Japan to the Western World, and his older brother, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, hero of the Battle of Lake Erie, close relations of his grandmother. For, just as Le Grand Skinner was steeped in steam engines, Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry commanded the first American steam war vessel, the *Fulton II*. He also planned the *Missouri* and the *Mississippi*, the first steam frigates of the United States Navy.

Le Grand Skinner, being an inventor of steam engines, naturally became intensely interested in the true inventor of the first steam boat, John Fitch.

Born in Pooleville, Madison County, N. Y., May 23, 1845, the son of Frank and Charlotte (Eaton) Skinner, Le Grand Skinner's boyhood days were spent in the little town of Eaton, N. Y., where he went to live with his uncle, the second manufacturer of portable engines in the United States. Besides learning about steam engines working for his uncle, young Skinner spent considerable time in the tool room of the Remington Arms Manufacturing Co. at Ilion, N. Y. In 1868 he constructed his first engine after his own design, his work being conducted in a little shop built on the site where stood the little log cabin which had been built by his maternal grandfather. He had 12 men working for him, and after going home for dinner would return to the shop and work until early the next morning. He also maintained a small shop in the basement of his house, where he perfected his inventions. However, his mind would find relaxation in music, which also soothed his weary body from hard work. In 1871 he began the manufacture of engines at Chittenango, N. Y., then in Chicago, and on July 3, 1873, established a small manufacturing plant in the Lilley Shop, Erie, Pennsylvania. In 1875 he formed a partnership with Thomas Wood and the firm of Skinner and Wood eventually built a large plant. Dissolving in 1883, Mr. Skinner conducted the business alone for 2 years, and then the Skinner Engine Co. was incorporated, with him as president. He, also, was one of the organizers of the Union Iron Works, manufacturing boilers.

Skinner engines played their part grandly in three wars—the Spanish-American War, and World War I, and World War II. During World War I, Le Grand Skinner was adviser to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, in Washington, D. C. Both during this war to make the world safe for democracy, and afterward he gave more and more time to his love for music, writing many musical compositions, including a descriptive nocturne, As Twilight Deepens Into Night, and a fantasy, Adrift on a Golden Sea, to mention but two fine works.

Having over 30 inventions to his credit, Le Grand Skinner had close association with the late Henry Ford, with whom he exchanged thoughts of mutual interest, Ford often visiting him in Erie. The founder of the largest plant in the United States devoted exclusively to the building of steam engines died in 1922, and his son, Allan David Skinner, succeeded him as president. Now the founder's grandson, J. Le Grand Skinner, is president of the Skinner Engine Co.

In World War II the Skinner Engine Co. was the first company to receive the Army Transport Service flag, but the flag was recalled because Congress did not make any financial appropriation. This company was the second plant in the United States to receive the Army-Navy E award, August 25, 1942.

In 1942, 40 percent of the employees of the Skinner Engine Co. had worked continuously for the company for over 40 years. They worked around the clock during both World War I and World War II.

So, to the heritage of the Skinner Engine Co., as manifested in its founder-inventor of the Skinner marine unaflow steam engine, the principle of which has for its object the elimination of one of the greatest losses in reciprocating steam engines—initial condensation—to Le Grand Skinner posthumously accepted by his grandson and the present head of the company, J. Le Grand Skinner, we are happy to give this citation for service to the marine industry.

BUILDING STEAM ENGINES EXCLUSIVELY FOR 82 YEARS—SPECIALIZING IN MARINE ENGINES—SKINNER ENGINE CO. SINCE ITS INCEPTION HEADED BY MEMBERS OF SAME FAMILY

Skinner Engine Co., Erie, Pa., has been building steam engines exclusively for the past 82 years. In that period it has advanced to the leading position in the industry, and continues to specialize in high-economy steam engines: stationary type, for the generation of power, and marine engines for ship propulsion.

This company is unique in that since its inception it has been headed by members of the same family. Its founder, Le Grand Skinner, was president until his death in 1922. His son, Allan D. Skinner, succeeded him as president, serving actively in that capacity until his death in 1942. The third generation, J. Le Grand Skinner, son of Allan D., became president in 1942.

At the end of the Civil War a growing Nation found increasing need of power to turn the wheels of its expanding industrialization. Until the advent of electricity, power was more commonly available through the mechanical use of a water wheel or a very small steam engine arranged to drive a given piece of production machinery. The use of lineshafting, though now outmoded, had not yet been fully accepted, and an individual power drive for each machine was common practice.

Being a young man of unusual mechanical ability, Le Grand Skinner decided to build a steam engine which would satisfy popular power requirements. He realized in those days that portability would be desirable, for one engine could then be used to operate any number of machines, simply by moving the engine from one to another, and by attaching a belt to the pulley of the machine to be driven.

Accordingly, he designed and built his first steam engine in 1868, in a small barn at the rear of his home. This double acting engine

was mounted on top of a small boiler, so that the combined unit could be moved to any location requiring power. The original engine-boiler unit was raised at 5 horsepower and is shown at the left.

This design proved to be highly marketable, with the result that Mr. Skinner, as an individual, was no longer able to take care of the demand. A partnership was then formed with Thomas C. Wood, and the business thrived under the name Skinner & Wood until 1885, when Mr. Skinner acquired his partner's interest and incorporated under the present name—Skinner Engine Co.

He realized that, no matter how well an engine was built, its economy was directly dependent upon how tight its slide valve could be made. He pioneered this theory, which is still the objective of the present company. As the result, he invented and developed the Skinner steam-tight valve which came into use on all of his slide-valve steam engines.

This valve expands to compensate for its own natural wear, with the result that it always remains steam-tight. The engine was sold on the basis of the value of the fuel it could save against other makes of steam engines whose valves were inherently leaky after only a few months' service. This method of selling became known as the Skinner guaranteed saving contract.

The unaflow type of steam engine was introduced in this country by Mr. Skinner in 1913, and, because of its unique features and high economy, it gradually replaced other types of counterflow steam engines, both slide valve and Corliss.

The unaflow principle has for its objective the elimination of one of the greatest losses in reciprocating steam engines, namely, initial condensation.

In the case of the counterflow engine, after the steam has expanded on the power stroke it returns and is exhausted from the same end of the cylinder at which it entered. Thus the comparatively cold expanded steam of considerable volume washes the hot cylinder walls on the return stroke, cooling them to such an extent that a portion of the incoming steam is chilled and condensed as it enters the cylinder.

In the unaflow engine, the steam enters the cylinder at the ends, after passing through steam-jacketed heads; and after cutoff and expansion have taken place, the steam is exhausted through ports arranged around the center of the cylinder which are uncovered by the elongated piston at the termination of the power stroke from each end of the cylinder. Consequently, the steam has a unidirectional flow—hence, the derivation of the name "unaflow." Initial condensation is almost completely eliminated.

Poppet-type valves were found to be most practical for the unaflow engine, and again Mr. Skinner developed the only known poppet valve which would remain steamtight indefintely. Like the steamtight valve on the slide-valve engine, the Skinner double-seat poppet valve has a telescopic seat which compensates for natural wear and for expansion and contraction due to temperature changes.

The success of this engine was so rapid that, notwithstanding its higher price, Skinner Engine Co. soon found it was producing more than twice as many unaflow steam engines as all other makes combined. Because of its steamtight valves and other patented refinements, the Skinner Universal Unaflow was replacing all other types of stationary engines on the basis of the savings it effected by reduced steam and fuel consumption.

Until the late twenties, all of the engines built by the company were of the single-cylinder horizontal type. Realizing the importance of reducing space, in 1928 the company developed its first multicylinder vertical Unaflow steam engine for stationary powerplant service, designed to drive generators, pumps, compressors, blowers, etc., at moderately high speeds, and with the same features for initial and maintained economy found in the horizontal type.

The success of the multicylinder vertical, stationary unaflow steam engine led to the development in 1932 of the first Skinner marine Unaflow steam engine. These are built in a variety of 7 lengths of stroke, each available with from 2 to 8 cylinders, resulting in a wide range of capacities at various speeds. The present ratings vary from 500 to 6,000 indicated horsepower. The largest of these engines yet built was shipped early in 1950.

These marine engines have been used to propel various classes of commercial vessels, such as luxury coastwise passenger ships, railroad car ferries, automobile and passenger ferries, express cargo ships, bulk ore carriers, tankers, hopper dredges, icebreakers, harbor and oceangoing tugs.

The Skinner marine Unaflow steam engine is fully enclosed, force-feed lubricated throughout, and all cylinders, valves, pistons, connecting rods, and other parts are exact duplicates. Operating on the simple condensing Unaflow cycle, each cylinder takes full throttle pressure twice per revolution and exhausts directly to the condenser.

Short cutoffs of steam in the cylinders are employed at normal full-load rating, averaging from 12 to 15 percent of stroke, but with 70 percent available for overload and maneuvering. Since the valve gear is so designed that control is entirely by cutoff, these engines provide unexcelled ship-maneuvering qualities. The time element for reversal of full power from ahead to astern is dependent only on the speed of the operator in moving the controls. Tests have proven this can be accomplished within 4 seconds.

Permanently steamtight, patented, expansion-compensating, poppet inlet valves, as originally developed for use in Skinner stationary Unaflow engines, are employed in the marine design. These valves, of forged steel, as well as the cylinders and heads, made of special alloy metal, permit the use of high pressures and temperatures.

The employment of the unaflow cycle, with the elimination of valve leakage and initial condensation, results in the distinct advantage of a flat water-rate curve. Therefore, economy is practically the same at fractional loads as it is at full load.

During World War II the Skinner Engine Co. was engaged in a very large production program involving the facilities of other plants as well as its own, in order to meet the requirements of the armed services. Skinner marine unaflow steam engines were used to propel escort aircraft carriers and landing ship docks (LSD's) for the United States Navy, as well as mine planters and oceangoing tugs for the Army.

These engines are manufactured in Canada under license. Since 1945 a considerable number of these engines have been produced by the licensee for various types of Canadian and foreign vessels.

Up to this time approximately 12,000 Skinner engines have been produced. These engines are in service in almost every known industry and in almost every part of the United States and in many foreign countries.

That the Skinner Engine Co. pioneered in creating and manufacturing marine steam engines is found in the early inventions of Le Grand Skinner, who had made a study of steam engines from the earliest times. He even went back to the Pneumatica of Hero of Alexandria, Egypt, 130 B. C., where is described the aeolipile, which is a primitive steam reaction turbine. From the time of Hero to the 17th century there is no progress on record. The next distinct step was the publication in 1601 of a treatise on pneumatics by Giovanni Battista della Porta. Then there was Thomas Savery's steam engine that first became commercially successful in 1698, and Dennis Papin's earliest cylinder-and-piston steam engine around 1690, leading up to Thomas Newcomen's atmospheric engine in 1705 that brought James Watt, an instrument maker in Glasgow, to the fore.

But undoubtedly Le Grand Skinner must have been intrigued by the fundamentals of the engine of the first practical steamboat devised and successfully demonstrated by the Connecticut Yankee, John Fitch, in 1796.

Imbued with United States history, Le Grand Skinner delved into the earliest records to be found in the archives of the Nutmeg State, where John Fitch was born in Windsor, January 21, 1743.

This American pioneer of steam navigation, son of a Connecticut farmer, went to sea at the age of 17. Discontinuing his sailor life after a few voyages, he became successively a clockmaker, a brass founder, and a silversmith. During the War of Independence he was a sutler to the American troops, and amassed in that way a considerable sum of money, with which he bought land in Virginia.

Following the Revolutionary War he began an exploration of the northwestern regions, with a view of preparing a map of the district. While sailing on the great western rivers the idea occurred to him that they might be navigated by steam. Settling down again he invented the first practical marine steam engine, which was favorably reported upon by the legislatures of several States, but he was unable to obtain any pecuniary assistance to build his engine. He did, however, form a company for the prosecution of his enterprise in 1786 and a steam packet of his invention was launched in the Delaware River.

Considering this date, and that of the first successful trials of a steamship in the city of New York as shown elsewhere on this page, it will be seen that steam navigation and the development of steam engines grew with our country. It may well be said that the marine steam engine was born with our Republic and developed along with it.

And here are two great States, Connecticut and Pennsylvania, jointly responsible for the world's first and largest marine steam engines. What is more appropriate than that these two States should do honor to the inventive genius of two outstanding developers of the marine steam engine, John Fitch and Le Grand Skinner.

It is a most interesting coincidence that when John Fitch went to sea, as mentioned, he sailed out of Mystic, Conn., April 19, 1760.

STEAM ENGINES AND THE BIRTH OF THE NATION—ORIGIN OF STEAM NAVIGATION

Six years before Robert Fulton made a trial of his boat upon the River Seine in France, and 10 years prior to his putting the *Clermont* into operation in New York, the first boat with paddle wheels or screw propellers propelled by steam was constructed by John Fitch, of East Windsor, Conn.

In the summer of 1796 he steered his steamboat several times around the old Collect Pond situated a short distance north of the present city hall in the city of New York. According to testimony of several prominent witnesses, Fitch explained his steam engine to Robert R. Livingston and Robert Fulton. The Fitch steamboat was a common yawl about 18 feet in length with a 6-foot beam, square stern and round bow. She was steered at the bow with a small oar when the propeller was used.

The boiler was a 10 or 12 gallon iron pot with a lid of thick plank, firmly fastened to it by an iron bar placed transversely. The cylinders were of wood, barrel-shaped on the outside and straight on the inside, strongly hooped. The main steampipe led directly from the boiler top into a copper box, about 6 inches square, receiving the cylinders, and each piston rod was attached to the ex-

tremities of the working beam. This beam was supported by an iron upright, the connecting rod so arranged as to turn the crank of the propelling shaft which passed horizontally through the stem of the boat and was made fast to the propeller or screw. The valves were worked by a simple contrivance attached likewise to the working beam.

The boat, together with a portion of its machinery, was abandoned by Fitch, and left to decay on the muddy shore of Collect Pound. John Fitch died in Kentucky in the year 1798.

Second Decade of the Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, at the jet age conference of the Air Force Association, held at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington a few days ago, the Commander in Chief of the Continental Air Defense Command made some pertinent remarks about problems confronting the Nation, and especially the Air Force, as we move into the second decade of the jet age. The speaker was Gen. Earl E. Partridge. His job is to coordinate the air defense of the United States, and the North American continent. His command is a joint command—made up of elements of the Army, Navy, and United States Air Force.

I suspect that some of my colleagues have already become so accustomed to the sound of jet aircraft that they fail to realize what an innovation jet propulsion is, from the joint of view of history.

The first American officer to fly a jet aircraft has only recently retired from active duty, and his retirement was not due to age. Far from it. It was ill health, not advancing years, that deprived the Air Force and the Nation of the further services of Gen. Laurence C. Craigie who only 13 years ago flew the United States' first jet aircraft.

The free world's first jet ace, Maj. James Jabara, won his distinction in May 1951. The first man to cross the sonic barrier, Maj. Charles Yeager, did so less than 9 years ago.

But already our Air Force is so nearly an all-jet air force that the noise of supersonic jet aircraft is considered a civic problem, and municipalities, thinking more of comfort than of defense, are seeking to have Air Force bases pushed farther and farther away from the communities they were built to serve, and to protect. The mere fact of the effort indicates a certain lack of understanding of the problem of defense. It is as if the American people themselves had been taken in by what General Partridge called the fast alternating diet of smile and bile whch is fed this globe by the Soviet Union from day to day. They think the threat to freedom less important than the occasional annoyance of the sonic boom.

The result of all this is that many Air Force commanders have to prepare defenses for the Air Force on the platform in almost equal ratio to the amount of time they give to preparation to defend America from air attack. The relative importance of their two duties seems not to have been weighed by the groups whose protests necessitate the defense of the Air Force buildup.

Mr. Speaker, there should be no need to defend the Air Force against our own citizens. The Air Force recognizes its obligations to the community, and is doing everything it can to abate the admitted nuisance of jet noise. But the problem is still a new one, and one that requires time for the solution. The problem of defense is an old one—but one that has taken on frightening new aspects as organized communism tightens its hold on the minds of masses, everywhere, and extends its control over an alarmingly large section of the globe.

This problem, the problem of defending America and the free world against organized communism in the second decade of the jet-age, is not solely an Air Force problem, or a community problem. It is a national problem requiring a national solution. It is one to be approached with a sense of immediacy, and largeness, and danger. Public education to the seriousness of the problem is mandatory; action is of primary importance.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD General Partridge's able address, which is a healthy, helpful review of the problem of jet noise in the jet age—and of the community's obligation to the Air Force.

General Partridge's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY GEN. EARLE E. PARTRIDGE, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, CONTINENTAL AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, BEFORE THE JET AGE CONFERENCE OF THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 3, 1956

General Doolittle, gentlemen, on this short film, you have just seen the United States Air Force first supersonic jet fighter—the F-100, the initial member of the so-called century series of aircraft which will be coming in great numbers into the Air Force and American consciousness in a few months.

The sonic boom is not just a raucous way for this new offspring of aeronautical science to make its grand entrance, but it is one aspect of a problem we will hear much of during the next two conference days.

Actually, I am not going to stress the problem of the sonic boom, but rather, the United States Air Force requirements in two areas during the second decade of the jet age—first, the jet air base from which flights originate and home, and second, in flight. Or, put another way, the base from which we operate and air-traffic control.

The United States Air Force has long recognized the difficulties of community relations at jet air bases, and in the Continental Air Defense Command we have worked on community relations with great energy near our bases. Later on the program here you will see the film, Twenty-four Hour Alert, which dramatizes this work and drew much of its material from our base commander's experience at Truaz Field, near Madison, Wis.

It is perhaps indicative of what must be done on an even grander scale, if we are ever to solve this problem. This film was the product of a motion-picture studio giving of its talents, an aircraft company putting up money, a motion-picture star contributing his prestige in public service, and, of course, the all-out cooperation of the United States Air Force. The result is a film editorial which has facts, substance, logic, and educational qualities which can hardly fail to move any viewer.

We have not been content with working around bases, although we do not discount the tremendous value of close contact with the citizen and the community. The Air Force does feel, however, that there must be a well-organized plan and program subscribed to not only by the Air Force, but which goes across-the-board in Government, industry, and science if we are to really make inroads on the difficulties in jet aircraft operation in the United States.

By now, it should be obvious to everyone that none of this flying is done just for the sake of thrill to the pilot, but for the sake of our existence as a Nation and a world power. The fast alternating diet of smile and bile which is fed this globe by the Soviet Union from day to day pits us against a ruthless international combination. While we recognize a world full of political and military booby traps, we can never afford to become the candidate for the booby prize.

About 2 years ago, the Air Force Chief of Staff appointed a committee of experts headed by General Thatcher, and this group worked for more than a year on the problems built into jet operations. At the outset, they agreed with the President's Airport Commission report of 1952 which stated:

"Recognizing that aeronautics is an essential element of our national economy, they (the public) asked only that all possible steps be taken to minimize nuisance and hazard."

The Air Force experience around its bases verifies this attitude on the part of communities alongside. The Thatcher committee summed up the problems of noise and hazard in such an excellent manner that I should like to quote further:

"The committee has been impressed throughout its study by the pervasiveness of two basic influencing considerations. First, the conflict between communities and airbase operations is not simply an Air Force problem. It is a problem affecting national politics and the national economy as well as national defense. It applies to the civil populace, to Congress, to the other Armed Forces and to industry, as well as the Air Force. United States Air Force airbase utilization is a national problem and there must be a national solution. Second, the answer to the problem must be effective in resolving present conflicts as well as effective in preventing future ones. An effective long-range solution will be cheaper and will give better defense and will be more acceptable than a series of temporary solutions."

The problems of the military airbase are not easily solved as long as one Air Force flying unit is located in or near a community, and at no time can solutions be more than temporary or relegated to status of a routine staff function. Community growth, airbase mission changes, introductions of new weapons, as well as each new design or type of aircraft will bring up new local issues.

Noise and hazards can never be completely eliminated, but a nation is compelled to accept some inconveniences as a penalty for national security and advancement of the national economy. The magnitude of this inconvenience varies inversely as the distance between the source of the annoyance and those affected by it.

The Air Force has three broad courses of action which will lessen adverse operational effects.

At its existing bases, the Air Force may obtain public understanding of the necessity for the inconvenience of the disturbing fac-

tors in order to elicit community support of Air Force operations;

By scientific research, the Air Force can decrease noises and hazards at their source.

And, the Air Force can move its units an effective distance away from communities and properly orient its local traffic.

That last proposal—the moving of Air Force units away from communities—is the one which is generally brought forward by the communities themselves.

And this is not one of those problems which will die of old age, or like an old soldier will just fade away. The truth has to be told to the citizen, told quickly, and told in detail—told in terms of what it means in national defense, and in terms of what it means economically, or financially to him.

Since the end of World War II, we have quit-claimed to many municipalities airfields which were built with Air Force funds, and we have held onto such bases as skeleton requirements for the Air Force as our budget would permit. We have spent about $7 billion in worldwide air base construction.

And today, if various communities had their way, the Air Force would immediately have to start spending $3 billion for construction of new bases to house units which are faced with removal pleas and petitions. And such is the way of the real-estate operator, or subdivider we have encountered, any such removal is only momentary as he begins to cut up land adjacent to the base into lots and starts selling them to householders who will be newer champions of eviction in time to come.

We have had considerable Air Force experience with nuisances both ways, the effects of our own, and those who commit them against us. We have the man who acquires land at runway ends, shrewdly guessing that runways will have to be lengthened eventually to take the newer, more powerful military and civilian planes. We have known city commissioners who resist runway improvements required for jets at municipal airports, yet take as much money as the improvements would cost to build monuments and fountains out in front of the terminal where a suitable plaque can be mounted extolling the virtues of the commissioner. We have had newspapers who dredged up a dozen military aircraft accidents over a 7-year period as an excuse to move an airfield, yet found no reason to remember there were more than 3,000 accidents on the highways in that same area in the same 7-year period.

Meantime, the Air Force has gone scientifically about doing something to help. We have put barriers around the tailpipes to corral and enclose the sounds of run-up. We have also moved this phase of ground operations to the most isolated part of the airfield. And we have had our base or unit commanders on speaking engagements, making local and logical explanations to the people beside whom they live, and the people their unit defends. We have found that many of our commanders have to prepare defenses for the Air Force on the platform in almost equal ratio to the amount of time they give to preparations to defend America from air attack. Personally, I'd feel safer if he spent all his time on the latter.

Unfortunately, we have to start from where we are now, and in my Continental Air Defense Command alone, we live on 18 civil airports—that's about one-third of our operational bases. Now, what is an air base requirement? A distinguished group of people, experts assembled by the office of the Secretary of Defense, have submitted a very complete report on the types of airfield operations we should have for jets. For single-engined aircraft, there should be a 10,000-foot runway 200 feet wide. For multi-engined jets, 11,000 feet long, 300 feet wide. Taxiways and parking area must be in proportion and heavy duty pavement.

In the Continental Air Defense Command, we want at least 9,000 feet, but we do not have this on the majority of our stations. We are paying in manpower and busted airplanes because of the short fields from which we operate. An airfield which can barely take an aircraft in cool, dry weather of northern United States, comes up dangerous and short in ice and snow, or rainy periods.

In our landing patterns and approaches, wer are now using speeds of 225 miles an hour and up, and in the last stages, aircraft go over the airfield fence at 175 miles an hour or more. This requires long runway overruns, giving the pilot a chance to make a slight error in judgment without paying with his life.

We are trying to get all our new airfields at least 15 miles from the nearest major community, and we want the approach and takeoff corridors 7 miles long and 4 miles wide. This means 2 miles on either side of the center line of the runway, since we have found by experience that about 60 percent of all the takeoff and landing accidents occur in these corridors. The reasons for our concern about this is that the air defense missions are short, but we make about 400,000 landings in the Continental Air Defense Command every year after a corresponding number of takeoffs. Since 1921, when the Air Force began keeping an accident count, we have been beating the rate down steadily. It was 467 per 100,000 hours flown in 1921, and it was 20 per 100,000 in the last annual compilation. In my command, we cut the rate in half over the past 2 years. Any accident is unacceptable, but we're making flying safer as speed increases, a feat of some proportion.

As we bring down the number of hazards, noise, unfortunately, is going up and up in decibal measurements. Between 40 and 86 decibels, only a Rip Van Winkle can sleep; from 86 to 98, no man can yell loud enough over it to be heard; from 98 to 140, there is physical discomfort; and from there on, it's painful to the ears.

Some examples of this:

Tape recordings of B–25, the high noise-maker of prop-driven types; a T–33; F–86D, as examples in the present inventory.

Film clip of 102 showing not only sound attributes but peculiar high-angle takeoff characteristics.

You may have guessed that the F–86D was just 2 points short of the ear-paining decibel count, but the F–102 goes 1 point over the minimum without earplugs. This plane, which comes into our inventory in a few months, has to get up 2 miles to get out of the speech-interference range. The blessing is that it gets there quickly.

Before leaving the matter of the airfield itself it would be wrong to leave you feeling that all the problem ends with flying the aircraft. All the Continental Air Defense Command planes are fighter-interceptors of all-weather varieties, and they are always loaded when on missions. The smallest rocket-load capacity is twenty-four 2.75-inch projectiles, each the equivalent of 3-inch artillery shells in blast power, while the F–89D Scorpion carries 104 of these in tactical scrambles.

We have built all manner of control sequences into these weapons systems to save them, and we are putting more safety features into the controls for the future. The reason is that the present weapons are only midgets in comparison to what we are going to have.

There are high-explosive storage facilities on our airbases now, and the day is not far off when we shall have atomic weapons at the various stations in storage and on the planes in flight. Even with all the safety factors we can understand the uneasiness of civilian pilots taxiing around where we have armed fighters. This contributes to our determination to remove military flying from municipal or civil airports as soon as possible, but that $3-billion cost of relocation has to go along with our ability to pay over a period of years.

The other problem of size is air traffic control. Once most of our jets get off the ground, they turn into projectiles themselves, streaking along just this side of the speed of sound, and at least as fast as a pistol bullet. We now ask for the pilot to come under the air traffic controls of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, this projectile, or bullet, if you like, by asking the man aboard to tell where he is and what his intentions are.

Remember now, the pilot is going 10 miles a minute, and he is being asked where he is so he can be provided with a track for clearance. In the first place, the pilot doesn't know where he is—exactly— and he's changing that uncertainty as he goes along. By the time he finishes reporting his fix by radio, he's miles from here. In our Air Force opinion, the CAA traffic control system is completely outmoded. Bear in mind we have no quarrel with CAA. The CAA makes the Continental Air Defense Command business possible, and we work in closest harmony with CAA. They are trying to do something about it, because they know they cannot do the job which has to be done.

The second decade of the jet age will be featuring high rates of climb and descent, fighters being expected to climb at 40,000 to 50,000 feet per minute. The fighters just around the corner are going to climb at supersonic speeds, and once they get off they'll go immediately to high altitudes always where they will cruise at terrific speeds and have equal fuel consumption. It takes no particular imagination to know that this is going to make wide loop landing patterns, and have its effect on air traffic control when these lightning-like objects begin mingling with slower varieties.

We require an air traffic control system capable not only of riding herd on military jets, but jet civilian aircraft of the supersonic variety. The herding must take them off the ground, up to altitude, down to their destination, and into final approach without ever letting go.

Remember, it's not solely an Air Force problem, or a community one, it is a national one requiring a national solution. Public education and action along all lines is mandatory, like the sample I want to close with which is indicative to civilian airport operators of the noises jet airlines will be making for them to defend—that equivalent being the Strategic Air Command's 8-engined B–52 jet bomber.

Thank you.

The School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times for January 26, 1956, points up plainly the major differences between the proposals in the House and Senate on Federal aid to the public schools. I commend the editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

THE SCHOOL BILL

The first major piece of legislation to be taken up in the House this year is the pro-

posal to give substantial Federal aid to the public schools. The Kelley bill, reported by the Education and Labor Committee last July, is now being considered for clearance to the House floor by the Rules Committee. On the other side of the Capitol Senator SMITH of New Jersey has introduced a bill embodying the revised program put forward early this month by President Eisenhower.

The two measures differ in scope, but only to a limited degree in philosophy. The Kelley bill would provide a total of $1.6 billion in grants-in-aid to the States for school construction over a 4-year period. This compares with $1.25 billion over 5 years under the Eisenhower plan. Both proposals wisely require matching appropriations by the States. The difference in amounts is considerable, but it is not so great that a compromise could not be reached; and in fact both sums, huge though they are, would provide only a fraction of the construction necessary to meet the present classroom shortage. Both measures allocate $750 million in Federal credits for the purchase of bonds of school districts that are unable to sell them at reasonable rates.

The major philosophical difference between the two bills is in the method of distributing the Federal grants among the various States. The Kelley bill would make a flat grant, based on the number of school-age children in each State. The Eisenhower method of apportioning Federal aid is more complicated and, in our view, more equable. It would distribute the funds according to a formula that takes into consideration the relative wealth of the respective States, the number of pupils, and also, to some extent, the degree to which they have done their part to support public education out of their own resources.

The practical difference between the "flat-grant" principle in the Kelley bill and the "equalization" principle in the Eisenhower program is illustrated by figures showing, very roughly, what would happen in New York. Under the former measure New York State would receive over $32 million per annum from the Federal Government; under the Eisenhower plan New York would get only some $12 million. We favor the latter program in principle, for the simple reason that it seems far more sensible to give Federal aid roughly according to need than merely to redistribute tax money on a per capita basis without any reference to the financial ability of the respective States to meet their own school construction problems. It must never be forgotten—and the Eisenhower program emphasizes the point—that school matters are essentially and primarily a local responsibility; but the present crisis is so great that the Federal Government must step in for temporary help.

Honest disagreement over questions such as this can be ironed out. But what we fear cannot be ironed out in conjunction with a Federal school-aid bill is dispute over the segregation issue. While one can sympathize with the desire to deny Federal aid to school districts that fail to integrate their schools in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court, it is basically irrelevant to the fundamental purpose of the pending legislation. Furthermore, it is so charged with emotion that once an antisegregation amendment becomes attached to any school-aid bill. We fear that school aid in general will be doomed to defeat.

President Eisenhower was perfectly right yesterday in stating that "the need of the American children for schools is right now, immediately, today," and for suggesting that the segregation issue would delay passage of any such measure. It would not only delay it; it would very probably kill it. The Supreme Court has prescribed its own wise method for ridding this country of the curse of segregated education. That is one problem; Federal aid to education is another. If we want the latter, let us get it without amendments that—no matter how sincere and praiseworthy their purpose—would in all probability kill it.

Export of Tanks to Saudi Arabia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in a very difficult dilemma as a result of halting and then approving the export of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. This situation points up a need for clarification of our position in the tug of war in the Middle East.

The State Department should review its entire foreign policy with a view to reducing the cold war tensions that have been aggravating the Middle East for several years.

Far more caution would appear to be indicated. Certainly the evidence points to employment of such arms shipments in this struggle for power.

Even granting that we have made certain commitments to Saudi Arabia for assistance in return for permitting us to utilize an air base at Dhahran on Saudi Arabia's east coast, and granting that this base is of great strategic importance to the free world's maintenance of its security, it seems to me we are endangering the world's security by shipments of arms to nations which have openly demonstrated their readiness to go to war with each other.

War in any form must be avoided. Within our own lifetime we should have learned the bitter lesson that little wars grow inevitably into big wars.

Certainly there must be some other form of compensation we can make to Saudi Arabia than actual shipment of relatively modern armed tanks. These to a nation engaged in a grim struggle for power within an orbit that is patently in a powder-keg state.

In addition, the protests from Israel and other nations in the Middle East make it amply clear that concessions, such as this shipment of tanks, only place us in a position where other concessions must be made to nations adversely affected by the shipment.

The arms race between the Arab States and Israel already has resulted in armed clashes. Shipment of materials that could be converted to wartime use and outright assistance both from the Soviet Union and the United States have seemed to encourage these skirmishes.

History repeatedly has demonstrated the folly of such arms competition. In fairness, it must be admitted that we are today facing the uncomfortable fact that if we do not assist the Arab States, the Soviet Union will. In fact, the Soviet Union is now supplying some Arab States regardless of what action we may take.

Most of us are aware that the East-West rivalry has resulted from the simple fact that 75 percent of the Free World's proven oil reserves are held by Saudia Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrein, and Qatar. Western Europe receives most of its oil supplies from this area.

The benefits to the Soviet bloc from curtailing or disrupting this flow of oil from the Middle East are all to obvious. Most of these countries, while under the complete domination of hereditary rulers, are subject from day to day to Communist pressures .

In the face of this background of great riches and unrest, the United States has on the high seas a shipment of tanks. These 18 war machines undoubtedly will make a big difference in the balance of power between Israel and the Arab States.

We must consider carefully the consequences of such shipments.

I am not trying to hold any brief for or against the quarrels that have created this situation between the Arab States and Israel.

It is my conviction that we are courting world conflict if we continue a policy of shipping arms to nations, which in fact already are fighting each other.

The Attack on Veterans' Medical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, February 18, 1956.

My remarks follow:

There is a move underway to cut down medical services for veterans under the cloak of economy.

Memory and gratitude can be very short when some people see the opportunity of saving on taxes by forgetting human obligations.

The Hoover Commission has made excellent recommendations on other phases of Government operations, but on the question of reducing medical services to veterans, many of us believe that it is going too far.

The Commission advises the cancellation of all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals, except for those now under construction or under contract.

And that the Veterans' Administration dispose of by sale or otherwise, any hospital which, in its judgment can no longer be operated effectively and economically.

The VA replies that this would present a question for legislative consideration, since the Congress has authorized the construction of two proposed 500-bed general medical hospitals as replacements, one at Washington, D. C., and the other at Cleveland, Ohio. In both instances, these hospitals are necessary and are located in areas of large patient demand.

Insofar as the closing of existing hospitals is concerned, the VA believes that any determinations which are made along this line should be followed by notice to the appropriate committees of the Congress well in

advance of the proposed closing dates. This appears to be a proper and advisable step, in view of the fact that the acquisition and construction of hospitals operated by the VA was pursuant to congressional authority. In commenting on this proposal by the Commission, may I say that it vests too much power in government by directive. In recent years there has been a tendency for the executive branch to take over powers that properly belong to the Congress, thus upsetting the balance upon which a free and representative government depends. Committees and administrators without any direct mandate from the people, are assuming authority that was vested in duly elected Senators and Representatives. As the Federal Government becomes larger and more complex, power must be delegated but supervised. Administrators can never be a law unto themselves. The VA is correct in reminding the Hoover Commission that the Congress must have the final say in these matters. The living veterans of the Korean war number 4,346,000, and their average age is 27 years.

A PASSING THOUGHT

The Commission further recommends "that the statement of a veteran of his inability to pay for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities, should be subject to verification; and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to collect in case such a statement is not substantiated."

For one thing, this would require changes in the existing law. The present law provides that the statement of the veteran "shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses." No other verification is required and the statute does not permit the conditioning of free hospitalization upon verification thereof, pursuant to investigation.

In 1953, after hearings conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, it was decided to require a veteran to state his assets on the hospital application form (VA form 10–P–10.). But, irrespective of the facts reflected by the statement of assets, hospitalization may not be denied if the applicant makes the required statement under oath of his inability to defray the expenses of hospitalization. It was felt that this additional procedure would serve as a deterrent to abuses.

Since that time, out of more than one-half million applications that have been forwarded to central office up to December 1955, only 200 cases revealed that the applicant could have paid for his necessary hospital and medical care. This is only one twenty-fifth of 1 percent, a trifling percentage of the whole. It is believed that the relatively insignificant number of questionable cases which have been turned up by this procedure does not justify the apparent views of the Commission that the present system is subject to widespread abuses.

The VA seriously questions the wisdom and practicability of a verification procedure such as that contemplated by the Hoover Commission.

The second part of the recommendation, to the effect that collection should be made where the statement is not substantiated, is inconsistent with the first part. If the oath were subject to verification, the applicant would not be admitted to the hospital in the first place. This also brings up a serious question of policy. Neither the VA, nor any other governmental agency should enter into the business of providing hospital care for pay, in competition with private, public, or charitable institutions.

Remember, there are 15,391,000 living veterans of World War II, whose average age is 36½ years.

Another Hoover recommendation would provide, and I quote: "That the veteran should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability if he can do so at some reasonable time in the future. Such a debt should be without interest. Congress should pass appropriate laws for the collection of such obligations."

Hospitalization for non-service-conected disabilities was authorized as far back as 1933. This basic law contemplates the furnishing of hospital care and treatment on a free basis, to veterans who are eligible under its provisions. In this respect, the program of hospitalization, both for service-connected and non-service-connected cases, is part of the overall pattern of benefits, including compensation, pensions, and readjustment aids for veterans, which has been established for the assistance and relief of eligible veterans as a measure of the Government's obligation and therefore at the expense of the Government.

It may be mentioned also, that the proposal to pay back in the future, would be administratively expensive and unwieldy. The follow-up procedures, both with respect to determination of when the veteran might have attained an economic position enabling him to make payment and with respect to collection procedures, could be most cumbersome. It would tend to emphasize the commercial aspects of a governmental activity in behalf of a large group of persons hitherto regarded as having a special claim on the Government by reason of their service in time of war in the Armed Forces.

How about this fact? There are 68,000 living veterans of the Spanish-American War whose average age is 78½ years.

It should be noted that the Commission's comments with respect to collecting from insurance companies, are rather misleading and unrealistic. The insurance companies have very largely written their policies to exclude reimbursement for hospital care afforded at public expense. The Commission's recommendation would not affect this nonassumption of liability, and it is beyond the power of the Congress to require change of these insurance policies on this matter, or to prohibit private persons from entering into such contracts.

The Hoover Commission also recommends:

"A. That the responsibility and authority to establish and maintain medical criteria for disability, both initial and continuing, should be transferred from the Compensation and Pension Branch of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

"B. That the Department of Medicine and Surgery should also develop and maintain a mechanism for review of disability allowances based on the possibility of increase or decrease in disabilities."

The law provides that ratings shall be based, as far as practicable, upon the average impairments of earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations. Thus, the impairment of earning capacity is not that of the individual, but rather "average impairment" as related to a large class of individuals. This, therefore, does not permit the reduction of percentage rating in an individual case where the veteran has been successful in overcoming the handicap.

It may also be noted that the one example used by the Commission of an excessive disability rating in the lower brackets is described in such a way as to reflect a misunderstanding. It stated that amputation of a great toe is rated at 30 percent, for which the veteran is entitled to a minimum of $50 per month, regardless of his other income. In fact, the uncomplicated amputation of the great toe entitles to a rating of only 10 percent. When it is associated with removal of the metatarsal head, and consequently with the loss of muscle tone of both arches of the foot, it entitles to 30 percent. This is not high in relation to 10 percent for the simple loss of the toe, or 40 percent for the loss of the foot. The question of whether such a rating is realistic can be determined only by a survey of the resultant average impairment in earning capacity, and not solely on the basis of medical opinion, no matter how well informed.

As to section B of the recommendation, the Hoover Commission states that there is a tendency to regard disabilities as continuing and progressive, and to avoid re-examinations.

The fact is, that unless examinations by medical personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery indicates that the disability is static, re-examinations are required until the disability has remained at the same level as shown by examination over a period of 5 years.

In my opinion, the Veterans' Administration has effectively answered these implied criticisms by the Hoover Commission.

It appears that the Commission is probing for an opening in the defenses we have established to protect the rights of veterans.

Under the guise of saving money, the economy skirmishers would undermine the whole program of veterans' benefits.

By emphasizing the few abuses, they would try to void the Nation's obligations to the men and women whose health was impaired in service to our country.

Behind the quiet words and the dull legalism is the intent to reduce veterans' benefits to the minimum.

Educational, and on-the-job-training programs for the veterans of World War II have already expired, insofar as beginning such courses is concerned.

The men of World War I never had such opportunities.

Now we must concentrate on maintaining suitable programs for the sick and aging veterans.

This is no time to economize at their expense.

I hope that the American public will insist on continuing medical care for all deserving veterans.

Remember this fact, there are 3,105,000 living veterans of World War I, whose average age is 62 years.

The Powell Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following statement issued on February 18, 1956, by the board of directors of the National Education Association in opposition to the Powell amendment:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION FEBRUARY 18, 1956

In a special action taken at its regular midwinter meeting, the board of directors of the National Education Association today voted to oppose strongly the Powell amendment which now imperils urgently needed school construction legislation. The board feels that this amendment would serve no useful purpose, that its inclusion in a school construction bill would contradict the intent of the Supreme Court in its decrees which provide for gradual compliance, and furthermore, that it would not hasten the integration of a single school system.

Almost 1 year ago during Senate hearings, the National Education Association board of directors went on record opposing any so-

called antisegregation amendment to school construction legislation. Such legislation (H. R. 7535) now awaits a decision by the House Rules Committee, and has reached a crucial stage in its progress.

President Eisenhower has twice within the past year spoken clearly and firmly in opposition to extraneous and unnecessary amendments such as the one proposed by Representative ADAM C. POWELL, of New York. In June 1955 the President warned of the dangers of such amendments not only to school construction legislation, but also to other comparable Federal legislative proposals. He pointed out that the two separate issues of emergency school building aid and civil rights should not be confused, and stated that now the problem of ending segregation in the public schools lies clearly within the jurisdiction of the courts, not the Congress. Recently, leaders of both political parties have spoken out against the attempts to defeat school construction legislation by attaching an alleged antisegregation amendment.

The Board believes with the President and many leaders in both parties that school construction aid must be enacted this session of Congress to help relieve the critical school building shortages throughout the country. A recent public opinion poll showed nationwide support of more than 2 to 1 favoring Federal assistance for school construction; this is in the same ratio expressed by the White House Conference. The welfare and security of the country and the future education of children of all races are involved. It is our sincere hope that attempts to cloud and complicate the basic issue will not result in denying educational opportunity to American children.

Upper Colorado River Project—Weather Control Makes It a White Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an important scientific development since the upper Colorado River project was conceived which makes such project, if possible, even less economic and more unfeasible than ever before.

The development is weather modification or control, commonly known as rainmaking.

The President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control has just made its report to the President. Additional precipitation of water through cloud seeding and similar weather modification methods has been proven, and acceptable methods of measurement of the degree of success of obtaining precipitation over normal have been found.

The President's Advisory Committee has studied the possibilities of additional water for the Colorado River through weather control operations in the upper Colorado watershed and has stated that if the precipitation can be brought to 20 percent above the normal—that is, what it would be for a given year without such weather control—the upper river basin runoff for dry years would be increased by approximately 3 million acre-feet; for normal years by approximately 4,500,000 acre-feet; and for wet years by approximately 5,700,000 acre-feet.

Dr. Irving Krick, meteorologist of Denver, Colo., who has carried out many such weather modification projects including studies and test work in the Upper Colorado watershed, states that a 20 percent increase in precipitation is an exceedingly conservative estimate and that the average increase of precipitation over normal in other projects has approximated 50 percent. If the 50 percent figure were used for the upper Colorado Basin, the additional runoff in dry seasons would be about 7 million acre-feet and for normal seasons would be more than 11 million acre-feet.

The upper Colorado River project now before Congress creates no additional water. It merely impounds water that is in the river anyway. It actually causes the available water to be decreased because it is admitted even by the proponents of the project that close to 1 million acre-feet would be evaporated into the air annually from the proposed reservoirs.

The water that would be brought to the Colorado River by weather control—rain-making—in the upper Colorado River watershed is more than the needs of the upper basin area. It can be used on its way down to the main river from the snowpacks, rainfalls, and so forth, to give moisture to pasture lands. It can be impounded here and there near its sources in small reservoirs to take care of the needs of present or proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and then it can go down to the river for use below Lees Ferry.

The cost of such small impounding dams above various points of use would be small compared with the nearly $1 million for the project as proposed in the bill.

The cost of obtaining this added runoff would approximate—according to the President's Advisory Committee—less than 50 cents per acre-foot or about $1 million per year. On Dr. Krick's estimate of a greater precipitation the annual cost per acre-foot would be much less than 50 cents.

This added water, as it passes into Lake Mead and through the Hoover power plant, would be worth at least 50 cents per acre-foot for electric generation alone. But it then goes down the river where it can be used by various irrigation districts and water districts such as the Imperial and Coachella irrigation districts and the Metropolitan and San Diego water districts. The water for these purposes is worth more than $2 per acre-foot.

Thus, on a more than self-sustaining basis from the start and with an expenditure of approximately $1 million per year, all the nonpower objectives of the upper Colorado River project are met without the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

Furthermore, this increased precipitation will cause the water as it reaches points of use in the lower Colorado areas to have less salt content, whereas the evaporation of 1 million cubic feet a year resulting from the carrying through of the upper Colorado River project would admittedly cause the salt content of the water to increase materially. The water already carries about a ton of salt per acre-foot of water. Any increase of this salt content would require more water by the irrigator for leeching purposes and if the salt content increases greatly it would render such irrigator's soil worthless for purposes for which now used.

Weather modification in the upper Colorado Basin, in view of the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, should be tested for a few years before commitment is made for a billion-dollar project. The billion-dollar project will merely impound water already in the river and destroy part of its usefulness through evaporation. Weather modification at almost insignificant expense—which will be self-sustaining from the start—will create additional available water through increased precipitation and increased runoff.

The potential deficit of water in the Colorado River Basin is indicated by the President's Advisory Committee to be 9 or 10 million acre-feet per year. This cannot be produced by the project covered by the bill because no water is created. It can be produced without such project by simple and inexpensive weather control by cloud seeding, and so forth.

Dr. Krick has indicated his willingness to undertake such weather modification at actual out-of-pocket cost estimated at not to exceed $1 million per year and to take his fee for services on a contingent basis at the rate of a certain number of cents per acre-foot of water produced over normal for the year in question.

From the above it is clear, based on the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, that the Colorado River project cannot be justified from the standpoint of irrigation and domestic needs in either the upper or lower river basins.

Few who have considered in Congress the bill for the upper Colorado River project have known much about weather modification—rainmaking—and its possibilities in the upper Colorado Basin. What has been accomplished in this new field has been known only by a few. But the recent findings of the President's Advisory Committee change all this.

The upper Colorado River project bill should be sent back to the Interior Committee and carefully restudied in the light of this new development. It points the way to greater benefits for the areas and populations involved at far less cost.

American Aid to Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the concluding

installment of a report on Asia, written by Mr. John Cowles, the editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. The article appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 19. This article, like its predecessors, deserves the closest attention of the Senate and the country.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the same subject, which appeared in the Washington Post on February 19, 1956. It is entitled "Standing Pat in Asia."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of February 19, 1956]

COWLES SEES ASIA SLIPPING—ONLY AMERICAN AID CAN SAVE SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By John Cowles)

"Why," I asked one of the most distinguished editors in India, "are the Indian people, who are so violently opposed to colonialism in Asia, apparently indifferent to Soviet Russia's colonialism in Eastern Europe?"

"Because Asians think of colonialism as being the rule by white people of colored people," the editor answered, "and the people who live in Russia's European satellites aren't colored."

"But then, why don't Indians regard Communist Russia's occupation of Czechoslovakia and Poland as being, if not colonialism, at least imperialism?" I asked.

"Because Russia does not have an emperor," was the reply. "To Asians imperialism means exploitation by a foreign country that has an emperior. You will recall that the British formerly called their king the Emperor of India. Russia today has no emperor, no czar. The Communists liquidated him. Therefore, what Russia may be doing in Eastern Europe is not by our definition imperialism."

Americans may think this is a silly, hair-splitting exercise in semantics, but a few days later after another distinguished Indian editor in another city had answered my same questions in almost the same way, I began to realize why many of our propaganda broadcasts and appeals to Asia apparently have so little effect.

Some of the Asian leaders are, like Prime Minister Nehru, pure Aryan in their racial ancestry, but the bulk of the people of Asia, constituting over half the total population of the globe, have brown or yellow or black skins, and they are extremely sensitive to what they suspect are white people's assumptions of racial superiority.

They, the peoples of Asia, irrespective of nationality, have many things in common, which we must understand if we are to comprehend why they act and react as they do.

Most of them have just recently won their national freedom from European colonial powers, and have what one might call a psychosis on the subject of colonialism and foreign interference.

They all want their dignity as free and sovereign nations respected. They all want to raise their standards of living. They all want peace.

Although President Eisenhower has enormous personal prestige in Asia, largely because of his emphasis on peace at the Geneva summit meeting, Communist propaganda is nevertheless highly effective in presenting the United States as a nation which wants war in Asia so that Americans can subsequently exploit the Asians.

Whenever we press an Asian country to sign any kind of a military-assistance agreement, or even indirectly try to encourage Asian nations to join such things as the Baghdad Pact, of which Great Britain rather than the United States is the nominal sponsor, we provide the Communists with rich propaganda material. One important effect is that some of the other Asian neutral countries become suspicious, fantastic as we may know it to be, of our motives.

A few days ago some 7,000 American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines descended on Thailand from sea and air to demonstrate to the Thais in a much-ballyhooed operation that the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization has real teeth in it, and is not just a paper tiger.

Undoubtedly we convinced the Thais that American armed might is real, but the fact of highest significance is that no other Asian mainland nation participated in these military maneuvers.

Philippine military forces took part, but all the rest were white non-Asians, Americans, British, Australians, and New Zealanders.

Even the Pakistanis, with whom we have a military pact and to whom we have given much military equipment, were conspicuously absent! This was despite the fact that Pakistan is the sole Asian mainland nation other than Thailand which is a member of SEATO.

While we are conducting a military demonstration near Bangkok, the Russians continue such things as operating a free medical clinic and hospital in Teheran, Iran.

Undoubtedly this free clinic is also a center for Communist espionage, but is an example of how clever the Russians are in dressing up their activities so as to appeal to the Asians, while we, in the minds of the neutralists, appear to be concentrating on preparations for war.

Even Pakistan is beginning to weigh the relative value of its military pact with the United States in comparison with the benefits it might get from Russia and China if it terminated its agrement with us, "went neutral," and signed peace and good will treaties with the Communists.

The prime minister of Pakistan volunteered to me a few weeks ago, for example, that he was planning a good will mission to China shortly after the conclusion of Secretary of State Dulles' much publicized visit to Karachi next month.

The American position is progressively deteriorating throughout most of Asia. If we want to be realistic we must recognize that before long we will probably face 1 of 2 alternatives:

1. Either the free world must be prepared to accept the loss to the Communist orbit of most of what remains of free Asia, and with it the tin, and tungsten, and manganese, and other natural resources on which a substantial part of our own national security depends: or

2. We must rapidly adopt a bold, imaginative and appealing policy in Asia.

It seems perfectly clear to me what our policy toward southeast Asia should be. It is to adopt a partnership approach toward the 600 million people in the 10 new countries there that have won their independence since the end of World War II, a partnership in the cause of world peace and freedom. They have much to give. We have much to give.

Those nations in alphabetical order are Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Laos, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, and South Vietnam. Perhaps Iran should also be included in this group. Perhaps Iran should be part of another program for the Middle East area.

Most of these countries are economically and politically extremely weak, but most genuinely want to establish themselves as independent, free, self-sufficient democracies.

The United States, incomparably the strongest and richest democracy in the world, ought to regard it both as a necessity in connection with our own long-term national security and as a tangible affirmation of our own basic philosophical faith to help these struggling nations raise their living standards and maintain their liberties from totalitarianism.

These nations are all children of revolution. So is America. They all want to escape war, stay neutral and avoid entangling military alliances just as George Washington in his farewell address urged a then weak United States to do.

Should we criticize these politically immature and unstable countries for desiring to remain neutral as between the two colossal power blocs, the Communist world which abuts many of them on the north, and the free world, consisting primarily of the United States and Great Britain, plus a part of northwestern Europe, which is thousands of miles away?

Our own country stayed neutral for nearly a century and a half after its creation. We have learned to respect and esteem other nations which also have wished to remain neutral. Sweden and Switzerland are examples.

Instead of criticizing these new southeast Asian countries for their wish for peace through neutrality, we should give them understanding encouragement and financial aid, not solely for reasons of our own national security, but also because of our honest desire to see them suceed as independent democracies, and because of our deep, almost religious, American conviction that all men should be free.

Fortunately, the chance is good that if we act promptly and imaginatively and sympathetically, we can save this vital quarter of the world's population, and probably at only a small fraction of the financial cost of our Marshall plan aid to Western Europe.

But Asia is overwhelmingly worth saving even if the cost should prove commensurate with that of the Marshall plan. Our own eventual freedom may be at stake.

Nor, in increasing our expenditures for foreign economic aid, should we reduce our expenditures to intensify our own military strength, particularly in the field of scientific research and development.

But those Americans who regard foreign economic aid simply as giveaway programs and glibly profess ambitions to liquidate them, should be wary that in the process they do not liquidate the whole free world.

[From the Washington Post of February 19, 1956]

STANDING PAT IN ASIA

There is a disturbing complacency among American policymakers about the Soviet inroads in Asia. Let the Russians make their promises, the argument goes, and then let us see whether they can carry them out. No particular change in American policy is needed to counter them.

This, we submit, is the way to lose the race. For by the time there is evidence as to whether the Russians will redeem their promises, Asia may well have been captured intellectually, if not economically. In the first place, it is by no means improbable that the Russians will produce on their promises. Certainly they can absorb agricultural surpluses such as Burmese rice; certainly, too, they can divert their resources to carry out foreign economic objectives merely by depriving the people at home. In the second place, even if the Soviet promises turn out in the end to be false, the Russians in the meantime are enjoying a propaganda field day—and at our expense. They are able to do this in large part because they talk, not in terms of arms and military alliances, but in terms of "peace" and cultural values that the individual can understand.

Surely it is not enough for us to stand pat, to be content with the record. Granted, we have done a great deal in Asia. In India, for example, we have extended some $500 million in loans and grants. But we seem to lack the sense of psychological nicety to follow through. Only through the stubborn intervention of Ambassador Cooper were the aid funds for this year restored to the authorized level. Too often we do not do an adequate job of explaining what we have done. We seem to boast of the well-being of the American worker instead of suggesting practical steps by which local populations may improve their own lot. We seem to expect political agreement and military support as the only indication of gratitude—ignoring the fact that the strengthening of local independence is our best reward. As J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the board of the Committee for Economic Development, pointed out here the other day, "The loss to communism of a so-called neutralist country in the underdeveloped world could be just as damaging to our security as the loss of a military ally. * * * The Communist threat in the underdeveloped world is not solely—not even primarily—military."

Frequently it is not so much a matter of dollars as of attitude. Dollars will not "save" Asia, though a moderate increase in our aid employed imaginatively could do a very great deal to spread technical assistance, support essential public works and stimulate investment. Even more important than money, however, would be a positive declaration that we are interested in the welfare of the independent peoples of Asia, not primarily as allies in the cold war, but for their own sake as human beings.

Paul Hoffman has proposed a Marshall plan concept to meet the individual economic needs of the newly independent nations of Asia ranging from Pakistan and India to the Philippines and Korea—an area containing 800 million people. John Cowles has reported how we flubbed Burma's offer to pay for needed aid with rice which could have been stored as a famine reserve in the area. The American delegation to the United Nations General Assembly spoke eloquently of the need to make "newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations." Virtually every perceptive traveler, beginning with Chester Bowles, has called for a combination of flexibility and imagination that will serve the real American interest in Asia.

Fortunately, there are signs of such flexibility in the present efforts to help Ceylon despite her shipments of rubber to Communist China (undertaken in the first place because we lacked either the authority or the ingenuity to engage in premptive buying). How much more meaningful it would be if this sort of flexibility could extend, say, to Burma and could bring recognition of the psychological value of a small atomic reactor to be located in Colombo!

Merely to wait out the Soviet promises would be to abandon the field, in wholly negative fashion, to the Russians. It has been a long time since any concept in foreign relations approached the boldness (not the magnitude) of the Marshall plan. Yet essentially what our interest requires is a galvanizing device for stirring the imagination of the peoples of Asia, for giving practical meaning to the values expressed in the Declaration of Independence. It would be encouraging if Secretary Dulles were enabled to give at least a hint of this sort of approach on his visit to Asia next month.

Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following comment by Mr. Benjamin R. Epstein on the subject of religious training for children, which appears in the October 1955 publication of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT RELIGIOUS ILLITERACY IS A PROBLEM FOR THE HOME, NOT THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

The place of religion in the public schools is controversial. Differences of view are sharp and often so weighted by emotionalism that tension creeps in among otherwise friendly groups. We have first, the strict interpreters of the principle of separation of church and State. They say that any recognition of religion within the school program violates the Constitution and is as harmful to religion as it is to the State.

Next are those who believe that sectarianism violates the constitutional principle, yet they feel that schools have a responsibility not to ignore religion.

Finally, those who go further; separation of church and state does not mean public schools may take no cognizance of religion, they say. Indeed, it must include religious teaching in order to foster basic concepts essential to the growth of American ideals. There are no villains in this piece. The disparate views are honestly held by men concerned with the commonweal. If there are villains, they are found on the fringes of our society, taking advantage of these honest differences to attack the public-school system.

Jews on the whole have been among the strict interpreters, believing, however, that religion is essential in the lives of all children. The question is: Who is responsible for a child's religious education? The church and family—not the public school, has been the traditional Jewish answer. And, traditionally, Jews provide for the religious training of their children in the home and synagogue. They wonder, too, whether the efforts of some groups to use the public schools for religious indoctrination are not dictated by failure of the home. To look to the public schools for this kind of rescue action is a dangerous gamble that can only pay off in all sorts of intergroup problems.

The American democratic system is founded upon ethical and moral concepts derived in large part from the great religions of mankind. In turn, the unique vitality of our religious institutions stems in good part from our country's tradition of separation of church and state. The public-school system is also a bulwark of American democracy, a unifying medium through which different racial, ethnic, and religious groups are given the common impress of Americanism. It follows, therefore, that the public school must recognize the realities of religious differences in the American community—as indeed it does. We believe our schools have properly taught acceptance of and respect for religious differences.

Some very practical problems on religion in the public schools are confronting many communities throughout the country. Among the points of contention are the reading and distribution of Bibles in public schools; the recitation of prayer in such schools; the use of released time and dismissed time programs and similar aid to religious groups; classroom observances of religious holidays, and recurring proposals for teaching about religion as a secular subject.

Christians and Jews accept the Old Testament as the word of God. But each major religious denomination has its own version of the Bible and believes that those used by other groups are not the true writ. It follows, then, that the Bible in its varying versions, is a sectarian book. Reading from it as a public-school exercise, or the distribution of Bibles to pupils by religious organizations, or teaching a Bible course in a public-school class, all involve sectarian religious indoctrination, violating the first amendment. For this reason, ADL opposes these practices.

It is ADL's belief that the use of prayer in a public school can serve only to place pressure upon a child to engage in religious practices which may be contrary to those he has been taught by his religious leaders and his family. Such a situation also emphasizes religious differences to the child without, at the same time, teaching acceptance of those differences.

Since neither the time, facilities, personnel or funds of the public school system may, under the first amendment, be used for purposes of sectarian religious instruction, it is ADL's judgment that "released time" programs are improper.

The practice here is to excuse from class earlier than usual at the end of one school day each week, those pupils who agree to attend religious instruction in their own faith. Parents' consent is necessary. Children who do not participate in the program remain in class.

There is a variation of released time called "dismissed time' 'in which the entire class is dismissed and school authorities take no account of which children attend religious classes and which do not. ADL does not encourage dismissed time, but regards it as preferable to released time.

Some persons have advanced proposals for teaching a "common core of religious belief" based on concepts common to and represented in all religions. ADL believes that this is impossible. The isolation of such a body of religious principles, we believe, would do violence to every denomination. Might it not—to show one of its dangers—result in the creation of a new religion sponsored and taught in the public schools?

It is customary in public school courses in history, literature, social science, art and music to teach children what religion and religious institutions have contributed to these fields. Now, there are proposals that public schools establish separate courses to teach about religious practices and beliefs.

In considering such proposals, ADL has noted that teachers today are not properly trained to teach such courses. We also doubt that children in elementary grades are qualified to discuss such matters of faith in objective terms. Yet, ADL is not opposed to further study of specific plans and curricula for use in separate classes about religion. Such studies must determine whether courses can be formulated that would teach only the objective facts about religion, and what effect they might have on children.

Another proposition is that courses be instituted in public schools to instill in the children the moral and spiritual values based upon religious law.

It is ADL's opinion that our public schools have always imparted to children moral and spiritual values. No good teacher can operate without infusing into all her teaching the basic moral laws. The question is whether the public school should undertake to stress the religious sources of moral law.

We think not. We believe that in the public school such values should be taught without reliance on religious approval, though nothing the teacher says on this subject should negate what the child learns at home or in his church or synagogue.

ADL does not favor the observance of religious holidays in public schools. But we recognize that such celebrations are imbedded in current practice. Wherever religious holidays are programed in the schools, ADL is prepared to make available, upon request, its facilities and material dealing with the Jewish cultural aspects of such programs.

Religion has always been and continues to be the central core of Jewish life. We believe, too, that religion is of vital importance to most Americans, even those who do not adhere to any organized church. We believe that religious training, as an essential aspect of every child's education, is the prerogative and responsibility of the home and church.

We believe it is unwise to burden the school with this responsibility. Sound policy, it seems to us, dictates that we strengthen our religious institutions so that they may successfully perform their educational work, rather than invoke the power of the State, through the public schools, to achieve that goal.

BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN,
ADL National Director.

The Winter Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on the subject of the Olympic games, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the February 7, 1956, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, and an article from the February 10, 1956, issue of U. S. News & World Report magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 7, 1956]

THE WINTER OLYMPICS

The seventh winter Olympic games have passed into history. The outstanding feature of the performances at Cortina d'Ampezzo was the appearance, and the success, of the teams from the Soviet Union. The fact, apparent long before the Russian athletes appeared, that sport has become an instrument of Soviet policy, was a reminder that the competitive ideal handed down from antiquity through the Olympic games has not survived wholly untarnished. The contest of individuals, on equal terms, for the sheer glory of a winner's wreath, has become infected with national pride and ideological rivalry. Yet enough of the tradition remains to keep the Olympic torch a symbol of sportsmanship and gallant effort.

The United States, in the face of the brilliant showing of many nations (notably Austria), as well as the organized Soviet onslaught, did not do as well as at Oslo in 1952. But the American figure skaters were well out in front and the skiers, bobsledders, and hockey players performed creditably indeed.

If the young people of America come to realize that they face increasing competition in sports abroad, and that this does affect the Nation's prestige, the results at Cortina may well have a beneficial effect. Broader and keener participation in sports may be stimulated. There should be no attempt to "nationalize" athletics, but there are ways in which the existing skills of American athletes can be made to show to better advantage in international events than at present.

Meanwhile, congratulations and gratitude are due all the Americans who entered the contest at Cortina, and all their countrymen will wish good luck to those who represent them in the major Olympics at Melbourne this fall.

[From U. S. News & World Report of February 10, 1956]

IF RUSSIA WINS OLYMPIC GAMES—RED ATHLETES WILL BECOME BIGGER WEAPON IN COLD WAR

Soviet sport champions are turning out to be effective propagandists for communism. They have won the winter Olympics. It looks as if they will win at Melbourne, too.

Their victories are boosting Soviet prestige around the world.

But the Russians never used to be so good. The Olympics have been dominated for years by Americans.

How did the Russians get so good so fast?

Here is the explanation: The Kremlin has taken over Soviet sports, mobilized an army of 12 million athletes. State money finances their training, rewards their victories.

The newest Soviet offensive in the cold war is being waged by Russian athletes. And the objectives of that offensive are now becoming clear:

The Russians are out to dominate the world—and beat the United States—in Olympic sports.

Then they intend to turn their athletic victories into powerful propaganda for communism.

Russia, in this drive, already has scored an important victory. Its snow-and-ice athletes outscored every other nation in the winter Olympics at Cortina d'Ampezzo, Italy.

Ahead lies the big Russian goal—the summer Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia. The way it looks now to a lot of sport experts in the West, the Russian are very likely to win at Melbourne, too.

Soviet tactics leave no doubt about the Kremlin's determination to win the Melbourne Olympics. The Russians have been aiming deliberately at this goal for years. The whole force and financial backing of the Soviet Government have been thrown into the campaign. They've gone about it with the large-scale efficiency of a nation preparing for war.

An army of 12 million sturdy youths has been assembled for this athletic offensive. Training camps resembling military posts have been set up throughout the vast area of the Soviet Union.

Athelets have been awarded ranks like soldiers, and are promoted up through the ranks as their skill increases.

Highly paid jobs go to athletic winners.

All this has been done at Government expense and under Government direction.

Some sport officials in the West have questioned the amateurism of the athletes this Soviet system has produced. But none can question the system's effectiveness. No nation has ever risen so fast as a sport power—from nowhere to the top in a few years.

First-try winner: Russia never before had even competed in the winter Olympics. Yet Russians won the unofficial team championship at Cortina on their first attempt. Since the Communist Revolution, the Russians had never completed in the summer Olympics, either, until 1952. Then they almost beat the United States on the first try.

If the Russians win at Melbourne, Western officials now are beginning to realize, the Kremlin will have achieved one of its greatest propaganda successes since World War II. And the victory would be at the expense of Russia's greatest rival, the United States.

American athletes for decades have dominated the Olympic games. Only once since 1920 has any nation outscored the United States in the summer Olympics, and that also was a dictatorship, Nazi Germany, in 1936. A Soviet triumph over the United States at Melbourne would surely be hailed by Communists everywhere as proof of American "decadence" and the superiority of the Communist system.

To winner, world prestige: What Westerners now are realizing is that Communists are not the only ones who would be impressed. Among millions of people throughout the world, athletic skill carries enormous prestige. It is regarded by many as an indication of national health and vigor.

Not only that, athletes are proving to be powerful propaganda agents, effective ambassadors of good will. A champion athlete can open doors that diplomats cannot unlock.

Russia, already engaged in a world-wide campaign of exchanging delegations, undoubtedly would find greater opportunities to get Russians into other countries and lure foreigners into Russia if it could hold out the bait of an Olympic championship team.

Soviet chances of achieving this goal appear good. At Helsinki in 1952, Americans saved their team championship only by swamping the Russian men in track and field. But, since then, Russian men have set half a dozen world records in track and field. Distance runners such as Vladimir Kuc, hurdlers such as Jurii Lituev and hammer throwers such as Mikhail Krivonosov are considered likely to crack the United States track and field monopoly at Melbourne.

In women's events, Russians are rated supreme. Their Amazonian women hold at least 10 world track and field records, including the shotput, and discus and javelin throws.

Gymnastics, a big part of the Olympic programs, are a Russian monopoly, Russian soccer teams are the scourge of Europe. Russians are strong in boxing and weight lifting. Russians have won world titles in shooting.

Soviet athletes even have challenged western nations at their own traditional national sports—and won. They have beaten the British at rowing, the Canadians at ice hocky, the Scandinavians at skiing. And at Helsinki in 1952 they threw a real scare into the United States in its own game of basketball.

It was not until the closing days of the 1952 Olympics that the United States team passed Russia in the unofficial point totals. The final score was United States 614, Russia 553½. With the rapid improvement Russians have been showing since 1952, American sportsmen fear the 1956 positions may very well be reversed.

Soviet Government's role: How has Russia improved so fast? The answer: Russia has turned sports into a big state business. Like nearly everything else in Communist life, athletics have been taken over by the Government.

An All-Union Committee on Physical Culture and Sports was created with the status of a Cabinet ministry.

Physical training is compulsory for every schoolchild. Any child who shows athletic

promise is singled out for special training in one of several hundred sport schools. The best of those athletes, in turn, are graduated into higher sport schools where specialized skills are taught by expert, state-paid instructors.

Trade unions operate additional training centers and sponsor countless athletic teams of all kinds. So do universities.

Financial rewards go with athletic success in the Soviet Union. If an athlete shows championship promise, a good job is provided—one sure to leave him plenty of time and opportunity to train. And the pay has been known to go up after an athlete wins an important international contest.

Best among 12 million: To single out the best in Russia's army of athletes, local, regional, and national meets and contests are held periodically throughout the Soviet Union. Nikolai Romanov, chairman of the All-Union Committee on Physical Culture and Sports, recently reported to the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers that more than 9 million school youngsters and 3 million trade-union athletes took part in such contests.

Avery Brundage, American sports leader who is currently president of the International Olympic Committee, reported after a tour of Russia last year that Soviet officials told him the U. S. S. R. has in training 4 million track and field athletes alone, with 800,000 other athletes being trained in gymnastics.

Money in plenty is provided for this enormous program. The Soviet Government's budget in 1954 allowed 29 billion rubles more than $7 billion at the official exchange rate—for health measures and physical culture. In the same year, the All-Union Trade Congress announced that 600 million rubles—$150 million—was spent from that organization's funds on athletic training.

When Soviet teams go abroad, as to the Olympics, or when foreign athletes visit the Soviet Union, the Government or one of its agencies picks up the check for all expenses.

By contrast, no Government money is provided for American Olympic teams. Funds are raised by contributions of individual sportsmen—and sometimes fall short of the amount needed.

Russia's motives in this big sport offensive are made unquestionably clear by such official Communist pronouncements as these two:

"The superiority of Stalinist Socialist athletes over capitalist athletes must be continually demonstrated."

"Physical culture and sports are not a matter of amusement but a matter of state importance."

Here to win: A Russian official who accompanied the U. S. S. R. rowers to the Henley regatta in England, in 1954, summed it all up.

"This is sport to you," he told the British. "But we are here to win."

A Must Among Magazines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of Mr. Norman J. Holter, of Helena, Mont., I have been receiving the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. Mr. Holter is an outstanding scientist in his own right and the contributions of his research laboratory and the Holter Foundation are nationally recognized. Since reading the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists I agree with the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 13, 1956, that this is a "must among magazines." The editorial follows:

A MUST AMONG MAGAZINES

The 10th anniversary of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists is an occasion which we hail warmly. Editor Eugene Rabinowitch and his associates can look back on a decade of achievement that has been solid and distinguished. They mean to celebrate it by publishing this year a series of special symposia discussing the changes in society brought about by the spectacular growth of science during these 10 years.

When the atomic age broke in 1945, the scientist generally was hardly a political animal. This was especially true of scientists in the fields that make up nuclear physics. But the mushroom cloud over Hiroshima was a galvanizing force for them even more than for all the rest of the world. Deeply moved by a growing sense of their responsibility as citizens in a democratic society, they sought to participate in it as never before. The Bulletin is one of the finest manifestations of that phenomenon. Its first issue appeared on December 15, 1945.

Since then, working in an unfamiliar field, the atomic scientists have done a job that would be a credit to veterans. Their Bulletin has striven ceaselessly to keep the public informed of nuclear facts and, more important still, of what those facts mean. The magazine has spoken out courageously against secrecy and security restrictions which retarded the nuclear program or persecuted scientists. It has been worldminded—significantly, the lead article in the current issue, by Mr. Rabinowitch, is on International Cooperation of Atomic Scientists. Technically one of its most remarkable accomplishments has been its high degree of readability for laymen.

At 10 the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists has already earned the right to be called one of the most important magazines in today's world.

The President's Committee on Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Harold Fellows at the National Conference of Christians and Jews brotherhood dinner on February 20, 1956:

In this strife-torn world the most precious property that can be owned by mankind is brotherhood, founded upon faith and belief in God. The work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews stands out as a true labor of love. That groups within our Nation voluntarily have acknowledged the high principles of the NCCJ and with unusual initiative undertaken the challenging task of living up to those principles—sometimes even in the face of adversity and criticism—is one of the most encouraging and hopeful signs on the horizon.

I am particularly pleased tonight to have the honor to represent the National Conference of Christians and Jews in presenting to Ivan L. Willis, vice president of the International Harvester Co., representing the President's Committee on Government Contracts, this modest recognition of the committee's fine work on behalf of brotherhood. This is but a parchment, and perhaps—in the time of man—perishable; but, the sentiment behind it is not perishable nor are the admiration and high regard in which NCCJ holds the members of this committee. Mr. Willis will you please step forward—sir, it is my pleasure now to read the citation to you and, again to thank the committee for its wonderful work:

"The National Conference of Christians and Jews presents this Brotherhood Award to the President's Committee on Government Contracts for 'commencement' for outstanding contributions promoting the cause and goodwill and understanding among all the people of our Nation—thereby fostering amity, justice, and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews; helping to eliminate intergroup prejudices which disfigure and distort religious, business, social, and political relations; materially aiding the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and bringing us nearer the goal of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

"EVERETT R. CLINCHY,
"President.
"HAROLD FELLOWS,
"Chairman, Mass Communications Commission.
"TAYLOR M. MILLS,
"Chairman, Media Awards Committee.
"Date: Brotherhood Week 1956."

Anniversary of Marines Landing on Iwo Jima February 19, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, amid the pressures and selfish concerns of daily living an important anniversary in this Nation's history slipped by almost unnoticed yesterday.

But the marines of the 7th Fleet, now engaged in peacetime maneuvers on the scarred beaches of Iwo Jima, remembered and kept faith with their comrades whose blood once crimsoned the blackened sands and rocky slopes of that lonely island.

With bared heads and reverent hearts they gathered at the crest of Mount Suribachi. It was just 11 years earlier, on February 19, 1945, that other valiant marines had first raised the flag of freedom with aching battle-weary hands.

Navy jets whined a requiem and Old Glory billowed against a bright blue sky while Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Wornham delivered an unforgettable memorial tribute.

Those who fought here would want no eulogy.

He said:

These men were not martyrs. They represented all races and creeds. Each had a job to do.

To those who died, may you rest in peace. To those who were maimed, may your pain be eased. To those who survived, may we never forget.

And to the newcomers in the corps, he had this to say:

May you be as worthy if put to the test.

General Wornham's words were wrung from his own experience. As a marine colonel 11 years before he had led his men in the bloody assault on Iwo Jima, and had seen 6,000 die before victory was attained.

Less than a year after that historic hour, I traveled the tortuous road to the top of Mount Suribachi. Below me the sun glistened on the marked graves of those who, in the proud tradition of the Marine Corps, had given uncomplainingly and willingly of that "last full measure of devotion." I felt both humbled and proud to be part of a nation whose ideals and principles could inspire her children to such dedication, such sacrifice. It is a moment I shall never forget and never want to forget.

May those blood-drenched sands of Iwo Jima and wherever brave men have fought and died for freedom be forever held sacred in our hearts. May we be inspired by such sacrifices to hold evermore dearly those things for which so great a price was paid.

Shore Erosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1956, Representative EMANUEL CELLER and I submitted a statement to the House Committee on Public Works, which is presently holding hearings on the bills H. R. 3093 and H. R. 6205, which would amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property" so as to extend such aid to privately-owned property as well. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, the problem of the erosion of our beaches is not new. Some of our shores have been subject to continuous erosion throughout the period of recorded history. State and local governments have attempted to deal with the problem of erosion control. In the past years, however, it became abundantly clear that help from the Federal Government was necessary, and in 1946, a law was passed authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property. H. R. 3093 and H. R. 6205 would extend this aid to privately owned property as well.

Many of us remember the hurricane of 1938 and the storm of September 1944, but all of us well recall the storm of November 1953 and that veritable holocaust of hurricanes in 1954 and 1955—Carol, Edna, Hazel, Connie, and Diane. In each year following 1938, a substantial part of the budget of each of the villages that make up the Great South Bay of Long Island, had to be devoted to hurricane and erosion protection projects. Experience has demonstrated, however, that no community has the resources to furnish complete protection against the ravages of the ocean and the destruction of storms. The exposed condition of these communities demonstrates beyond question the imperative, compelling necessity of immediate short-term protective measures, as well as a long-term program to preserve the existence of the beaches involved. The extremely short intervals between the hurricanes of 1954, caused shattering losses to public and private property. Before the debris of one storm could be cleared away, another followed, and successive evacuations from the communities had to be ordered by the Coast Guard. In computing losses, it was found to be impossible to distinguish between the damage caused by one storm as differentiated from another. Similar experiences were encountered during hurricanes Connie and Diane of 1955.

The problem continues inexorably. On Janauary 27, 1956, in the wake of the January storms, the Fire Island Erosion Control Committee stated as follows in a letter to the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors: "In view of the severe damage caused by recent storms, we wish to reiterate to the board the immediacy of our need for beach feeding and dune rebuilding if we are to prevent a catastrophe. Houses in several communities are now undermined and these properties, together with the houses behind them, are in danger of being destroyed in the next storm tide. There are several places where breakthroughs are imminent."

In any discussion of this area, it is important to consider the need for improvement of Fire Island Inlet. This inlet provides the only means for boats of reasonable draft to enter the Great South Bay. Commercial fishing vessels must make daily trips to and from the Atlantic Ocean via the inlet, and the skippers of these vessels have had to contend with the hazardous conditions encountered in the inlet as a result of the constant shoaling which has taken place during the last few years. It is difficult to tell the number of fishing men actually affected by Fire Island Inlet. A fair estimate of persons wholly or partially dependent upon fish and fish only, which are transported through the inlet, is well over 3,000 persons. While we are on the subject of these fishing vessels, it is well to remember that this fishing fleet was used in the defense of our country, as demonstrated during World War II. Because the Navy felt that these vessels could be advantageously used as an advance guard against enemy submarines, it supplied each vessel with sealed radio-telephones to be used if and when suspicious craft were sighted. In this manner the fishermen gave important information to the Coast Guard and the Navy, and in 1 case, 1 such ship saved some 20 persons from a watery grave when their cargo ship was torpedoed by the enemy.

Although we are not now involved in a shooting war and our hopes are pledged to continued peace, one look at the world situation and the menace posed by the Soviet Union, brings immediately to mind the problem of civil defense. If there were to be an attack on the metropolitan area of New York City, the Great South Bay area could care for evacuees by the thousands and give them shelter. But, if motor transportation were disrupted and railroads rendered impotent, it would be waterborne vehicles to which we would have to turn for supplies; medical, food, clothing, fuel, etc., and Fire Island Inlet is the entrance to the Great South Bay.

The south shore of Long Island is the only coastline enjoyed by the State of New York. Its natural advantages should be maintained, and it should be the responsibility of both the State and Federal Government to maintain all natural channels that can accommodate craft of any reasonable size, for the protection of life and property.

When speaking of Long Island, most people are inclined to overlook the fact that while the counties of Queens and Kings (coterminous with the Boroughs of Queens and Brooklyn) are wholly within the City of New York, they nevertheless geographically are also wholly within Long Island.

The same storms and the same ocean waters that cause damage along the southern shores of Long Island, which are part of Nassau-Suffolk Counties, also cause tremendous damage to Manhattan Beach, Brighton Beach, Coney Island, and Sea Gate. All of those places also are part of Long Island.

During World War II the United States Government maintained important military installations in Manhattan Beach and in Sea Gate. Large training stations were maintained in Manhattan Beach.

The United States Coast Guard maintained very important installations at Manhattan Beach.

Land based military installations, coast artillery gun emplacements and antisubmarine installations were maintained in Sea Gate because it is directly at the mouth of the entrance to New York Harbor. It provided military and defensive installations in aid of Fort Hamilton and Fort Wadsworth. It is a convenient line of direct communication with Fort Hamilton, which is across from it on Gravesend Bay, and with Fort Wadsworth, which is opposite it on the Narrows. The United States still maintains a radar and fire-control station in Sea Gate, as well as a lighthouse at Norton's Point in Sea Gate. All of these areas require the protection which this bill would help provide.

As is obvious from the above, it is impossible to separate, in consideration of the problem of erosion control, the losses incurred by publicly owned or privately owned property. Both are involved equally in the same storms. H. R. 3093 and H. R. 6205, and many other similar bills, recognized this fact in their provisions. Passage of this legislation is vital to our own national interest.

We appreciate the opportunity afforded to us by the committee to submit this statement in support of these bills.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—5304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*.—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*.—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Granahan, William T., *Pa*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*

Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*

Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*

Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*

Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*

Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La*

Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*

Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*

Quigley, James M., *Pa*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.

Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*.—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*

Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*

Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*

Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*

Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*. 1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Lead Time and Military Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, Chief Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission, and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion of the Navy Department.

This address was delivered at the January 12, 1956, dinner sponsored by the Society of Business Magazine Editors, at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington, D. C.

In this address Admiral Rickover discusses brilliantly and effectively the problem of "lead time" which is so important in the matter of our preparation for national defense. It should be a must reading by all Members of Congress.

I have a letter from the Government Printing Office estimating that it will cost approximately $214 to print this article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in its entirety, in view of the extreme timeliness of Admiral Rickover's comments entitled "Lead Time and Military Strength."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAD TIME AND MILITARY STRENGTH

(Remarks prepared by Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, U. S. Navy, Chief, Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, Navy Department)

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to you. Perhaps you expect me to address you on the subject with which I am most familiar—development of atomic power to propel naval vessels. However, I asked your chairman to permit me to speak on a broader subject, and one which I consider more important than atomic power—the effect of lead time on military strength.

It is my contention that lead time—the time which elapses between conception of a new idea, its development, and finally its fruition in the completed new article rolling from the production lines—is the factor which more than any other is likely to win the next war for the nation which succeeds in reducing it significantly below that of its competitor.

I have chosen this subject because I feel that, for the good of all of us, some things we presently assume must be reexamined, even if they are unpleasant. None of us can afford, for our own or for the national interest, to wrap ourselves too tightly around our present assumptions and habits.

Assumption No. 1 is that a world war has become so deadly to both sides that men are not likely to start another one.

Assumption No. 2 is that our great edge in productive capacity will prove decisive in the next world war, as it did in the first two.

Assumption No. 3 is that our system of capitalist democracy will prevail because it offers mankind the best hope for freedom and for spiritual and material gain.

Assumption No. 4 is that our superior inventive genius will guarantee us a good technological margin over an enemy.

Let us examine these assumptions:

Assumption No. 1, the deadliness of war.

It is true that there has been a revolutionary change in the nature of war. It is conceivable that this change may have ended the danger of war. I pray to God this may be so, but all the evidence of history says otherwise. It certainly is a dangerous belief and one which we have not based, and cannot base, our national policy.

Wars have often been started by weak states and by reckless men. Such men, corrupted by power, may fight us again even though they should know that they themselves will be destroyed in the process. We can hope that this will not happen, but we must not allow this hope to influence our judgments or our actions.

Now let us examine the second assumption, our advantage in productive capacity.

The production of the free world far exceeds that of Russia and her satellites and allies. The free world, for example, last year produced more than three times as much steel as the Soviet-dominated world. The United States alone produced 40 percent of the world total, compared to Russia's 17 percent. Other statistics for heavy industry—nonferrous metals, electric power, petroleum, rail transportation, and the rest—are comparable.

Our productive superiority was the decisive factor in both World Wars. In 1941–45, for example, we produced as much armament as all the other nations combined, on both sides.

But several factors are present today which were not present in 1917 and 1941, and which lessen the military effectiveness of our productive superiority.

First, there is the time margin. In both World Wars we had the preparation time which comes from not being directly involved in the early fighting. While others fought, we were able to convert to war. Second—and this is really another facet of the same fact—wars moved more slowly then; years were required to work sufficient destruction to subdue an enemy. In the interim, a buildup of military strength was possible.

I think it highly improbable we shall be as fortunate in a future war, for in the next all-out war the side which moves fastest will most likely destroy the other's capacity to wage war. There may be no time to convert industrial plants.

There is also the vast difference today in the manner in which production is utilized in the Soviet Union and in the United States.

We use our production to sustain the highest standard of living in history for all of our people. The Russians concern themselves very little with the standard of living of the broad masses of their people. In effect, they maintain two standards of living; one, a relatively high one, for the small privileged class; another, very low, for the rest of the population. The first priority of their production goes where their leaders want it to go—to armaments, to capital expansion, to selected development projects, and to the small group chosen by the leaders for a privileged position. The general consumer gets what is left over after these first-priority needs are met. It does not matter much that he lives crowded, many to a single room, that he is poorly clothed, that he lives amid constant shortages of the most elementary consumer goods, from buttons to matches. Few Russians have ever known anything better.

We should not fall into the easy error of confusing this low standard of overall Russian living with their high standard of military production; there is ample evidence of the quality of the latter, and of the high priority the Russian leaders give it.

The net result of this is that our margin of industrial production is substantially reduced, and in certain circumstances it could be completely nullified. There is no longer any guaranty that the side which has the greatest productive capacity has a built-in survival capacity.

The third assumption, that the democracies must win simply because they are right, could be the major fallacy of our time. It is very much the same as saying "Virtue will triumph." There have been occasions in the past where virtue has not triumphed. Furthermore, since history is generally written by the victorious side, it is the winner who most frequently stands out as virtuous.

The Russians have a long-range plan which clearly calls for technical, political, and military domination of the world. They have announced that the 20th century will be the century of communism. And recently Mr. Khrushchev said: "We don't have to fight. Let us have peaceful competition and we will show you where the truth lies. * * * Victory is ours." Having such a plan goes far to counteract the weaknesses and internal contradictions of the Russian system.

We, of course, being a democracy, and dedicated to the belief that government exists for the welfare of its citizens, cannot have such a plan.

But the last of our assumptions that we will be protected by our superior technical skill is, perhaps, the most dangerous one of the four. This assumption is compounded by the comfortable belief many of us have, that whatever anyone else can do we can do better. Besides which we do not like to look at facts which are unpleasant. This assumption is also bolstered by statements such as one that appeared in a January 1 newspaper, "Our greatest asset in 1956 will be the continued prosperity of the United States."

It is important that we spend some time discussing this fourth assumption.

A review of Soviet textbooks and scientific papers available in the United States on mathematics and related areas, such as aerodynamics, will show that in some of the most advanced areas of these sciences they are on a par with the best work being done in the West. They are excellent in the use of large-scale electronic computers, both for solving mathematical problems and for formulating broad attacks on major scientific

tasks. American experts who recently examined Soviet calculators stated that these machines matched the most advanced American units of this type. In fact, Mr. Albert C. Hall, research director of the Bendix Corp., said he saw one Russian calculator of a type unknown in the United States.

The Russians are very attentive to fundamental research—to research for its own sake, without any special reference to a particular problem. Witness the considerable number of their young people who are studying astronomy—a number we do not equal.

You have read what kind of job the Russians have done on jet engines, on radar, on long-range weapons, and on atomic weapons. Look how frequently the American public is surprised by Soviet displays of ultramodern aircraft, naval vessels, and by their work in atomic weapons. Any competent United States aeronautical engineer who examines published photographs of modern Soviet aircraft can readily deduce that they are doing absolutely first-class work in the aeronautical sciences.

The Russians apply the best capitalist incentives to top people to get them to do a good job—and to this they add the whip of individual responsibility for failure. The concept of nearly complete personal responsibility for a project—somewhat like the responsibility vested in the commanding officer of a naval vessel—can sometimes produce rapid results, as the Russians have shown. The leading scientists, educators, top designers, and development engineers in this so-called classless society are millionaires compared to their other workers. For example, the pay spread in Russia between an Army private and a leading writer, artist, or scientist is more than 300 to 1. And in addition to this high pay there are large bonuses; a top aeronautical engineer may have received a number of Stalin prizes and Orders of Lenin; these can raise his pay to a million rubles.

In addition to their own abilities, the Russians are expert at exploiting the knowledge of others. Our atomic scientists learned at Geneva last summer that the Russians have great respect for American technical literature. They know well the technical publications of the western nations, and they make special efforts to publish the best articles rapidly and to disperse them widely.

Our people also learned that in certain areas important to the Russians, such as electric power and key military technology, they permit considerable latitude to the man in charge. Nor are the top people in research and development penalized quite as promptly or as harshly for failures as are top men in other work. Someone seems to have put across the idea that chances must be taken in these fields, though it is true that a top man will not stay on top very long if he is wrong too many times.

The Russians do penalize severely at the production level. In fact, a considerable percentage of their plant managers are fired every year. They pay a price for this, of course. A plant manager who anticipates a short tenure will not go out of his way for long-range-improvement programs. But this system does force to the top a class of managers who are able to achieve production of selected urgent items in low lead times.

Let us look at a couple of examples: It is reported that for 2 years they have had in operation the most powerful nuclear-particle accelerator in the world, and that sometime this year they may be operating a 10-billion-volt accelerator. We will have nothing to surpass that until 1959.

On December 15, three engineers from major American corporations toured a large ball-bearing plant in Moscow. One of them, a man from the automatic transmission division of the Ford Motor Co., stated, "I have never seen a better example of automation in my life." The other two agreed.

The second point I would make regarding Soviet industrial capability concerns the rate of progress they are making. Former Senator Benton returned from a tour of Russia last month with the statement that their rate of industrial production is increasing 6 percent a year, in contrast to a rate of increase of 3 percent in this country.

The present annual increase in our industrial production is about 3 percent as compared with 2 percent which we experienced for many years. This difference of 1 percent means a very large increase in national production. Now consider the difference between our 3 percent and the 6 percent of the Soviet.

The Russians have also undertaken a vast educational program to train their people. It began a long time ago and it is now being accelerated.

I will not elaborate on this subject tonight, for it has been covered thoroughly in many articles and addresses, and the statistics are both voluminous and convincing. They all agree that the Russians are increasing their engineering and scientific talent faster than we are. Enrollment in their engineering schools is about one-third larger than ours. Mr. Allen Dulles, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, has stated that between 1950 and 1960 Soviet Russia will have graduated 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared with 900,000 in the United States. And by 1960 it is estimated they will have more scientists and engineers than we.

These statistics do not tell the entire story. We know that the Russian student spends more hours in the classroom. We have evidence that his curriculum may be better suited to producing the kind of scientist or engineer the Soviet Union is looking for. And we know that the technical schools of Russia are turning out, by the hundreds of thousands, the second-level technicians whose work releases the first-level men for more important duties.

In a speech he made on December 4, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Lewis L. Strauss, disclosed these facts:

Fifty-three percent of our high schools do not teach physics at all.

Half of our high schools do not teach chemistry.

Between 250,000 and 400,000 of our high-school students are learning their mathematics and science from teachers who are not trained to teach these subjects. Part-time science teachers now outnumber full-time science teachers.

It is also a fact that the percentage of high-school pupils who today study chemistry, physics, and mathematics is far lower than it was in 1900. We could not have chosen a worse time to reduce the intensity of our secondary school training in scientific subjects.

Other factors make this statistical picture even worse for us. The rate of attrition of Russian engineers and scientists is lower than ours because they are younger. And also we run into the basic difference in the utilization which is being made of our manpower resources as compared with those in Russia. There the government assigns every engineer to the job where he is most useful to the State. He has no choice. Here we compete for our engineers of whom we have too few: one corporation against another, one industry against another, private enterprise against the Government.

The third point I would make is this: Great inventions and revolutionary discoveries in the industrial field today are no longer the work of 1 man working in 1 laboratory in 1 country.

Inventions today are the product of groups of men working as a team, backed by great resources, using the ideas of many other men, perhaps in other countries. The day of the single creative genius is over. Thomas Edison closed an era.

To prove this I ask: How many of you can name the man chiefly responsible for the development of nylon? Of radar? Of the automatic-gear shift? Of the electronic computer?

This now brings me to my second major thesis: The language of invention today is universal. An idea does not come singly to one nation. The same discoveries are being made simultaneously by the scientists of many nations, and they canont be hoarded to give any state or group of states an advantage. From now on no significant inventions are likely to be available to one country alone for more than a very brief period of time.

A discussion I had a few days ago with an official of a research and development organization exemplifies this. He told me that they had been working for several years on a new metallurgical process which they believed was unknown to anyone else. Recently they learned that three other laboratories had simultaneously been working on the same development—but no one of them was familiar with the work the others were doing.

Sooner or later all theoretical knowledge becomes universal. It follows that what counts today is not so much inventive genius as the practical ability to translate inventions into items rolling off the production line. This is a field in which Americans have always shown particular aptitude. We have it still; witness all the marvelous things which make life pleasant and easy. But we have not fully applied this aptitude to the cutting of lead time on important items. The Russians on the other hand have concentrated all they have in this field—which is why they have been able to improve so rapidly.

Lead time, of course, has always been a key factor in warfare, from the days when a man equipped his army with stone hatchets faster than his enemy. There has been a tremendous increase in technological complications in modern warfare, and lead time is now measured in years. In 1940, for example, about 17,000 man-hours were required to build a military fighter. Today the time for the same category of plane is 1,380,000 hours. In 1960 according to estimates, it will be 2,150,000 hours, and that in spite of greatly increased productiveness of each man-hour.

We pride ourselves that a man-hour now produces much more than before World War II. A fraction of a man-hour now produces many items which a decade ago required several man-hours. So, to get a true picture of the increased complexity of modern war machines, you must factor into the above figures the increased effectiveness of the present-day man-hour.

Here are some typical examples of lead time:

Our armed services have needed 3 years to design, develop, test, and construct a landing ship for tanks; more than 4 years for the 57-millimeter recoilless rifle, or for a medium tank; 5 years for a destroyer; 7 years for a jet fighter plane; 6 years for a bomber. It even takes us nearly 3 years lead time to effect a change in a uniform. And every United States plane used in World War II was on the drawing boards before December 7, 1941. No plane whose design was started after that date saw action in that war.

Let me illustrate the importance of lead time for military power by citing some examples from recent history where the side which was inferior in industrial capacity might nevertheless have won a war by recognizing the potential of a new weapon or by reducing the lead time to bring it into use.

POISON GAS

The Germans used gas shells in a local attack in Poland in January 1915. The experiment failed because of the intense cold. They next used gas 3 months later in France in April 1915. But this time the gas had to

be discharged from cylinders because the military authorities refused to provide the necessary shells which the inventor had asked for. Even so, a wide breech was made in the French line. However, since the German high command had been disappointed with the results of the initial attempt in Poland, there was neither enough gas nor were there reserves to pour through the 4-mile gap where no living defender remained. Two French divisions had completely disappeared. For 8 days after this discharge of gas there were large openings in the Allied line, but the Germans did not take advantage of this favorable situation.

This was the most complete surprise of the entire war. By failing to have a suitable supply of gas on hand and by not exploiting the opportunity offered, the Germans perhaps missed the chance to win the war in France in 1915. Once forfeited, the opportunity was lost.

SUBMARINE WARFARE IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR

It is well known how close the German submarines came to winning the war. At one time in 1917 the British forces in France had only 4 days' supplies left. Had the German authorities realized the significance of the submarine, begun construction sooner, and authorized its unrestricted use in 1915 instead of 1917, they would have won the war.

In this use of poison gas or submarines I am not touching on the moral or legal aspects of their use; I am simply discussing their military use.

USE OF TANKS IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The idea of the tank was conceived in 1914. It was backed by Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, over official opposition. In September 1915 the British made a surprise attack with tanks against the Germans on the Somme. This premature employment, before large numbers of tanks were ready, was a great mistake and was contrary to the advice of the tank people. The chance of a great strategic surprise was missed. The British military authorities then lost faith in tanks. Some urged their abandonment, and 1,000 which had just been ordered were canceled by the War Office. But the officer in charge of contracting for the tanks was a reserve officer who was not concerned about his career in the Army. He went to Lloyd George, the War Minister, and the order for the tanks was reinstated. In 1918 the German military headquarters, in reporting to the German Government that there was no longer any prospect of winning, listed the tank as the primary reason.

USE OF THE V–2 LONG-RANGE ROCKET IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The first flying bombs crossed the English Channel in June 1944. They carried 1 ton of explosive, but because of their straight-line flight and relatively low speed the British were able to cope with them.

Then, in September 1944 the Germans fired the V–2, the long-range rocket. But by that time the V–2 could no longer, of itself, win the war. The story could have been different if, starting 18 months earlier, long-range rockets with increased range, accuracy, and effect had been developed at top priority.

When Hitler finally realized the effect of this delay on the outcome of the war he said to Walter Dornberger, who headed the German rocket work: "I have had to apologize to only two men in my life. The first is Field Marshal von Brauchitsch. I did not listen to him when he told me again and again how important your research was. The second man is yourself."

These few examples show the importance of exploiting new ideas rapidly, and that it is not necessarily the most productive nation or the most powerful which will win but the one which can develop new ideas fastest, which gets new items into hardware first.

It should be carefully noted, however, that although the timely use of poison gas, the submarine, the tank, or the V–2 rocket might have caused the loss of Europe to the Germans or Asia to the Japanese, the United States would still have remained unconquered. Not only unconquered but protected by friendly oceans. And with this protection, time would have been available to develop countermeasures for the new weapons and to bring our industrial strength to bear against the enemy.

The situation today is quite different. There are only two major military powers. If a world war breaks out these two will be engaged, and there will probably not be time to develop countermeasures against a new potent weapon.

This is the reason why lead time is of such great importance today—why the nation with the lowest lead time has the advantage.

It seems that the Russians have been able to cut their lead time considerably on important items; this is borne out from public displays in the annual air shows over Moscow.

This reduced lead time under the conditions of present day invention and technology constitutes one of the gravest long-range threats to the security of the Western world. And this is why this problem should be of great concern to all of us.

There are doubtless many reasons for Russian success in this field even though these may be different for Americans to understand. One of these reasons is that the totalitarian rulers are not answerable to their people. The Soviets constitute a state that, for nearly 40 years, has been organized for permanent and total conflict. In light of this, their accomplishments become more understandable.

Let me make myself clear: I know the evils and the weaknesses of the Russian system but, in spite of these evils and weaknesses, we have reason to fear their results. Russian engineering and scientific development challenges our military power. We cannot allow this challenge to stand and I, for one, do not believe that a democracy must of necessity be less efficient than a total state. We can meet this challenge but we may have to revise some assumptions which have comforted us up to now, and take action to analyze and improve, as necessary, our present methods of producing important items.

Our scientific discoveries will no longer be of particular advantage to us if the enemy develops them faster than we do. We have known for several years that our scientific training has been deteriorating and have done little about it.

The first step we must take is to improve the technical and scientific training of our young people. We are faced with a national problem of the first order, and nothing less than an over-riding effort by all of us will meet it. There is no lack of knowledge of what must be done. Profound studies have been made on the subject and much has been said about it. But so far little has been done.

In a talk on November 22, 1955, I suggested that industry, at its own expense, lend its engineers for a year's teaching service in our schools—as an emergency measure to offset the present critical shortage of teachers, especially in mathematics and science. I also suggested that a clearinghouse be set up to receive and channel all contributions by industry to colleges and universities and that industry recognize the need to increase such contributions substantially and consider this as part of the expense of running the business; that the length of the school year be extended from 180 to 210 days to bring it more in line with the school year in Europe and Russia; that extraordinary pains be taken from now on to seek out and cultivate our gifted children; that two different kinds of high schools be set up, one having higher standards, to enable our gifted youth to advance as rapidly as they are able to, unhampered by the slower rate of the children whose abilities lie in other fields than the academic.

The second step which we must take is to speed up design and development of military goods. This may have to be done by cutting down the delays which stem from too much review, too much coordination, or too many overhead people. This is not a problem peculiar to the Federal Government. Private industry is also plagued with it, and knows that it is. Fortune commented on the subject last September in an article called The Vice-President Problem. Time magazine wrote about it on December 26 in an article called Company Conferences—The Perils of Table-Sitting. A manager of an eastern manufacturing plant estimated that he spends 65 percent of his working time in conferences, and that little of this time is usefully spent.

Important work can be streamlined and the lead time cut down.

The money we try to save by checking and counterchecking, by being too careful not to make mistakes, is frequently offset by the lengthening of our lead time. Time, after all, is money; but time today is more than money; it is our margin for survival.

We shall undoubtedly discover other ways to improve our technical and scientific development and to cut our lead time, once we put our minds to work on the problem.

As individuals and as a Nation we have to ask ourselves this question: Is the Soviet Union a serious threat to our survival? If the answer to that is "Yes," then we must ask ourselves this second question: Is the Nation doing all that it can and all that it should to turn back that threat? If the answer to that is "No," then I submit that something is wrong with us and that we are in trouble.

One final thought: You know that there can be no second place in a contest with Russia and that there will be no second chance if we lose. But if we lose, it will be largely by default. It will be because we have acted without vision, because we will have wasted the marvelous ingenuity and fine spirit of the American people in providing us with things which make life more pleasant but which really do not matter much if they are bought at too high a cost.

Upper Colorado Project's Financial Scheme Wholly Unsound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River project's financial scheme is wholly unsound. None of the irrigation reclamation projects are financially sound. The irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay only about 12 percent of the direct irrigation investment, which, including storage costs, would range from $750 to $900 per acre varying with the number of projects included. The power dams are supposed to provide the

revenues to pay for themselves as well as 88 percent of the irrigation investment.

The project repayment provisions contemplate an overall repayment period of at least 100 years. This is unrealistic and economically indefensible. The hearings make it clear that the repayment plan might work for only a minimum number of projects and that with additional projects there would be no possibility of payment within 100 years unless the power rate were increased substantially above the 6-mill rate contemplated in the Bureau's report. Furthermore, it is extremely doubtful that a market for the power even at the 6-mill rate would continue for 100 years. The approaching availability of atomic electric power will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete. In fact, the market area is not now in need of the power which would be provided. The power dams are in the bill because they are the only hope of making the overall project appear feasible.

The project is not self-liquidating as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Studies show that simple interest alone on the investment would be greater than the estimated net revenues.

The upper Colorado project as now proposed deserves a "no" vote.

Cradle of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 20, 1956:

BOSTON'S CRADLE OF LIBERTY

(By Emilie Tavel)

"They call it a cradle
But it doesn't rock.
A grasshopper weathervane
Twirls on top.
Name rhymes with "flannel"—
For some, but not all.
Answer to the riddle:
Faneuil Hall."

It has always been like this. Some Americans can't seem to get their tongues around French words. Like the colonists, people here today still can't agree on how to pronounce the name of Peter Faneuil, donor to Boston of the now famous hall.

Some say "Fannel," some "Funnel," and others insist on "Fan-y-el." Peter's tombstone in Granary burying ground only complicates matters with "P. Funel."

However it comes out, the name is one increasingly heard today.

The 214-year-old brick building in Boston's downtown market district has been known as the Cradle of Liberty since fiery orators of Revolutionary days won it that name.

The newest "cradle" noises being heard, however, are not concerned with the mighty issues of freedom and tyranny but with the three-story structure itself.

More and more people are beginning to think that the time has come to tidy up the whole area around Faneuil Hall, even tear down buildings if necessary, to give this architectural and historic gem a more suitable setting. City officials recently made this proposal.

The immediate plea most often heard is to banish the meat markets and produce stores with their variety of signs and smells, which occupy the first floor of the hall.

The basic trouble with a market is that it is practically impossible to keep its environs clean

Advocates of a change don't favor altering the original commercial character of the ground floor. To add dignity, they would simply rip away the disfiguring modern metal awning that runs around the building and replace the food stalls with stores selling replicas of the 18th century wares.

Cabinetmakers, silversmiths, printers, and sellers of chocolate and mustard, they say, could market Faneuil Hall-labeled goods that would be eyecatchers and strong tourist attractions.

These enterprises should draw many more than the 40,000 visitors that come each year, proponents say.

Countering these arguments is the claim that to take away the food stalls would be to rob Faneuil Hall of the very element that gave it cause for existence.

The 1742 building, designed by portrait-painter John Smibert and later enlarged by Charles Bulfinch, was given to the city by Faneuil, an opulent merchant of French Huguenot descent.

But even in those days the market idea wasn't thoroughly popular. Due to a controversy over the market-house system versus door-to-door peddling, agitated Bostonians voted to accept the munificent gift only by a 7-vote margin.

What may be a trend away from the marketing district where Faneuil Hall is located has already begun. The first break from the 200-year tradition came in 1935 when some distributors moved to Cambridge. Recently all the big wholesale meat dealers have transferred to a modern distribution center in the South End.

The fascinating part about the meeting hall is that it is still fulfilling its original purpose as a gathering place for all people. Protected by the city against sale or lease, the hall is available to any group willing to pay the slight honorarium and to obey the regulation not to charge admission fees.

The same well-kept interior that witnessed the Stamp Act speeches, plays by British troops, orations by Daniel Webster and Wendell Phillips, and a banquet for America's first President, is now, among various other things, a balloting place for longshoremen.

One recent Sunday night the Friends of McCARTHY held forth here. Women's patriotic groups gather regularly, and children give concerts. The 2 weeks preceding each primary and election are reserved for political rallies.

But the fact is that public gatherings are dwindling. Hector Campbell, custodian for 20 years, says the customary 130 events during a year have dropped to only about 50. The ban on admission fees and the availability now of other auditoriums is cutting into the hall's usefulness.

Under these circumstances, a switch in tenants, calculated to heighten public interest in the building, should be a welcome improvement.

One tenant, dating from 1746, which doubtless never will be disturbed, is the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, whose spacious and beautifully maintained armory on the third floor is a treasury of military Americana for the public to see.

Back to the Thinking of America's First Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial appearing in the Murray Hill News of February 1956, by Miss Dorothy Frooks, publisher. The Murray Hill News is a nonpolitical, nonsectarian, neighborhood paper circulating in the heart of Manhattan, and I am informed is winner of the Freedoms Foundation award at Valley Forge for promoting the American way of life through editorials encouraging respect for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The editorial follows:

BACK TO THE THINKING OF AMERICA'S FIRST LEADERS

(By Dorothy Frooks)

"Books are wastepaper," once wrote George Washington, "unless we spend in action the wisdom we get from them."

Washington's epigram applies more to the reading of books than to the books one reads. When buying books for your library it is a capital thought. One cannot gain wisdom from books that contain no wisdom. Individual tastes and needs differ so widely that books which are useful and constructive to one will often be of no value to another of equal intelligence. Your library would be deficient if it does not contain a good history of your own country. The histories of other countries should follow.

One can understand situations much better if one knows the historical backrgound and geographical position of places and people.

It is interesting to note that the Founding Father of our country, George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate on the 22d of this month, has been in the same situation as our President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Very few people have read that phase of the life of George Washington, as we look upon him as a strong man of great physic and indefatigable strength. But an article in American Heritage written by Dr. Rudolph Marx, discloses that as stalwart as the general was, he was often ill and required medical care. Reported to have been 6 feet and 3½ inches tall, at the age of 67, he still carried on with his duties although he was subjected to numerous diseases. We have conquered them by medical science and research. Scarlet fever, diphtheria, smallpox, malaria, were common at the time, and doctors during Washington's time were incapable of giving a scientific explanation of most disease phenomena.

Men today, with 1 or 2 of the diseases that Washington had contracted, would have been found physically unfit for any branch of service and any occupation. At the time that Washington was graduated from William and Mary College in Virginia as a public surveyor, a profession that he practiced for many years, the great stretches of Virginia swamps gave him a malaria infection. He had previously suffered smallpox, and on 1 calamitous trip not only failed to cure his brother of consumption, who died subsequently, but the germs weakened George's body.

Regardless of his physical handicap, he went into military service, and during that

period was often on his back in a weakened condition. His political life was not disabling, for even when he was sick and suffered, he carried on with full force and effect. There is no record that he was ever incapacitated all during the Revolutionary War. The continuous strain evidently raised his normal powers of endurance, resistance and immunity. He alone was destined to keep alive so that Revolutionary War was successfully won. Of his 9 brothers, half brothers and sisters, 2 died in infancy, the other 7 between 13 and 64. George, the most sickly of all, survived them as well as his 2 adopted children.

The doctors in those days had little to work with, yet this sick man lived to serve 2 terms as President. He could have had a third term if he had not thought of precedent for the future, as he well knew that the longer the term, the greater the power and the greater the power, the easier a dictatorship. It was that reason alone, not his illness, that made him feel that 2 terms were enough.

Today we have a man in the White House with a far less hazardous health condition who should carry on. Health is something for God, and a weak heart can outlive many healthy people. Washington without modern medical care withstood sickness. Eisenhower with modern medical care will live to a ripe old age. Both Washington and Eisenhower, spiritual men were alike in the spirit of determination.

The Upper Colorado River Storage Project—A Patchwork Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project is scheduled to be brought before this Chamber for consideration next week. Before any such serious consideration can be deserved, many inherent inconsistencies and fatal defects in the proposal should be eliminated.

The House should not be expected to further patch this patchwork proposal on the floor of this Chamber in final debate. At the least the bill should be recommitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for further study and hearings upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget. The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects thereof have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget.

There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic, and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. These unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in the upper Colorado River storage project bill should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project, with its intricate web of engineering and financial arrangements, cries out for such a review.

The haste and pressure under which this whole project has been presented to the Congress has already resulted in a strange piece of legislative history. In a rather unusual step, a majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on February 8, 1956, considered and approved amendments to H. R. 3383, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none.

A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House. It should not be permitted.

The new H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil-bank proposal now before the Congress would require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses. H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops—some of which may well be placed in soil-bank reserve—to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

Save for the extraordinary provision apportioning power revenues among the four States in which the projects will be built, the bill remains substantially the same. The only change in projects enumerated has been the substitution of San Miguel and Yellow Jacket for Woody Creek, all in Colorado.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS

Principal objections to the bill which call for answer and revisions in the bill before any serious consideration by the Congress are the following, which have been outlined by members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in House Report No. 1087, 84th Congress, 1st session, issued on July 8, 1955, and supplemented by part 2 of this report issued on February 14, 1956:

First. The $1½ billion upper Colorado storage project approved by the Senate, and the ostensibly smaller House bill, are one and the same thing. In actuality the project is the nondivisible $1½ billion entity described in House Document No. 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole project as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it appear palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the initial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

Second. Invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by Echo Park Dam and power facilities will be unavoidable if the bill passes. The effort to delete Echo Park is misleading. Echo Park is an integral part of the project which will be required for inclusion at some future time in the effort to rescue vast expenditures on an infeasible project. As the bill now stands, the committee is sending to the House a bill which the Commissioner of Reclamation has conceded is economically infeasible.

Third. The project will damage the Nation's agricultural economy. The project would grow crops already in agricultural surplus. The project will service, for the most part, only marginal agricultural land. When needed, there exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped land which can be placed in production at a fraction of the cost of acreage serviced by the project.

Fourth. The ultimate direct and hidden costs of the project total at least $5 billion. This figure is probably low because it is based on Bureau of Reclamation cost estimates which have proved notoriously short of actual construction costs.

Fifth. Ninety-eight percent of the project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located.

Sixth. The appropriation authorization of $760 million is misleading. It actually amounts to $933,468,300 based on Bureau of Reclamation estimates. It should be $1.6 billion to reflect actual direct construction costs.

Seventh. The huge concealed Federal subsidy to the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico flowing from the project are unwarranted and unconscionable.

Eighth. The project's financial scheme is wholly unsound and will burden taxpayers for generations to come. Irrigation projects are financially infeasible, requiring an average subsidy of 88 percent of their cost. Project repayment provisions are unrealistic and economically indefensible. The project's financial scheme is based on the impossible assumption that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years. Low cost nuclear electric power developments and potentialities have been disregarded and ignored. The project is not self-liquidating. The project's power dams

are unneeded for power and are included only to subsidize irrigation components.

Ninth. Central Utah—initial phase—the project's largest irrigation segment, is the most infeasible of all. The estimated cost of this project for the irrigation features alone is $127 million to irrigate 160,000 acres at a cost of $794 per acre, exclusive of hidden interest subsidy by the taxpayers. The Bureau of Reclamation studies show that the water users could repay only $94 per acre, or 12 percent of the construction cost, over a period of 70 years.

Tenth. Water rights upon which the project depends for power revenues are now in litigation before the Supreme Court and may never become available.

Eleventh. Three physical and geological difficulties in addition to Echo Park make the project unreasonable and impractical: (a) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam; (b) the construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge; (c) large quantities of water may be forever lost by absorption into the sandstone walls of Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Twelfth. The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

Thirteenth. Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are jettisoned by the project.

Fourteenth. The project wholly ignores the Hoover Commission report.

Fifteenth. The bill includes projects which have been disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Sixteenth. The bill varies substantially and materially from the administration-approved project. The bill's projects are different. A reexamination of economic justification of the project, called for by the administration, is missing. Financial repayment features are basically contrary from those approved and recommended by the administration.

Seventeenth. The project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering, and financial surveys prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete.

Eighteenth. The project would critically impair the quantity and quality of water to which the lower Colorado Basin States, particularly southern California, have prior rights.

Nineteenth. The project would critically impair operations at Hoover Dam and lose $187 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Twentieth. The assistance to the Navajo Indians in the bill is negligible. Cost of the project's benefits is $200,000 for each and every Navajo farm.

Twenty-first. The project would forever tie the future of the intermountain West to a horse-and-buggy farm economy and forestall development of its rich industrial potential.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Recent material affecting this project and the new committee amendments have not been given any serious consideration.

There are physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit which cast doubt on its engineering and financial feasibility.

The bill is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy which issued its report on December 22, 1955.

The project would seriously impair water rights in the lower basin of the Colorado River. H. R. 3383 is planned on interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are the exact opposite of those involved in the planning and operation of Hoover Dam. These interpretations are at issue in Arizona versus California, now before the Supreme Court. Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and the United States are parties to this litigation and will be bound by the result. The Court recently denied a motion to join the upper basin States as such, at this stage of the proceedings, by a 5-to-3 vote, without opinion. The important thing, however, is that the United States will be bound by the final decision and will be required to operate its projects, whether in the upper States or the lower, in accordance with that decision. That decision will determine which set of assumptions, those on which lower-basin projects have been built and are operating or those on which the upper-basin project is planned, is correct. Both cannot be. While this litigation is pending and while the water rights remain in doubt, Congress should not authorize H. R. 3383.

There are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

Go After 'Em, Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has justly earned for himself a reputation as the Senate's watchdog. He has presided with fairness, with dignity, and integrity over the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, and deserves the plaudits of Americans everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial concerning our distinguished colleague which appeared recently in the New York Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GO AFTER 'EM, SENATOR

Yesterday in Washington, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, began some public hearings which we hope will be productive.

As chairman of a Senate Investigations subcommittee, McCLELLAN wants to find out how much trading in startegic items is going on between non-Communist nations and the Red Slave Empire.

The United States agreed about 2 years ago to a loosening of other countries' restrictions on sales of such goods to Red Russia and Red China. We thought that was a mistake at the time.

Now, Senator McCLELLAN says, the volume of business in things which may be useful some day in killing United States fighting men and civilians has become "very dsturbing." He mentions such items as heavy metal-working machinery, electric generators, and British wire made from copper mined with United States financial aid.

Up to now, McCLELLAN is getting no help from the State Department in his effort to paint the full picture of these dealings with the enemy, pinpoint blame, and recommend ways to halt them.

State objects to public hearings, on the ground that some of our alleged allies' feelings might be wounded.

We hope McCLELLAN will go ahead at full speed. The object would be, not only to shrink Russia's takings of war gear from the West, but also to head off any deal that may be cooking to shoot some holes in the United States refusal to trade with Red China.

Any statesman who tries, as Senator McCLELLAN is trying, to make war preparation tougher for the Red slave empire, deserves the support of all patriotic Americans.

American Military Personnel in Foreign Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, for some time the Congress has been considering the modification of the status of forces agreements which give to foreign courts criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel.

This is a matter of great moment, for it not only deals with United States prestige abroad but also with the very lives and futures of the young men and women who are serving our country in the armed services.

The press has understandably given this matter wide attention. I was also happy to note that among those who have been strongly advocating a modification of the status of forces agreements so that American citizens in uniform may receive American, not alien, justice, is a distinguished citizen-soldier, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, Illinois National Guard. General Klein, in addition to combat service in the Pacific under General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey, was a close friend and adviser of our late colleague, Senator Taft. More recently, as special consultant to the Senate Armed Services Committee, during the 83d Congress, his report on his study mission to Europe received the approbation of Members from both sides of the aisle.

I should like to have printed in the RECORD General Klein's recent testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the status of forces agreements, supplemental material from an

American Broadcasting Co. network broadcast interview with Commentator Bryson Rash and several pertinent newspaper stories.

There being no objection, the statement and supplemental material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARD, RETIRED, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HEARINGS ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 309

Mr. Chairman, to identify myself, I am from Chicago, a retired major general in the Illinois National Guard, and have served in the Army abroad during both World Wars and commanded troops in the Pacific theater. After the last war, as special assistant to Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, I worked on the unification program. During the 80th Congress, it was my privilege to be consultant on national defense to the Republican members of the Armed Forces Committee of the United States Senate. During the 83d Congress, I was honored to be a special consultant to the Senate Committee on Appropriations in which capacity I made a several months' survey of the nations of Western Europe at which time, among other topics, my studies included the problem now before this committee. Last year, I again spent several months in Europe and had the opportunity to further this study. I have been a newspaperman, a motion picture executive, a soldier and am now the head of an international public relations company.

In the spring of 1946 I participated in the deliberations of the so-called Doolittle committee which was constituted under the direction of Gen. James Doolittle to explore the changes necessary to the system of military justice. It is not my intention to give a detailed review of my testimony at that time; it is a matter of public record. I might add that I have also studied the distinguished evidence already presented and do not wish to impose by repetition. However, I do wish to point out the basic concept that underlined my testimony—and the testimony of others similarly familiar with the situation—before the Doolittle committee: The American soldier feels that he has a right to the same justice and the same personal constitutional guaranties as a soldier that he enjoyed as a civilian. How much more important is this concept when it applies to American service people abroad who must face a foreign court, using a strange language and unfamiliar procedures under a system of justice altogether alien to our own.

We have fought several wars to resist the imposition of these foreign ideologies upon our citizens here; why should we acquiesce to the imposition of foreign concepts of justice upon our American service people abroad who go there not of their own free will and not for a selfish purpose. It is too often forgotten that our military forces in foreign lands are there to protect the country in which they are stationed just as much as they are there to protect our own shores.

An American soldier tried in a military court has the right of appeal to the highest military authority, the Commander in Chief—the President—and also, in certain instances, can appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. This was done successfully recently where the jurisdiction of the Army in the case of a discharged soldier was questioned. But can the decision of a foreign court be challenged where it is believed fundamental American rights are violated—the answer of course is in the negative. This recourse should be supplied.

May I say that in common with many Americans, I have been deeply disturbed by the fact that American servicemen stationed on foreign soil are subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts under circumstances which deprive them of the protection of the United States Constitution, which they are sworn to defend and preserve.

The core of the dilemma that confronts us is that the urgencies of the struggle between East and West have compelled us to commit many thousands of our young men to areas of the world where the individual soldier finds himself under systems of justice and local conditions absolutely foreign to him. It must be said at the very outset that in his adherence to the laws of man and God, the American serviceman does us great credit as a Nation. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that what we are dealing with here is not even a minute fraction of our mililtary services but an individual here or there who falls into error or wrongdoing. Yet I wonder whether those who negotiated the agreements between the United States and foreign powers on the problem before this committee took into account the unique value our Government places on the right of an individual to full protection of the law, whether the wrong-doing assessed against him is justified or not. It is in this area, it seems to me, that we have failed to take account of the differences that obtain between the legal and judicial concepts of the United States and those of foreign states in which our servicemen are stationed.

It will surely come as no surprise to this committee that the American doctrine which holds that a defendant is presumed innocent until he is proved guilty does not prevail in a number of foreign countries. Nor is it any secret that because of the variations between American and foreign laws, what might be a misdemeanor under our codes can be subject to definition as a felony in a foreign court. And conviction for a felony by a foreign court can expose a United States national to loss of his American citizenship.

I am sure this committee is aware of the painstaking and conscientious efforts made by our armed services to inculcate in the young men inducted into the Armed Forces a high sense of responsibility and a recognition that when they are called upon to serve on foreign shores, they are expected to comport themselves in a manner that will reflect the utmost credit on the country whose uniform they wear. Some very practical considerations have entered into the orientation programs of our armed services. We have made a careful effort to bring our young people to understand that their behavior in foreign countries can have a direct effect on how foreign populations think and feel about the United States. We have tried—and I believe, successfully—to convey to our young men the capacity of our Communist enemies for availing themselves of every opportunity that comes to hand to defame and revile the United States in round-the-clock propaganda attacks.

But I wonder whether we realize that in failing to extend the full protection of American legal and constitutional guaranties to our servicemen overseas, we have given the Communists a weapon that no amount of troop education and orientation can overcome.

I have here a clipping from the German picture magazine Quick, which enjoys a circulation in Germany comparable to the distribution in our own country of such publications as Life and Look. This clipping deals with an American airman, Jose Montijo. There is a picture which shows Airman Montijo in shackles and wearing his United States Air Force uniform.

I should like to read into the record the caption under the photograph in this German news story. It says:

"The pastor performed the wedding. The policeman did not trust him. Tied, on one side, by the loveliness of his young bride, on the other side by the handcuffs of a policeman, the American Airman Jose Montijo is being married in the St. Antoine Church of Fontainebleau by a priest to the pretty French girl, Madeline Thomas. Right after that he had to return to the prison of Melum where he is facing his indictment for manslaughter. As a wedding gift he gave his bride a golden chain."

May I point out to this committee that the alleged crime, and the wedding, took place in France. Yet the episode was found sufficiently newsworthy to get widespread circulation in Germany. It is not likely that this, and similar incidents, will escape the attention of Communist propagandists whose dedicated task it is to drive our forces out of Europe by whatever means this objective can be accomplished.

We most assuredly have confidence in our own American system of military justice; we most assuredly can enforce discipline among our own servicemen without reliance on alien courts. This self-assurance should fortify our determination not to abandon American servicemen to foreign systems of justice.

Only yesterday the press carried a story which quoted those who defend the present system as saying: "After all, in general, these men found guilty get off with lighter sentences from foreign courts than they would have received from an American courtmartial." The same story pointed out that in some of the lands the United States forces are now protecting, "petty larceny is punished by the amputation of the offending, thieving hand." I shudder to think of the public indignation such punishment for an American soldier would arouse.

I realize full well that the present situation is the result of agreements made between the United States and foreign sovereign powers. But these agreements should be amended as provided by House Joint Resolution 309 to obliterate this blot on the American conscience. I urge that our Government should no longer endure the members of its uniformed armed services being the victims of unfamiliar foreign laws, judicial systems, customs, and courts without the constitutional safeguards and methods of judicial and executive appeals which are the birthright of all Americans. The status of forces agreements should be modified so as to include these safeguards.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL KLEIN IN AN INTERVIEW WITH BRYSON RASH, OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

I do feel that the American soldier has a right to the same justice and the same personal constitutional guaranties that he enjoyed as a civilian. How much more important is this concept when it applies to the American serviceman abroad. He must face a foreign court, using a strange language and unfamiliar procedures and a system of justice altogether alien to our own. In the American court and courts-martial—and I have presided over many courts-martial myself—a person is presumed innocent in the eyes of the court until proven guilty. In many foreign countries the system of justice is the other way around.

I believe that our commanding generals and commanding admirals have the responsibility of enforcing discipline in their commands and I would hate to admit that any American general or admiral is not in a position to enforce this order in a foreign country. I think it is a disgrace to see American soldiers handcuffed to foreign policemen. I could never picture Gen. Douglas MacArthur, my old commander in the Pacific, turning over a single GI to a Japanese court or Adm. William F. Halsey, who was also my commander in the South Pacific, turning over a single sailor to a Japanese court for trial of any violations of domestic laws. We are in these foreign countries not only to protect the security of the

United States but more so, the security of these foreign soils. We ought to continue to give the American soldier the privileges and rights as American citizens and not yield that sacred heritage before foreign courts.

I have made several trips to Europe and have spoken to many GI's. They all feel terribly embarrassed when they see one of their own buddies being tried in a foreign court. They do not want clemency. They want the soldier to be punished when he commits a crime but they feel humiliated when they see an American soldier with all his decorations and ribbons handcuffed to a foreign policeman.

[From the New York Daily News of February 3, 1956]

COURT ALLOWS JAPAN TO TRY FOUR OF OUR GI's

(By Paul Healy)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Federal Judge Joseph C. McGarraghy today held that under the status-of-forces treaty four United States soldiers must stand trial in a Japanese court on a charge of inciting a riot in Japan.

The judge rejected defense attorneys' claims that the treaty is unconstitutional. He then turned down a request for an injunction forbidding United States authorities in Japan to surrender the four for trial.

The attorneys said they will appeal to higher courts in the hope of obtaining a temporary order holding up the trials until their arguments can be heard here.

TO NATO COUNTRIES ALSO

Under the various status treaties, the United States gives Japan and NATO countries the right to try United States servicemen for crimes committed off their bases.

Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, and Representative FRANK BOW, Republican, Ohio, appealed to the House Foreign Affairs Committee to seek revision of the treaties. Bow charged that many foreign courts empowered to try our GI's do not recognize the basic ideas of American justice.

PROPAGANDA FOR RUSSIA

Klein, a former consultant to Republicans on the Senate Armed Services Committee, submitted a photograph of an American in an Air Force uniform shackled to a French policeman while being married to a French girl in France. Klein explained that the airman had been released from a French jail for the wedding, but kept in chains because "the policeman did not trust him."

"It is not likely that this, and similar incidents, will escape the attention of Communist propagandists whose dedicated task it is to drive our forces out of Europe by whatever means this objective can be accomplished," Klein said.

[From the Chicago American of February 3, 1956]

FOREIGN GI TRIALS RIPPED BY GENERAL KLEIN

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, of Chicago, says Communist propagandists are making hay out of inequities resulting from status of forces agreements.

Under this agreement GI's can be judged by foreign countries for violations of their laws.

Klein testifying before a House committee, presented a photograph of a uniformed American GI chained to a French policeman which Communist propagandists circulated throughout Europe.

Klein called for congressional modification of the status of forces agreements so American soldiers serving abroad would have the same rights and safeguards they enjoy in the United States. He declared:

"We have fought several wars to resist the imposition of those foreign ideologies upon our citizens here. Why should we acquiesce to the imposition of foreign concepts of justice upon our American service people abroad, who go there not of their own free will and not for a selfish purpose?

"An American soldier tried in a military court has the right of appeal to the highest military authority, the President, and in certain instances can appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

"But the decision of a foreign court cannot be challenged even where it is believed fundamental American rights are violated."

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 3, 1956]

GENERAL KLEIN HITS UNITED STATES SURRENDER OF RIGHTS OF GI'S—PROPAGANDA WEAPON FOR REDS, HE SAYS

(By Philip Dodd)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—By failing to extend the protection of American legal and constitutional guaranties to its soldiers, sailors, and airmen serving overseas, the United States has given the Communists a potent propaganda weapon, retired Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, told Congress today.

Klein, former Illinois National Guard officer and a veteran of both wars, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He urged modification of the Status of Forces Treaty, under which the United States surrenders criminal jurisdiction over servicemen overseas to foreign courts.

"We have tried, and I believe successfully," Klein said, "to convey to our young men the capacity of our Communist enemies for availing themselves of every opportunity to defame and revile the United States in round-the-clock propaganda attacks.

"GIVE REDS A WEAPON

"But I wonder whether we realize that in failing to extend the full protection of American legal and constitutional guaranties to our servicemen overseas, we have given the Communits a weapon no amount of troop education and orientation can overcome."

Klein showed the committee a photograph from the German magazine Quick, showing a uniformed American airman chained to a French policeman during a wedding ceremony in France. The airman was Cpl. Jose Montijo, who was awaiting trial in a French court for manslaughter.

Klein said it was "not likely" that the Montijo and similar incidents will escape the attention of Communist propagandists intent on driving American forces out of Europe.

American servicemen, Klein said, have a right to expect the same justice and constitutional guaranties they enjoyed as civilians. But when they are sent overseas, often against their will, the status of forces treaty denies them those rights, Klein told the subcommittee.

HOUSE MEMBERS TESTIFY

Other witnesses today were Representative Bow, Republican, of Ohio, author of a resolution which would direct the President to revise or denounce the treaty, and Representative ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana, who told of visiting a Japanese prison where American servicemen are held.

Bow said public hearings on this resolution had "engendered a lot of activity" in the Defense Department, including studies of foreign laws and court practices, steps to improve the treatment of servicemen jailed overseas, and closer observation of Americans' trials.

But Bow said there could be no justification for the "selling of American soldiers" under the status of forces treaty with nations of the North Atlantic Treaty organization or a similar agreement with the Japanese Government.

Bow said the publicity of last year's hearings brought VIP—very important person—treatment to Airman Montijo, of whom Klein spoke. He was tried last November 25 and given a 5-year sentence, which later was suspended. He was then released.

But Montijo was fined an equivalent of $10,000, Bow said. The Congressman said he believed three-quarters of the fine would be paid by the United States, under treaty provisions.

Zealotry and the School Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Zealotry and the School Issue," written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star. The article is intelligently written, and from an understanding viewpoint. It is of great value.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZEALOTRY AND THE SCHOOL ISSUE—ADVOCATES OF COERCION ARE LIKENED TO THOSE WHO LOSE SIGHT OF AIMS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The great issues of life seldom are struggles between right and wrong but between two conceptions of right. Democracy can only be sustained by the compromise that takes this fact into account.

In the greatest present national issue, that of abolishing all separate State-supported educational institutions for colored citizens and integrating them into white schools, more than the issue of mixed schools is involved.

The Southern States believe that the Supreme Court ruling, which reversed numerous previous rulings from years back, is an unconstitutional violation of the 10th amendment, which specifically reserves to the States "all powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States." They argue that nothing in the Constitution empowers the Federal Government to control the State school systems, and that the Supreme Court has in its recent decision usurped legislative powers.

To test this they have invoked interposition.

Their doing so is neither unlawful nor unprecedented. Recently in the Wall Street Journal, the eminent Felix Morley reviewed the history.

Interposition, he recalls, first was invoked by Thomas Jefferson against the Alien and Sedition Acts that set our new Nation on its first witch-hunting crusade. These acts made it a crime to print, utter, or publish anything that might bring the President or Congress into contempt or disgrace. Jefferson knew that the Federalists who sponsored the acts exercised a dominant influence in the Supreme Court, and, on the suggestion of a Kentucky delegation, he drafted the first resolution of interposition. The Virginia Legislature followed, calling on the other States to concur with them in declaring the acts to be unconstitutional.

In 1859, Wisconsin interposed against the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision, on behalf of a Negro slave, arrested by a United

States marshal to be returned to his owner, as the Supreme Court had decreed. The slave was forcibly freed; the Wisconsin Legislature denounced the Supreme Court for assumption of power over the reserved rights of the States, and upheld its decision until the Civil War settled the issue.

Jefferson advocated that where an issue involved the authority of the Federal Government and that of the States the matter should be settled by a clearcut constitutional amendment, as now advocated by the State of Virginia.

Vice President RICHARD NIXON has unwittingly given 10th amendment pleaders some excellent ammunition by attributing the Supreme Court's decision to a "great Republican Chief Justice." Thus, according to Mr. NIXON, it was not a constitutional but a political decision—as Jefferson feared a ruling on the Alien and Sedition Acts would be.

Secondly, there is the problem of enforcement. The question involves every school district and family in 17 States, among which 3 have taken no action on integration and 8 are fully resisting. Does Governor Harriman want the Federal police to move into homes and marshal children into desegregated schools under the protection of tommy guns?

Do those who advocate suspending Federal aid to segregated schools (white and colored alike) wish to break or increase southern intransigence?

What is the purpose of these contemporary Thaddeus Stevenses?

Is it to improve race relations or inflame them past the boiling point?

Do they think to improve the educational climate? Do they not realize that what they advocate would produce the opposite of an educational situation?

The Government cannot force citizens to send their children to any public school. Some of those who can only think of punishing, not of reconciling, have never sent their own children to public school. They have segregated them with money.

Already the patient, courageous work of southerners who have contributed to the remarkable improvement of race relations during recent years is being nullified.

Editors who have championed Negro rights are losing their influence, as extremism breeds counterextremism on both sides.

Those who now think of coercion are examples of that zealotry that "redoubles its zeal as it loses sight of its aims."

Segregation in Public Education—A Study in Constitutional Law

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, southern States have been making a serious effort in recent years to provide schools for the colored race equal to those provided for the white, despite the fact that in many areas the whites must carry 90 percent of the burden of cost. This effort has been in accord with a long line of State and Federal court decisions holding that separate but equal schools met requirements of the 14th amendment.

Since the school case decisions of the Supreme Court in 1954 not only abandoned and reversed all of these previous decisions but also completely reversed the intent of the Congress that proposed the 14th amendment and of all the States that ratified it, several of the southern States have felt fully justified in adopting resolutions of interposition.

The soundness of their ground in taking that action is convincingly demonstrated in an article by Mr. Clarence O. Amonette, a distinguished member of the California bar and for many years a member of the American Bar Association, which presents historical evidence to show that the Supreme Court attempted to write into the Constitution something which never has been a part of the organic law of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Amonette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that it is estimated to make four and a quarter pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $340.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION—A STUDY IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

(The writer is concerned only with the constitutional question presented and not with the question whether segregation is or is not desirable as a matter of policy.)

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and three other cases (347 U. S. 483). The three other cases are: *Briggs et al.* v. *Elliott et al.*, on appeal from the the United District for the Eastern District of South Carolina; *Davis et al.* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al.*, on appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia; and *Gebhart et al.* v. *Belton et al.*, on certiorari to the Supreme Court of Delaware. The Brown case was on appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Kansas, in a consolidated opinion, concluded "that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place," and held unconstitutional segregation statutes of four States (Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware), on the ground that the plaintiffs, minors of the Negro race, "are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment" to the Constitution of the United States. The question presented, as stated by the Court, was:

"Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?"

More properly stated, the question presented was:

"Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States?"

And the Court concluded:

"We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

In its opinion, delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Warren, the Court stated that the reargument (argument was heard in the 1952 term on December 9, 1952, and the reargument on December 8, 1953) "was devoted largely to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the 14th amendment in 1868" and that it "covered exhaustively the amendment in Congress, ratification by the States, then existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the amendment." The Court, while admitting that this discussion and its own investigation cast some light, was of the opinion that they are, at best, inconclusive and not enough to solve the problem. Thus, the Court in these cases of such great importance, constitutionally and otherwise, summarily disposes of the historical context of the 14th amendment.

One of the objects of the 14th amendment was to secure to the Negro race equality of civil rights with the white race. (*Virginia* v. *Rives* (100 U. S. 313, 318); *Ex parte Virginia* (100 U. S. 339, 344, 345).) In ascertaining the intention of Congress, in this respect, in proposing the 14th amendment, and that of the States in ratifying it, its historical context should not be forgotten. (*Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1, 23).) Likewise, legislative exposition of what constituted equality of civil rights in the field of public education immediately prior to, at the time of, and subsequently to the proposal by Congress and the ratification by the States, of the amendment, the generally accepted understanding by the States and by the courts after ratification that the amendment did not proscribe segregation of the races in the field of public education, and the long acquiescence by the Congress, by the States, and by the courts that such segregation of the races does not constitute a denial of equal civil rights, should not be overlooked or ignored. (*Stuart* v. *Laird* (1 Cranch 299, 309); *Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee* (1 Wheat. 304, 351); *Cohens* v. *Virginia* (6 Wheat. 264, 420); *Prigg* v. *Pennsylvania* (16 Peters 539, 621); *Cooley* v. *Board of Wardens, etc.* (12 How. 299, 315); *Burrow-Giles Lithographing Co.* v. *Sarony* (111 U. S. 53, 57); *Ames* v. *Kansas* (111 U. S. 449, 463–469); *The Laura* (114 U. S. 411, 416); *Wisconsin* v. *Pelican Insurance Co.* (127 U. S. 265, 297); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 28–35); *Knowlton* v. *Moore* (178 U. S. 41, 56); *Fairbank* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 283, 308); *Ex Parte Grossman* (267 U. S. 87, 118); *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 174, 175); *Hampton & Co.* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 394, 412); *United States* v. *Curtis-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 322–329); *Ex part Quirin* (317 U. S. 1, 41).)

The doctrine of separate but equal apparently originated in 1849 in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* (59 Mass. 198), which upheld school segregation, separate schools for the white and colored races, against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality. (See note 6 to the Court's opinion in the segregation cases. See also, *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78, 86), in which the Court said that the case of *Roberts* v. *City of Boston, supra*, upheld the separation of colored and white schools under a State constitutional injunction of equal protection, the same as the 14th amendment. In the Roberts case, a colored child, 5 years of age, brought suit by her father and next friend to recover damages on the ground that she had been unlawfully excluded from public-school instruction in violation of the Constitution and laws of Massachusetts to the effect that all persons regardless of age, sex, birth, color, origin or condition, are equal before the law. In holding that the action could not be maintained, the Court said (p. 205):

"The plaintiff had access to a school set apart for colored children, as well conducted

in all respects, and as well fitted, in point of capacity and qualification of the instructors, to advance the education of children under 7 years old, as other primary schools."

By an act (12 Stat. 394) approved May 20, 1862, Congress provided for the public instruction of youth in primary schools throughout the County of Washington, in the District of Columbia, without the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown. Section 35 of tht act provided for initiating a system of education of colored children in said county. By an act (12 Stat 407) approved May 21, 1862, Congress made it the duty of the municipal authorities to initiate primary schools for the education of colored children in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia. By an act (12 Stat. 537, 538) approved July 11, 1862, Congress created a board of trustees of the schools for colored children in the cities of Washington and Georgetown. By an act (13 Stat. 187) approved June 25, 1864, Congress provided for the public instruction of youth in the city of Washington, D. C. Section 16 of that act provided:

"That any white resident of said county shall be privileged to place his or her child or ward at any one of the schools provided for the education of white children in said county he or she may think proper to select, with the consent of the trustees of both districts; and any colored resident shall have the same rights with respect to colored schools."

Section 17 of that act provided among other things:

"That it shall be the duty of said commissioners to provide suitable and convenient houses or rooms for holding schools for colored children, to employ and examine teachers therefor, and to appropriate a proportion of the school funds, to be determined by the numbers of white and colored children between the ages of 6 and 17 years, to the payment of teachers' wages, to the building or renting of schoolrooms, and other necessary expenses pertaining to said schools, to exercise a general supervision over them, to establish proper discipline, and to endeavor to promote a thorough, equitable, and practical education of colored children in said county."

Section 18 of that act made it the "duty of the municipal authorities of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, to set apart each year, from the whole fund, received from all sources, by such authorities, applicable, under existing provisions of law, to purposes of public education, such a proportionate part thereof as the number of colored children, between the ages of 6 and 17 years, in the respective cities bear to the whole number of the children thereof, for the purpose of establishing and sustaining public schools in said cities for the education of colored children; that the said proportion shall be ascertained by the last reported census of the population of said cities made prior to said apportionment, and shall be regulated at all times thereby."

With the background hereinbefore recited, on June 16, 1866 (14 Stat. 358), the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, by joint resolution, proposed to the legislatures of the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and this proposal was adopted as the 14th amendment. (When the proposal was submitted, Congress undoubtedly knew of the decision in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston, supra,* upholding the segregation of white and colored schools under a State constitutional injunction of equal protection like that of the 14th amendment, and also of the laws enacted by Congress providing for segregation in the District of Columbia. Charles Sumner, who had been counsel for plaintiff in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston, supra,* was a Senator from Massachusetts at the time the segregation legislation was enacted by Congress and also at the time the 14th amendment was proposed. He was most zealous in his efforts to secure equal civil and political rights for the Negro race. In History of the United States, by Charles Truslow Adams, volume 3, page 179, Mr. Sumner is referred to as a "negrophile." See also an article in volume 50, Columbia Law Review, page 131, entitled "The Original Understanding of 'Equal Protection of the Laws,'" by John P. Frank and Robert F. Munro, in which there are set forth (p. 156, et seq.) the unsuccessful efforts of Senator Sumner to have Congress eliminate segregation in the District of Columbia and to include schools in the measure which became the Civil Rights Act of 1875.)

Within less than 6 weeks after proposing the 14th amendment, Congress by an act (14 Stat. 216), approved July 23, 1866, provided that the 18th section of the act approved June 25, 1864 (supra, p. 4.), should be construed as requiring the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, "to pay over to the trustees of colored schools of said cities such a proportionate part of all moneys received or expended for school or educational purposes in said cities, including the cost of sites, buildings, improvements, furniture, and books, and all other expenditures on account of schools, as the colored children between the ages of 6 and 17 years, in the respective cities, bear to the whole number of children, white and colored, between the same ages," thereby authorizing and approving in effect separate but equal facilities. Also, by an act (14 Stat. 343), approved July 28, 1866, Congress authorized and required the commissioners of public buildings to grant and convey to the trustees of colored schools for the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, certain lots of land in the city of Washington for the sole use of schools for colored children.

Thus, when the States ratified the 14th amendment Congress prior thereto, had established segregation with equal facilities in the field of public education in the District of Columbia. In contemporaneously establishing separate schools with equal facilities for the education of colored children in the District of Columbia, the Congress which proposed the 14th amendment set the standard for equal civil rights in the field of public education, and, in effect construed that amendment as not proscribing, but as permitting, segregation with equal facilities. This was the understanding of the effect of the amendment not only in the years immediately following its adoption when the events leading to and surrounding its adoption were undimmed by the passage of time, but also for over three-quarters of a century until the Supreme Court repudiated that understanding on May 17, 1954.

After the adoption of the 14th amendment, Congress, by its enactments, in effect approved segregation with equal facilities. By an act (17 Stat. 619), approved March 3, 1873, Congress fixed the number of the members of the board of trustees of schools for colored children in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, D. C., provided how they should be appointed, and also provided for the appointment of a superintendent of schools for colored children.

By an act (Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the District of Columbia, 1873–74, pp. 1–149; 18 Stat., pt. 2), approved June 22, 1874, Congress revised and consolidated the statutes of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, relating to the District of Columbia, in force on December 1, 1873. Sections 276–293, both inclusive, dealt with primary schools without the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown. Section 281 embodied section 17 of the act of June 25, 1864, making provision for schools and teachers for colored children and the apportionment of funds (supra, p. 4), and this is now section 31–1110 of the 1951 edition of the District of Columbia Code. (The segregation provisions now contained in the 1951 District of Columbia Code are applicable to the schools in the District of Columbia without distinction between those within and those without the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown.) Section 282 embodied section 16 of that act, providing for the attendance of white children at white schools and colored children at colored schools (supra, p. 4), and this is now section 31–1111 of the 1951 District of Columbia Code.

Sections 294–311, both inclusive, of the Revised Statutes dealt with colored schools in Washington and Georgetown. Section 294 provided for a board of trustees of schools for colored children. (See act approved July 11, 1862, supra, p. 4.) Section 304 contained the provision for a superintendent of schools for colored children. (See act approved March 7, 1873, supra, p. 6.) Section 306 embodied the provisions of the act of July 23, 1866 (supra, p. 5), requiring the payment to the trustees of schools for colored children of a proportionate part of all moneys received or expended for educational purposes, and this is now section 31–1112 of the 1951 District of Columbia Code. Section 310, now section 31–1113 of the 1951 District of Columbia Code, provided:

"It is made the duty of the trustees to provide suitable rooms and teachers for such number of schools in Washington and Georgetown as, in their opinion, will best accommodate the colored children in the various portions of said cities."

The Congress has in other acts approved segregation in the field of public education, thus recognizing that segregation with equal facilities does not deprive the colored race of equal civil rights, and therefore, does not deprive the colored race of the equal protection of the laws contrary to the 14th amendment. By an act (34 Stat. 316), approved June 20, 1906, control of the public schools was vested in a board of education to consist of nine members. Section 3 of that act provided (p. 317) among other things:

"The board, upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, shall also appoint 1 white assistant superintendent for the white schools and 1 colored assistant superintendent for the colored schools."

By an act (34 Stat. 267), approved June 16, 1906, Congress provided that the inhabitants of the Territory of Oklahoma and of Indian Territory might, under the conditions prescribed in the act, adopt a constitution and become the State of Oklahoma. Section 3 of that act provided among other things (p. 269):

"The constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence."

The fifth condition of admission contained in the act was as follows (p. 270):

"That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control; and said schools shall always be conducted in English: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude the teaching of other languages in said public schools: *And provided further*, That this shall not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children.

In pursuance of the enabling act, on September 17, 1907, Oklahoma adopted a constitution in which section 3 of article XIII provided (Thorpe, American Charters, Constitutions and Organic Laws, 1492–1908, vol. 7, pp. 4271, 4321):

"Separate schools for white and colored children with like accommodations shall be provided by the legislature and impartially

maintained. The term 'colored children' as used in this section, shall be construed to mean children of African descent. The term 'white children' shall include all other children.'

On November 16, 1907, President Roosevelt, pursuant to section 4 of the Enabling Act, issued a proclamation (by the President, Elihu Root, Secretary of State (35 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2160)) that "the State of Oklahoma is to be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union under and by virtue of said act on an equal footing with the original States." The proclamation contained the following recital (35 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2161):

"And whereas, it appears that the said constitution and government of the proposed State of Oklahoma are republican in form and that the said constitution makes no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States or to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and that it contains all of the six provisions expressly required by section 3 of said act to be therein contained."

Segregation of the races in the public schools of the District of Columbia has been before the Congress at other times. Section 12 of an act, (43 Stat. 367, 374), approved June 4, 1924, fixing the salaries of teachers, provided:

"There shall be two first assistant superintendents of schools, one white first assistant superintendent for the white schools who, under the direction of the superintendent of schools, shall have general supervision over the white schools; and one colored first assistant superintendent for the colored schools who, under the direction of the superintendent of schools, shall have sole charge of all employees, classes, and schools in which colored children are taught."

The quoted provisions are included as section 12, title 5, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 488, 498), approved July 21, 1945, and as section 11 in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 248, 258), effective July 7, 1947. Also, they are included in section 31–669 of the 1951 edition of the District of Columbia Code.

The Congress which proposed the 14th amendment, having set the standard of equal civil rights for the races in the field of public education, which was concurred in a number of times thereafter by the Congress, under which the segregation of the races, with equal facilities does not constitute a denial of equal civil rights, and, therefore, not a denial of the equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment, 14 States in the Union at the time of ratification followed the standard set by Congress and provided in their respective constitutions for the segregation of the races in the public schools. These States were: Tennessee (in sec. 12, art. XI, of its constitution of 1870; Thorpe, American Charters Constitutions and Organic Laws, 1492–1908, vol. 6, pp. 3448, 3469), West Virginia (in art. XI 8 of its constitution of 1872; Thorpe, vol. 7, pp. 4033, 4061), Alabama (in sec. 1, art. XII, of its constitution of 1875; Thorpe, vol. 1, pp. 153, 176), Missouri (in sec. 3, art XI, of its constitution of 1875; Thorpe, vol. 4, pp. 2229, 2263), North Carolina (in sec. 2, art. IX, of the constitution of 1876; Thorpe, vol. 5, pp. 2822, 2838), Texas (in sec. 7, art. VII, of its constitution of 1876; Thorpe, vol. 6, pp. 3621, 3644), Georgia (in par. I, sec. I, art. VIII, of its constitution of 1877; Thorpe, vol. 2, pp. 842, 868), Florida (in sec. 12, art. XII, of its constitution of 1885; Thorpe, vol. 2, pp. 732, 754), Kentucky (in sec. 187 of its constitution of 1890; Thorpe, vol. 3, p. 1316, 1345), Mississippi (in art. 8, Education, sec. 207, of its constitution of 1890; Thorpe, vol. 4, pp. 2090, 2115), South Carolina (in sec. 7, art. XI, of its constitution of 1895; Thorpe, vol. 6, pp. 3307, 3339), Delaware (in sec. 2, art. X, of its constitution of 1897; Thorpe, vol. 1, pp. 600, 628), Louisiana (in art. 248 of its constitution of 1898; Thorpe. vol. 3, pp. 1522, 1575), and Virginia (in art. IX, sec. 140, of its constitution of 1902; Thorpe, vol. 7, pp. 3904, 3934). All of these States, except Delaware, Kentucky, and Mississippi ratified the 14th amendment (U. S. C. A., constitution, pt. 3, p. 3). As above stated, Oklahoma provided for segregation in its constitution of 1907 (*supra*, pp. 8–9).

Some States authorized or required by statute segregation in the public schools. New York did this prior to the adoption of the 14th amendment, and the statute was upheld by the highest court of the State after the adoption of the amendment as not being violation of it. (See infra, p. 14.) The same situation obtained in Ohio. (See infra, p. 12.) Within less than a year after the adoption of the amendment, Indiana provided by statute for segregation, and the statute was upheld as constitutional by the highest court of the State. (See infra, p. 13.) California provided for separate schools for the white and colored races by a statute passed on April 4, 1870, and this statute was upheld in *Ward* v. *Flood* (48 Cal. 36; this statute was later repealed) as not being in violation of the 14th amendment. Other States have by statute either authorized or required segregation in the public schools, including the following: Arizona (Arizona Code Annotated, 1939, official edition, sec. 54–416–2), Arkansas (Arkansas Statutes 1947 Annotated, official edition, ch. 80–509 (c)), Kansas, in cities of the first class, including high schools in Kansas City (General Statutes of Kansas Annotated 1949, ch. 72, art. 17, sec. 1724), New Mexico (New Mexico Statutes 1941 Annotated, official edition, sec. 55–1201), and Maryland (Annotated Code of Maryland 1951, art. 77, sec. 124, 207, 208, 269). The States or Arkansas, Indiana, Kansas, New York, and Ohio ratified the 14th amendment, though in January 1868, the Legislature of the State of Ohio passed a resolution withdrawing its consent (U. S. C. A., constitution, pt. 3, p. 3), and the States of Arizona and New Mexico were not States at the time of the adoption of the amendment. (Other States may have enacted similar statutes and some of those referred to may have been repealed. Exhaustive research has not been made to determine this. The constitutional provisions and statutes are referred to for the purpose of showing the general understanding on the part of the States that the 14th amendment was not intended to prevent segregation in the field of public education. In this connection, the Court, in the segregation cases, referring to the elimination of segregation in the Boston public schools in 1855, said in note 6:

"But elsewhere in the North segregation in public education has persisted in some communities until recent years. It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern."

Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, in the segregation cases, the courts, both State and Federal, conformed to the standard of equal civil rights in the field of public education set up by the Congress which proposed the 14th amendment, and concurred in by the Congress a number of times thereafter. Under that standard "separate but equal" facilities does have a place in the field of public education without depriving the colored race of the equal civil rights the 14th amendment was designed to secure, and without denying the colored race the equal protection of the laws required by that amendment.

One of the first segregation cases in the field of public education, after the adoption of the 14th amendment, was *The State ex rel. Garnes* v. *McCann et al.* (21 Ohio State 198, December term, 1871). In that case, the parent of three colored children sought a writ of mandamus against the local school director and teacher compelling the admission of his children to a specific school district for white children. In refusing the writ, the court held that the exclusion of colored children from schools provided for white children, when schools with equal facilities were provided for colored children, violated neither the constitution of the State nor the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution. While plaintiff's argument was based primarily on the privileges and immunities clause of the 14th amendment, the court did not confine its attention to that clause. It upheld segregation under the amendment generally. The court said (p. 209):

"Unquestionably all doubts, wheresoever they existed, as to the citizenship of colored persons, and their rights to the equal protection of the laws, are settled by this amendment.

"But neither of these was denied to them in this State before the adoption of the amendment. At all events, the statutes classifying the youth of the State for school purposes on the basis of color, and the decisions of this court in relation thereto, were not at all based on a denial that colored persons were citizens, or that they are entitled to the equal protection of the laws. It would seem, then, that these provisions of the amendment contain nothing conflicting with the statute authorizing the classification in question, nor the decisions heretofore made touching the point in controversy in this case. Nor do we understand that the contrary is claimed by counsel in this case. But the clause relied on, in behalf of the plaintiff, is that which forbids any State to 'make or enforce any laws which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States'."

The State of Indiana ratified the 14th amendment on January 29, 1867. (U. S. C. A., constitution, pt. 3, p. 3). At the next session of its legislature after the adoption of that amendment the General Assembly of Indiana passed "an act to render taxation for common school purposes uniform, and to provide for the education of the colored children of the State," which was approved May 13,1869. Section 3 of that act provided that: "The trustee or trustees of each township, town, or city shall organize the colored children into separate schools, having all the rights and privileges of the other schools of the township." (*Corey et al.* v. *Carter* (48 Ind. 327, November term, 1874), the same year in which Congress consolidated the permanent statutes relating to the District of Columbia, including those providing for separate schools for the education of colored children, supra p. 7). In *Corey et al.* v. *Carter* (supra), a Negro father sought a writ of mandamus to compel the admission of his children into a school for white children. The court held that the statute of May 13, 1869, did not conflict with section 1 of article 8 of the State constitution which made it the duty of the general assembly "to provide by law for a general and uniform system of common schools, wherein tuition shall be without charge, and equally open to all"; that it was not in conflict with section 23 of article 1 of the State constitution which declared: "The general assembly shall not grant to any citizen, or class of citizens, privileges or immunities which, upon the same terms, shall not equally belong to all citizens"; and that it did not conflict with the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (The Court, after referring to the acts of Congress establishing separate schools for colored children in the District of Columbia, said (p. 366)):

"This legislation of Congress continues in force, at the present time, as a legislative construction of the 14th amendment, and as a legislative declaration of what was thought to be lawful, proper, and expedient under such amendment, by the same body that proposed such amendment to the States for their approval and ratification."

Another early leading case is *People ex rel. King* v. *Gallagher* (93 N. Y. 438, October 1883). In that case, the Common School Act of 1864 of the State of New York empowered the school authorities in cities and incorporated villages to establish schools for the exclusive use of colored children, when, in their opinion, the interests of education would be promoted thereby. Under this law, separate schools for white and colored children had been established in Brooklyn. A colored female applied for a writ of mandamus to compel her admission to a school provided for white children. Counsel for relator argued that the 14th amendment, under the laws of the State of New York, giving equal privileges in its common schools to every citizen, conferred upon relator not only the right to equal educational facilities with white children but also the right to have such education furnished at the same time and place with that afforded to any other child, otherwise she was denied the equal protection of the laws in violation of the 14th amendment. The court, referring to the legislative history of the amendment and to the legislation enacted by Congress establishing separate schools for colored children in the District of Columbia, held that the establishment of separate schools for colored children, with facilities equal to those for white children, was not a denial of the equal protection of the laws in violation of the 14th amendment. The court said (p. 450):

"The implication that the Congress of 1864, and the State legislature of the same year, sitting during the very throes of our Civil War, who were respectively the authors of legislation providing for the separate education of the two races, were thereby guilty of unfriendly discrimination against the colored race, will be received with surprise by most people and with conviction by none."

The Court also said (p. 452):

"The highest authority for the interpretation of this amendment is afforded by the action of those sessions of Congress which not only immediately preceded, but were also contemporaneous with, the adoption of the amendment in question."

There are other early cases, both State and Federal, which held that separate but equal facilities for the education of the colored race does not violate the 14th amendment, among which are the following: *Ward* v. *Flood* (48 Cal. 36 (1874)); *Bertonneau* v. *Board of Directors of City Schools et al.* (3 Fed. Cas. 294, No. 1, 361 (C. C. La. 1878)); *United States* v. *Buntin* (10 Fed. 730 (C. C. S. D. Ohio 1882)); *Lehew* v. *Brummell* (103 Mo. 546, 15 S. W. 765 (1891)); *Wong Him* v. *Callahan* (119 Fed. 381 (C. C. N. D. Cal. 1902)). In the *Wong Him* case, the Court said (p. 382):

"Concerning the authority of the State over matters pertaining to public schools within its limits, and the validity of legislation of the character of that under consideration, it is well settled that the State has the right to provide separate schools for the children of the different races, and such action is not forbidden by the 14th amendment to the Constitution, provided the schools so established make no discrimination in the educational facilities which they afford. When the schools are conducted under the same general rules, and the course of study is the same in one school as in the other, it cannot be said that the pupils in either are deprived of the equal protection of the law in the matter of receiving an education."

The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld separate but equal facilities for the education of the different races. In *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), the Court, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, held that a child of Chinese birth, born in, and a citizen of, the United States, is not denied the equal protection of the laws contrary to the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States by being classed by the State among the colored races who are assigned to public schools separate from those for the whites, when equal facilities for education are afforded to both classes. The Court said (p. 85):

"The question here is whether a Chinese citizen of the United States is denied equal protection of the laws when he is classed among the colored races and furnished facilities for education equal to that offered to all, whether white, brown, yellow, or black. Were this a new question, it would call for very full argument and consideration, but we think that it is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution," citing the following cases: *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* (5 Cush. (Mass.) 198, 206, 208, 209); *State ex rel. Garnes* v. *McCann* (21 Oh. St. 198, 210); *People ex rel. King* v. *Gallagher* (93 N. Y. 438); *People ex rel. Cisco* v. *School Board* (161 N. Y. 598); *Ward* v. *Flood* (48 Cal. 36); *Wysinger* v. *Crookshank* (82 Cal. 588, 590); *Reynolds* v. *Board of Education* (66 Kans. 672); *McMillan* v. *School Committee* (107 N. C. 609); *Cory* v. *Carter* (48 Ind. 327); *Lehew* v. *Brummell* (103 Mo. 546); *Dameron* v. *Bayless* (14 Ariz. 180); *State ex rel. Stoutmeyer* v. *Duffy*, (7 Nev. 342, 348, 355); *Bertonneau* v. *Board* (3 Woods 177, S. C. 3 Fed. Cas. 294, Case No. 1, 361); *United States* v. *Buntin* (10 Fed. 730, 735); *Wong Him* v. *Callahan* (119 Fed 381).

In *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337), it was held that the action of the State of Missouri in furnishing legal education within the State to whites while not furnishing legal education within the State to negroes, was discrimination repugnant to the 14th amendment, but the Court reaffirmed the doctrine of separate but equal facilities. In reaching its conclusion, the Court, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, said (p. 351):

"Here, petitioner's right was a personal one. It was as an individual that he was entitled to the equal protection of the laws, and the State was bound to furnish him within its borders facilities for legal education substantially equal to those which the State there afforded for persons of the white race, whether or not other negroes sought the same opportunity."

There have been a number of other cases, both State and Federal, applying the doctrine of separate but equal facilities, including the four cases dealt with by the Supreme Court in its decision of May 17, 1954. (*Brown* v. *Board of Education* (U. S. D. C. Kans., 98 F. Supp. 797); *Briggs et al.* v. *Elliott et al.*, (U. S. D. C. S. C., 103 F. Supp. 920); *Davis et al.* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Va.* (U. S. D. C. Va., 103 F. Supp. 337); and *Gebhart et al.* v. *Belton et al.* (Sup. Ct. Del., 91 A. 2d 137).)

In determining whether the children of the colored race are deprived of the equal protection of the laws contrary to the 14th amendment when they are furnished separate but equal facilities for their education, the following circumstances should properly be considered:

Prior to the time the 14th amendment was proposed, it had been decided (*Roberts* v. *City of Boston* (59 Mass. 198)) that separate schools for the white and colored races, with equal facilities, did not violate a State constitutional guaranty of equal protection, "the same as the 14th amendment" (*Gong Lum* v. *Rice, supra*). In 1862 and again in 1864, the Congress had provided for the education of white and colored children in separate schools in the District of Columbia. Within less than 6 weeks after proposing the 14th amendment, Congress approved separate but equal facilities for the education of colored children in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, by providing for the apportionment of funds expended for educational purposes between the white and colored children in the proportion that "the colored children between the ages of 6 and 17 years, in the respective cities, bear to the whole number of children, white and colored, between the same ages" (supra, p. 5). Following the adoption of the 14th amendment, a number of States adopted constitutions providing for the education of white and colored children in separate schools, thus evidencing their understanding that the 14th amendment does not proscribe segregation in the field of public education. Some other States have evidenced a like understanding by providing by statute for such segregation. Since the adoption of the amendment, Congress has shown its approval of segregation in the District of Columbia by enacting legislation relating thereto. (While the 14th amendment is inapplicable to this legislation, Congress, by such legislation, has concurred with the Congress which proposed the amendment that segregation does not deprive the Negro race of equal civil rights in the field of public education, and the purpose of the amendment was to secure to the Negro race civil rights equal to those enjoyed by the white race.) Also, since the adoption of the amendment, the courts, both State and Federal, including the Supreme Court of the United States, prior to its decision on May 17, 1954, have upheld and applied the doctrine of separate but equal facilities in the field of public education as not being in violation of the 14th amendment. (These circumstances, rather than the views of writers on social science, are determinative of the question whether the doctrine of separate but equal facilities has a place in the field of public education and the question whether segregation is inherently unequal.)

The legislative construction by the Congress which proposed the 14th amendment that segregation with equal facilities in the field of public education does not deprive the colored race of equal civil rights, the long acquiescence in such construction by the Congress, by the States, and by the courts, both State and Federal, and the long acquiescence in the construction of the amendment as not proscribing, but permitting, such segregation, fixes the construction of the 14th amendment as permitting such segregation. (See the cases cited, supra, pp. 2–3.) In *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52), the Court, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, held (p. 175):

"This Court has repeatedly laid down the principle that a contemporaneous legislative exposition of the Contitution when the founders of our Government and framers of our Constitution were actively participating in public affairs, acquiesced in for a long term of years, fixes the construction to be given its provisions."

Certainly, the provisions of the 14th amendment furnish no such clear and definite support for the decision of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, as to justify disregard of a construction of the amendment which had been acquiesced in for over three-quarters of a century.

The 14th amendment does not in terms proscribe segregation with equal facilities in the field of public education. The Supreme Court, in the segregation cases, states

that the amendment's history, in respect of this question, is inconclusive. This finding by the Court affords, in itself, a basis upon which the segregation statutes properly should have been upheld as not being in violation of the amendment when equal facilities are afforded.

It is a "maxim of constitutional law that a legislature is presumed to have acted within constitutional limits, upon full knowledge of the facts, and with the purpose of promoting the interests of the people as a whole, and courts will not lightly hold that an act duly passed by the legislature was one in the enactment of which it has transcended its power." (*Atchison, Topeka, etc., Railroad* v. *Matthews* (174 U. S. 96, 104); *Salsburg* v. *Maryland* (346 U. S. 545, 553, note 9).) An infraction of the 14th amendment is not to be assumed. "On the contrary, it is to be presumed that the State in enforcing its local policies will conform its requirements to the Federal guaranties. Doubts on this point are to be resolved in favor of, and not against, the State." (*Corporation Commission* v. *Lowe* (281 U. S. 431, 438).) Also, "The presumption of validity which applies to legislation generally is fortified by acquiescence continued through the years." (*Life & Casualty Co.* v. *McCray* (291 U. S. 566, 572).)

The education of the youth of a State is a matter belonging to the State; and "the right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear." (*Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78, 85).) In that case, the Court, holding that a child of Chinese birth, a citizen of the United States, is not denied the equal protection of the laws contrary to the 14th amendment by being classed among the colored races who are assigned to public schools separate from those for the whites, when equal facilities for education are provided for both classes, said (p. 87):

"The decision is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools, and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

As broad as the 14th amendment is, it was not designed to interfere with the power of the State to prescribe regulations to promote the education of its people. (*Barbier* v. *Connolly* (113 U. S. 27, 31); *Giozza* v. *Tiernan* (148 U. S. 657, 662); *In re Kemmler* (136 U. S. 436, 449).) "Any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools can be justified only in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land." (*Cumming* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528, 545), in an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Harlan.) In view of the Court's finding in the segregation cases that the history of the 14th amendment, in respect of this question, is inconclusive, and the long acquiescence in the doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities as not denying the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the amendment, segregation with equal facilities does not constitute "a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land," and is not a violation of the 14th amendment.

The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment is "a pledge of the protection of equal laws." (*Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356, 369); *Truax* v. *Corrigan* (257 U. S. 312, 333); *Power Co.* v. *Saunders* (274 U. S. 490, 493); *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337, 350).) In *Truax* v. *Corrigan*, the Court, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, said (p. 334):

"The accuracy and comprehensive felicity of this description of the effect of the equality clause are shown by the frequency with which it has been quoted in the decisions of this Court."

A law which provides separate but equal facilities for the white and colored races in the field of public education is an equal law. (*Missouri ex rel Gaines* v. *Canada*, *supra*, in which case the Court held (p. 350) that the equal protection of the laws is "a pledge of the protection of equal laws," and also (p. 351), in respect of a Negro seeking a legal education, that "the State was bound to furnish him within its borders facilities for legal education substantially equal to those which the State there afforded for persons of the white race, whether or not other Negroes sought the same opportunity.")

The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment is not a pledge that all of those subject to equal laws shall fare alike or equally under such laws. How those subject to equal laws fare thereunder depends upon their respective capabilities, acts, and complexes.

In this connection, it should not be overlooked that the Court, in the segregation cases, said (p. 490): "Today • • • many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences as well as in the business and professional world," notwithstanding the fact, as stated (note 6) by the Court, that segregation "has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern," and the 14th amendment does not require the States, in order to comply with its requirements, to fashion their laws so as to eliminate or prevent inequalities which result from differences in capabilities, acts, and complexes of those subject to equal laws. The 14th amendment does not require legislatures to reflect sociological insight (*Goesaert* v. *Cleary* (335 U. S. 464)), in which case the Court, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, held (p. 466):

"The Constitution does not require legislatures to reflect sociological insight, or shifting social standards, any more than it requires them to keep abreast of the latest scientific standards."

And for the same reasons, the Constitution does not require legislatures to reflect psychological insight.

Construing the 14th amendment in the light of its historical context and in accordance with principles and rules of construction in effect and accepted for approximately a century and a half (see the cases cited supra, pp. 2–3) the doctrine of separate but equal does have a place in the field of public education, separate educational facilities are not inherently unequal under the amendment, and segregation with equal facilities does not deprive either the Negro race or the white race of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

CLARENCE O. AMONETTE.

The Next Step in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which has caused widespread comment in this country and abroad since it first appeared 4 years ago in Look magazine, on November 18, 1952. Its author is the distinguished British historian, Arnold J. Toynbee. He writes on the topic The Next Step in History.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEXT STEP IN HISTORY

(By Arnold J. Toynbee)

Let us suppose—and this seems quite a supposition—that the strain and anxiety under which we are living today are not a passing phase of history that is going to end tomorrow in a third world war that is now just round the corner. Let us suppose, instead, that this difficult and painful, but not intolerable, state of affairs is going to be with us for a lifetime, or perhaps for several generations or even centuries on end, without being wound up either by a last judgment or by a millennium.

This is a reasonable expectation, because most human beings, at most times and places, have lived and worked under conditions such as these. The normal texture of private life is neither catastrophic nor beatific; it is a humdrum tale of "just one damned thing after another"; and we have no reason for expecting our public life to be different. If we can bring ourselves to see our present troubles in that light, we shall be giving ourselves our best chance of coping with them.

Let us take stock of some of the troubles that, in our Western World, seem likely to be with us for as far as we can see ahead into the future. If we are right in reckoning that these troubles are likely to be perennial ones, the steps that are needed are not emergency measures but permanent arrangements for putting and keeping our western house in order in the straitened circumstances by which the Western World is now being overtaken.

Suppose that the West is not, after all, on the eve of having to conquer or die on the battlefield of Armageddon. Suppose, instead, that we have to provide, at a minimum cost in blood and treasure, for holding a number of military frontiers like the northwest frontier of British India from 1849 to 1947 or like the Roman Empire's frontiers across Britain and along the Rhine and the Danube during the first four centuries of the Christian Era.

The frontier across the Korean Peninsula—a modern Hadrian's Wall—will be the first one to spring to American minds; French minds will think first of Indochina, and the British minds of Malaya; each nation is naturally most conscious of the particular sector of our besieged western fortress' common perimeter in which, at present, that particular nation is bearing the brunt of the burden. We have to make joint provision for the probability that all these fronts will have to go on being defended for years and years.

There will be some fronts, like the Greek and the Turkish fronts today, where there may be no actual fighting but where there will none the less be a need for eternal vigilance—a military need which will impose the economic burden of a constant mobilization in force. There will be other fronts, like the Korean, Malayan, and Indochinese fronts today, on which blood will continue to be spilled. We have to provide for different calls upon us in different sectors, and surely it is bad housekeeping to go on handling these common western frontier problems piecemeal in a western world that is going to have to husband its resources; for, in holding a common perimenter, disunity spells waste of effort. And then we have to look behind the immediate military task of manning our besieged western city's walls to the underlying financial and economic task of providing the sinews of war for the perpetual demands of our common western frontier defense at a minimum cost to our common western economy.

Here, again, our western nations are still indulging in the extravagance of trying to live in about 40 separate watertight compartments, each sealed off from the rest by migration restrictions, by tariffs and quotas limiting the movement of goods and by ex-

change restrictions limiting the movement of money.

Why, our western community today is spending about three-quarters of its political energies and is depriving itself of about half of its potential economic resources in desperately struggling to go on keeping up these internal barriers that have now become not only useless but perilous for us. They are useless because they do not help us any longer to preserve the things that we value in our western way of life; they are perilous because they already handicap us in our efforts to preserve these western values against the mounting pressure of the present siege of the West by the great majority of mankind in the East—a siege which is going to last at least as long as our lifetime. We cannot afford any longer to keep up any internal barriers, inside our western world, that are found to be handicapping us in our joint defense and therefore to be endangering the survival of our common values.

There are times when we can see ahead of us an inevitable destination that we shall not be able to escape, do what we will. But, when we find ourselves in that situation, we do not then just give up the game and let our feet carry us at random. Even when we see before us one of these destinations at which we are bound to arrive, we may still have a choice between alternative roads for reaching it; and we know very well that this still open choice may make an enormous difference to our fortunes.

We may choose a rough, steep road which will bring us to the inevitable goal half dead from exhaustion, or we may choose a well-graded, well-paved road which, when it brings us to the same goal, will deliver us there with our energies unimpaired. It is well worth finding the best road, even when we know beforehand that all roads lead to Rome; and this is just as true in our public life—in politics and economics on the big scale—as it is in our private affairs.

On that big scale, are we headed today toward one of those inevitable destinations that can be approached by different roads but which cannot be bypassed? Personally, I believe that, in our generation, we are headed toward an inevitable union—in the nearer future, toward a union of the peoples of our Western community, and then, beyond that, sooner or later, toward a union of all mankind. This seems to be the destination toward which we are being carried willy-nilly by the progress of technology. We can see no end to this progress; it seems to be continually gathering speed and momentum; and, in this mighty march, we can see one persistent tendency. Each successive technological advance has the effect of enlarging the scale of all human operations for all purposes—good and bad, peaceful and warlike, constructive and destructive.

DISTANCE HAS BEEN ANNIHILATED

Why is western union inevitable? First, because the western nations, all told, are only a small minority—not much more than one-fifth—of the human race. Secondly, because technology has already annihilated distance, so that everybody in the world is now living within point-blank atom-bomb range of everyone else. Thirdly, because the know-how of a technology that has mostly been invented by us westerners is now rapidly being picked up by other people—not only by the Russians but by the Chinese, Indians, Africans, and, in fact, all mankind. Technological know-how gives power; and, as the great nonwestern majority of mankind is gaining this new power, its numbers are beginning to tell once more against our handful of westerners.

During the last four or five centuries we westerners, thanks to our temporary monopoly of a technological know-how, have been lords of creation in spite of the smallness of our numbers. We have taken for ourselves the choicest of the still empty quarters of the world (and they were not all entirely unoccupied); and we have imposed our economic, and even our political, ascendancy on most of Africa and on large parts of Asia. Today the tide is turning. It is right, as well as natural, that it should turn, and we western peoples certainly ought to give up trying to go on sitting on other people's heads. My own country, Great Britain, for example, has, I should say, done right in letting go of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon. But it is one thing to give up dominating other people and another thing to let other people turn the tables on us.

While we westerners may have no right to go on depriving Asian peoples of their independence, we certainly have a right to preserve our own independence; and the western union is the only way to preserve western independence in a world in which the nonwestern four-fifths of the human race is now drawing abreast of the western runners in mankind's technological marathon race.

In the days—now rapidly running out—in which we westerners were enjoying our decisive technological lead, we could indulge in the luxury of being disunited among ourselves. We could afford this, because, at that time, each single western nation by itself was more than a match for the whole of the non-Western World. But for us westerners those spacious days are now over, and the division of our western one-fifth of mankind into about 40 sovereign independent states would be suicidal if we were to allow it to linger on into an age in which we are losing our technological lead and are therefore being thrown, militarily and politically, onto the defense against the rest of mankind's formidably superior numbers.

When we can see ahead of us a destination that we cannot bypass commonsense will counsel us to find and take the best and quickest of the various roads leading to it. Suppose now that we westerners were to flinch, for the moment, from taking any steps toward meeting the undeniable change for the worse in our collective western position in the world. What would be our western prospects then? Well, the temptations which we should be dangling before our enemies' eyes in willfully refusing to repair the disunity that is our present great western weakness—those temptations might lead those enemies into action that would bring on a third world war; and then we should have unity with a vengeance.

The sole surviving power at the end of an atomic war to the death would find itself condemned to the hard labor of setting up a dictatorial world government over worldwide ruins, including the dictator power's own. This postwar world government would have to be dictatorial, because the postwar state of the world would be desperate.

UNION BY AGREEMENT OR FORCE

An atom-bombed world could not afford what would then be the luxury of preserving even a minimum of local variety and liberty. Uniformity and despotism would be the necessary penalties for our having allowed the world to come to this pass; and, even if the power on whose shoulders this grim task of imposing unity fell were to be the United States and not the Soviet Union, a unification of a devastated world on this dead level and at this high price is a prospect to which neither the Americans nor any other people could look forward with anything but dismay. If union is—as it surely is—our destiny, then clearly the best option, among the alternatives before us, is union today by agreement in preference to union tomorrow by force.

This idea is, of course, already sold to American minds; for it has been translated into fact long ago in the domestic life of countries with federal constitutions. The political pioneering job that America, Canada, and the nonfederal as well as the federal countries of our Western World have to take in hand together today is the planning and execution of a first practical step toward western union in a world which has now been through two world wars but has not yet condemned itself to having to fight a third of them that certainly would be by far the worst of all.

Of course, what form this step would take is being discussed all the time between statesmen and officials of our different western governments; but we all know that a mere cooperation between the agents of separate national governments is not enough to establish and maintain our political and economic unity. At any rate, this is not enough in democratic countries like ours in whose domestic political constitutions the last word lies with the electorates of elected legislative bodies. In western countries whose constitutions are federal as well as democratic, it is an axiom that a political unity at the governmental level will remain precarious, and perhaps illusory, unless and until it has been underpinned by unity at the deeper level of popular representative institutions. And here is a chance for our western community to recapture the initiative in the world by taking the next step in history.

WE CAN'T IGNORE DEMOCRACY

We western peoples claim to be democratic peoples. We claim that democratic self-government is one of the most distinctive and most valuable elements in our common western way of life. If we mean this seriously, we cannot intend to leave out democracy, as we understand it, in making our long-term provision for preserving the vital common interests of our western community. It would be not merely un-American but unwestern to leave the management of vital common affairs exclusively in the hands of officials and heads of states.

What, then, might be our first step toward bringing western democracy into action on behalf of western defense? If we start from national democratic institutions that are already going concerns, we shall put our finger on those committees for all manner of purposes through which the national legislatures of western countries have learned, by experience, to conduct their business.

A combination of standing committees with committees appointed ad hoc has been the organizational device through which our western national legislatures have made themselves effective for action. Most western national legislatures today have well-established standing committees for reporting to them on cardinal affairs such as foreign policy, defense, and finance, and they all deal with business for which no standing committee happens to exist. Why should not the legislatures of all the western states members of NATO instruct their standing committees on finance, defense, and foreign policy (or instruct committees appointed for these purposes ad hoc, where there do not happen to be any standing committees for them) to meet regularly in common session in order to consider, discuss, and recommend a common western policy, a common western system of defense, and common ways and means for financing these common western services?

If we were now to take this first step of convening delegations of national legislatures from all the NATO countries to deal, at this level, with NATO's common affairs, we might find that we had created a growing point from which a democratically governed western community could bring itself into being step by step.

The first business on the agenda of a convention of delegations of legislatures would be to agree upon rules of procedure. Should each delegation cast a single vote en bloc on behalf of the national legislature by which it had been elected? Or should each delegate

be as free in this joint convention as he would be in his national legislature at home to cast his own vote according to his own individual conscience and judgment?

The whole tradition and spirit of western constitutional history would tell in favor of the second of these two possible rulings. Who would dream of suggesting that, in the House of Representatives at Washington, all the Representatives from, say Pennsylvania, must always vote the same way or that, in the Senate, the pair of Senators from each State must always act as if they were Siamese twins? What would be unacceptable in a national legislature must be also unacceptable in a common legislature; and we might therefore expect that, if and when a common western legislative body had once been set up, the members would not vote by countries but would assert their individual responsibility by combining and dividing in parties distinguished by policies and not determined by State lines.

This, though, would be unlikely to be the end of the process of western constitutional development, for a western electorate would soon begin to ask itself why it should not elect this common western legislature as well as the local national legislatures. If democracy means the control of governments by legislative bodies that are elected and reelected by the people, then democracy would call for the direct election of a common legislative body charged with the supreme responsibility of controlling the western community's common executive services.

A STEP-BY-STEP ADVANCE

Here would be a way of putting an inevitable western union on a characteristically western democratic basis. One strong point in this approach would be that it would lead our western community toward the goal of common democratic self-government step by step, in response to a succession of practical demands. If the West could thus build itself together into a united democracy instead of remaining the pack of 40 separate sovereign independent States that it now is, then we westerners could begin to look the future in the face with a renewed confidence.

We may hope, then, that the next step in history will be the creation of a growing point for western union on a democratic basis; but, of course, this prospect raises further questions. In achieving western union, should we be throwing the U. N. onto the scrap heap? And, in bringing one-fifth of mankind under a single system of self-government, should we be prejudicing the chance of achieving union on a world scale? To these two questions, there is a single answer; and this answer is well known to Americans because it is a point that has had to be considered by every people that has a federal form of government.

The answer is that, in order to bring a number of peoples together into political union, it is not enough just to draw up a federal constitution and enact it. Federation will not work unless the peoples that it is intended to unite are close enough to one another already in their ways of life to be capable of cooperating effectively. We western peoples do seem to be like enough to one another to be capable of making common political institutions work, and there is no reason why the circle of states included in NATO should not be extended progressively, as the Original Thirteen States of the United States have been increased to 48 by the successive admission of territories to statehood.

We ought to go on the principle that the door stands ever open for the admission of states that have given practical evidence of a capacity for democracy. Turkey, for example, who is already within our western circle, clearly demonstrated her eligibility in 1950, when she performed the notable democratic feat of passing, without bloodshed or revolution, from a one-party to a two-party regime as the result of a genuinely free general election, which was neither manipulated nor overridden by the party then in power. Turkey will certainly not be the only once nondemocratic country to qualify for entry; Ceylon, for instance, might also soon be a strong candidate. Yet, though our western community could, and should, be an open one, it is unfortunately not yet possible today to foresee the time when parliamentary democratic countries and Communist countries will be able to federate with one another; and here we can see the abiding importance of the United Nations.

U. N. FORUM IS VALUABLE

The constitution of the U. N. is not federal or even confederal. The U. N. is not, in fact, a political community; it is a political forum, in which questions can be debated and opinions aired but in which no act of government can be performed. Yet we cannot do without this forum, however successful the development of NATO may be, so long as the U. N. remains the closest approach the United States and the Soviet Union can make to one another; for to meet—and even to quarrel—in a forum is far better than never to meet at all.

The constitution of the United Nations at least gives a chance for peoples that have been brought physically close together while remaining spiritually far apart to keep in touch with one another.

But would it be possible for a democratic western union and a group of Communist countries to go on living side by side in a shrinking world for an indefinite time to come without drifting into war with one another? Perhaps the most one can say about this is that, at least once in the past, something of this kind has been successfully accomplished. In the last generation before the beginning of the Christian era, a Graeco-Roman world stretching from the Atlantic coast of Europe to the shores of the Indian Ocean was divided, by peaceful agreement, between 2 powers, Rome and Parthia; and, for the next 250 years, these 2 did contrive to go on living side by side, in spite of local frontier incidents.

Why should not we Westerners and the Russians manage to get on with one another at least no worse than that? And, if, at the price of this minimum of mutual forbearance, we could purchase even as much as 50 years of coexistence without a third world war, the prospect of world unity, which seems so remote today, might perhaps by then have come within the range of practical politics.

Meanwhile, the next step is western union on a democratic basis; for this is practical politics now.

"That I Might Live as a Human Being Has a Right To Live"—Letter From Robert S. Marks to His Parents in Corpus Christi, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a friend of mine in Texas recently sent me an excerpt from a letter written to his parents by an 18-year-old college student. It is a letter which states in moving fashion the patriotic thoughts of a youth in one stage of growing into maturity.

The letter was written by Robert S. Marks, a freshman at Princeton University, to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ben D. Marks, of Corpus Christi, Tex. I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt I have mentioned be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in order that all Senators may know why one young American is, in his words, "proud to be of a people such as we."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the way from the train station to the house, we drove through Arlington National Cemetery. Colorado mountains impress the eye, a symphony or a soprano impress the ear, Plato impresses the mind, Arlington National Cemetery impresses the heart. I have never been quite so moved by anything as I was by the sight of acres of plain, unmarked graves. Row upon row of simple white crosses covered the tree-dotted hills, looking strangely like the very marching soldiers they represent. For every cross there was a soldier that died in pain, and a family who cared, and someone who loved him—a life unlived. Soon I began to wonder just what moved these men to sacrifice the things that seem so important to me—love, family, security, and indeed life itself. I became very morbid—the sunshine seemed futile as it danced off the white crosses, and the birds seemed only to mock those beneath the sod.

Later as I stood openmouthed in the Lincoln Memorial, I was reminded of what those unknown men had died for. The great rawboned figure of Abe Lincoln, the Gettysburg Address inscribed in marble; and off in the distance a gleaming white spire jutting up as a tribute to our first President. All these purged my disillusioned state of mind. I can see now that lives lost in battle transcend even sacrifice. It's rather like a holy bargain with some omnipotent being—their lives for mine, that I might live as a human being has a right to live. I had not really considered all this before; formerly it was all flag waving and little deep meaning. Somehow I feel little and inconspicuous and then again I'm proud to be of a people such as we. I think the general sentiment is aptly put on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier: "Here lies in honored glory, an American soldier known but to God."

History of Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Felix Morley, entitled "Interposition: Its History Is a Study of American Political Philosophy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 16, 1956]

INTERPOSITION: ITS HISTORY IS A STUDY OF AMERICAN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

(By Felix Morley)

Alexis de Tocqueville, in his classic study Democracy in America, confessed himself "startled by the variety of information and

the amount of discernment" necessary to understand our Federal system. Its constitutional complexity, he predicted in 1832, would eventually subject the nominally sovereign States to "the yoke of a centralized administration."

The prophecy of this brilliant French observer is recalled by the general lack of information and discernment in regard to "interposition," a political device almost as old as the Republic.

After long obscurity, interposition is back in the news now because several Southern States are employing it in an effort to maintain segregation in their public schools. Yet it has been, and still could be, applied in issues devoid of racial content. The attorney general of Texas, for instance, was recently quoted as suggesting that it could be used in that State to prevent Federal regulation of gas and oil production.

Interposition is official action on the part of a State government to question the constitutionality of a policy approved by the Federal Government. This action literally interposes the sovereignty of the State between its citizens and the authority of Washington.

DEMAND FOR CLARIFICATION

It says, in effect, that the people of the interposing State should at least question, and perhaps even oppose, the Federal policy until or unless the moot question of its constitutionality is resolved. The device has been used both to demand that the Supreme Court rule on the constitutionality of an act of Congress and—as now—to demand that the Congress clarify the constitutionality of a Supreme Court decision.

The theory of interposition rests on the indisputable fact that the Union was formed by the States, on the terms of a contract, revisable by amendment, which we call the Constitution. While the States by this contract ceded certain powers, such as control of foreign policy, to the National Government, all undelegated powers, including control of education, were retained.

To make this crystal clear the 10th amendment was in 1792 written into the Constitution, saying: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This amendment rounds off the so-called Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—which is a solemn assertion of the rights of the States as well as of the rights of individuals. But while the courts may be expected to uphold the latter there is no mechanism, other than interposition, available to a State which considers that its reserved powers are being usurped by the central Government. On this reasoning John C. Calhoun asserted that: "This right of interposition * * * I conceive to be the fundamental principle of our system, resting on facts as historically certain as our revolution itself."

THE FIRST TIME

That had also been the earlier opinion of Thomas Jefferson, who drafted the first resolution of interposition. The 5th Congress, disturbed by the effects of the French Revolution, in 1798 adopted 3 drastic laws, known as the Alien and Sedition Acts. The third of these made it a crime "to write, print, utter, or publish" anything that might bring the President or Congress "into contempt or disrepute." This was clearly in violation of the constitutional guaranties of free speech and a free press. But it was feared that the Supreme Court, under the influence of the Federalist Party, might not so rule.

Therefore, a delegation from the newly admitted State of Kentucky prevailed on Jefferson, who was then Vice President, to draft anonymously a resolution of interposition, questioning the constitutionality of these Federal laws. It was in this first Kentucky resolution, adopted November 16, 1798, that Jefferson used the famous slogan: "In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

A month later the Virginia Legislature adopted a similar but somewhat milder resolution of interposition, drafted by James Madison. This, used as a model by the Virginia General Assembly in its resolution of February 1, 1956, called on the other States to "concur with this Commonwealth in declaring, as it does hereby declare, that the acts aforesaid are unconstitutional." Kentucky then responded with a second, more fiery, resolution, asserting "that a nullification, by those sovereignties (the States) of all unauthorized acts done under color of that instrument (the Constitution), is the rightful remedy."

These resolutions were directed against the Congress. An equally notable case of interposition, by Wisconsin in 1859, was directed against the Supreme Court, and on that occasion in behalf of a fugitive Negro slave. Under the then existing law, as confirmed by the Dred Scott decision, a runaway named Joshua Glover was arrested in Racine by a United States marshal. He would have been returned to slavery, as the law prescribed, but was forcefully freed from Federal custody by abolitionists, whom the Wisconsin courts refused to prosecute.

POSITIVE DEFIANCE

In support, the State legislature, on March 19, 1859, adopted a resolution of interposition denouncing the Supreme Court for "assumption of power" and declaring "that the several States * * * have the unquestionable right" to exercise "positive defiance" in behalf of their official interpretation of the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution.

No matter how carefully worded, a resolution of interposition must by its very nature be defiant of Federal authority, which means that 1 of 3 consequences will follow. Either the central Government will tacitly back down, or the resisting State will, or a mutually acceptable solution will be found by clear-cut constitutional amendment, which was the method advocated by Jefferson and now again by his State today.

In both of the cases cited here, however, the recalcitrant States made their point. Wisconsin maintained its position until the Civil War swept the whole issue of fugitive slaves. Earlier, Kentucky and Virginia opposed the Alien and Sedition Acts until their expiration, in 1801. Jefferson was elected President partly because he had led that opposition. The political effect of the present interposition resolutions cannot as yet be assessed. But, in an election year, it is likely to be considerable.

VIRGINIA PATTERN

Both the almost unanimous approval and the moderate phrasing of the Virginia interposition resolution voted this month insure that it will be a model for those Southern States that have not yet acted. Of the total of 17 States where compulsory segregation was in effect when the Supreme Court ruled against it, six have been moving cautiously toward integration, three have taken no action one way or the other and seven (besides Virginia) are following, or propose to follow, the Old Dominion's lead. There is no question that the movement will retard integration throughout the entire South. Indeed, that is its clear objective.

However one reacts to that prospect, the Virginia resolution is important for all who take constitutional government seriously. It expresses the certainly reasonable doubt that the 14th amendment ever contemplated compulsory integration. It points out that "the very Congress which proposed the 14th amendment for ratification established separate schools in the District of Columbia."

It further notes that for nearly 90 years the Supreme Court consistently upheld the constitutionality of "separate but substantially equal" schools and thereby implies that the single contrary opinion, of May 17, 1954, may well have been mistaken. Then it concludes that the only proper way to resolve the issue is to put it to the test of constitutional amendment. The fact that such an amendment can be blocked by the negative action of 13 States—one more than a quarter of this total—is not emphasized.

De Tocqueville, were he alive today, would certainly be fascinated by this developing issue of interposition. Its reincarnation, for the first time since the Civil War, will test the validity of his prediction. He may or may not have been right in thinking that in a showdown Americans will prefer authoritarian democracy to the complicated balance of a federal republic. But it is once again becoming clear that the two doctrines may be antagonistic.

Endorsement of Adlai Stevenson by Local 1145, Employees of Honeywell Regulator Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Local 1145 Endorses Stevenson," published in the March issue of Local 1145, Honeywell News. This article contains very pertinent comment on the economic issues confronting the American people.

This particular publication serves and is brought to the attention of more than 8,000 members of this particular union and their families. The union has an outstanding record in labor-management relations with the Honeywell Regulator Co. Its record in labor statesmanship is second to none.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL 1145 ENDORSES STEVENSON

At the last regular meeting of local 1145, the membership, on recommendation of the executive board of local 1145, endorsed Adlai E. Stevenson in the Democrat-Farmer-Labor primary.

Adlai Stevenson was endorsed on the basis of his outstanding record as Governor of Illinois and his programs and policies enunciated by him in the 1952 election, in which he drew more votes than any other candidate for President, outside of Eisenhower, up until that time, including the men who had been elected President.

It was pointed out that the endorsement of Adlai Stevenson was not meant as any slur or attack on any other candidate in the primary election of the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party, including Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. ESTES KEFAUVER has been a good Senator.

Perhaps, more than anything else, it was the support and endorsement of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Gov. Orville Free-

man which brings the endorsement of Adlai E. Stevenson for President of the United States.

Senator HUMPHREY and Governor Freeman are the heads of the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party of the State of Minnesota, and they are, undoubtedly, more conversant with the abilities and attitudes of the two candidates than any other persons in the State of Minnesota.

Senator HUMPHREY, as Senator since 1948 and as mayor of Minneapolis from 1945 to 1948, has shown ability and has shown leadership and integrity, and, in particular, he has shown that he is a friend of working people and of local 1145. In 10 years of public service he has never once failed to support a policy which was favorable to the people, and particularly the working people of Minnesota.

This is likewise true of Governor Freeman. To oppose the man supported by Senator HUMPHREY and Governor Freeman is to undercut and undermine, for no good reason whatsoever, their leadership of the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota.

MANY ECONOMIC ISSUES

Many economic issues face the people of America today. The farm problem, which has been badly mishandled and bungled by the present Republican administration, is one of the top problems that must be met. Economists in America realize that if the farm income continues to decline and deteriorate that it will undoubtedly have a drastic effect on the income and jobs of the working people in the larger cities.

Another problem is the fact that automobiles, which is the second largest industry in America, were overproduced to the tune of 700,000 to 800,000 cars in 1955. This could have a most adverse effect upon our entire economy.

A third major problem is the tremendous indebtedness of the American people as individuals. Home loans are at an alltime high; consumer credit on goods such as television sets and furniture are at a tremendous alltime peak; small bank loans are at an alltime high.

In other words, the people are in debt up to their necks, and this is a real danger signal, not only to the people who are in debt but to the American economy as a whole.

These are but a few examples of black clouds on the economic horizon. These are problems that a man of the caliber of Adlai Stevenson, together with Senator HUMPHREY, Governor Freeman, and others, can face up to and resolve.

"Follow Lincoln," Murphy Cautions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting news story that appeared in the National Tribune Edition—the Stars and Stripes published February 23, 1956.

Included in this article was the stirring, enthusiastic, and forceful address of Timothy J. Murphy, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who is an outstanding leader in all veterans' matters and a highly qualified attorney, and a former public official of high repute.

"FOLLOW LINCOLN," MURPHY CAUTIONS—VFW COMMANDER, AT TOMB OF EMANCIPATOR, ENJOINS CITIZENS TO RECALL VETS' SACRIFICES

The Veterans of Foreign Wars and all citizens of the Nation must accept the ideals of Abraham Lincoln with conviction, and practice them with sincerity, if we are to strengthen the country and make of it a better place in which to live, cautioned Timothy J. Murphy, of Boston, Mass., commander in chief of the overseas veterans' organization in a Lincoln Day address delivered in the shadow of the martyred President's tomb February 12 at Springfield, Ill.

In the presence of Gov. William G. Stratton, VFW State Commander Roy K. Lechner, of Chicago, his personal aide Matthew J. Kane, of Washington, D. C., and a large assembly of veterans and other citizens, Commander Murphy said that we must keep in mind as we struggle to gain the minds of men, and as we continue to make democracy live, Lincoln's injunction to nobly serve, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth, if we are to win the struggle for human freedom.

Quoting liberally from words of the man who belongs to the ages, Murphy also contended that it is the job of the free world to live up to his democratic precepts in order to encourage 800 million people under the Communist yoke to break their mental and physical bonds, and he issued an implied warning to those who would violate Lincoln's ideal of caring for those who have borne the battle, when he quoted the words of the Emancipator that it was "something more than common that those men struggled for," and when he said that "these thoughts are brought to mind when we visit Arlington Cemetery or our other national cemeteries at home and abroad."

EPITOMIZED AMERICAN DREAM

The text of Commander Murphy's address follows:

"Today, we gather on hallowed ground to pay homage to one of the greatest of all Americans—one who, in the words of Stanton, truly 'belongs to the ages.'

"The privilege of rendering this tribute as the representative and commander in chief of the more than 1,250,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply felt. Because of my lifelong reverence of his name and a belief in his democratic ideals, I deem it a personal honor that I shall never forget. We should all have a fierce pride in being citizens of a country that provides the opportunity for the full development of a Lincoln. Of all the great men in American history, the life of Lincoln most accurately portrays the example of a man who sacrificed himself in devotion to a cause.

"And in preserving the Union, Lincoln himself epitomized the American dream. His life, the success of his democratic philosophy, and his leadership of free people under the pressure of war, refute with compelling logic, the theory sometimes advanced, that we, the people, are incapable of governing ourselves. He also, by sheer accomplishment, fulfilled the fond hopes of the Founders—namely, that in the democratic system the poorest and the lowliest of the Republic are not barred by accident of birth from rising to the top. Of Lincoln it could be said, that it was not in spite of, but because of his struggle, labor, and grief, there emerged at the right time a strong and wise American who brought victory and unity to a divided land. Ever shall we call him great.

"He was superior in so many ways. Would that time permitted more detailed comment upon his nobility of character, his intellectual grasp of the important things in Government, and his understanding of human behavior. In the highest sense, Lincoln had what is called for the want of a better name—the common touch—the rare genius of talking plainly to plain people and making them understand. This quality has received much comment, but I do not think adequate mention is made in the average eulogy of his distinguished position and stature as a citizen of the world. Because he was a living example of the freedom of opportunity, it is not surprising that he became one of the most articulate of those whose actions have become milestones along civilization's rugged and often bloody road to freedom. He hoped and prayed that by freeing the slaves and preserving the Union, 'succeeding millions of free, happy people, the world over, shall call us blessed, to the latest generations.' And by the Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln moved a step farther to establish Jefferson's principle in the Declaration of Independence that, 'all men are created free and equal'."

MUST FOLLOW PRECEPTS

"Americans should cherish, as never before, the priceless documents and expressions of the spirit that reach from the Beatitudes to the Emancipation Proclamation, all of which gave hope and freedom to large segments and races of men. It is the job of the free world to live up to those democratic precepts in order to encourage 800 million people under the Communist yoke to break their mental and physical bonds. Those today who are struggling and planning to break the yoke of the Red master must often be reminded of the words of Lincoln, who said: 'As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this to the extent of the difference is no democracy.' I ask you, is that not the antithesis, the direct opposite of the materialistic philosophy of communism?

"He said, 'As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master.' This, from a man who in youth experienced great privations and disappointments; this from one whose face, it has been remarked, portrayed to his dying day a life of struggle—abject poverty in youth, repeated defeats for public office, and a domestic life that held much sorrow and tragedy. Lincoln never aspired to be a big shot, a tough boss, a master. In fact, he repeatedly accepted ruination of personal ambitions by sacrificing self in devotion to a cause because he respected the dignity of man.

"No one appreciated more than Lincoln the vicissitudes and hardships of the poor. When nominated for the presidency, he was asked to give some material for an account of his boyhood. 'Why,' he said, 'it is a great folly to make anything out of me or my early life. It can all be condensed into a single sentence, and that sentence you will find in Gray's Elegy—"The short and simple annals of the poor." That's my life, and that's all you can or anyone else can make out of it.' Lincoln, who came from the poor, helped the poor all that he could, but he believed in the freedom of opportunity and not in radical socialism. He would have been the last to even think of the dictatorship of the proletariat or a monstrous conspiracy to dominate the world. Slavery was abhorrent to him in any form or by any class. He loved freedom as a man loves his family and prayed and hoped that in time democracy would extend to the ends of the earth. His was a spirit that soared beyond the Nation he saved.

"It was a spirit that intuitively understood the mass. "The mass," as Carl Sandberg wrote, "the Napoleons and the Lincolns come from me. They die and then I send forth more Lincolns and Napoleons." No leader in the Civil War could more accurately than Lincoln fathom what the sol-

diers or sailors were thinking. He did what he could to alleviate their hardships and mitigate their courts-martial—a man of kind and compassionable heart. History's greatest commoner would have been shocked by knowledge of the regimentation of the masses and the official murders decreed by Stalin. Those who resist Red tyranny may find some comfort in what Lincoln said: 'Men will pass away—die; but the principle of democracy will live forever.'

"MORE THAN COMMON

"He knew full well how these principles were established by the American Revolution. In later life, Lincoln recalled that when a boy, by the light of an open fire, he had lain on the floor and read Parson Weems' 'Life of Washington.' The deeds and magnificent leadership of the Father of Our Country moved him greatly, but not more than the heroism of the soldiers of the revolution. He commented, 'Boy even though I was, I thought there must have been something more than common that those men struggled for.' And do we not think that thought today when we visit Arlington Cemetery or our other national cemeteries at home and abroad? Yes, it was 'something more than common that those men struggled for.' Lincoln knew the veterans. Did he not ask all to resolve 'that these dead shall not have died in vain' and 'to care for him who shall have borne the battle and his widows and orphans'?

"That should be kept in mind as we struggle to gain the minds of men, as we continue to fight to make democracy live. Few will disagree that the career, the writings, and the sayings of Lincoln comprise the most splendid exhibit in the showcase of our democracy. He is a shining example of the worth of the system and his life should be used more in our overseas information programs and literature. He did not appear in a blaze of glory, although vindicated by victory. He remembered the sufferings on both sides. He recognized the desolution and despair of the vanquished, and his feelings were of compassion and forgiveness so beautifully expressed in the immortal words. 'With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall borne the battle, and to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.'

"Those abroad who read the Lincoln papers and speeches will soon realize that in addition to his faith in the common man's capacity for self-government, that Lincoln also had an abiding faith in the mercy and goodness of Almighty God. His belief that 'righteousness exalteth a nation' inspired those around him. This again is the opposite of the Communist doctrine that 'religion is the opiate of the people.' In his Presidential candidacy, Lincoln said, 'I know that there is a God and that He hates injustice and slavery. I see a storm coming, and I know that His hand is in it. If He has a place and work for me, and I think He has, I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything.'

"I ask, are we ready and willing to carry on this struggle for human freedom? We have seen many fail in the struggle. In our own time, many governments that were of the people, for the people, and by the people have perished from the earth. Many people have been put to death for resisting the Red octupus and many still resist by underground activities. If Lincoln could speak, he would say, 'Hold on. Your cause is worth fighting and dying for,' and for those who have died for the cause, he would say for them as he said to us, 'These dead shall not have died in vain.'"

LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH

"Ah, these deathless words. How many people have looked at and pondered the Gettysburg Address graven upon the south wall of the Lincoln Memorial at Washington will never be known, but the total is millions. There, day after day, people come by the hundreds to look at that incomparable memorial and to gaze at the heroic statute of a brooding Lincoln in a majestic location, within the walls of a temple of Greek design like those once consecrated to the gods. Of those who come, one will note there are many young people—school boys and girls. Lincoln would have liked it that way, for he had a way with the young. It is reported that he was down on his knees with a group of boys playing marbles when the news came that he was elected President of the United States. Youth would do well to remember that never did words of malice, hatred or unforgiveness fall from his lips. We should remember also as veterans that Lincoln gave 'the last full measure of devotion' as did our own good comrades who did not return.

"Yes, this man of the people gave his all for us. His 'malice toward none' philosophy, his unswerving fidelity to the Constitution, his emancipation of the Negro, and his preservation of the Republic inspired his people to have graven high in stone over the statue in his memorial: 'In this temple, as in the hearts of his people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined.'

"We gather here today near his mortal remains to pay tribute because he is deeply enshrined in our hearts. Our few words of reflection on his consecrated life were also from the heart. But unless we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and our fellow citizens accept his ideals with conviction and practice them with deep sincerity, our lipservice will do little good. If we follow his precepts and determine to make a better place for all, we are carrying on his great tradition, and that is to strengthen the Nation. He knew as do we, that a nation cannot escape history, and that is this grave problem in our time. No one phrased it more eloquently than Lincoln—it is whether 'we shall nobly save—or meanly lose—the last best hope of earth.'"

House Joint Resolution 433—Joint Committee on United States Information Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have underscored the urgent need for a Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs. As every careful observer in the field knows, we are not winning the cold war, we are making slow progress in winning the minds and hearts of millions to our side in the struggle against the colonial and imperialist forces of Russian communism. In this struggle we face the basic peril of defeat. Joint congressional action is desperately needed to bolster and expand our informational media in every possible way in order to meet and expose the lies of the heavily subsidized propaganda machine of Moscow.

To satisfy this need, I have submitted House Joint Resolution 433, calling for the creation of such a committee. The tasks and functions of this proposed committee would be as specialized and purposeful in character as those of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Situated in the realm of ideas and spirituality, they are even more essential and fundamental, and thus deserve specialized attention and care.

It is my earnest hope that Congress in this session will give its most serious consideration to this measure and authorize a rapid implementation of its provisions. I am happy to see a growing popular support for House Joint Resolution 433. In this connection, I wish to place in the RECORD a statement of support issued by the national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is also a professor of economics at Georgetown University. Appearing in the issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, January 1–15, 1956, one of the two organs of this national organization, this statement commits the support of 1½ million Americans behind House Joint Resolution 433:

CONGRESSMAN FEIGHAN PROPOSES ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS

In connection with the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN'S sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 433, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America chairman sent the following communication to Congressman FEIGHAN on December 29, 1955:

"It is my happy privilege to inform you that the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, by the unanimous vote of its executive council, extends its full support to your remarkable measure, House Joint Resolution 433, calling for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs.

"We take pride in offering the support of our national organization with complete certitude as to the urgency and utter necessity of the passage of this vitally important measure by Congress. And you may be assured that this committee will do everything within its power to advance your measure toward this end.

"It should be quite evident to all Americans that as a Nation we are now, more than ever before, in a phase of the cold war which presents the greatest challenge to our ability to prepare and disseminate skillfully truthful and pointed information aimed at the most vulnerable parts of the Russian Communist enemy. It is nothing short of incredible that Moscow is capable of making considerable and dangerous inroads in Asia and Africa on the theme of colonialism and imperialism, while it is itself the basic center of widespread Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism, ruling an empire that in geographical area and predatory exploit surpasses all in the pages of human history. The non-Russian nations of Central and Eastern Europe and those in Central and Eastern Asia are the captive states of imperialist Moscow, totaling a number that far exceeds the ambitions of its Czarist Russian predecessors.

"The overwhelming fact is in itself an adequate reason for the establishment of this active joint committee. If we are to win the hearts and minds of men everywhere and to counteract Moscow's obvious intention to iso-

late us by misleading but heavily financed progaganda, Congress must begin to view our informational programs as being in many respects even more important than our atomic enterprises. The formation of a joint committee as you propose is the best possible means for meeting this urgent need.

"In closing, we should like to take this opportunity to express our warmest congratulations on your excellent Report of Inspection of the Administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as Amended, and Related Programs in the Countries of Southeast Asia and North Asia. It is by all measures a solid contribution to the strengthening of our security in tests.

"With warmest personal regards and best wishes for the continuance of your noble patriotic services to our Nation, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"LEV E. DOBRIANSKY."

Mr. Fischer Emotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial from the Galesville Republican of February 9, 1956, written by Mr. Bert Gipple. Mr. Gipple's editorial, which follows, comments on the article written by Mr. John Fischer in a recent issue of Harper's magazine:

It is strange but nonetheless true, that in what is oft termed the effete east of these United States there are many, including some listed among the intelligentsia, who picture anything west of the New York State line as still in the raw, with painted Indians lurking about with scalping knives, denizens of the forest ready to seize upon Little Red Riding Hoods, and even an occasional buffalo stirring up the dust.

One of such, seemingly, is John Fischer, editor in chief of Harper's, a magazine founded 101 years ago, and which for more than half a century was rated as tops of monthly publications.

Mr. Fischer now occupies that "easy chair" once occupied by writers of fame. One might well say, "How the mighty have fallen."

In the December issue of Harper's, over his own signature, Mr. Fischer discusses the farm problem. According to his mass of gray matter, there just ain't any such thing, aside from there being too many farmers—an idea that seems to possess other easterners in high places.

Mr. Fischer vizualizes the American farmer (the little ones with two or three hundred acres or less) as an individual of low intellect, with the legs of his baggy jeans thrust into his boot-tops, sucking on a straw as the hayseed trickles down from beneath his battered hat, and standing with outstretched hand to Uncle Sam, saying, "Gimme, gimme."

The Fischer article in Harper's is headed, "The Country Slickers Take Us Again." In the first paragraph he alludes to the farmer as "Our Pampered Tyrant." He follows this by saying, "The record of recent elections indicates that the farmer is generally eager to sell his vote to the highest bidder," and that "City people are too indifferent (or benumbed) to resent this legalized corruption."

That for a starter. Then he goes on with this: "Everybody knows that it is the taxpayer who keeps the farmer (or rather a favorite group of them) living in clover and Cadillacs, but the taxpayer seldom realizes how much it is costing him." To which he adds, "When any hog keeps his jowls in the trough long enough, he gets to thinking he owns the trough."

Does he let it go at that? He does not. His next blurb is "At least 40 million of our 350 million acres of crop land should be taken out of production," and that "One million farm families ought to be nudged gradually off the land, and helped to find some useful occupation." In conclusion, he quotes a "respected" economist who asserts. "It is not inconceivable that 5 percent of the work force could produce all the farm products which the United States and part of the rest of the world would take at profitable prices."

Having finished his diatribe, Editor in Chief Fischer sits back in whis swivel chair and reads his manuscript with a smile of satisfaction. So pleased is he with it that a copy goes to the Secretary of Agriculture. Somebody there sends to Harper's a note, which reads:

"I have read the article by John Fischer in the December issue of Harper's with a good deal of interest. It is excellent.

"EZRA T. BENSON."

Weeks later, the Farmers Union heard of this, and there was an explosion. Reporters for the daily press seized upon it and broadcast it the length and breadth of the land. Secretary Benson said he was amazed; that he had not read the article, nor signed the note sent to Harper's. Somebody in the Department of Agriculture did. That is admitted.

However that may be, Fischer's picture of the American farmer as a "country slicker and living off legalized corruption," has gone around the world. Russia could not have sent out propaganda of life in America more to our disadvantage.

Echoes From Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as one who is interested in the current distress of the American farmer and desirous of effecting a solution, I offer a commentary on the plight of the poor pumpkin. I refer to a humorous article prepared by Mr. Edward H. Dickson, Washington correspondent for the McClatchy newspapers of California, one of the great independent newspaper organizations in this Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article herewith for the benefit of my colleagues:

ECHOES FROM CAPITOL HILL

(By Edward H. Dickson)

No matter which political party is in power, a small, willful group of Washington bureaucrats seems determined to strangle the Nation's pumpkin industry with a lot of regulations.

The whole ugly business started back in 1934 during the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt when standards were set up for canned pumpkin with the power-greedy bureaucrats, including squash, too.

No relief was to be expected, of course, during the administration of Harry S. Truman and his Fair Deal regimentation but everybody thought that when the Republicans took over in 1953 business was going to get a breather and there would be an end to this interference from Washington.

But the brutal fact is Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's Department has issued an order, effective just 2 weeks from today, not, mind you, doing away with the old regulations but imposing sterner new ones.

Wake up, citizens.

There are only 14 more days in which to save America.

Benson, of course, may not have seen this pumpkin order, just as he did not see the slick-cover magazine article he endorsed without reading and which got him into a lot of trouble because it implied farmers are a bunch of mendicants.

In all justice it must be pointed out the order actually was signed by Roy W. Lennartson, Deputy Administrator of Marketing Services. But Marketing Services is an important agency in the Agricultural Department and you would imagine Benson would know what was going on around there.

The regulations set up a point system for scoring pumpkin for canning on the basis of color, consistency, finish, and lack of defects.

And they are so rigid that even a pumpkin like the one in which Whittaker Chambers hid the Alger Hiss data scarcely could qualify as a 100-percent American pumpkin.

Take the matter of consistency in pumpkins, for instance, which often is sadly lacking both in pumpkin and politicians.

A housewife getting ready to bake a pie for Thanksgiving or Christmas has this formula to follow as to whether her product will be consistent:

" 'Good consistency' means that the canned pumpkin or canned squash, after emptying from the container to a dry, flat surface, retains the approximate shape of the container, or holds a high mound formation, and at the end of 2 minutes after emptying on such surface the highest point of the mound is not less than 60 percent of the top of the container, except with respect to No. 3 size can or larger the highest point of the mound is not less than 50 percent of the height of the container, and irrespective of can size not more than 10 cubic centimeters of free liquor separates for each 30 ounces of net contents."

Looking back on it now, it is amazing how grandma turned out those delicious pies without ever bothering to use a stopwatch or micrometer.

The Department says it is none of its business how much pumpkin is put in the can because quality and not fill is the basis for regulation.

It does offer this helpful advice, however:

"It is recommended that each container be filled as full as practicable with pumpkin or squash."

The Department does not wish to take jurisdiction in cases involving irate housewives who might feel they got shortchanged.

One of the bright things about the new regulations is that they come years after the writing of the famous fairy tales and nursery rhymes.

Imagine the strain which would be put now on the author of Cinderella in the scene where the good fairy turns white mice into horses and a pumpkin into a coach so Cinderella can go first cabin to the prince's ball.

Even fairies have their limitations and by the time she and Cinderella found a pumpkin which would pass the standards, it would be past midnight before Cinderella even got started, much less arrived home.

And at best you can bet the evil stepmother and Cinderella's ugly stepsisters would be around trying to influence the inspectors.

Or take the case of Peter, Peter, pumpkin eater.

The little rhyme goes like this:

"Peter, Peter, pumpkin eater
Had a wife and couldn't keep her;
Put her in a pumpkin shell
And there he kept her very well."

Peter would be in a nice fix with the Government unless he could show the pumpkin shell met the regulations promulgated pursuant to the authority contained in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087, et seq. as amended: 7 U. S. C. 1621, et seq.)

Resolutions on 38th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from citizens of my congressional district of Lithuanian descent containing resolutions adopted by such on the observance of the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY
COMMITTEE,
Paterson, N. J., February 19, 1956.
Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: On February 19, 1956, citizens of Lithuanian descent residing in Paterson, N. J., during their program in observance of the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the people of Lithuania during 700 years have time and again fought aggression to defend her freedom, have shed their blood to prove to the world that Lithuania is worthy of independence; and

"Whereas Lithuania was an independent state for several hundred years before Russia's first occupation in 1795; and

"Whereas the yearning for self-rule and freedom existed throughout 123 years of Russian occupation, Lithuania severed its ties with Russia by announcing its independence on February 16, 1918; and

"Whereas Soviet Russia renounced for all time its rights to the territory of Lithuania, and recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state; and

"Whereas the United States of America and other nations recognized and continue to recognize Lithuania's rightful independence and sovereignty; and

"Whereas almost 16 years ago the Baltic democratic republics slipped beneath the sea of misery and death that is Soviet communism; and

"Whereas because of the global and totalistic nature of the Kremlin's peaceful coexistence line is designed primarily to gain time in order to divide and destroy free world alliances and pave the way for world conquest: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent shall continue to support the efforts of Lithuanian people to regain freedom; and

"Resolved, That we respectfully urge the United States Government to develop an overall dynamic program against international Communist conspiracy; and

"Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States to incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries as an integral part of United States foreign policy; be it further

"Resolved, That this meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Paterson, N. J., expresses their deepest gratitude to the Federal Government and the Congress of the United States for their keeping enslaved nations' hope of liberation alive and for their unwavering stand and attitude toward the eventual restoration of independence of Lithuania and other Baltic States; and be it finally

"Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of the State, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Representative of the Eighth District of New Jersey, and the press."

Sincerely yours,
ANTHONY GUDONIS,
Chairman.
Rev. VYTAUTAS DEMIKIS,
Secretary.
JOHN SPRAINAITIS,
KEENEUN PRAUTKA,
JOHN JOSY,
VACLOVAS CIZIUNAS,
Commitee Members.

Failure of Integration in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. A. H. Harrigan, and which appeared in the February 21, 1956, issue of the Charleston News and Courier, one of our Nation's oldest and most distinguished newspapers. The article spells out a few of the many complications being encountered in efforts to integrate the public schools in our Nation's Capital, which has been designated as the "pilot model" for others to follow. The article is entitled "Integration Hasn't Helped Either Race in Capital, Newsman Finds."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION HASN'T HELPED EITHER RACE IN CAPITAL, NEWSMAN FINDS

(By A. H. Harrigan)

The District of Columbia's year and a half of experience with integrated schools has been probed, analyzed, and summed up in a series of eight articles published in the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Star.

The overall situation, as seen by veteran Washington Newswriter Paul Harmon, is contained in the quoted comment of an educator who spent 25 years in the Washington system. He said that integration is "not benefiting the Negro pupils, and Lord knows it isn't helping the white pupils."

Norfolk, with a large transient population, is not a wholly typical southern city. Integration of Norfolk's public schools has been advocated by some Norfolkians. The afternoon Ledger-Star set out to get the facts on integrated schools in the major testing ground of Washington.

Harmon's series establishes two things: (1) That integration has meant a big drop in educational standards and (2) that whites who can do so are fleeing Washington.

Harmon pointed out that Washingtonians themselves are ill informed as to whether or not integration has been successful. He described the news blackout on how integration is working and the reluctance of school personnel to allow their names to be used in stories. When newsmen agree to withhold the names of sources, teachers, principals, and school-board members have plenty to say.

The educator quoted above said: "There isn't a shadow of a doubt in my mind that a greater number of white students have been irrevocably hurt (by integration)."

The effect integration has on student behavior is graphically described in the Harmon article headed "Washington Handles Negro Children With Kid Gloves."

"White teachers, principals, and school officials all along the line are so afraid of public opinion that they are reluctant to punish a Negro child for even the most serious offense," one principal told the Ledger-Star. He added that "Negro school-board members, NAACP leaders, and some white proponents of integration might be quick to pounce upon any incident which can be made to look like mistreatment of Negroes by white school people."

He added that Negroes "came into the schools in large numbers in September of 1954 with the feeling they had won a great victory in this decision on integration. They would not bow to any authority."

Harmon reported that numerous incidents (of student crime) were cited by parents, teachers, and pupils. Most of these were reported in the newspaper.

These reports included the flashing of knives by Negro boys, fist fights and hair-pulling contests between Negro and white girls, Negro boys approaching white girls asking them for dates, making remarks about their personal appearance, sometimes even putting their hands on them.

Harmon's reporting points clearly to an increasing exodus of whites from integrated Washington. He said in the series that a large segment of Washington's permanent citizenry, including top civic leaders and businessmen, are profoundly concerned with racial population trends.

A school principal said: "I am deeply concerned at what is happening to the white population of our city: I'm concerned what's happening to the tax structure; to the civic pride formerly displayed in residential sections all over the city."

Harmon said the moving out of white residents to nearby Maryland and Virginia and the influx of colored families has been a cause of major concern to real-estate men.

The Ledger-Star was told of one high-school district where the parents of more than 25 students continued to live in Washington, but sent their children across the city line to a Maryland school. The parents paid more than $200 per pupil per year to avoid sending their children to integrated Washington schools.

Integration is complicating tremendously the already vastly difficult problem of obtaining teachers. The latest count in Washington's integrated teachers college, Harmon was told, "is 489 white students and 814 colored students."

A school board member commented, saying, "And we expect only a few of those white teacher trainees who graduate will accept jobs in the Washington school system." Another school board member said, "In my opinion, you 'ain't seen nothing' yet. It will be interesting to observe the shift at the end of this year."

As to the cost of operating the integrated system, it has gone up, not down as integrationists forecast.

Dr. H. M. Corning, school superintendent, admitted to Harmon that little if any money has been saved so far due to integration.

"Actually, we hope to obtain an increased appropriation to correct some conditions," one school official said. He explained he referred to a large number of pupils who have an IQ of 70 or below, now attending classes with pupils of more normal development. The system hopes to obtain funds for special teachers for these students. They also want to teach simple shop skills to those who are incapable of absorbing an academic education.

Senator Paul Douglas Opposes Upper Colorado Boondoggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has a considerable reputation as an economist. Of the "solid gold cadillac" upper Colorado River storage project he said this during debate on the issue in the other body last year:

This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program. It is about the worst program I have ever seen during the time I have been a Member of the United States Senate. It would be a waste of the taxpayers' money. * * * To my mind it is not justified on any basis whatsoever, and I hope the bill will be defeated.

Those who may as yet be undecided with respect to this issue should be considerably influenced by the words of Senator DOUGLAS.

I will quote further from his remarks made in the other body on April 20 of last year so that they may be before my colleagues for evaluation:

It is because I believe that this project is not good for the Nation that I oppose it.

The area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. * * *

The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over $500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost of most dams on the Columbia River. * * *

If we were to pick out one of the worst places in the United States at which to erect a public-power project, we would pick out this one. * * *

I doubt that this sum—the appropriation for power—will be paid out, for power from coal oil and shale oil in this region can probably be produced at the same or a lower cost. Furthermore what about atomic energy? Will not that be ready for use in 60 years?

* * * so if we add the hidden interest costs, which will amount to more than $1,100,000,000, the cost of the irrigation features will come to more than $2 billion and the total cost of all features to probably close to $3 billion or more.

The average cost of construction, let alone interest, for the project as a whole would be $952 an acre * * * if we include interest, the cost per acre will be $2,142. The cost for the central Utah project with interest will be $3,953. These are fantastic figures. The most fertile land in the country * * * is not worth more than $600 or $700 an acre. Here we are proposing to spend more than $2,000 an acre for land which, when fully irrigated, will not be worth more than $150 an acre. On a big project, we will be spending approximately $4,000 an acre.

We must remember that these irrigation projects are not in low altitudes * * * (at which) the average temperature is high and the growing season long. They are, instead, in the mountains, at altitudes from 4,500 to 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, where the winters are long, and where the crops produced will be, by the admission of the proponents of this bill, primarily alfalfa, hay, and some corn, for the feeding of livestock. These are costs which cannot be borne. Irrigation can better be used to put water on the more fertile land of the Midwest to raise the yields per acre there. This would be at a very low cost instead of at the astronomical costs of this project.

* * * who then will pay for this gigantic project? The interest is forgiven, and borne by the taxpayer. Eighty-five percent of the principal is not to be paid by those who own the land, but is supposedly to be saddled on the power revenues. If we examine the costs and the power revenues, we find that it would be almost impossible for the power system to earn the money necessary to meet the 85 percent of direct irrigation costs. * * *

This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program.

Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, last February 16 the Lithuanian Americans, of whom there are almost 1 million in our country, celebrated the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania is a country with a rich, historical background. It was an independent state as far back as the 12th century and at one time comprised a vast area of Eastern Europe. Since 1940, however, the valiant people of Lithuania have been under the domination of the Soviet Union. The legal government of Lithuania as well as those of its neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, was deposed by the masters of the Kremlin and Lithuania is now incorporated as part of the Soviet Union with attendant terror and loss of freedom. Since the Reds have taken over Lithuania, hundreds of thousands of these brave people have been deported to slave labor camps.

On Saturday night, February 18, 1956, I had the honor to address a group of fine, patriotic Americans of Lithuanian extraction who belong to the Lithuanian-American Society of Los Angeles. The president of the society is Mr. Anthony F. Skirius.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our country can well be proud of the patriotism of the Lithuanian Americans and their devotion to our principles of freedom and justice. It is my hope that once again Lithuania may be free and throw off the yoke of Soviet slavery.

Responsibilities of Operators of Radio and Television Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, television is a wonderful educational medium. Those who have been trusted with licenses to operate television and radio stations should never take lightly their responsibilities to the public in presenting educational programs, especially those which are designed to portray history.

In this connection, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by a distinguished writer, Mr. Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION
(By Arthur Krock)

MORE PORTRAYAL OF HISTORY BY TELEVISION

WASHINGTON, February 20.—In its second TV dramatization of the history of the Constitution the Ford Foundation, through its Omnibus program yesterday, again in several respects conquered the sharp limitation of the medium. Also again, it was faithful to the facts it presented and the casting and performance of the actors were excellent.

But in this second of the programs, which dealt with the strains on the Union and the Constitution after 1789, once more an important balancing fact was omitted, and another was only half told. That same flaw was noted in this space on February 8 with respect to the opening program when, in accurately allotting to the actor who played Thomas Jefferson the lines in which he said the Constitution should continuously be interpreted according to the changing concepts of following generations, the playwrights failed to add Jefferson's vital reservation. This was that the changes should come through constitutional amendments submitted by Congress and ratified by the States, not through judicial amendments by the Supreme Court.

In that previous dispatch it was estimated that more than 7 million view Omnibus. Its management responded that the viewers number at least 17 million, which stresses its importance as a vehicle of historical reporting.

LINCOLN AND DOUGLAS

There were two episodes yesterday which, being truncated history, could have left on most of the viewers a deeply mistaken impression. No suggestion is intended here that the slanting was deliberate; the time is short in which the long story has to be told; and the distinguished consultant for the script, Professor Hofstadter, of Columbia University, encountered complex problems of selection. But:

Among the passages chosen from the celebrated debates between Lincoln and Douglas in Illinois in 1858 was this from Douglas: "The Negro ought never to be a citizen of the United States." Since Lincoln was faithfully presented on the program as a statesman who loathed slavery, and the issue between him and Douglas in their senatorial contest was over Negro citizenship and the extension of slavery to the Territories, that may explain the choice. But the passage

left the impression that one of the issues between the candidates was the award of equal political rights to free Negroes and those thereafter to be free.

Yet in these same debates Lincoln took a stand on that subject even more adverse than Douglas, a vital fact in the context. At Charleston, September 18, 1858, Lincoln said: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the black and white races. * * * I am not, and never have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people. * * * There is a physical difference * * * which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality." No viewer of Omnibus yesterday was informed than Lincoln made this response to the passage excerpted from Douglas.

The program's narrator, Joseph N. Welch, who doubtless was chosen because of the acting skill he displayed on TV in the Army-McCarthy hearings, very fully and correctly recited Lincoln's views on slavery: that he looked forward to the day when all men would be free; that the Nation could not endure half slave and half free; but that, if the only way he could preserve the Union would be to continue slavery for a time, he would do that, etc. Continuing, Welch announced that in the Emancipation Proclamation, a few years after 1858, Lincoln achieved his purpose and that most of the slaves were free. But an essential part of the truth, not conveyed by Welch, was that the proclamation was a wartime military, not a sociological, measure, and that the only slaves it freed (on paper) were those behind the Confederate lines.

Since Douglas' stand on Negro political rights and the Emancipation Proclamation were both brought into the script, surely a round portrayal of history required the balancing factors listed above. They are facts, not just somebody's interpretations or opinions.

Nevertheless, the subject of American history, much neglected in the schools, was usefully illuminated by Omnibus. Those who did not already know learned that:

New York and New Jersey merchants, opposed to the War of 1812, brazenly supplied the British Army and Navy. South Carolina had an acute economic reason in the tariff law of the Jackson period for proposing nullification and secession. But its object was "disunion" and Jackson denounced the South Carolina doctrine as "treason," elements conspicuously missing from the current southern stand against the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. Lincoln was never an interpositionist: it was a northern as well as a southern doctrine; but Lincoln, too, sought to reverse Supreme Court decisions (the difference being that the agency he would employ was Congress). From 1789 to 1861 "the Union," in the TV script's true words, "subsisted on a series of compromises."

That is something the extremists in the North and South should bear in mind now.

Seven of Greatest Americans Appraise George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to present a few excerpts from the many tributes paid to George Washington by seven of the outstanding Presidents of the United States. On this, his birthday, it is highly appropriate that we reappraise George Washington in the light of the considered opinion of 4 deceased Presidents of the United States as well as in the light of 3 living Presidents of our great Nation.

These appraisements follow:

"His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known; no motives of interest or consanguinity of friendship or hatred being able to bias his decision. He was, indeed, in every sense of the word, a wise, a good, and a great man." (Thomas Jefferson.)

"Washington is the mightiest name of earth, long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation. On that name no eulogy is expected." (Abraham Lincoln.)

"No American should ever forget Washington's insistence upon the absolute necessity of preserving the Union; his appeals to our people that they should cherish the American nationality as something indestructible from within." (Theodore Roosevelt.)

"The greatest political leader of his time and also the greatest intellectual and moral force of the revolutionary period. * * * His principles of government have had more influence on the development of the American commonwealth than those of any other man." (Herbert Hoover.)

"This absence of sectionalism, together with his interest in the means of knitting the scattered people of the new Nation together, was the imperishable contribution of Washington." (Franklin Delano Roosevelt.)

"Washington's efforts for freedom were twofold. He was concerned first with making the ideal of democratic government work. He was also concerned with the defense of that ideal against the forces opposed to it." (Harry S. Truman.)

"We remember the picture of the father of our country, on his knees at Valley Forge seeking divine guidance in the cold gloom of a bitter winter. Thus Washington gained strength to lead to independence a Nation dedicated to the belief that each of us is divinely endowed with indestructible rights." (Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

Interposition and Freedom of Choice in the Public School System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Atlanta Rotary Club, Hon. Robert B. Troutman, Sr., spoke to the club on the subject Interposition and Freedom of Choice in the Public School System.

Mr. Troutman is a prominent attorney of Atlanta, and a recognized leader of the bar. During his career at the bar his fellow members of the legal profession have elected him to serve as president of the Atlanta Bar Association, and as president of the Georgia Bar Association. He has also been active in the affairs of the American Bar Association, where the influence of his personality, his abilty, and integrity have been widely felt and appreciated.

When I learned of Mr. Troutman's address to the Atlanta Rotary Club, I requested and obtained a copy of it. I was profoundly impressed with the logic and soundness of the manner in which he dealt with this serious and important question which now faces us. His views and suggestions deserve the thoughtful attention and consideration of all those who are now devoting attention to the problem which the Supreme Court, through its unwarranted action, has thrust upon us.

Under unanimous consent previously obtained, I insert the address of Mr. Troutman herewith:

Interposition means the interposing of the State's sovereignty between the unauthorized exercise of power by the Federal Government and the citizens of the State. Jefferson was called upon by some friends in Virginia to assist in that State's protest against the sedition law, enacted during John Adams' administration. He drafted a series of resolutions of interposition which were submitted to Virginia and actually passed by Kentucky also. They not only declared the Federal Act to be beyond the Federal Government's powers, but called upon other States to join in similar declarations. Few other States gave encouragement. They did not follow. Kentucky, nevertheless, redeclared the act to be invalid.

In the early 1800's Pennsylvania passed a similar resolution of nullification of a decision of the Supreme Court. The Governor called out the militia to prevent the carrying out of the Court's mandate. The State appealed to President Madison, who refused to interfere (notwithstanding the fact that he had helped Jefferson prepare the original resolutions for Virginia and Kentucky mentioned above). The upshot of it all was that the Federal Government won and the State capitulated. There will be found an elaborate discussion of this case and others wherein Pennsylvania resisted the encroachmen of Federal power for 25 years in Warren's History of the Supreme Court, volume I, pages 267, et seq. The State even resorted to armed resistance. In the end, some of its military officers suffered imprisonment for their resistance of Federal process in the enforcement of the Court's decree.

John C. Calhoun advocated nullification of certain acts of Congress which he deemed to be violative of the Constitution. Although President Jackson threatened his hanging, Calhoun's methods resulted in some modification in the laws.

Other States resisted what they deemed to be unlawful exercise of power by the Federal Government, speaking through the Supreme Court. They include Connecticut, Massachusetts, Georgia, and Wisconsin (over the fugitive slave law).

Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt were thoroughly and violently in disagreement with the Court's decisions. Franklin Roosevelt, in our lifetime, tried to get Congress to help him pack the Court with men who would interpret the Constitution the way he thought it ought to be interpreted. His attack succeeded. Finally, because of death and retirement he was enabled to appoint Judges who shared his views. He literally remade the Supreme Court by changing the Judges.

The Southern States' position, as I understand it, may be summarized as follows:

When the Thirteen Original Colonies gained their independence from England, they became separate, independent sovereign nations. They occupied the same status as England, France, Russia, and other sovereign nations.

By mutual consent these nations delegated certain of their sovereign powers to the

Federal Government. The extent of the grant is expressed in the Constitution of the United States, which became a compact between them and the Federal Government. All other powers were retained by the States. To make this clear, they brought into being the 10th amendment, which declares that all powers not delegated in the Constitution and not prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States.

It must be recalled that the agreement—the Constitution—expressly provides that it and the laws enacted thereunder are the supreme law of the land.

The Federal Supreme Court has for more than 150 years asserted that it possesses the power to interpret the Constitution and to declare whether a power asserted by any branch of the Federal Government falls within the delegated powers or not, and whether a State law or constitution violates the Federal Constitution. Thus one party to the compact, by its court which is one of its coequal branches, declares what the contract between the parties means and the other party, the State, has nothing to say about it.

The States contend further that the 14th amendment, adopted in 1868, following the War of Secession, was not intended by its framers to vest in the Federal Government, acting through its courts, power to control the operation of the public schools of the States. In fact, the Supreme Court, itself, in previous decisions had in effect held that the 14th amendment did not prevent segregation of the children between the two races, if both were given equal facilities.

The language of the 14th amendment has not been changed since those decisions were rendered. It remains the same general language. No other relevant language in the Constitution has changed. But under succeeding Presidents the personnel of the Court has been changed. The words of the agreement—the compact—are the same, but the judges are different.

The States say that in reliance upon the "separate but equal" doctrine laid down by the Court in its earlier decisions they have spent billions of dollars in their public education systems. And since the term "education" is not mentioned in the contract, the Court is in effect amending the Constitution by interpretation. In so doing the Federal Government through one of its branches is violating the agreement (the Constitution) of the parties. It is changing the contract.

Personally, I agree with their position. It is evident to me that the framers of the 14th amendment did not intend it to be a limitation upon the State's power to segregate the pupils in their schools on the basis of race. Otherwise the same Congress which framed the amendment and submitted it to the States would not have passed a segregation law for the public-school system of the District of Columbia. Nor would several of the States which ratified it have retained the segregation school laws on their books. Several States had such laws.

If conditions have changed since 1868 so as to write into the Constitution this restriction on State power to operate public schools, let the Constitution be amended in the manner provided. No court of nine men has power to amend the Constitution by interpretation.

The decision in the segregation cases is but one of many instances in recent years in which Federal powers have been expanded by construction. More and more the Court is taking from the States their sovereignty and delegating same to the Federal Government, all without any change in language of the Constitution.

So the States reiterate that the Federal Government by use of its courts is not adhering to the contract between the parties.

Several means of redress have been suggested.

Secession is not available. No state can withdraw from the contract. The war of 1861–65 settled that.

Amendment to the Constitution is another. Such an amendment has been proposed in Congress by Judge VINSON, of Georgia. However, in the light of its own previous decisions laying down the "separate but equal" doctrine, it does not seem that the States should be relegated to the imponderable method of amendment. Rather it should be left to the proponents of this further expansion of Federal power to amend the agreement so as to include control over public education. The Constitution is now silent on the subject.

In addition, in the present state of party politics, I don't see much chance of the amendment receiving the required two-thirds of Congress and three-fourths of the States. I hope that I am in error. Curb on Federal expanding powers is needed, if our liberty is to be preserved. Only by local self-government may we retain our freedom. Centralized power has always been destructive of liberty.

Nullification is another remedy and so is interposition. But mere declaratory resolutions of protest or opposition are ineffective. It is for that reason that Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and even Mississippi, would not go as far as Georgia's Governor Griffin urged at the recent conference in Richmond, Va. Alabama, without Governor Folsom's approval did pass a nullification resolution.

The questions which these sister Southern States ask are: What means will be adopted to effectuate the resolution? Will the State resort to armed resistance? I think the answer is "No."

How many States will join in the resolutions? No one knows.

The Southern States might well adopt the solution which has been suggested by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, in a proposed resolution to be introduced in Congress. Alabama is now considering a constitutional amendment embracing the same plan. It should receive the support of all people in the country. Even the Federal Constitution might be amended to authorize it if necessary. I do not believe it is necessary.

It is a simple plan, giving the parents a freedom of choice in the matter.

The Southern States are contending that, no matter what the future may hold, the present view of the best thinking on the part of both races is that white and colored children should not be compelled to attend the same schools. Certainly, the overwhelming majority of the parents of the white children in the South hold that conviction. While we deplore the disorder on the campus at the University of Alabama, it shows how deeply the white people feel on the subject.

We believe that among our most valued freedoms is the right to choose one's associates. It is as basic as the right of free speech, free worship, and free press. No government has the power to compel us to associate with anyone else.

Furthermore, in this age, where juvenile delinquency is on every tongue, every day, parents have a definite responsibility to select, as best they can, the associates of their children.

Every southern State has compulsory school attendance laws. The parents, under threat of punishment by fine and imprisonment, must send their children to school. In most communities no private schools exist. Most parents are financially unable to send their children to private schools, even if such schools are available. So only the public schools can be available to meet these compulsory education laws. Unless, therefore, there can be separate schools for the races, children are forced to associate with those of another race contrary to the fundamental constitutional right of freedom of choice in selecting one's associates.

The Supreme Court's decision in the segregation cases did not hold that children could not be separated on a voluntary basis. It held only that a Negro child could not be denied admission to a school merely on the grounds of race.

The States, therefore, should be permitted to establish three types of schools. First, a school to which children of both or all races are admitted, if they desire to attend school together. Second, a school where only white children are admitted, for those who desire to attend such a school. Third, a school where only Negro children are admitted, for those who desire to attend such a school. It could apply to all races. It gives to the parents a reasonable choice in selecting the associates for their children.

I believe it will be within the boundaries of the Constitution, even as interpreted by the Court as now constituted. It is reasonable. Recent surveys in the schools of the District of Columbia reveal that since integration has been ordered, the children have fallen below the national average in grading their qualifications to be in their respective classes. The Negro children are now far below the whites in intelligence and culture. Obviously, white parents should have a choice to avoid the holding back of their children in their school work due to inferior equipped associates.

The choice of associates among members of the races is in practice throughout the entire country. There is practically no mixing of the races in the churches, in offices, or in clubs, or social gatherings, or in the homes, in any place in America. So by voluntary choice the right of selection of associates is being practiced by both races in America. The same process makes it desirable in the schools.

For this reason, I believe that in the South the number of mixed schools on this voluntary plan will be negligible. The majority of both races, on a voluntary basis, will choose segregation.

I believe it is a sensible way out. It may be more expensive. However, so deep is the conviction of our people on the desirability of separation of the races, I think they will pay the price, if necessary. I believe it will save our public-school system.

In the meantime, all of the delaying tactics to which the States are resorting will be followed. There will be disorder, and in some cases, there will be bloodshed. Innocent people will be hurt. Emotions and feelings are running high. But we must live under law. To do so we must have courts. We must have independent judges. Without them our rights are nil. So we won't solve our problems by defying either the Federal Government or the courts of the land. They must be solved according to law or we will have anarchy. We cannot get support on any emotional plea of "down with the court" or the Federal Government. We may incite riots and bloodshed for a while, but ultimately law and order will triumph. That is what happened thus far in every nullification case. The Federal Government won out in the final test of strength.

The "freedom of choice" plan is legal and within any reasonable interpretation which can be placed on the language of the Constitution. No one can complain if he is allowed to choose whether he wishes his child to go to a school solely with members of his own race or with members of both races.

The plan would give the parents some choice in the selection of the school associates for their children, at least to the extent of selection of one race of children as schoolmates.

If the courts of the United States strike down such a plan, then, indeed, they will establish themselves as superboards of education. They will confirm what the Southern States say they have already assumed in the school cases, by holding in this highly emotional area of race relations, the States and the local school boards are not authorized to segregate the races, although in their private lives and occupations the members of both races now practice voluntary segregation throughout the Nation.

I am aware that freedom of choice of associates in a public school system must be confined to reasonable limits. It cannot go to the extent of letting parents draw lines among social or economic groups. But differences in race are substantial. The voluntary segregation now being practiced by our people and by the surveys of the mixed-school system in the District of Columbia prove these differences. So race can well be a reasonable dividing line of freedom of choice by the parents of America.

It is a serious problem and an old problem. It is honeycombed in politics. It is filled with emotions. It has resulted in crises for our people. It calls for statesmanship at a high level.

Upper Colorado Scheme's Revenue Apportioning Provisions Unprecedented and Unsound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the new provision of the upper Colorado River storage project scheme for apportioning revenues to each of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming is unprecedented and unsound.

The revised bill H. R. 3383 contains in section 5 (e) an unprecedented proposal of apportioning by arbitrary percentages all of the net revenues from power to the four States of the upper Colorado River Basin. These apportioned revenues are to be reserved for use to subsidize uneconomic irrigation projects solely in those States. This means on the one hand that the Federal Government and the taxpayers would be holding the bag in the probable event that the revenues available to certain of these States under the proposed inflexible proposal would prove insufficient to repay the irrigation costs as required, while on the other hand certain other States might have revenues available in excess of repayment requirements of initially authorized irrigation projects and would demand authorization of additional irrigation projects on the basis of avaliability of such funds, regardless of economic justification or need.

There has been no report by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget on this unprecedented proposal which on its face is unsound and bad business for the Federal Government. It represents a total departure from existing law, which, under the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment of 1938—43 United States Code Annotated, section 392a—requires that net revenues from power, after the power allocation has been repaid, be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The huge concealed Federal subsidy to the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico is unwarranted and unconscionable.

Under the proposed plans of financing the project, the concealed subsidy by way of accumulating interest on money borrowed to construct the project would be huge. Its burden would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers for generations to come.

Under the repayment provisions of the Senate approved project bill, the concealed Federal subsidy on only the projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior—Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and 11 participating projects—as estimated and admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation would be $1,153,000,000 over the repayment period or $3,150 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated. If the four additional storage units and the Navaho, San Juan-Chama, and Gooseberry participating reclamation projects authorized by the Senate bill are included, the corresponding Federal subsidy, based upon equivalent methods of computation, would amount to $4 billion or over $5,000 per acre on the 745,000 acres to be irrigated.

Under the repayment provisions of House project bill, the concealed Federal subsidy on the minimum number of projects authorized by the bill—4 storage units and 11 participating projects—would amount to $1.6 billion at the end of the overall repayment period of 90 to 95 years, or $4,300 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated; but with the inclusion of additional projects contemplated for authorization, the subsidy would be substantially the same as under the Senate approved bill, namely $4 billion or $5,000 per acre.

As compared to Federal subsidies amounting to $3,000 to $5,000 per acre that would be involved in the project, the value of irrigated land in the area of the proposed reclamation projects averages only about $150 per acre.

In view of the fact that the crops that would be grown on the proposed project's high altitude marginal land would be largely hay, grain, and forage crops for livestock, and dairy products, which are now largely surplus and would in turn be resubsidized under the farm program, the huge Federal subsidy required for the proposed upper Colorado River project would be a totally unwarranted and unconscionable burden on the Nation's taxpayers for many generations hence.

The benefit-cost ratio has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects which are both economically and financially infeasible, first, by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits, while, second, at the same time, overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1: On one participating project—the Hammond—the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only $2.02 per acre per year, but says the direct benefits are $41.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2: The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time—which may be as long as 25 years—the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find $638,500 of "indirect benefits" and $313,100 of "public benefits" to add to the finding of $614,500 in "direct benefits"—all items over a 100-year period—to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The "indirect benefit" category includes such nebulous factors as "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers," while the "public benefits category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau guesses as to the "increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy."

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

Trade With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter addressed to me by Dr. Frank S. Wong, president, the American University Club of Hong Kong. Dr. Wong's correspondence indicates apprehension concerning the results which would be sure to follow in the wake of increased trade with Red China. Re-

laxation of opposition to trading with the Communists would be fatal to the West:

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY CLUB,
OF HONG KONG,
Kowloon, Hong Kong, February 17, 1956.

Hon. ROBERT BYRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BYRD: May I congratulate you on your statesmanlike and friendly stand toward the embargo against Communist China in the course of Premier Eden's visit to your country. I am glad I had the opportunity of a chat with you during your brief sojourn here.

Red China is getting most of the strategic goods from Soviet Russia at higher prices and at longer time than those that would have obtained from the free world. As soon as the 5-year plan has become a success, Communist China will be in a position to fight the democratic nations, and she will be in a firm position. So Peiping is more eager to have the embargo lifted than to be admitted to the United Nations. The lifting of the embargo would be a great victory and a moral sanction for Peiping, for it would constitute a statement to the world that the U. N. and United States embargo was wrong and that the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea could be condoned. Such encouragement would be fatal to our cause.

I hope that you will interest a sufficient number of legislators to call for giving more ships and planes to Taiwan to strengthen the blockade against the China coast, because ships are carrying strategic goods from Southeast Asia and Europe to Red China. We have to fight communism in all fronts. The blockade has brought great results.

I shall be pleased to tell you more facts and views of the embargo and look forward to having the pleasure of hearing from you. With best wishes to you and all those who uphold justice and liberty.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK S. WONG,
President.

Interior Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations rendered a great public service in recommending $15 million for construction of physical facilities in our national park system. For several years many of our national parks have deteriorated because of lack of funds. This is particularly true with our smaller parks. The reason for this lack of funds in the past decade is due to our international commitments and not to a lack of interest in the Congress.

The Vicksburg National Military Park is one of the parks that has been neglected. It is of great historical significance and attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors each year. Several roads in the park need paving; drainage work needs to be done; seepage problems need correction. The National Park Service has done an excellent job with the liimted funds at their disposal, but additional funds are needed now to prevent a further deterioration of the Government's investment. Actually, the increased appropriations recommended by the committee is an economy move. If a restoration program is not undertaken within a short period of time, a replacement program at a much higher cost will have to be initiated to provide ample facilities to the increasingly large number of Americans who take advantage of our national parks.

On February 19, 1956, an excellent editorial appeared in the Vicksburg Post-Herald on the subject of the Vicksburg Park. I include this editorial as a part of my remarks and commend it to the House. It follows:

FUNDS FOR NATIONAL PARKS

According to an Associated Press dispatch, there will be a very sizable increase in funds for national parks. President Eisenhower at first requested $5,200,000 to increase facilities in the Nation's parks. This was followed by a second request for an additional $8,350,000. The Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives exceeded the President's request and approved $15 million for the increase in physical facilities in national parks.

It is a source of interet to us in Vicksburg to note that Congress and the President are both cognizant of the needs of national parks. What is vitally important to us in Vicksburg is the extent to which our own national park will participate in these funds.

The Vicksburg National Military Park has not, in several decades, had sufficient appropriations to properly care for and operate this great battlefield shrine. Funds have been kept at a minimum and the physical aspects of the park have, necessarily, been neglected. The fact is that splendid use has been made of available funds by the local park authorities—we just haven't had enough funds to do our park justice.

Vicksburg should use every effort to support the requests for funds of our park authorities, and Vicksburg's civic bodies and her official bodies should see that their voices are heard in the Congress through our representatives. As we are undertaking our most ambitious tourist program, which will continue on a large scale each year, we should also see that our beautiful park is presented in its most beautiful aspects and we should goall out in our drive for additional funds which will be available should the report of the House Appropriations Committee be adopted.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*——3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——The Brandywine
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	

Vacancy

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*----------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*----------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*-------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*------The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*-----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*--------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*------1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*------
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*----------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*--------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*---------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*------
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*---------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*---
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*-----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*---
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*---------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*------The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*------

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*------
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*----------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*------
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*--------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*------3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*-------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*-------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*-------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*----
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*--------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*---------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*---------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*-----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*------4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*-------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*---------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*-------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*-------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*--------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*-------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*------The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*-------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*---------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*-------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*-------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*-------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*-------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*------------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*-----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*--------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*--------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*----------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*--------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*-------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*-------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*-------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*---------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*-----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*-----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*------2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*------Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*------
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*--------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*--------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*--------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*--------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*------
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*------
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*-------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*

Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*

Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*

Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*

Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*

Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La*

Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Prost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*

Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*

Quigley, James M., *Pa*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*

Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*

Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*

Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*

Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

The Conservatism of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last evening the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] delivered a very intelligent and informed address on the conservatism of George Washington. The Senator spoke in his usually fine, impressive manner. I think a reading of the address would be of value to Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSERVATISM OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Address by Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, before the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C., February 22, 1956)

I am deeply honored to join with you in celebrating the birthday of our first President. The annual George Washington Day Dinner has become a splendid tradition in the Nation's Capital. These annual observances of the American Good Government Society will, I hope, become a tradition in communities all over the country.

Of all the great men in American history Washington is unique in that he is, and always has been, beyond responsible criticism. Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson, Calhoun, Hamilton, and Marshall, to name only a few, continue to be somewhat controversial. Washington stands alone, universally acclaimed and unanimously accepted as the Father of his Country.

For Americans of all ages it was ever so. Take, for example, Henry Adams, grandson of the sixth President and great-grandson of the second. Even at the tender age of 12, Henry Adams was urbane, somewhat cynical, an ardent abolitionist, and completely unawed by the power and prestige of Presidents. Adams, in his famous autobiography, The Education of Henry Adams, gives these impressions of his first trip to Washington, made in 1850 at the age of 12:

"No sort of glory hedged Presidents as such, and in the whole country, one could hardly have met with an admission of respect for any office or name, unless it were George Washington. That was—to all appearance sincerely—respected. People made pilgrimages to Mount Vernon and made even an effort to build Washington a monument. The effort had failed, but one still went to Mount Vernon, although it was no easy trip."

* * * * *

"George Washington was a primary, or * * * an ultimate relation, like the Pole Star, and amid the endless restless motion of every other visible point in space, he alone remained steady, in the mind * * * to the end."

Then Henry Adams tells of his trip to Mount Vernon in a carriage and pair with his father, Charles Francis. On the way Henry was tempted to ask his abolitionist father how a slave state could produce such a man as Washington. He never put the question. He wrote in his Education the following words:

"Luckily Charles Francis Adams never preached and was singularly free from cant. He may have had views of his own, but he let his son Henry satisfy himself with the simple elementary fact that George Washington stood alone."

Daniel Webster expressed this feeling in a single sentence: "Washington is in the clear upper sky." To speak about a man of such great and unquestioned stature is a most difficult assignment. The task is further complicated by the fact that millions of words have been spoken and written about George Washington, the most important of which are familiar to an audience such as this.

Tonight, I shall talk about Washington's conservative political philosophy. Whether or not Jefferson and Lincoln were liberal or conservative, is still a topic of lively debate. To the best of my knowledge, however, nobody has tried to pin the neoliberal label on Washington. Again it is indicative of Washington's unique place in history that even the most militant of modern liberals do not seem disturbed by Washington's conservatism. They appear to assume that the conservative policies pursued by Washington were sound under the circumstances of time and place.

Only when we begin to apply Washington's conservative principles to current problems do we involve Washington in political debate. I have often thought what would happen if God should see fit to return Washington to us for a period of 30 days. Let us imagine that Washington is scheduled to arrive at the National Airport tomorrow in a celestial DC–7.

There would, of course, be a motorcade from the airport to the White House along the route reserved for visting celebrities. Government offices would be closed early. I suspect, however, that few Government employees would use this extra time off for shopping on F Street.

In touring this vicinity, three places would give Washington particular pleasure. First, he could not fail to be deeply moved by the monument erected to his memory and dominating the skyline of the Nation's Capital. No man could ask for more in the way of an official token of gratitude.

Washington would be more pleased, I think, to find that Mount Vernon had become a national shrine. Watching the steady stream of visitors to his beloved acres on the Potomac, Washington would know that he never really died; that he continues to live in the minds and hearts of the common people.

Washington would derive great satisfaction from a visit to the Fairfax County Courthouse. There he would find recorded in the office of the clerk his last will and testament. Dusty records in the clerk's office would convince him that we had taken seriously the advice in his Farewell Address: "To maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property."

Shortly after his return there would be a nationwide TV appearance. Then the American people could judge with their own eyes whether history has been right in painting Washington as frigid and austere. I suspect they would see a simple dignity—a dignity regrettably lacking in many public officials. Our crackerbarrel philosopher, Charles F. Browne, better known as Artemus Ward, showed a keener insight than many historians when he said:

"The prevailin' weakness of most public men is to slop over. G. Washington never slopt over."

The revivified Washington could not wholly despair of America's future after meeting the leading figures in our Government. He would find in President Eisenhower a worthy successor. They have much in common—a military background, an unimpeachable personal integrity, and a deep disgust for those who would gamble with the Nation's security for the sake of political advantage.

Washington would be very proud to find his beloved Virginia so ably represented in the Senate of the United States. No man in public life has done more than HARRY BYRD to implement the conservative fiscal policies which Washington deemed so important. In his Farwell Address, Washington advised us to "cherish public credit" and to avoid "the accumulation of debt," while at the same time making those "timely disbursements, to prepare for danger which frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it." We are indeed fortunate in having as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee a man so well qualified to strike this delicate balance.

Washington would also be gratified to find as Secretary of the Treasury a man who compares so favorably with his own great Secretary Alexander Hamilton. A greater compliment is not within my power to bestow. We shall, I hope, hear all about Secretary Hamilton's remarkable career in 1957 when we officially observe the bicentennial of his birth.

During his brief visit with us, Washington would certainly discover a close political kinship with Senator GEORGE. The theme of Washington's Farewell Address is the danger of factionalism and "the fury of party spirit," particularly in the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. No one has done more than Senator GEORGE to prevent partisan attacks on settled principles of American foreign policy.

Of course, Washington would make a triumphal tour of the United States, culminating, I suppose, in a mammoth ticker tape parade in New York. For Washington this adulation would be no new experience. He would be reminded, I think, of April 16, 1789, and the days immediately following.

George Washington was up before dawn on that eventful day. Martha did not go along with his ungodly hours, so he sneaked softly downstairs and headed for the kitchen. A subdued clatter of skillets assured him that the cook was already on the job, and his nose detected the promising aroma of corn meal hoe cakes.

The vast sweep of the Mount Vernon plantation was still wrapped in slumber, but we can well imagine that a fledgling cockerel was practicing an adolescent crow; that a hungry calf was complaining about the lack of service—and that a reckless foxhound puppy was teasing an irascible and noisy goose.

These were matinal sounds that were dear to the heart of the farmer-general—and he had thought that they would be his own forever. He felt that he had had enough of public life.

Eight years before—at Yorktown—he had said, "The work is done and well done."

Six years before, he had said goodbye to his officers, put away his uniform, hustled home to Mount Vernon and enthusiastically written to Lafayette that, "At length, my dear Marquis, I am become a private citizen on the banks of the Potomac; and under the shadow of my own vine and my own figtree, free from the bustle of a camp and the busy scenes of public life, I am solacing myself with those tranquil enjoyments of which the soldier * * * the statesman * * * and the courtier * * * can have very little conception."

The work was done for his muscular and triumphant little army. But the work was not done for Washington, and today, April 16, 1789, he was saying goodby once again—this time to Mount Vernon—as President-elect of the new United States.

He had his hoe cakes—with honey—and a pot of tea, and as he went outdoors, he found his horse, already saddled, full of oats and groomed to a glistening sheen. It nickered a welcome, and his dogs swarmed around his legs—a small and turbulent sea of waving tails and jealous clamorings for his personal attention. There were men in those days who said they could not understand this always dignified, austere and sometimes frosty man—but animals—and children—understood him very well indeed.

The President-elect of the new United States was in no hurry to get going on the long and muddy-roaded journey to the temporary capital in New York City. There was time enough to note that one of his mares had foaled the night before, and the oldest ewe sheep on the place was calling his attention to the charms of her new-born twin lambs. The Presidency could wait a little longer.

There would even be time for a second breakfast of fresh fish, ham and eggs, more corn cakes and more tea, and the President-elect was well aware that neither Col. David Humphreys, his aide, nor Charles Thomson, the Secretary of the Congress, who had brought him official word of his election, would be astir for at least another hour.

Those two men were to accompany him to New York, and it was 10 o'clock before the carriage wheels began to turn. We are given to understand that Washington rode in silence. Possibly he was oppressed by the fact that he had to borrow money to make the trip. As always, he was rich in land, and poor in cash. It is more likely that he was oppressed by the frightful responsibilities that had been thrust upon him by the unanimous vote of the presidential electors. As a commander in the field, he recognized his own abilities. As a military strategist, he had no lack of faith in himself, but his confidence in the future of George Washington as a statesman was almost nonexistent.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that he had little time to brood about it. His first stop was at Alexandria, Va.; there was a public dinner, and a large bouquet of flowery speeches. At Georgetown, there were parading troops in full dress; cannon belched salutes, and bells were tolled.

Baltimore was a mob scene of enthusiastic citizens, delirious with hero worship.

It was a triumphant march. The Governor of Pennsylvania met the carriage at the border with a uniformed escort, and at Trenton, N. J., 13 young girls who were dressed to represent the 13 States, recited a long and fulsome poem in unison.

New York wrapped both arms around him. It was before the days of ticker tape, but our modern parades through the heart of New York have nothing on Washington's reception at the temporary capital. New York had entered into the spirit of the occasion with a fervorous abandon. The city shook with the thunder of gunfire and the peals of bells. Flags and streamers fluttered in the breeze, and the rooftops were black with people—some of whom naively believed that Washington was about to be crowned as a king.

The inauguration took place on April 30, 1789. The Congress was in session. The Government of our infant federation was about to be launched. Three times in the course of his inaugural address Washington invoked the favor of God. Midway in his address he declared that, "no people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States." If Washington were to speak to us today, he would ascribe to Providence the major credit for America's progress over the past 167 years. In all of his writings, Washington invariably recognized the creative acts of providence.

If Washington were to spend a month with us, the gulf separating him from contemporary liberals would soon be obvious to all. Washington constantly stressed the need for self-restraint and self-reform. He believed not only that men must act in conformity with ethical absolutes, but that their morality could not prevail in the absence of religious conviction. Washington regarded the Constitution primarily as a restraint on men in their collective capacity. He recognized as the two great constitutional pivots:

"[First] That the general government is not invested with more powers, than are indispensably necessary to perform the functions of a good government."

And secondly, "that these powers * * * are so distributed among the legislature, executive, and judicial branches, into which the General Government is arranged, that it can never be in danger of degenerating into a monarchy, an oligarchy, an aristocracy, or any other despotic or oppressive form, so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

In other words, Washington felt that the struggle between good and evil is waged primarily in the individual rather than in society; that the individual's base instincts must be restrained by morality and religion; and that the popular will of the State must likewise be restrained by the immutable political truths of the Constitution.

Contrast Washington's political philosophy with the philosophy recently expounded by a leading Senate exponent of modern liberalism. This Senator recently wrote for publication:

"The one distinctive aim [of liberalism] was the liberation of man from traditional restraints."

This Senator also said:

"The liberal approach must be experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic. Believing that no particular manifestation of our basic social institutions is sacrosanct or immutable, there should be a willingness to reexamine and reconstruct institutions in the light of new needs."

And the Senator concluded:

"We must release ourselves from the shackles of yesterday's traditions and let our minds be bold."

Here we have a difference of first principles—a difference which cannot be composed by mediation and compromise. As a result, we find Washington insisting, "We are not to expect perfection on this world." On the other hand, all traditional restraints are regarded by modern liberals as impediments to achieving paradise on earth.

As Washington went about the United States, he would probably not express himself on specific political issues. After his retirement from the Presidency, he was reluctant to intrude upon what he described as "the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." He did not even seek to buttress his place in history by writing his memoirs. He wrote to his personal physician, Dr. James Craik, who broached the subject that "any memoirs of my life, distinct and unconnected with the general history of the war, would rather hurt my feelings than tickle my pride whilst I lived. I had rather glide gently down the stream of life, leaving it to posterity to think and say what they please of me."

How refreshing.

However, Washington might not be wholly successful, if he were among us, in maintaining a posture of political neutrality. Suppose, for example, he were asked about current proposals to amend the Social Security Act. Could he resist repeating what he said in his Farewell Address about "not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear?"

It would be improper for me to suggest what position Washington might take on my proposed treaty-control amendment. He would be keenly interested in this debate, for the Jay Treaty was the most controversial act of this administration. Alexander Hamilton, writing under the pen name Camillus, was his staunch defender in that fight. Hamilton pointed out that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land. He emphasized the power of the Senate to approve or to reject a treaty. And he emphasized the fact that the only constitutional exception to the power of making treaties is that it shall not change the Constitution. Hamilton wrote that "a treaty cannot transfer the legislative power to the executive department, nor the power of this last department to the judiciary; in other words, it cannot stipulate that the President, and not the Congress, shall make laws for the United States; that the judges and not the President shall command the national forces."

In sum and substance, the treaty power as defined by Hamilton was limited to those objects over which neither contracting nation had sovereign jurisdiction. My amendment would merely impose on the treaty-making power the restraints originally intended to govern its exercise.

Could Washington remain silent upon seeing with his own eyes the extent to which political power has been centralized in Washington? There would be those who would explain the altered Federal-State relationship on the ground that "times have changed," or that the "Constitution must evolve to meet new conditions." Washington might remind them of what he said in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

During his brief visit with us, Washington would certainly be given a reception at the United Nations headquarters. Perhaps he would repeat his warning about "the policy and will of one country (being) subjected to the policy and will of another." He might refer again to the danger of "passionate attachments for others" in foreign affairs.

In many ways Washington was like the great British conservative, Edmund Burke. Both men sacrificed themselves for the masses, but not to them. As representatives of the people, both men insisted on the right to exercise their own best judgment. Like Burke, Washington distrusted the spirit of innovation, and respected custom and tradition. Washington's conservatism explains in considerable measure why the American Revolution bears such little resemblance to the French.

At the end of Washington's imaginary return, I like to think that he would make a second farewell address. However, I do not believe that its content would differ greatly from the one delivered on September 17, 1796. He might point out that his earlier statement in opposition to entangling alliances has been distorted by some. He would certainly say that nuclear weapons and intercontinental bombers have overcome America's "detached and distant situation" which existed in 1796. But now, as then, I believe that Washington would pin his hopes for America's survival on the indispensable supports of religion and morality.

Before Washington ended the visit which I have imagined, I am afraid that he would be a highly controversial figure. We might expect to read snide editorials attacking hero-worship; warning about "the dead hand of the past"; and scoring Washington for doubting both the inevitability of progress and the perfectibility of man. So, it is probably just as well, that Washington will not return to us in person. It is good to have one great American as a fixed and noncontroversial point of reference. So long as Washington remains "in the clear upper sky," the conservative principles for which he stood will never be wholly erased from our political conscience.

The Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am today extending in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the 34 participating projects which are a part of the Colorado River storage project. I am including the construction cost of the projects, the total area in acres each of the projects would serve, the irrigation allocation per acre, and the percentage of the irrigation allocation which would be repaid by the irrigators.

Mr. Speaker, not one single irrigation project in all of the 34 participating projects is financially sound.

If we consider the original 11 approved by the President and Secretary McKay, the cost for area served on the individual projects ranges from $200 to $800 per acre for construction alone. The water users can repay a weighted average of 17.5 percent. This average is that low because the largest of all the projects, central Utah, is the least feasible.

However, Mr. Speaker, these figures of cost per acre fail to represent a true measure of cost, because nearly two-thirds of the acres to be served are already in production and would receive only a supplemental water supply. In most cases this additional supply would be only a few inches in depth per annum, and thus only a small fraction of the amount of water necessary to put arid land into full production.

The real cost of putting enough water on an acre of land in this arid to semi-arid region would on the central Utah project be over $2,600 an acre.

It must be remembered that in these figures I am considering only construction costs. I am not considering interest charges on the Government's investment.

Nor do the figures I am presenting include another legitimate charge for irrigation. This is the proportion of the cost of building the storage reservoirs which should be borne by the irrigation projects.

As many an unlucky farmer has learned by bitter experience, the real value of his land is not what he has put into it in money and labor, but what he can get out for what he produces. The lands proposed to be irrigated in the Colorado River storage project lie at altitudes from 5,000 to 7,000 feet above sea level. They are not in tropical or semitropical latitudes. They have a short growing season and are generally capable of producing only forage crops and grains.

Land in the region, fully irrigated and improved, brings in the market an average of only about $150 an acre.

The list of projects follows:

Colorado River storage project participating projects

Project	Project construction cost	Total area served	Irrigation allocation per acre	Percentage of irrigation allocation to be repaid by irrigators
	Thousands	*Acres*		
1. La Barge	$1,673	7,970	210	29.6
2. Seedskadee	23,272	60,720	383	20.6
3. Lyman	10,564	40,600	260	21.3
4. Silt	3,356	7,300	450	31.1
5. Smith Fork	3,367	10,430	321	31.3
6. Paonia	6,944	17,040	399	35.5
7. Florida	6,942	18,950	343	26.3
8. Pine River extension	5,027	15,150	332	40.7
9. Emery County	9,865	24,080	400	38.6
10. Central Utah (initial phase)	231,044	160,380	794	11.9
11. Hammond	2,302	3,670	627	16.1
Total (11 projects)	304,356	366,290	[1] 545	[1] 17.5
12. Eden	7,287	20,200	361	20.6
Total (12 projects)	311,643	386,490	[1] 536	[1] 17.7
13. Navaho	211,237	137,250	1,530	14.6
14. San Juan-Chama	135,169	225,000	480	25.8
15. Gooseberry	5,761	16,400	350	41.5
Total (15 projects)	663,810	765,140	[1] 694	[1] 18.4
16. Savery-Pot Hook	10,814	31,610	340	12.9
17. Dolores	24,633	66,000	370	6.2
18. Sublette	37,099	84,000	430	3.7
19. Fruitgrowers Dam extension	1,690	3,850	440	27.8
20. Bostwick Park	2,634	6,870	380	26.4
21. Dallas Creek	10,330	21,940	470	9.2
22. East River	212	2,750	80	44.8
23. Fruitland Mesa	11,551	19,400	590	9.2
24. Grand Mesa	20,164	25,300	800	.1
25. Ohio Creek	3,402	16,910	200	1.0
26. Tomichi Creek	11,523	27,580	420	0
27. Battlement Mesa	5,854	6,830	860	11.0
28. Bluestone	3,330	10,875	310	11.1
29. Eagle Divide	3,412	10,875	310	8.9
30. Parshall	11,882	27,510	430	12.0
31. Rabbit Ear	4,733	19,190	250	16.1
32. Troublesome	5,243	13,640	380	13.8
33. West Divide	79,676	65,610	1,220	7.5
34. Woody Creek	178	2,965	60	100.0
Grand total (34 projects)	912,170	1,228,845	[1] 633	[1] 14.8

[1] Weighted average.

Methodists May Spend $37 Million To Fight Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch, a newspaper which circulates in my district. This dispatch is entitled "Methodists May Spend $37 Million to Fight Reds." This is a heartening sign in the continuing battle against atheism, and the article is herewith set forth at length:

METHODISTS MAY SPEND $37 MILLION TO FIGHT REDS

With half the world already enslaved "Behind the Iron Curtain" and with Communist Russia avowedly bent upon bringing what is left of the free world down to its knees and made satellites of the Kremlin, every movement directed at combating this godless force for evil commands our appropriation.

Since communism is fundamentally atheistic and directed at undermining religion whenever and wherever it can, churches everywhere are a prime Red target and per se must and have alined themselves in the forefront of the battle to save Christian civilization. We think churches of the free world have generally and adequately demonstrated their awareness of an enemy that is communism. Pope Pius XII, as head of the Roman Catholic Church, has consistently fought against Red tenets and practices, and the great Protestant denominations and Jewish groups have lent their weight and influence in the battle to defeat Red aggression and reclaim the lands and people the Communists have enslaved.

Latest evidence of awareness on the part of our churches of the Communist menace is the agreement reached on Sunday by the 4 top-level administrative agencies for 40,000 Methodist churches with a membership of 9,300,000 to recommend that the church

spend $37 million in the next 4 years to combat communism and secularism.

The 4-year plan to be submitted to the general council of the church in April was drawn up at a meeting of council of bishops, council of secretaries of boards and agencies, council on world service and finance and coordinating council. General council, which meets every 4 years and which represents 40 different countries, is the supreme law and policymaking body. It usually accepts the recommendations of its administrative units.

Coordinating council, which has the responsibility for preparing the quadrennial program of the church, declared communism and secularism "must be seen for what they are—attempts to master the mind." Bishop Charles Brashers, of Chicago, chairman of the council, observed that "communism exploits the mind, regiments the person, tyrannizes the soul. It lacks the cohesive power of love that is essential to social unity."

The plan to be recommended to general council proposes that the $37 million be raised on a regional level by a contribution of a dollar a year from each of the church's 9,300,000 members. The sum would be distributed among the 116 colleges and universities associated with the church.

Integration of Common Supply and Service Areas Among the Military Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert two letters concerning plans for the Department of Defense to integrate the handling of certain common supplies and services. These two letters relate to those which I placed in the RECORD on January 16, 1956.

The step which Secretary Wilson has now taken, though belated, is important. It is hoped that he will insure that his directive to integrate these common use items will receive diligent followup lest it suffers the fate of other directives of similar purport. I also hope that this is but one of several steps that will be taken to carry out the full intent of the National Security Act and the O'Mahoney amendment of 1952.

As I have previously stated, the large savings through integration of the common supply and service areas among the military departments will go a long way toward financing some of the things which we so desperately need at this time.

The letters follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Secretary of Defense Wilson advised you by letter dated January 27, 1956, that I would furnish you complete information regarding our efforts toward improvements in the logistics field. The purpose of this letter is to reply to your letter of December 13, 1955, and to outline our program for supply of common-use items and common services.

The position of the Department of Defense with respect to supply, as discussed in the references cited in the second paragraph of your letter, was based on the supply techniques known to be available and developed as of that time. While it is true that our present plans may seem to change the previous concept, at the same time they reflect our never-ending effort to improve supply management as practical methods for doing so are developed. It is a seemingly simple task to designate that "supply support will be accomplished by single-service assignment." On the other hand, the tools and organizational arrangements to do so and insure adequate support in time of both peace and war must be carefully developed and considered, else we create a situation more objectionable than the one we endeavor to correct. We have vigorously worked on the problem and, among other actions, have developed what we feel is a sound solution—the single manager plan.

A significant factor affecting the previous efforts to solve the supply system problem was unquestionably the lack of the Federal Catalog, and hence, a common identification of items. Despite the sincerity of efforts to develop and further the concept of cross-servicing or making single-service assignments for supply, they cannot be effective without the common language of the Federal Catalog program. In this regard I wish to point out that all catalog identification is scheduled for completion by September 1956, but it will not be until 1957 that a few more classes will be converted and the balance in 1958. In addition to the necessity of being able to use the common language of the Federal Catalog, we had to await the extension of the principle of stock fund financing in the departments to effect a sound financial basis for furthering our concepts. The military departments have vigorously pursued programs for refinements and improvements in their own military supply systems in a commendable manner, which has further assisted us. At this point I would like to explain briefly what we mean by conversion so that you will appreciate the time required after catalog identification has been completed. Conversion involves the renumbering of all items that are physically in inventories in all warehouses, the reprinting of all stock lists and reference material for procurement, and the revision of operating and maintenance manuals so that new numbers will be used when parts are requisitioned.

At the present time only subsistence, medical, clothing, and petroleum items are completely converted. Following the completion of conversion, the potentialities for cross-servicing become a reality and a major step completed in our efforts to develop single-service supply responsibility.

During the winter and spring of 1954–55, my staff completed the detail analysis of the single manager plan for supply of common-use items. As you know this culminated in the assignment of subsistence to the Army on November 4, 1955. Concurrently, we pursued a very active effort to analyze and develop assignments in other commodity categories. Our actions culminated on January 31, 1956, by Secretary Wilson's decision that the single manager plan be extended in the supply field to petroleum, medical-dental, clothing-textile, photographic equipment, and in the service field to traffic management. A copy of his memorandum to the military service secretaries, together with Department of Defense Directive 5160.12, also dated January 31, 1956, is inclosed. This directive sets forth the policies and implementations of single manager assignments.

I would like to point out the reasons why we selected subsistence before medical supply for the application of the single manager plan. Subsistence represented the commodity that had the greatest degree of single service (Army) integration and the fewest complications with respect to technical aspects of the inventory and the magnitude of mobilization reserves to be repositioned under the distribution policies of the plan. The Army already bought for all services and stored and distributed for the Air Force. Since only approximately 10 percent of the inventory is for mobilization reserve and complicated by many very technical items. A complication regarding distribution of medical supplies, emphasized by Operation Alert in June 1955, is that the need for medical supplies by the civilian population might take precedence over military requirements in the event of attack on continental United States. The need to provide dispersion even at some sacrifice in basic supply economy became apparent. These factors were all considered. As I have indicated, we now are assigning medical and dental supplies under the single manager concept to the Navy.

In our study of the single manager plan for common-use items, it also became quite evident that the same concept could be applied for common services such as Traffic Management, Military Sea Transportation Service, and Military Air Transportation Service. As indicated in the inclosure, this procedure has been approved by Secretary Wilson.

I trust that this answers your question as to our policies and programs. If further information is desired, I shall be pleased to provide it.

Sincerely,

T. P. PIKE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WILSON: I am in receipt of Assistant Secretary T. P. Pike's letter of February 8 in response to my letter to you dated December 13, 1955.

I am pleased to learn that you have embarked upon a relatively broad program for the supply of common-use items and services as contemplated by the O'Mahoney Act of 1952. Respecting Mr. Pike's explanations as to the reasons for a change in policy involving the handling of medical and subsistence supplies respectively during the past year and a half, I want to state that my concern is not upon what is past, but what may be done to insure the success of the program that has now been charted. I am not unmindful of the difficulties which confront you in accomplishing this program, which I am sure can bring about tremendous savings.

In order that I may keep abreast of development, will you please send me copies of implementing documents which are issued from time to time? When available, I should like to learn by categories of supply (subsistence, medical, etc.) where the depots will be located and their respective missions, the locations of supply-demand-control points for each category of supply, the prescribed stock levels, what the interval of stock status reporting will be (i. e., monthly or quarterly, etc.), and whether standard forms, procedures, accounting, etc., are planned.

You are to be highly complimented for the action you have taken in this matter, and as stated in my letter of December 13, 1955, I am sending copies of pertinent correspondence to other interested Members in both Houses, and will also insert same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Pray for a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the address of Hiram W. Warder, attorney at law and register of wills of New Castle County, Del., before the Delaware Congress of Polish-American Societies at Washington-Lincoln-Kosciuszko celebration at Wilmington, Del., February 12, 1956:

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to three of the greatest men in the history of the world.

Mankind reveres George Washington as the father of our country. Abraham Lincoln is enshrined in the hearts of humanity as the Great Emancipator. Tadeusz Kosciuszko earned a debt of universal gratitude not only because he was the father of American artillery and a leading engineer and strategist of the American Revolution. Kosciuszko is endeared to lovers of freedom everywhere as the father of Polish independence.

What were the qualities which made Washington, Lincoln and Kosciuszko great benefactors of mankind and great builders of free civilization? Was it their intellect alone? By all means, no. Was it simply their zeal for profit or the compulsion of personal ambition? Most certainly not.

The magnificent achievements of the three great leaders whom we honor today displayed the workings of their great souls.

Before tackling the problems of their times, each of these three leaders unequivocally accepted two great truths. Then each of these men dedicated his life to making these truths the solid foundation of our free civilization.

The two great truths which Washington, Lincoln and Kosciuszko accepted and made the guiding beacons of their lives are these: First, God is our Supreme Ruler; second, all men are created equal.

These fundamental truths are the very life of the document which founded our Nation, the Declaration of Independence.

These great truths are the guiding principles which we must reaffirm today. These great truths are the guiding principles which our leaders must inject into the solution of the problem of our time—the problem which overshadows all other problems.

The threat of Communist enslavement is unique in world history.

We find the people of Poland and of 11 other nations, 800 million souls in all, pinned under the heel of a despotism and an inhuman tyranny such as the world has never before known.

We have seen the story of 14,000 men, the flower of Polish leadership, massacred in the Katyn Forest. We have learned the story of 42 million Russians murdered by order of Joe Stalin during his 29 years of godless misrule.

From pronouncements of our Federal Bureau of Investigation, we learn of the existence within our own borders of no less than 25,000 key Soviet agents, who are supported in their subversion by hundreds of thousands of dupes.

We have seen the heroic military victories of GI's and their allies in Korea upset by diplomatic and political treachery.

One assistant member of the Presidential Cabinet has served a prison term for committing perjury when questioned about his treason. Another assistant member of the same Cabinet has also been exposed as a traitor who, among other staggering crimes, gave Soviet Russia the engraving plates to print American guaranteed money without restriction, whereby billions of American tax dollars were thrown down the Communist rathole.

We have seen the Senate of the United States, upon signal of the Kremlin, tied up in weeks of inconsequential censorship debate. We have seen the executive leaders of our country follow the Kremlin signal to the Geneva Conference, which was convened for the sole purpose of manufacturing Communist propaganda.

We find our leaders cringing and cowering before the bluff of Soviet military power. We see before us men who lack the vision and the courage to realize and to know that Soviet Russia, in her conquests, has never fired a shot simply because she has no real ability to fight. Besides lacking the economic capacity to wage major war, Soviet Russia is utterly lacking in the moral capacity to wage major war. Past and present Russian history show that Russia never has been and is not now a real military threat to a first-class power. Without the help of God-fearing America in World War II Russia would have been crushed as she has always been crushed before real military strength.

We find ourselves with leaders who will not face up squarely to the reality of the Soviet plan—the plan which is to crush this country after she has been paralyzed by subversion from within.

The American people detest communism and all its designs. The overwhelming majority of people everywhere in the world despise communism and all that it stands for.

Our people and free people in all parts of the world somehow seem to sense the phony ring of Communist propaganda and the falsity of Communist tactics.

In the face of anguishing and continuous threats of war—in the face of persisting high and ruinous taxes—in the face of the trickling stories of horror that reach us from behind the Iron Curtain—in the face of American surrender on the installment plan to the forces of evil, American hearts cry out. The hearts of the American people cry out in compassion for enslaved peoples. The hearts of the American people cry out to be saved themselves. The hearts of the American people cry out for a leader.

We need a real leader. We need to pray for a leader. We need to conduct a crusade of prayer for a leader.

We need a leader who will have the vision and the understanding to know that the problem we face at home and abroad is basically moral. We need a leader who will have the vision and the understanding to know that the practical remedy we need for this great problem is political and not military.

We need a man who will adopt and execute a plan that will end forever the menace of communism, both here and abroad. We need a man who will know and understand that the task can be accomplished.

We need a man who will be dedicated and consecrated to the application of the two fundamental truths upon which this nation was founded and upon which it has flourished.

We need a man who will know and understand that all we really have to fear is God.

My friends, we may ask ourselves what we, the ordinary people, can do to obtain such a leader as we need today.

In this year of presidential elections, let us remember every minute this, the greatest problem which is before our nation and the world. Let us remember that the complete power to defeat communism forever lies in the hands of one man—the President of the United States of America.

While the Reds labor, endlessly year after year to place thousands of agents to destroy us, we, the people have to pray and to labor only a few months this year to place one man in the Presidency to save us and to save the world.

Yes; the right man in the Presidency of the United States can and will save the world.

Let us resolve to make the fullest possible use of the greatest power that was ever given to man—the power of prayer. Let us pray for a leader. Let us crusade among all people who believe in prayer to pray for a leader, another Washington, another Lincoln, another Kosciusko. Pray for a leader.

We will get one. Through prayer we will get a leader.

My friends, I thank you.

Deserved Tribute to Dr. Evans, His Hospital, His Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Hudson Dispatch, a distinguished newspaper of the 14th Congressional District entitled "Deserved Tribute to Dr. Evans, His Hospital, His Life." Dr. J. Lawrence Evans has had a distinguished career in North Hudson, N. J. He has been truly devoted to the cause of humanity. His work has brought happiness and surcease of pain to many who are commended to his care. We in the 14th District are proud of him. This editorial sets forth in a brief way some of the mileposts in a distinguished life dedicated to mercy:

DESERVED TRIBUTE TO DR. EVANS, HIS HOSPITAL, HIS LIFE

Outstanding and unsurpasesd service to North Hudson Hospital in a wide variety of capacities over a span of more than a half century were fittingly marked on January 18 when Dr. J. Lawrence Evans, administrator and medical director of the hospital, was honored at a surprise party on his 77th birthday.

Few men have ever displayed more zeal and devotion to a cause than has Dr. Evans. Ever since early in the present century, this highly capable physician and administrator has given everything he possessed in energy, talent, know-how and unremitting stick-to-itiveness to promoting the services and expansion of North Hudson Hospital. He truly has devoted his life to this cause and it has been a hard, uphill struggle beset by no end of difficulties, particularly the economic phases of keeping a private institution of this kind in the black.

Undoubtedly, much of the credit for what has been accomplished over the years at this hospital which serves the six communities of the northern end of Hudson County belongs to Dr. Evans. His diplomacy and resourcefulness has been a major factor in overcoming countless obstacles which would have defeated many men of lesser determination and purpose.

Dr. Evans served as staff president of the hospital from 1912 to 1925, except during World War I, when he was surgeon of 115th

Machine Gun Battalion and later sanitary inspector of the 30th Division, comprising the National Guard of the two Carolinas and Tennessee, which was among the combatant forces of the British Army.

The recent annual meeting of the hospital board of governors marked the 24th consecutive year in which Dr. Evans has been chosen medical director of the institution. In addition, he has served as hospital administrator for some years.

Despite his 77 years, Dr. Evans continues to handle his manifold duties with vigor and zest that belie his age. He seems to be wellnigh indefatigable and we wish him many more years in professional harness, a desire, we are sure, he himself entertains for he'd surely be lost without his beloved hospital to guide and serve.

We recall back in February of 1938 when the redoubtable doctor, who had been on the go day and night in his hospital duties, private practice and personal matters, suffered an attack of gastritis, which had been brought on by irregular diet, lack of sleep and overwork. At first, it had been reported, Dr. Evans had suffered a heart attack. With characteristic reaction, he underwent examination by a heart specialist, got a pronouncement after a thorough examination that his heart was perfect and then issued a denial of a reoprt that he would discontinue his activities at North Hudson Hospital. He did consent to take it easy for a short time and then plunged full-tilt into his work there, which has continued without let-up another 18 years.

At his surprise party the other night, he was surrounded by members of the hospital board and staff, relatives and friends, including 3 sons, 2 of whom are also physicians, Dr. J. Lawrence Evans, Jr. and Dr. Robert Evans.

In his annual report for 1955, Dr. Evans said that cases at the hospital increased approximately 15 percent over 1954. Emergency cases treated at the hospital increased to 10,600, with more than 5,000 ambulance cases being treated. Approximately half were handled by the hospital ambulance.

Don't Let the House Be Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the impression seems to have been growing that there is a vast difference between the upper Colorado storage project bill passed by the Senate (S. 500) and the measure soon to be considered by the House, H. R. 3383. The following table is taken from the committee report which clearly indicates the falsity of this impression:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navaho.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navaho.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata.

This table clearly shows that as to projects, there is only this difference between the bills: The Senate has authorized the Echo Park and Juniper Dams and also the Gooseberry project, while the House version eliminates Echo Park and Juniper Dams and conditionally authorizes the Gooseberry project.

There are certain other minor details in which the bills differ but their objectives remain essentially the same and in particular the projects contemplated for the development of water and power in the upper Colorado Basin are exactly similar.

However, of the greatest importance, and I doubly emphasize, should the House pass the measure which will come before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to settle will be the three projects—Echo Park and Juniper Dams and the Gooseberry project. Most important of these, of course, is Echo Park. The question I would pose is: Should the House act favorably on the pending bill? What assurance have we that Echo Park and the other projects authorized in the Senate bill will not be restored to the House bill in conference? This becomes especially important in view of the fact that the Senate refused to eliminate Echo Park by a vote of 52 to 30 and would therefore undoubtedly insist on its inclusion. It would therefore seem to be a complete delusion for any Member to feel that merely because Echo Park has been eliminated from the House version that this means that it will not be included ultimately in the legislation.

Surplus Food for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to see that President Eisenhower is making our surplus food available to western Europe, which has suffered from blizzards and floods in one of the worst winters in 20 or 30 years. I am particularly pleased with his statement, and I quote:

The United States stands ready to make surpluses of agricultural commodities, which we have in abundance, available for relieving the distress of the people in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is a great humanitarian deed, and I am one who has always felt that it was ridiculous for us to have surplus food when people in other parts of the world are hungry. I congratulate the President on his immediate action to relieve the distressed.

Statesmanlike Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal for Tuesday, February 21:

STATESMANLIKE VETO

Convinced that its enactment would not be for the best interest of Mississippi, Governor Coleman has vetoed a bill which would have restricted investigative activities of FBI agents in that State. The action was taken after consultation with members of the legislature.

In his veto message Governor Coleman pays tribute to the FBI and points out that the inquiries which prompted the measure were ordered by the Attorney General's office. He also points out that in numerous ways the FBI "has been of untold benefit" to the people of Mississippi and expresses belief that its agents will continue to enjoy their "admiration, cooperation and benefit."

The heart of the Governor's veto message lies in his assertion that "Mississippi has nothing to fear from any honest investigation." "Since we have nothing to hide, nothing of which we are ashamed, and therefore, nothing to fear," he says, "it is the better part of statesmanship, calculated to serve our best interest in the years to come" to withhold approval of the bill.

He serves notice that the veto is not to be construed as criticism of the legislature and points out to any who might be short-sighted enough "to taunt a change of mind" that he "is under no obligation to follow blind consistency" but conceives it to be his "duty to act at all times, in the light of conditions then prevailing for the best interest of our State." The message concludes:

"Let no man mistakenly interpret this action as evidencing any lack of unrelenting determination to preserve that which we know to be right."

Governor Coleman has been a distinguished leader in the law enforcement field. It was his fine record as Attorney General which so appealed to the voters and helped place him in the high office he occupies. The courage and statesmanship revealed in his veto action Monday are further justification of their faith.

Thinking Mississippians and the South as a whole will approve his action. Those who will be undone by it are the Communists who have long sought to destroy the FBI, and the NAACP, which with other agitating groups would have used approval of the now-vetoed measure for mean and selfish propaganda purposes.

Interview Between Prime Minister Nehru, of India, and Former Ambassador Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editor of the Mankato Free Press has recently written an interesting review of a significant film television interview between Prime Minister Nehru, of India, and former Ambassador Chester Bowles. I think the editor's comments on Mr. Nehru's presentation are worth our attention, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seeing ourselves as others see us is always interesting, sometimes challenging. We should say that this latter term applies to the observations made about the United States in a filmed interview with Prime Minister Nehru, of India, released in this country last Sunday.

"America is a great and powerful country," said Nehru, "but for my part, if I may say so with all modesty, I do not attach much importance to America's bombs.

"I do attach importance to a great vitality and a great integrity, which sometimes, if I may say so, points in the wrong direction—gets excited—but essentially gives it strength."

That is one of the kindest, one of the most thoughtful, and as we have said, one of the most challenging observations made about us in a long time. An interesting question is whether we deserve it. Of course, we feel that we do, still it is a fair criticism that for a period of years we have been placing almost all of our emphasis on material and military power, with sounds largely muted which stress our integrity, our Christian principles, our idealism, and our unselfish generosity.

Nehru continued by saying that America's real strength is deeper than its financial, industrial or technological strength and "the more that comes into play the happier it will be for the world."

Here is the voice of the successor and heir to the great Gandhi; the voice of an idealist, it is true, but a voice that summons us to greater appreciation of the strength of those things which are spiritual as opposed to those which are almost wholly materialistic. The thought has been voiced on numerous occasions that we must fight communism with ideas rather than with military or materialistic force.

That is the point which Nehru is emphasizing, and he is giving us credit for having ideas, ideals, and character. No greater compliment could be paid a people than to credit them with integrity in an age when the world is combatting the crass opportunism, infidelity to professed principles, and sheer selfish power of Communist Russia.

Because so much of our strength and effort has been concentrated on fighting these materialistic forces of communism; because we have been compelled again and again to meet force with force, we may have lost sight for the moment of the greatest power we possess and can use—the power of national character, built upon Christian faith and Christian ideals.

Nehru has gently but firmly—and with great generosity and tolerance—pointed to this dereliction. For that he deserves our thanks. We should profit from his kindly and adroit suggestion.

International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present Day Circumstances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in August last it was my privilege to represent the United States Government at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Helsinki, Finland. It was also my privilege to address the group there assembled on the subject International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present-Day Circumstances.

I have received from Finland requests for copies of the address I then delivered, and inasmuch as the address was rather informative in view of events which have developed since, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, as I listened to the brilliant report of the Rapporteur, the words of an American poet came to mind:

"Oft to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood
For the good or evil side.
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Shows each the bloom or blight,
So can choice be made by all men
Twist the darkness and the light."

And as I thought on these words I remembered what Dante said: "Give light and the people will find the way." I paused and asked myself, what is the meaning of the word "light" to this age, and the answer came—freedom and opportunity of nations and people.

Then a second thought flashed across my mind. It was from an American philosopher, "What you are, speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say." I again paused and applied that maxim to the state of the world today. You all have done the same. We've heard time and again that the world needs deeds that reflect wisdom and understanding, not honey words. Right deeds by the rulers of certain nations would cast out fear and misunderstanding that is so prevalent and dangerous to the peace of the world.

Then the words came to me "Have that mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." What did the Apostle mean? What is the meaning of that statement to this age? Was it not to build peace and faith in the minds of the peoples and rulers of earth? Was it not a mandate that men and nations should find the way to the light (spoken of by Dante) so that deeds instead of words would reflect the meaning of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Otherwise nations will not "break their swords into ploughshares" and cease to war any more.

I have just come from Geneva and have seen the exchange in a friendly and peaceful manner of ideas about mankind's new servant for peace and war—nuclear power. Today as representatives of the free parliaments of the world, we discuss a related subject, international security and disarmament.

More than 10 years ago when the Allied and Associated Powers met at Dumbarton to consider the first draft of the United Nations Charter, one of the great powers put forth a bold suggestion. It proposed that the postwar international organization be given an international air force to help in the maintenance of international peace. The proposal was never spelled out in detail. But in the light of President Eisenhower's suggestion at Geneva a few weeks ago that mutual air inspection might be a basis for assurance against surprise attack, it would be most interesting if the authors of the international air force proposal—the Russians—were to look back through their files to examine the details of that 1945 proposal.

The years since 1945 have been most disappointing with respect to the control of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations has had commissions working on these problems constantly. While the United Nations has not had authority to impose any disarmament system on member states, there is nothing in the charter that has prevented that organization from considering any kind of disarmament proposal. And as a matter of fact, the U. N. has done a thorough job of studying, although the results have been nil.

As one looks back at those early years after the war, he cannot help but be amazed at the boldness of some of the proposals that were submitted to the United Nations.

It will be recalled, for example, that at the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission in New York in 1946, the United States proposed the creation of an International Atomic Development Authority. It suggested that this international agency be given managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities which might be dangerous to world security and that the United Nations be given powers of inspection, of licensing, as well as authority to foster peaceful development of atomic energy. The United States proposal went so far as to call for the relinquishment of the veto with respect to matters relating to the control of atomic weapons and called for the destruction of existing atomic weapons once an adequate system of international control had been established.

Although this proposal became the basis of a plan that was approved by the vast majority of the members of the United Nations, it was rejected by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union for its part called for the immediate destruction of all atomic weapons as a condition precedent to the creation of any system of international control and inspection.

I need not labor the points of difference between the Soviet approach to the control of atomic and other weapons and the approach of most of the other members of the United Nations. Suffice it to say that the free world was not willing to destroy its stock of atomic weapons while the Soviet Union maintained its massed armies. The Soviet Union was not willing to reduce its armed forces in the race of the atomic stockpiles of the West. Hence it was that the production of and experimentation with atomic and hydrogen weapons went forward on both sides, uncontrolled.

And while this process of competitive arming went forward, it gradually became apparent to more and more of the people of

this earth, that a nuclear war might spell the death knell for mankind. It gradually became apparent that a small war anywhere might degenerate into a worldwide nuclear war. The atomic clock ticked faster and faster.

Thus it was that the armaments race went on unabated. Meanwhile, the demands of peoples throughout the world for a permanent and stable peace grew in strength. While tensions increased and armaments mounted, the nations of the world vied with each other in proposing peace plans. The Stockholm peace appeal was signed by millions—but international communism plotted the military conquest of Korea. The Soviet Union called for the abolition and destruction of atomic weapons—but it moved as rapidly as possible to develop those weapons.

The nations of the West united in NATO and perforce by their weakness in manpower, considered the use of atomic weapons should they be required to defend their lands from military attack. Atomic weapons have been included in that arsenal of the West as a substitute for manpower. No less than 175 divisions of soldiers have been mobilized in the Soviet Union. At the maximum, the nations of the West have had in the vicinity of 40 divisions at their service. There have been some who have objected to consideration of the use of atomic weapons in defense against attack. But in the absence of manpower, reliance has necessarily been placed on these weapons.

We know that the free world is spiritually and morally incapable of using such weapons against any people except in a defensive war. The United States never has been and never will be a party to aggression. But atomic weapons have necessarily been held in readiness to deter possible military aggression—a course of action which we know by experience the Communists are capable of following. It was Sir Winston Churchill who some years ago noted that it was the existence of atomic weapons that has prevented the Communists from attempting to capture Western Europe by force.

Fortunately for the state of the world, in recent weeks we have seen some relaxation of tensions. The about-face of the Soviet Union on the matter of the Austrian State Treaty, the relaxed affability of Soviet officials, an apparent willingness to take a fresh look at the disarmament problem, and the announced intention of Soviet reductions in her armed forces, have all been good signs.

But we must never, at our peril, forget the underlying questions. Why this about-face? Is the Kremlin sincere or trying a new tactic to achieve its old goal of domination? Is it sincerely motivated by a desire to coexist? Will the Soviet Union continue on its new course, or is this part of a military redeployment to put the free world into a position where a dagger may be plunged into the back of freemen?

I speak frankly because for 10 years the Soviet Union has given us reason to be suspicious. Our own interests require that we be skeptical of the motivation of a totalitarian regime famous for the agility of its diplomacy, and unrestrained by responsibility to a free and informed electorate.

There is no check in the Soviet system on the power of the officialdom of the Communist Party. Soviet officials have for years doomed the Soviet people to a distorted view of life. They have denied their people the truth that makes men free. Those in political bondage to the Soviet rulers have been told that Mr. Dulles started the Korean war and that the NATO alliance is designed to serve the purpose of warmongers. These lies have been repeated so often that even should the Soviet officials desire to change the course of their foreign policy, it will be years before they can undo the damage they have wreaked on their own people by denying them the truth.

I fervently hope in the months ahead that the leaders in the Kremlin will see the need for giving the facts to the common man—the man who must bear the burdens of war and whose needs for food and clothing and shelter cannot be satisfied during an armed peace. The common people deserve the truth. A stepped-up program of exchanges of persons and a greater willingness to print the facts in the daily press will help build understanding between the peoples of all nations.

It is essential I believe that in the months ahead we view Soviet proposals for disarmament with a healthy skepticism. The announcement a few days ago that the Soviet Union planned to reduce its armed forces by 640,000 men is indeed welcome. It may be the "earnest of good intentions" which is needed in the interests of the further reduction of international tension. But we must remember that during the last year the United States reduced its own armed forces by some 660,000 men without the flurry of propaganda that his accompanied the Soviet announcement. It must be remembered that the total strength of Soviet forces is not known but that it is estimated that there are still close to 5 million men in those forces and that they are augmented by some 1,250,000 men in the satellite nations. The number still largely exceeds those under arms in NATO.

It would be a fatal mistake at this time for the NATO nations to slacken their efforts to maintain and develop their defensive posture. We must remain strong while we seek in good faith a feasible, reliable, foolproof method of reducing the burden and the dangers of armament.

The heritage we guard is not our own. It is the heritage of individual freedom built on the sacrifices of our forebears and to be cherished and passed on to our children. We have a continuity of freedom to maintain if we are to be true to our trust.

Despite our deepest desires, it would be a most grievous mistake for us to accept without the most searching inquiry the sweetness and light that has exuded in the last few weeks from the Soviet Union. We must not without further proof accept it as an indication of a profound change of heart. As was remarked recently, it is toughness in deeds, not words, that counts. We must not hastily recast the very policies that have finally brought home to the Soviet leaders the dangerous ground they tread.

While Soviet foreign policy can be changed overnight, the policies of free nations based on the fundamental desire of their people to establish a world of peace and security in which individual freedom may thrive, cannot be a will-o'-the-wisp policy. A free nation cannot chart its course by the light of each passing ship. It must not confuse the light of the passing ship with a star. Its foreign policy must be based on the veritable truths that freedom is hard to achieve, and easy to lose—that actions speak louder than words—and that man must be master of the state, not its servant.

There can be no doubt that the United States in reversing the policy held by nations, "to the victor belongs the spoils," to the policy "to the victor belongs the obligation to reconstruct," was searching for a way to peace. The United States will continue to search for a method to reduce international tension, to reduce armament, to control atomic weapons, hoping that a way to peace will open up.

Last spring President Eisenhower created a post in the Cabinet of the United States charged with the one duty of developing practical disarmament proposals. He put in charge of that operation the man who for the past 3 years has been charged with full responsibility for our mutual assistance program.

Even earlier, the President proposed that steps be taken to break the stalemate in the control of atomic energy by his plan to proceed with the exchange of information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. As evidence of our good faith we have offered to give fissionable material to an international atomic authority.

And most recently at Geneva, President Eisenhower in the utmost candor proposed a system of air inspection of air bases, ports, and rail centers, which might be used as bases for the launching of surprise attack. I have noted in the press of the last few days that General Twining, the highest ranking Air Force officer in the United States—a member of our joint chiefs of staff—has endorsed the proposal, thus indicating the seriousness with which we have entered upon implementing the President's proposal. I am sure that at the forthcoming meeting of the Disarmament Commission in New York we will see further elaboration of this plan.

Finally, the resolution before us recommends to the various parliaments that they keep themselves properly informed on the progress of disarmament negotiations and keep the public of their countries informed of progress in the field. The United States Senate this past session created a special Committee to study proposals for disarmament. That Committee, of which I am a member, will not only keep itself informed of developments in the field of disarmament, but it will actively and vigorously seek, in cooperation with the President, to develop fresh approaches to the control of these weapons which threaten mankind.

We are deadly in earnest in our search for a peaceful world. While, as I have indicated, the American people view recent Soviet turnabouts with a certain skepticism, we will spare no effort in trying to find ways to reduce armaments.

Fellow delegates, I would not want my candor in these remarks to be construed as indicating undue pessimism with the state of the world and the prospects for disarmament. Alexis de Tocqueville, the French philosopher of the last century who wrote so understandingly of democracy in America, said that without common beliefs no society can exist. Common beliefs are basic to a cohesive society.

I believe we may now be in the process of developing common understandings that can be the basis of the peaceful development of an international community. We now understand that modern war does not merely threaten mankind, it can destroy mankind. This is a situation comprehensible not only to good men, but to bad men. It is comprehensible to democracies and to dictatorships, to free men and to men in political bondage. Will the fear of destruction beget the wisdom to outlaw war? Will mankind broaden his horizon to see the grander view of peace?

President Eisenhower has stated that "there is no alternative to peace." It is the basis of Sir Winston Churcill's remarks that the terror of atomic weapons will force peace upon us.

Despite my admonitions and skepticism, we may be in the process of achieving what the scientists describe as a "breakthrough." As a result of the fear of war and mankind's search for a broader view, the way may open up. We must now seek to exploit every opportunity to reach a modus vivendi—an understanding—which will make it possible for mankind to resume his often interrupted climb toward the good life.

I believe I speak for the American people when I say that my country will never cease in its search for peace with freedom.

The words of a great common man of the people, Abraham Lincoln, come to mind: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present."

God grant that the nations will breed leaders who will recognize the truth of this statement as applicable to the changed and changing world of today.

The same American poet that I quoted in the beginning wrote:

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient creeds uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of Truth,
And serenely down the future
See the thought of men incline
To the side of perfect justice
And to God's supreme design."
—*James Russell Lowell.*

What's Wrong With Our Propaganda?—Is USIA Adequately Answering the Voice of the Kremlin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 22, 1956, carried an article by one of its foreign correspondents, C. L. Sulzberger, which asks "What's Wrong With Western Propaganda?"

Writing from Berlin, Germany, Mr. Sulzberger states that F. Bowen Evans, in a study of Russian propaganda, concludes that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. He says the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Former Senator William Benton, who recently visited the Soviet Union, prepared some observations on "the voice of the Kremlin" for the Encyclopedia Brittannica's 1956 Book of the Year. Benton writes:

At its most ambitious, the aim of Soviet propaganda is so daring that we in the West can hardly comprehend it; so to condition its citizens that they think of their personal freedom and their personal ambitions as identical with the purposes of Soviet society * * * in Russia the rulers seek to convert the total culture into a giant propaganda apparatus. * * *

This is a struggle of a new type, to be waged with new weapons. It is a struggle for which the Western World is little prepared. It boils down to an effort by two great opposing forces to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples. * * * Russia cannot match us in the export of automobiles, tractors or business machines. She proposes to beat us with her ideas and her trained manpower.

A FAITH IN ULTIMATE VALUES

Having set forth this information for our consideration Mr. Sulzberger continues as follows:

But it is questionable whether our propaganda has successfully faced this challenge. The West German Government has published a commentary complaining that we emphasize material things too much. We have allowed the initiative in the realm of spiritual ideas to remain largely in the very materialistic hands of comunism. "Are we," asks Bonn, "ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrifices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that in no way is dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future well-being, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire Western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned—freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion.

There is no sign that the powers of the West have sought seriously to analyze the problem of their propaganda and to coordinate efforts in presenting their case abroad.

THE RUSSIAN CHALLENGE CAN BE MET

In his budget message on January 16 this year the President recommended a modest increase in appropriations for the educational-exchange programs of the Department of State which, he said, "constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world. These programs bring to this country leaders of public opinion and facilitate the mutual exchange of students, teachers, and research scholars. In addition to appropriated funds, part of the foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad will be used to meet certain overseas costs of educational exchange."

The President's budget request for these strategic and highly important educational-exchange programs of the Department of State which, in the President's own words, "constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world" is being considered by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

In my statement to the House Appropriations Committee on Tuesday, February 21, 1956, I said that I could not personally attest to the exact amount of money needed for this important program. The President's budget request is for $20 million. I am sure that this is not enough, but I hope that the subcommittee will at least give the President every penny he requested.

The New York Times pointed out on December 12, 1955, that the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange recommended $31 million for this program. The distinguished educators and businessmen, appointed by the President of the United States as an advisory body on this program, certainly know what they are talking about. They know the program from a professional as well as an operating standpoint so they are in a position to make an accurate recommendation.

I shudder to think what the Russians and Red Chinese are spending on this type of thing. From all reports I see on their activities it must be a tremendous amount.

We should not attempt to get into direct and blatant competition with the Communists in this field but we should be willing to invest whatever amount is necessary to demonstrate our willingness to carry on our international relations on the highest plane possible.

I do not know what prompted the Secretary of State to disregard the Advisory Commission's recommendation that $31 million be allocated to this important program. I would personally concur in that amount, or even a much larger amount, for these activities.

I hope that the House Appropriations Subcommittee will agree with my estimate of the value of this program to our international relations effort and that it will recommend a substantial increase over the $18 million which it approved last year.

While the President recommended only a modest increase of $2 million for activities which constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world he recommended that the $89,218,895 available to the United States Information Agency in fiscal year 1956 in appropriations and obligations be increased by $48 million.

The vast difference between these two recommendations which follow each other in the budget message typifies the Madison Avenue approach to the problems of the world, an approach to world problems which is the hallmark and the most distinguishing characteristic of the present Republican administration.

AN ANSWER TO THE VOICE OF THE KREMLIN

Concerned as I am with these exchange programs which include the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, the interchange of persons under the technical assistance programs carried on by the International Cooperation Administration, and the cultural presentations programs of the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs, I have developed a measure which I am convinced will contribute importantly to the development of adequate answers to the voice of the Kremlin. This is a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, "to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs."

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, author of one of the great acts of Congress on exchange of persons, has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure.

In the House Members who have joined with me in sponsoring the joint resolution include Representatives HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, DON HAYWORTH, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., B. F. SISK, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and HERBERT ZELENKO.

I include as part of my remarks two articles from the New York Times referred to earlier in my remarks:

[From the New York Times of December 9, 1955]

INCREASE SOUGHT IN EXCHANGE FUND—ADVISERS ASK $31 MILLION TO STEP UP PROGRAM AND OFFSET GENEVA FAILURE

WASHINGTON, December 8.—The Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange recommended today a $13 million increase next year in the State Department's exchange program.

This would bring the total appropriation asked of Congress to $31 million. The recommendation was prompted by the breakdown in cultural interchange negotiations with the Soviet Government at the Geneva conference of foreign ministers.

The Commission, appointed by the President, acts as an advisory body within the State Department.

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, commission chairman, said: "It is evident that the Soviets have not changed their major strategy but are practicing deliberate fraud as shown through their refusal to negotiate on major issues at Geneva.

"This continued attitude increases the challenge to the United States to cooperate with all free peoples in the free interchange of persons and ideas."

He said that by increasing the program the Government would stimulate private organizations and educational institutions to step up interchange programs.

Mrs. Anna L. Rose Hawkes, commission member who is also president of the American Association of University Women, said that the association would increase its efforts along this line. It spent $100,000 this year in bringing 39 women from 22 foreign countries to study in the United States. It also provided 10 graduate fellowships for specialized work by foreign women students.

Mrs. Hawkes said the proposed increase in funds should go largely to projects aimed at bringing to this country leaders of thought and opinion.

"That is the best way to convince them of our motives," she said. "They go back and say: 'The United States is not warmongering. I have been there and I know.'"

The other members of the commission, which has just finished a 2-day meeting, are Arthur H. Edens, president of Duke University; Arthur A. Hauck, president of the University of Maine, and Laird Bell, Chicago attorney.

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1956]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—WHAT'S WRONG WITH WESTERN PROPAGANDA

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BERLIN, February 21—The greatest proof of the fallacy of Marxism is, curiously enough, the existence of the Soviet Union. For Karl Marx foresaw the triumph of his theory first in highly industrial countries like Germany or England. Yet what we call communism came initially to power in underdeveloped Russia, where it assumed the form, not of socialism but of the most massive state capitalism known to history. And the next outstanding triumph of the Marxist legend was in backward China.

Despite such glaring inconsistencies, Marx' latter-day prophets extol the "scientific" immutability of their dialectical materialism and insist it must logically inherit the earth. But the Communists themselves continually modify this "proven" doctrine. Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, Tito and Mao Tse-tung have each reinterpreted the credo. Now Khrushchev is the latest to amend accepted dogma.

Nevertheless, by blandly ignoring these constant fluctuations, Soviet propaganda seeks to convey the impression of a basic logic that progresses unalterably toward an inescapable end. Lenin, who brilliantly grasped what was helpful to him in Marx, taught that "propaganda is of crucial importance." Modern means of applying this dictum have been carefully coordinated by the Moscow monolith.

PROPAGANDA BUREAUCRACY

F. Bowen Evans, in a study of the subject, concludes that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. He says the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Former Senator William Benton, who recently visited the Soviet Union, prepared some observations on "the voice of the Kremlin" for the Encyclopaedia Brittannica's 1956 Book of the Year. He writes:

At its most, ambition, the aim of Soviet propaganda is so daring that we in the West can hardly comprehend it; so to condition its citizens that they think of their personal freedom and their personal ambitions as identical with the purposes of Soviet society * * * in Russia the rulers seek to convert the total culture into a giant propaganda apparatus * * *.

"This is a struggle of a new type, to be waged with new weapons. It is a struggle for which the Western World is little prepared. It boils down to an effort by two great opposing forces to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples * * * Russia cannot match us in the export of automobiles, tractors, or business machines. She proposes to beat us with her ideas and her trained manpower."

A FAITH IN ULTIMATE VALUES

But it is questionable whether our progaganda has succesesfully faced this challenge. The West German Government has published a commentary complaining that we emphasize material things too much. We have allowed the initiative in the realm of spiritual ideas to remain largely in the very materialistic hands of communism. "Are we," asks Bonn, "ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief, and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrfices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that in no way is dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future wellbeing, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire Western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned—freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion."

There is no sign that the powers of the West have sought seriously to analyze the problem of their propaganda and to coordinate efforts in presenting their case abroad. We remain constantly on the defensive, permitting the Kremlin's experts to exploit the very evident chinks in our imperfect armor. Thus, the tragic convolutions of the United States attempt to obliterate segregation feature the front pages of the world where Autherine Lucy is now a well-known name. What has already been accomplished in the name of Jeffersonian democracy remains forgotten. Britain's embarrassing attitude on Cyprus erases from popular memory her deeds in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Only when Moscow acts openly with brutal menace do the free powers respond in concert and remember that the essential contradictions of our time are those between themselves and communism. In periods of relaxation we tend to forget the need to constantly reassert the inner meaning of our ideology. This is a dangerous lack. Surely there are enough beneficial aspects in the democratic system, whatever imperfections it may have, to merit retelling to a redundant point.

Simple facts bear frequent repetition. As Pericles told Athens: "We are superior to our enemies * * * our city is open to the world * * * we live freely, and yet we face the same dangers as readily as they * * * those men surely should be deemed bravest who know most clearly what danger is and what pleasure is and are not made thereby to flinch."

Educational Television in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the last 2 years Alabama has been making history in educational television with a State-supported network that soon will carry its programs to the entire State. The story of this development and the purposes behind it is told in an article appearing recently in the magazine State Government. The article was written by Raymond D. Hurlbert, who was the first president of the Alabama Educational Television Commission and now is its general manager. Mr. Hurlbert for many years was chairman of the public-relations committee of the Birmingham schools and is past president of the Alabama Education Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Educational Television in Alabama," written by Mr. Hurlbert, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IN ALABAMA

(By Raymond D. Hurlbert)

During the last 2 years Alabama has been making history in educational television, with a State-supported network that soon will carry its programs to the entire State. The story of its development and the purposes behind it are told in an article appearing recently in State Government by Raymond D. Hurlbert, who was the first president of the Alabama Educational Television Commission and now is its general manager. Mr. Hurlbert for many years was chairman of the public relations committee of the Birmingham schools. He is past president of the Alabama Education Association.

Alabama, with the Nation's most extensive State network in operation, is setting a pattern in educational television.

The Alabama Educational Television Commission has obtained three very high frequency channels from the Federal Communications Commission, a unique achievement. It has put two stations in operation, with programs coming from three studios, and it is almost ready to begin construction of the third station. When this station is completed the network will cover Alabama and sections of neighboring States.

This achievement represents hard work, cooperation and teamwork of many Alabama citizens who believe educational television to be of great potential importance to the people. To repeat a summary we made to the National Association of Educational Broadcasters in New York near the outset of our work:

"We believe that Alabama is a great State—rich in natural resources, but our great need is to raise the per capita income of her citizens through education. We believe that educational television is a providential medium for increasing the general knowledge and culture of our people. We believe that the differences in adequacy, between urban and rural education can be diminished * * * that the people in impoverished and remote areas of our State will now have educational advantages which will bring new meaning to 'equal opportunity' in

education. We believe that educational television will better our communities, increase our income, enhance our culture and strengthen our democracy."

Also, with the shortage of teachers and mounting costs of education an acute problem, many believe that our program may be instrumental in making education more economical for the people of Alabama.

The Alabama Educational Television Commission, selected by Former Gov. Gordon Persons in 1953, was given the authority and an appropriation by the legislature to set up its system in a manner deemed best to serve the State. The network has developed step by step on the basis of principles closely adhered to by the commission. The Birmingham News has summarized editorially:

"Alabamians are justified in feeling pride over the fact that their State is the first to obtain permission for statewide coverage by educational television. It means that the State is getting in on the ground floor of a technique whose potentialities we still can only guess at. But we are tackling the matter boldly and constructively and in time."

As one commissioner states, "We made big plans and kept high standards." At the outset, the commission obtained as consultants for its first 2 years the firm of Norton & Holt in order to have the best possible technical, business and professional advice; the law firm, Hogan & Hartson, for legal service; and A. D. Ring & Associates, television consulting engineers.

Topflight engineers, although expensive, were put in charge of station construction. Long before construction was completed, the commission began planning for programing. Rudy Bretz was employed as program consultant. Author of books on television and dean of a television training school in New York, he was well qualified to begin training personnel for programing. Mr. Bretz held studio classes and workshops for high school students and adults in various communities, for training in programing, and to acquaint them with television equipment and the duties of cameramen, floor managers, mike room operators, directors, switcher and performers.

The commission contracted with three agencies, each of which has its own studios, for the network programs: The University of Alabama, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, and the Greater Birmingham Area Educational Television Association, Inc.

The commission set up a program board and delegated to it the responsibility for programing policy. Its members are the heads of the three programing agencies and the State superintendent of education, all of them eminent in education. The board president, Dr. C. C. Carmichael, is president of the University of Alabama, the Carnegie Foundation and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Other members are Dr. Frazer Banks, superintendent of Birmingham schools; Dr. Ralph Draughon, president of Alabama Polytechnic Institute; and Dr. Austin Meadows, State superintendent of schools.

It is the position of the commission that educational television is an extension of public education and that, therefore, the same general principles which govern teaching in the public schools also apply to television teaching. It is anxious to safeguard programs from political or propaganda purposes and wishes to have the agencies as autonomous as possible in programing and operation. With these ends in view, the commission believes that the establishment of the program board and the contracting for programs with the three agencies are the best possible arrangement for programing the network.

Since all stations of the network carry the same program, each agency is responsible for only one-third of programing time. The schedule varies, of course, according to conditions. Agreement on it is worked out by the directors of the three agencies in cooperation with the AETC program coordinator.

Within each programing agency there is a local executive committee. Dr. J. R. Morton, dean of the university's extension division, and Graydon Ausmus, director of the university's radio-television activities, represent the University of Alabama. Programing at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, at Auburn, is under the direction of Auburn's local committee, consisting of Dr. David Mullins, vice president of the school, and Ed Wegener, director of radio-television activities. For the Birmingham area programing is under a local committee consisting of Dr. J. W. Letson, superintendent of Bessemer City schools, and Mr. Bretz, the consultant to the network in its formative stages.

The director of each agency was chosen for outstanding ability. All are well known in television circles throughout the country. The commission's coordinator, Pat Smithdeal, a former member of the radio-television education department at Stephens College, and production manager of a commercial television station, works with the directors of the three agencies and assists with the organization of each day's programing schedule for the network.

State headquarters for the AETC are in the Protective Life Building, in Birmingham, where business is conducted by the president of the commission, Milton Cummings; the general manager; the chief engineer, Orbra Harrell; the program coordinator, Miss Pat Smithdeal; and the office manager, Mrs. Madge Law.

Five "levels of cooperation" have evolved in the commission's organization. There is the commission, the program board, the program board advisory committee, the three programing agencies, and finally the programing agency executive committee. Splendid cooperation within the organization, from the press, the State's commercial television and the citizens of Alabama, is making the project a success.

Our educational television, as indicated, has been developed as another facet of public education, entitled to support with public funds. Thus, it is protected from misuse by selfish interests, public or private. Public education is accustomed to steering clear of such influences and to operating in a democratic manner, answerable to the people. Educational television in Alabama, as a logical and normal development in educational history, will extend present school facilities, expedite learning, and disseminate hidden knowledge which represents an investment of millions of dollars in agencies, laboratories, museums, and libraries.

The commission believes that educational TV is economical public education in terms of capital outlay, operational cost, and number of people served. It says: "Compare the cost of building a television station to that of building a high school or a dormitory, and then think of the people educational television will serve, compared to the number who will use the high school or the dormitory."

Money is spent only after careful and long-range planning as well as expert technical and professional advice. The system is operated with very definite cost accounting, and equipment money is carefully spent, not for frills but for high quality. Programing is financed with appropriations by the legislature for that specific purpose as requested by the agency.

All of this has been a very rapid development, as a chronological summary will indicate.

The history of the commission began when the legislature on June 15, 1953, provided $500,000 to build and operate an educational television station atop Mount Cheaha, with an elevation of 2,407 feet, the highest point in Alabama. Within the month, Governor Persons appointed the Alabama commission and announced plans for the station. He staggered the terms of commission members from 2 to 10 years.

On March 19, 1954, the FCC approved the construction of channel 7 to be located on Mount Cheaha at Munford. In the same month, the AETC asked the FCC to assign channel 2 to Andalusia as a part of the State's educational network.

During this time, the Greater Birmingham Area Educational Television Association, composed of five public-school systems, was applying to the FCC for channel 10 in Birmingham. In May 1954, Dr. Banks, superintendent of the Birmingham schools and chairman of the Greater Birmingham Area Educational Television Association, withdrew their application and requested that the AETC be allocated channel 10. The State Television Commission in turn applied for channel 10, with the understanding that the greater Birmingham association would become a programing agency, contributing programs to the AETC network.

Things began to snowball at this point. In May 1954 the Storer Broadcasting Co., owners of WBRC–TV, Birmingham, donated telecasting equipment valued at $200,000 to the AETC. In addition to the equipment, it furnished housing for the transmitter and the use of studios atop Red Mountain in Birmingham. The commercial station WABT offered the use of its studios and installed a cable between its station and the educational station. The finest relationships and cooperation have been maintained by the AETC with commercial stations in the State. The commercial stations and the AETC have cooperated in various programs and expect to do more on programs of public interest in the future.

In September 1954 the FCC approved channel 2, Andalusia, which had been contested by a commercial organization. On October 13, 1954, channel 10 was approved for educational television in Birmingham.

In addition to the $500,000 appropriated by the legislature and the $200,000 in equipment from Storer Broadcasting Co., the Alabama State Building Commission appropriated $403,000 for construction of buildings and facilities for the educational network. The University of Alabama received $100,000 from the fund for adult education for additional studio equipment, supplementing that which the State was providing.

On January 7, 1955, channel 7, WTIQ–TV went on the air at 7 in the evening, completing the first link in the chain of stations that are to encompass the State. Its debut brought another $10,000 from the Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co., as 1 of the first 10 educational stations in the Nation.

Shortly after completion of channel 7, channel 10, WBIQ–TV, went on the air April 28, 1955. The two channels began carrying educational programs simultaneously. Channel 7 operates with a power of 316,000 watts visual, 191,000 watts aural; channel 10 with 18,600 watts aural and 30,900 watts visual. Plans are under way for construction of channel 2, to complete the third link, which will operate with 60,300 watts aural and 100,000 watts visual.

Programing on the Alabama network is now in high gear. It is gaining momentum all the time. Programs include inschool and afterschool viewing for children and features for teen-agers and adults. A great variety of programs are serving the citizens culturally, seeking to educate and inform through interesting and entertaining presentations.

The variety is very wide. For example, by viewing certain of the AETC programs one may study Macbeth, learn how to take a cow's temperature, have pertinent legal questions answered by a panel of attorneys, know the best food buys of the week, learn from a

physician the latest methods of child care, or study German. As a need is felt in a given area, a program is created that is felt to be capable of satisfying that need. New programs are constantly in rehearsal, then making their appearances in the living rooms of thousands.

The Greater Birmingham Area Educational Television Association, Inc., is doing systematic teaching in the primary classrooms with its program Learning Is Fun. Lessons follow the five phases of learning as prescribed in the Alabama State course of study. Handbooks have been published and distributed to all primary teachers in the State in order to coordinate classroom work with the program. The director-producer and series planner are very capable women, and the teachers on the program are some of the best primary teachers in Birmingham.

The Alabama Polytechnic Institute began contributing to the network on October 3, 1955, with 7 half hours of live programing a week. Its programs are in the areas of agriculture, home economics, veterinary medicine, books, and gardening. Auburn has excellent production facilities.

The University of Alabama joined the network October 31, 1955, with programs covering great literature, music, Government, small-business problems, home workshop, and special events. A recent live telecast from the university's studio of Puccini's opera, La Boheme, by the University Music Department and Opera Workshop, is believed to be the first live telecast of a complete opera on educational television. It was enthusiastically viewed by a large State audience.

On February 18, 1955, the educational network carried its first spectacular. Nearly 100 people, including a ballet company, 2 choirs and a dramatic group participated in a 90-minute show based on Birmingham's Festival of Arts. Prize winning works of Alabama artists, poets, writers, composers, architects, choreographers, flower arrangers and photographers were included in the show, produced by Fred Woodress, and directed by Rudy Bretz.

Besides a variety of live programs from the three agencies, the network also shows film from the Ann Arbor Center in Michigan—kinescopes of the best educational programs from other educational stations.

The University of Alabama has in its fine new studio one of the few kinescope recorders in the country, and Alabama plans to send kines of its best live programs to other educational stations.

Many civic and cultural organizations already are giving programs over the network, and still others are planning to do so. For example, the American Association of University Women has presented a series featuring cultural events and activities, and the Birmingham Bar Association has presented a popular weekly program, You're the Jury.

The 1955 session of the legislature continued the State's financial support, appropriating funds for operational costs in the current biennium.

Thus credit for the success of Alabama educational TV must go to many citizens of Alabama—former Governor Persons, Gov. James E. Folsom, the legislature, far-sighted citizens and educators, presidents of cultural and civic organizations mayors of many towns, our Congressmen and Senators in Washington, members of the AETC itself and of its State organization, volunteer workers, the Alabama press, and the commercial stations.

The philosophy behind the development of educational television in Alabama has been very important in shaping the whole program. If what we were already doing in public education is sound, then it is sound to use television to bring it to more people. On this basis, noncommercial educational television will live and grow, for there is a popular hunger today for general information, systematic learning, and intellectual and cultural entertainment.

Educational television is not intended to replace older methods, but merely to supplement them, and to give countless thousands educational opportunities who would not otherwise have them.

In our country and in our times, educational television is the best practicable means for informing the electorate and increasing public understanding. It should be a providential instrument for insuring the perpetuation of our democratic society.

Vice President Nixon's Lincoln Day Speech

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON's Lincoln Day speech in New York was a surprising performance in view of the recently initiated program to put over the new model RICHARD NIXON. The speech was delivered at the 70th annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club. The new NIXON was to be a man of integrity, moderation, a man who was especially concerned with the accuracy of his statements. However, in his Lincoln Day speech, NIXON reverted to type.

He demonstrated, in this speech, his characteristic disregard for fact, his characteristic use of misrepresentation and misleading and distorted statements. This was a speech by the man who is said to bring new meaning to the office of Vice President. What this new meaning really and specifically is has never been fully explained. It is indicated that this Vice President has a greater part in the function of the executive offices and in the Cabinet than had other Vice Presidents.

Three explanations exist to his new vice-presidential activity: First, that he is ineffective in the Senate; second, that the President needs help; and, third, that something has to be done with NIXON.

After a few introductory remarks, the Vice President launched into a recital of the present state of affairs under the Republicans as compared to those under previous Democratic administrations. "Think back," he said, "to what we left behind. Three years ago there was a war in Korea." Yet, the Vice President forgot to mention that negotiations began at Kaesong on July 10, 1951, were transferred to Panmunjom on October 25, 1951, and continued there until the armistice on July 27, 1953.

"Federal controls," continued the Vice President, "stifled our economy." This statement is contrary to the facts in the President's Economic Report of 1956, which shows that corporate profits in the last 3 years under President Truman were $5 billion higher than in the 3 years under President Eisenhower. Gross investment was the same during the last 3 Truman years as it has been in the 3 Republican years. Under the Democratic administration, defense spending, a support to the economy, was $10 billion less than under the Republicans.

"Every day," stated Vice President NIXON, "the people's take-home pay, pensions, and insurance were buying less and less at the corner store." Presumably the Vice President is referring to the cost of living. Again, his statement is contradicted by reports issued by the present administration. The cost of living rose but slightly after the Democratic President was given emergency powers, and it had actually started to decrease in November 1952. Except for the first 3 months after the Republicans took over the administration, the cost of living has never dropped beneath its low point of January 1953, when the Democrats left office. One reason that the overall cost of living has not risen more drastically is that the price of food has been consistently declining, which fact partly compensates for the higher costs of other goods—in addition to medical care, housing, rent. Also, for those in our country engaged in agriculture, costs have steadily risen while prices have steadily declined.

From 1942 to 1946, a Democratic President, with emergency powers, and the Democratic Congresses kept the cost-of-living increase to only 23 points on the old consumer price index. On the other hand, the Republican 80th Congress refused to consider a rational abandonment of presidential emergency powers, and the cost of living jumped 32.4 points from 1946 to 1948. It is clear that it was in this period of 2 years under the Republican Congress that the main assault was made on the "people's take-home pay, pensions, and insurance." It was not in the early fifties.

The Vice President also stated that when the Republicans took over in 1953:

> All over Washington plans were underway to socialize and federalize America's farmers, the medical profession, housing, schools, and power, including the atom.

Yet he mentioned no evidence to support this sweeping generalization.

RICHARD NIXON continued, saying:

> Most distressing of all, a great majority of the American people—Democrats and Republicans alike—had lost faith in the honesty, the integrity, and the reliability of those who served them in Government.

But he makes no reference to the intensive campaign of the Republicans to create this very attitude.

Then, after describing the world situation under the Democrats, the Vice President dismissed the present situation by saying that "for the first time in 15 years the world is at peace." Perhaps he merely overlooked the facts that the French Premier has just been stoned in Morocco, that there is trouble in Algeria, that violent action has just occurred in Cyprus, that the Arabs and the Jews are feuding in the Middle East, that serious tension exists in Formosa, in Korea, and in Indochina. He also neglected to mention that the Democrats successful met similar difficult situations in Greece, Indonesia, Palestine, Kashmir, and Berlin between 1946 and 1950.

Returning to the domestic scene, Mr. NIXON asserted that "the American people have had the biggest tax cut in history." This is a misrepresentation that has been repeated so often in the last several years that the Republicans themselves are beginning to believe it. As a matter of fact, the Republican-claimed $7.4 billion tax reduction breaks down in this way: $3 billion reduction in individual income taxes; $2 billion reduction resulting from the repeal of the corporation excess-profits tax; $1 billion reduction in excise taxes; and $1.4 billion reduction resulting from the new codification of the tax laws.

This $3 billion reduction in individual income taxes resulted from the automatic expiration date fixed by the Democratic 82d Congress when they passed the Revenue Act of 1951. The Democratic 81st Congress had scheduled the expiration of the excess-profits tax, which the Republicans had extended for 6 months in the 83d Congress. The $1 billion reduction in excise taxes had been proposed as a relief measure by the Democrats, but had been opposed by the administration. The $1.4 billion revenue reduction occasioned by the codification of the tax laws in 1954 was, in a sense, accidental, since in debate over this bill the Republicans emphasized that the bill provided tax revision, not tax reduction. It is this last "accidental" reduction that the Republicans can justly claim as their own, plus the $2 billion reduction in excess-profits taxes on corporations which they had previously extended.

The Vice President continued his story:

For the first time since the Republican 80th Congress we not only have already achieved a balanced budget, but our Republican President has submitted a balanced budget for next year as well.

This statement is false. In fiscal year 1951, under the Democrats, the publication Economic Indicators shows that the net revenue was $47.6 billion and expenditures were $44.1 billion. In addition, the Vice President gives credit to the 80th Congress for a surplus in 1948, but this surplus was administered by a Democratic President. If the Vice President were consistent, he would have to give credit to the Democratic Congress now for any possible surplus in fiscal year 1957.

Mr. NIXON takes great credit for the administration's management of the budget in fiscal year 1956. But, in fact, the administration predicted a deficit of $2.4 billion for 1956, and their prediction was proved false by an unpredicted increase in revenue. Still this 1956 budget is not balanced, since the House has just had to pass an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. The Senate has yet to act on this measure. When fiscal year 1956 is finally closed, and all of the bills are paid, then it will be time to claim a balanced budget. At the present time, the Vice President is a little too quick to skip over the over 4 months remaining in fiscal 1956.

For Mr. NIXON to state that the President has submitted a balanced budget for fiscal year 1957 is again misleading. The President's budget is as yet no more than a "paper" budget, not one of fact. There is evidence to believe that some of the estimates in the President's budget proposals are somewhat unrealistic. His proposed expenditures fail to include those for an adequate farm program that has been promised or for the needed highway program. The expenses for the Tennessee Valley Authority are listed outside of the budget. The President assumes that there will be an increase in postal rates. He also assumes a fairly conservative level of revenue. Yet, if the budget is to be really balanced, this level of revenue will have to be increased by higher tax collections.

It is also strange that RICHARD NIXON, as well as other Republicans, should boast of a budget containing expenditures in excess of $65 billion, when they consistently criticized President Truman for budgets in the $30 billions before the Korean emergency. During the Truman administrations, including the years of the Korean emergency, the national debt was decreased $13.1 billion. Under the Republicans it has increased over $8 billion. The all-time high for the national debt was reached under the Republicans when the debt reached over $280 billion in 1955.

Vice President NIXON went on to say that as a result of the economic policies of the Republicans the Nation was enjoying the greatest prosperity in history. The only new economic policies of the Republicans were the "hard money" policy, which they were forced to abandon quickly at great cost to the Government; special tax treatment for persons owning business stocks; and consumer credit inflation.

The Vice President continued to say that "plans for socializing American institutions have been filed in the wastebasket." He then said that the Republicans were offering more social services than the Democrats ever dreamed of, and he listed them, but he failed to distinguish how these Republican social services differed from the Democratic "socialistic" services. He might have mentioned that the Republicans are offering more socialized schools, more socialized highways, more socialized hospitals, more socialized child welfare, more socialized health insurance, improved socialized working conditions, higher socialized 90-cent minimum wage standards, and more socialized homes. Under the Democrats, such programs would have been branded as "socialistic," but under the Republicans Mr. NIXON terms them "social services." A fine distinction.

He continued:

And, probably most important, we have restored dignity, honesty, integrity, and dependability in public service to our Government in Washington, D. C.

He failed to mention the civil servants outside of Washington. He overlooked the security "numbers game," which has gone far to demoralize the civil service. And, most of all, he forgot to mention such Republican influence dispensers as Roberts, Talbott, and Strobel.

But he continued:

On the basis of this record, I am going to make some categorical claims which I think cannot be questioned.

His first claim was that—

Never has an administration kept its promises more faithfuly than this administration.

A look at the 1952 Republican platform shows these promises. A look at the present record shows how faithfully they have been kept. The platform promises "the development of a sound farm program—a prosperous agriculture with free and independent farmers is fundamental to the national interest." Under this "sound" program, many farmers have left their farms, the costs of farming have risen while farm prices have steadily fallen. The platform "favors" statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. We still have but 48 States. The platform promises a "reduction of expenditures by the elimination of waste and extravagance so that the budget will be balanced and a general tax reduction can be made." The latest budget proposals ask for $65 billions in expenditures. No Eisenhower budget has yet been balanced in fact, only on paper and in press releases. The platform promises that "We will aid small business in every practicable way." Since the last half of 1952, small business profits are down 66 percent, while big business profits are up 46 percent. Small business investors' returns went down 57 percent, while big business investors' returns went up 36 percent. Small business failures are up 36 percent. The platform states: "Our goal is a reduced national debt." The debt is higher than any previous peacetime high. The platform looks "happily forward to the genuine independence of captive peoples." Austria has been released from Soviet domination, but John Foster Dulles paid tribute on the occasion of the Austrian independence to the work of his Democratic predecessor, Dean Acheson. The platform promises more. The record shows a similar record of achievement.

The Vice President made another claim:

Never has an administration done a better job for all the people than this administration.

The record shows that some of the poeple have done well under this administration, but others have not done so well, or have done very badly. Corporate profits are up 26 percent. Corporation take-home pay was up 115 percent for U. S. Steel, up 74 percent for Alcoa, up 49 percent for General Motors; up generally 10 percent for stockholders. The average worker's income was up only 7 percent. This take-home pay was up only 3 percent. The farmer's income is down 11 percent. Big business failures are down 15 percent; small business failures are up 21 percent. Mr. NIXON states that "There are, of course, some who do not share our enthusiasm for this record." This is a true statement, and the Vice President should have full credit for it.

Mr. NIXON next criticized Adlai Stevenson for his criticism of the Republican foreign policy:

We find Mr. Stevenson has trouble even agreeing with himself. I know what a difficult time he must be having to find any honest legitimate grounds on which to criticize President Eisenhower and his leadership.

Mr. NIXON complained of Adlai Stevenson's criticism of the results of the Geneva Conference, and his criticism of John Foster Dulles' "brink of war" philosophy. Mr. NIXON seems to have forgotten the glowing phrases he used in speaking of Geneva before it took place. And again he must have forgotten the considerably more sober statements made by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles after the Conference ended. The President, upon his return from Geneva, cautiously stated that we had only made a begining and a month later he warned against the "pottage of a false peace." The Wall Street Journal stated about Geneva that the Russians have won "victory for a smile." Roscoe Drummond in the New York Herald Tribune wrote that the Kremlin has "now got all it wants for nothing." No one ever termed either of these papers organs of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Stevenson was certainly not alone in deploring the "brink of war" philosophy enunciated by Secretary Dulles. The Senate was almost in uproar as they demanded an explanation from the Secretary; even the members of the Foreign Relations Committee had not been informed that we had been three times to the "brink" and back. And the Secretary considerably mollified his philosophy, admitting that in election years one makes statements that one does not ordinarily make. Then Henry Luce absolved the Secretary of all blame.

It is difficult certainly to be consistent in either appraising or criticizing the Republican foreign policy. The policy itself is too inconsistent and shifting for a balanced examination.

The Vice President then turned his attention to the Democratic Party:

We must always identify which Democratic Party we are referring to. For the moment, let us define the Democratic Party in terms of its ADA, big city boss clique which controls its national conventions.

He claimed that the Democratic Party has "lost track of individual," that it is the—

slave of doctrines of uniformity, mediocrity and regimentation. In its eyes our people have dissolved into a multitude to be politically manipulated and managed.

The party, said the Vice President, has maintained a "steady appeal to mass and class."

The speeches of Republican Cabinet members, such as Ezra Benson, Charles Wilson, and Douglas McKay, indicate which party believes in management of the people and their Government, which party believes in setting class against class—city dwellers against the rural people, consumer against producer, big-business man against the small-business man. In 1953 Secretary McKay told the chamber of commerce: "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business, and industry." Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has stated to the Committee on Ways and Means that there are no social implications to be considered in setting tax rates, and that America needs big business to do things in a big way. Benson talks to city groups and blames the farm problem on the farmers; he talks to farm groups and blames it on the high wages earned by city groups. Mr. NIXON seems to have overlooked these Republican officials and their words and deeds.

Civil rights are another area in which Mr. NIXON claims great Republican accomplishment. Where the Republicans have advanced the cause of civil rights, they are to be praised, but the case is not as clear as Mr. NIXON would have it be. He mentions that the promises and the performances of the Democrats show a great contrast in this area. He mentions the different stands on school integration taken by Adlai Stevenson and the other Democratic candidates for the presidential nomination. Mr. NIXON stated:

President Eisenhower's great Republican administration has registered the greatest advance for the rights of racial minorities since the Emancipation Proclamation itself.

He claimed that the Republicans abolished segregation in the armed services, in the District of Columbia, in Federal contracts, in the field of civilian employment. He seemed to forget that integration commenced in the Armed Forces under President Roosevelt in 1944, and has been continued ever since. It is not yet complete. Mr. NIXON has also lived in the District of Columbia long enough to know that integration has been progressing for over 10 years. It is not yet complete. During World War II, President Roosevelt established the Fair Employment Board, which was to see that no segregation occurred under Federal contracts. This Board is still in existence, and has continued to exist, although with modifications and changes in name. For Mr. NIXON to claim that the Republicans ended segregation in the civil service is a complete distortion. The Civil Service System has worked on a "merit" basis that has been continually improved since the last century. In addition, the Civil Service Commission is supposed to be an independent agency, not a wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. NIXON also claimed the order of the Supreme Court ending segregation in the schools on a progressive basis as a victory for the Republican Chief Justice Earl Warren. This statement has been uniformly condemned throughout the country as a slur upon the Supreme Court and the Chief Justice.

Mr. NIXON, in commenting upon Adlai Stevenson's position on integration in the schools, seems to be deliberately inconsistent, since Mr. Stevenson's position is one of careful balance and is in essential agreement with both the decision of the Court and the statements of the President.

Actually, had RICHARD NIXON chosen to speak honestly of the accomplishments of this administration, he could have made a presentable case. The record of the Republicans is not altogether a bad record. But it appears that even when he has a legitimate case, the Vice President hesitates to use it. He seems to prefer the methods which were successful for him in his campaign for public office at three different times: first, for the House of Representatives; second, for the Senate; and third, for the Vice Presidency. He then and now seems to prefer half truths and distortions.

He appears to have lost confidence in the truth.

A Kind Word for the Civil Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, there has been agitation in some sections of this country to eliminate the constitutional bulwark of trial by jury in civil cases. This has alerted the bench and bar of the United States to the danger of encroachment of democratic processes.

On February 11, 1956, at the midwinter convention of the National Association of Claimants' Compensation Attorneys, one of the preeminent members of the Federal judiciary, Hon. David N. Edelstein, United States district judge for the southern district of New York, delivered the following significant address favoring the retention of jury trials in civil cases:

A KIND WORD FOR THE CIVIL JURY

"May it please the bar * * *" I open with a slight variation on the trial lawyer's speech reflex to the stimulus of arising to his feet before a judge and jury. And I do so for good and sufficient reason. For, while it is not unusual for me to be addressing myself to lawyers, there is some novelty in a situation where I am in no position to overrule their objections. It is, of course, a vain hope that there will be no objections. As a matter of fact, objection to what I have to say will not even be objectionable. Be that as it may, "may it please the bar." And to add a judicial reflex, "for whatever it's worth."

For whatever it's worth also, I have chosen to comment today upon a topic that is as timely as it is hoary. We are hearing and reading an abundance of words these days about the civil jury, and many of those words are unkind. The issue is not new, and almost everything that can be said has been said at least for a generation. Erudite scholars, eminent judges and renowned lawyers have stated the case exhaustively on both sides, and sometimes in the middle. It is not my purpose to present a detailed dissertation or argue a defense. It is my desire merely, on the basis of my relatively brief experience as a Federal trial judge, to go on record with a kind word or two for the civil jury.

By way of preliminary introduction, I should like to make the point that I do not conceive the issue of the merits or demerits of the civil jury to be one of adversary contention between plaintiff and defendant. There is perhaps, in the public mind, an impression that the jury is the plaintiff's or poor man's friend. I do not have the advantage of any good recent statistical studies of the problem, but there is certainly reason to doubt that judges are less favorable or less generous to plaintiffs than are juries.

It is undoubtedly true that the jury trial is normally demanded by the plaintiff rather than by the defendant, for the obvious reason that the plaintiff generally exercises first choice. But I am under the impression that defendants are not reluctant to demand jury trials when given the choice. The reasons may vary with the kind of case. For example, in a contract action, the defendant may be motivated by impulses similar to those of a plaintiff in a negligence case. And in a negligence case, a defendant may be motivated by reasons quite different from those of the plaintiff. The reasons and motives are myriad, and encompass the whole issue of the desirability of the civil jury. But they encompass also both sides of the aisle. Therefore I feel that I may address myself to the problem, as a judge should, without the slightest tinge of partisanship.

It seems to me that those who have had unkind things to say about the civil jury recently have approached the subject from two distinctly different points of view. One point of view emphasizes the contention that the civil jury is an anachronistic, unsound, and unworkable instrument for the determination of fact and the ascertainment of truth. The other point of view voices no disrespect for the functioning of the jury in its sphere, but emphasizes that it is responsible solely or in large measure for the law's delay and the frustration of the administration of justice.

The latter point of view is that of Judge Peck. In terms of the New York State courts, he presents a powerful case. My own recent experience has been with the Federal courts exclusively, and I am in no position to offer any comment on the practical situation existing in any other court. The problems differ in degree and in kind. But for the Federal courts, specifically for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, I am in a position to report that the civil jury does not represent an insuperable log jam in the stream of justice. A detailed analysis of that situation would require a whole afternoon, and I propose to devote myself today to the problem of the soundness of the concept of the civil jury as an instrument of justice. But in summary, this much can be said. We are one of the busier courts of the Nation. Even with the recent additions to the bench we have never been accused of being overstaffed. As a matter of fact, for some time now, we have not even had our full complement of authorized judges. But since the recent additions we have been enabled to inaugurate a new program and system of administration of our litigation. This program has already strikingly demonstrated, and shall in the very near future have conclusively demonstrated, that we can keep our litigation, including our civil jury trials, moving sufficiently rapidly so that there can be no ground for the classic complaint about the law's delay. Indispensable to the success of the demonstration is, of course, the wholehearted cooperation of a responsible bar. The ultimate summary conclusion which I present to you, on the basis of the experience of my court, is that the necessarily slower civil jury trial is not necessarily or inherently so slow as to be inconsistent with the true administration of justice.

It is the other point of view which I should like to discuss in some greater length, the point of view which emphasizes the inability and unsuitability of the civil jury to discharge the responsibilities assigned to it. But before proceeding further, the problem must be, from my point of view, narrowed by definition. Whether or not the jury is suitable for its assigned function, it must be borne in mind that the jury's function is not universally co-extensive with litigation. There are obviously many areas in the dispute settling machinery of our law in which the jury has no place, and in some of these areas it has had no place historically. There come immediately to mind, as examples, the courts of equity, other tribunals of specialized jurisdiction, quasi-judicial bodies and administrative agencies, to name only a few. A good deal of the discussion of civil juries does go into the substantial issues raised by this consideration, but the limitation of time prevents me from entering into that discussion this afternoon. I limit myself, therefore, to a discussion of the civil jury in the context of that area of the law where it does in fact customarily prevail. And even within that context, I make the preliminary concession, without discussion, that there are certainly cases not suitable for the decision of a jury.

But I address myself to the general indictment of the civil jury. It is not an indictment which is readily susceptible to practical proof, although there are those who talk as if the jury's inadequacy were a demonstrated fact. The point of departure in any discussion, I feel, must be an analysis of what the jury's primary functions are, and I think that there is no great dispute about the analysis. Broadly, the jury must make determinations of fact, and apply the facts as so determined to the law as given by the court, in order to reach a decision. But that "broadly" is enormously broad, the subject matter of comment without end and seemingly without beginning in legal literature. I trust that you will forgive me for adding briefly to the volume, if not the content, of that comment.

Litigation, and indeed the legal profession, would be of no consequence in the lives of men if there existed some mechanical or scientific method of determining objectively what in fact had occurred upon the occasion giving rise to a dispute between human beings. Even in the fields of pure science, the investigator's conclusions are not infallible, and the law is anything but a laboratory of pure science. By and large, in order to discover what has happened in a situation involving human beings, we must rely upon what human beings say. I needn't belabor, to a group of trial lawyers, the problem of the difference between the testimony of honest witnesses describing the same event. Honest variations in testimony arise from the difference in witnesses' sense perceptions, their memories, their abilities to articulate, and a host of other factors. In fact, so fundamental are these differences that identical testimony by two witnesses is frequently suspect. At the very best, the law is at the mercy of the lowest common denominator of human frailties in any attempt to get at the truth. And at the worst the law is at the mercy of falsehood, in its almost infinitely varying degrees. It is difficult enough to piece together a story on the basis of honest testimony, but it is indescribably more difficult to bear in addition the burden of determining credibility. The writer Stephen observed that "The natural and acquired shrewdness and experience by which an observant man forms an opinion as to whether a witness is or is not lying, is by far the most important of all a judge's qualifications, infinitely more important than any acquaintance with law or with rules of evidence. "* * * This preeminently important power for a judge," he continued, is not to be learned out of books. Insofar as it can be acquired at all, it is to be acquired only by experience, for the acquisition of which the position of a judge is by no means peculiarly favorable. "* * * Every one must learn matters of this sort of himself, and though no sort of knowledge is so important to a judge, no rules can be laid down for its acquisition. * * * No process is gone through, the correctness of which can be independently tested. The judge has nothing to trust but his own natural and acquired sagacity."

My own experience has been a verification of these wise words. The determination of what to believe is a problem that runs the whole gamut between witnesses who are honestly motivated and those who are deliberately lying, and it is one of infinite difficulty. Althought that determination is by far the most difficult problem in the law, it is not a legal problem. A view of witnesses from the bench affords no advantage over a view from the jury box. The view presented is a view of people, and the problem presented is one of judging people. This judgment, as Kent put it, "does not require a master's skill in the science of the law. It depends more on a knowledge of the passions and of the springs of human action and may be the lot of ordinary experience and sagacity."

But the determination of what to believe as a matter of fact must be followed by the making of a decision. As difficult as the process of factfinding is, the decision does not follow mechanically or automatically. Thayer and Holmes engaged in a memorable dispute about the nature of the jury function in a negligence case. The issue was what is involved in a jury's application of the reasonable-man standard to the facts as found. Thayer felt that this involved merely a further inference of fact, but Holmes held that each case involved a determination of the standard of conduct, and was thereby a temporary surrender of the judicial function. It is hardly to be doubted that this process is not one chained exclusively to the evidence. The juror selects from among his experiences those which he chooses to regard as normative. In applying the facts he has found to a rule of law he may, and indeed must, refer to a whole complex of additional concepts and attitudes, personal and impersonal, conscious and unconscious, articulate and inarticulate.

Thus we have the two main elements of the jury's job: The determination of what facts to believe and the making of a decision based on those facts. For neither job is there a determining rule, and for neither job is a judge peculiarly qualified by reason of his position and experience. And it is my opinion that 12 jurors can do these jobs better, in the long run, than 1 judge.

As G. K. Chesterton was quoted by Judge Peck recently, "I would trust 12 ordinary men, but I cannot trust 1 ordinary man." I suppose there is no spiritual significance to the number 12, although Lords Coke and Summers tell us that the number was chosen: "Like the prophets were 12 to foretell the truth; the apostles 12 to preach the truth, the discoverers 12, sent into Canaan to seek and report the truth; and the stones 12 that the Heavenly Hieruselam is built on." I would not go so far as to claim holy sanction for the number, but I do claim the sanction of reason and experience for a number substantially greater than one. Are not all appellate tribunals composed of several judges? And if we need a variety of minds to give us, in the long run, the most dependable judgments on supposedly definite rules of law, how much more do we need a variety of minds to give us dependable judgments on indefinite masses of facts? It cannot be denied that judicial opinions, from the lowest to the highest courts, represent in some measure the personal impulses of the judge, in relation to the situation before him, and that these impulses are determined by the judge's lifelong series of previous experiences, reflecting his temperament, personality, education, and environment. If that applies at all to the legal opinions of a judge, how much more it must apply to the decisions of a judge functioning as a jury. I do not mean to imply that judges are peculiarly subject to the influences of their backgrounds and value stand-

ards. But backgrounds and value standards are not altered when one puts on a judicial robe. Furthermore, a judge's personal values may be perpetuated and codified into a system. The ritualistic practices of our profession, leaning so heavily upon precedent and codification, render that a particularly likely danger. The occupational hazard of the judiciary is hardening of the categories, and when a judge sees similar situations before him, time and time again, year after year, they may, unconsciously on his part, merge into one. Certainly, all of you are familiar with the biases of some individual trial judges, and for all I know, with some of mine.

Obviously, I do not mean to imply that jurors are less subject to influence by personal idiosyncracies and value standards. But that, is precisely the point. With 12 of them, it seems to me, there is less likelihood that a verdict may be distorted by the personality factor of any 1 juror, and that there is more likelihood of a qualitatively better verdict based on the reconciliation of 12 varied temperaments and minds. Moreover, a jury of 12 brings a valuable array of experience in the problems of mankind and of acquaintance with the trials and obstacles that confront men in the pursuit of life, peace and security. No single judge, I venture to say, can bring to bear so varied and valuable an experience as can any jury. Wigmore suggested the experiment of inviting 12 intelligent friends, some evening, to your house, and asking them any question of opinion or fact, calling for serious thought—a question of politics, business, morals, health, science, recreation or what you like. "Will it ever happen," he asked, "that you do not glean from at least 2 or 3 of the 12 some argument or detail or judgment that the others (if they were agreed) had failed to mention?" And is not this precisely the virtue that is of supreme significance in the discharge of the two cardinal responsibilities of determining, in a trial, what facts are worthy of belief and the making of a decision based on those facts? The great Holmes did not think so. He wrote, in The Common Law, "A judge who has long sat at nisi prius ought gradually to acquire a fund of experience which enables him to represent the common sense of the community in the ordinary instances far better than the average jury. Furthermore, the sphere in which he is able to rule, without taking their opinion at all, should be continually growing." With the utmost of deference to that giant of our jurisprudence, that has not been my experience. Of course, I have not long sat on the trial bench, and perhaps when I shall have, I shall change my mind. But my present experience teaches me a greater respect for the jury's capacity than for my own in the performance of the functions I have described.

All of this, the antagonist of the civil jury may reply, is very interesting theoretical twaddle. For the jury's verdict has very little to do with the facts or the law or the judge or any of the virtues of mankind. It is said that the jury is a law unto itself, deciding by whim, chance or chicanery. A verdict may be returned by a juror who has slept through the testimony, as the result of the flip of a coin, or in order to get home quickly. Jurors consider matters prohibited by their oaths and they permit their verdicts to be rendered in obedience to their prejudices or sympathies, regardless of their duty; they discard the legal rules and the evidence and bring in a verdict out of their own heads or hearts. Even if they should try to follow the judge's instructions, they probably couldn't because they consist mostly, in Judge Jerome Frank's words, of "ineffective rigamaroles, incantations, or semimagical rituals which the judge utters to the jury's uncomprehending ears."

That is quite an indictment of the civil jury, and it is delivered in deadly earnest by highly respectable authorities in not inconsiderable numbers. Of course, it's a pretty difficult indictment to prove. I get the impression that the proof is presented in the vein of res ipsa loquitur, but it reaches me only in the vein of ipse dixit. My own experience with my juries has been satisfactory. I don't know what goes on in the jury room, and I shudder to think of the obvious suggestion to remedy that void. But until such a times coses, if it ever does, when we can know precisely how a jury behaves, I am convinced from my own experience with juries that they behave themselves very well indeed.

As a judge who takes great pains with his jury charges, I must concede reluctantly that they are not frequently models of clarity and conciseness. On the other hand, I fervently hope that they cannot, by and large, be characterized in the playwright Channing Pollock's words as "grand conglomerations of garbled verbiage and verbal garbage." In any event, I can report that juries listen intently. They seem to understand. By their questions, sent out from the jury room, they often indicate that they understand. And by their requests for repetitions of less admirably phrased portions, they also indicate what they don't understand and request clarification. Along with Judge Goodman of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, I venture to be skeptical about whether there is any basis in fact for the flat statement, so often and positively repeated, that juries frequently pay no heed to what the judge tells them to do. And along with Judge Goodman, I am also quite curious about the kind of evidence the other charges are based upon: namely that verdicts are often arrived at by the flip of a coin or because the jurors want to get home. I wonder whether these statements are based upon actual investigation or whether they are made for dramatic value. Not ever having had a tap on any of my juries, I can't make any categorical denials, but I personally have never heard a reliable report of such an incident. In fact, to cite a personal experience, which proves obsolutely nothing, I was once the intermediary between a woman juror and her harrassed husband on the subject of what to do with the chicken in the oven so as to get it ready for his and the childrens' supper. I spoke to her afterward and she hadn't the slightest intention of shortchanging her jury responsibilities for the benefit of her domestic responsibilities.

Of course jurors, like other human beings, make mistakes. But their mistakes are in no different a category from the mistakes that may be made by legislators, administrators and judges which equally may affect the life and security of the individual citizen. I can only insist that I am well satisfied that the juries in my experience have acted responsibly, in accordance with the oaths they have taken.

But ascribing to the jury the most honorable of motivation and intention, it may be said that in cases which relate to such matter as commerce, mechanics, science and medicine, the issues are invariably beyond the comprehension of the average juror. How can a mere voter be expected to decide intelligently whether a steamship has been equipped with proper machinery? How can a mechanic, however well-intentioned, judge of the propriety of an unsuccessful surgical operation? Is a housewife capable of weighing the testimony of rival geologists? Those are fair questions, but I should like to put one more fair question. How can a mere judge, however well-intentioned, resolve all of those problems? If our trials present technical and scientific questions for resolution, I submit that a judge is not in enough of a better position to resolve them to make any substantial difference, if he is any better position at all. It seems to me that the issue is not one between judge and jury, but between adversary and neutral presentation of expert testimony. I am not convinced that the usual battle of the experts presents an undue challenge to the jury. If it does, it presents a quite similar challenge to the judge. And if this is thought to be a serious problem, then there appears to be no sufficiently strong reason against providing that experts in the various specialized fields should be chosen not by the parties litigant but by the court and not at random, but from a carefully compiled panel of properly qualified authorities approved beforehand by the respective scientific associations involved. I am not entirely convinced that this would be a wise solution to the problem. Nevertheless, as between judge and jury the problem is a standoff. If, as one scholar has noted, the data in our modern cases not infrequently assume aspects as far above the understanding of the everyday citizen as modern science is beyond the science of the 14th century, then I submit that the chances are that it is also well above the understanding of the judge; and if, as the same scholar has said, the average jury in such a case is about as helpful as it would be in solving a problem in higher mathematics, in industrial finance or in electrical engineering, then I submit that the average judge is not the proper stalwart to fill the bench. And if, as Prof. Leon Green opined, the mere voter can do the job no longer, but must stand by for one who knows more about the true interests of society, more about the determination of facts and more about handling the complex business of men, then I submit, the mere voter is no longer qualified to vote, but should stand by for one who knows more about the true interests of society. For ultimately, the fact determinations involved in voting for a mayor, a governor, a Congressman or a President are more complex and infinitely more significant than any fact determinations called for from the jury box.

I trust that I will not be charged with injecting politics into the jury box. But no lesser a commentator than deTocqueville said that the jury is a political institution because it places the direction of society into the hands of the people. It is a segment of the community representing the community. Legislative law, as well as the common law, gets enforced through the courts. It is imperative, therefore that the popular attitude toward the administration of justice should be one of respect and confidence. Purely official justice is not likely to receive such confidence. The way to secure it is to give the citizen-body itself a share in the administration of justice. As the novelist Forsyth commented, "Each man in judging his neighbor thinks that he may be also judged in his turn." The citizen's jury service serves also to spread among the community at large a respect for the decisions of law. An exclusive system of judge trials, I am convinced, would never do so.

However, it may be fairly argued that the jury is not regarded by the citizenry at large as a bastion of democracy. And it must certainly be conceded that if there is any crush of prospective jurors at the courthouse doors, it is a crush of those seeking to avoid service rather than those seeking to serve. But is it not also true that the polling places on registration day are sometimes the lonesomest places in town? And on primary day, yes, even on election day, the voting booth sometimes sees fewer customers than the telephone booth. The fact that the citizen is not always anxious to exercise is democratic rights and prerogatives is hardly an argument in favor of their

abolition, though it may certainly serve as the cause. But suppose we were to abolish the civil jury in favor of the judge-trial. I doubt that there would be a popular hue and cry for the restoration of the jury, at least as an immediate consequence. Nevertheless, Wigmore has suggested what we may well expect. He predicted that if we were to shift over to judge-trial, we would witness an extreme and irresistible demand for the popular election of short term judges. And it is no enemy of democracy who sees in this a dangerous and inadequate substitute for the direct participation of citizens in the administration of justice.

I trust that my kind words for the civil jury have been taken as they were intended—as a purely personal opinion based upon my own relatively brief experience as a Federal trial judge. And the opinion was ventured with deference and respect for those of my elders and betters who disagree. The problem is one of profound significance and must one day be resolved. I do not know how near the day of resolution is, nor do I profess a confident opinion on what the resolution will be. But, if the practical problems of administration can be solved, I would cast my vote for the civil jury.

Philadelphia's Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, as all the Members of the House know, the State of Pennsylvania is facing a serious economic situation which confronts the city of Philadelphia and its surrounding metropolitan area. In my opinion, we have a chronic problem of unemployment in Philadelphia which requires Federal, as well as State and local government assistance.

There is now pending before the Senate, S. 2663, which is known as the Depressed Areas Act. The Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held public hearings on S. 2663 at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on February 10, 1956. At these hearings there appeared the former mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., and the present mayor, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth. Both these men made excellent statements in support of S. 2663, which I feel every Member of the House should read.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF FORMER MAYOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., OF PHILADELPHIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MEETING AT WILKES-BARRE, PA., ON FEBRUARY 10, 1956

First, may I express my wholehearted support of Senate bill S. 2663 on which these hearings are being held. I am happy that the subcommittee has come to Pennsylvania's anthracite coal area to see for itself economic conditions which cry out for governmental assistance. Assistance in which, I believe, the Federal Government must join, because the valiant and combined efforts of local and State governmental agencies together with private industry are not adequate to deal with the problem of economic blight and chronic unemployment.

Particularly I should like to endorse the splendid testimony given before your committee in Washington by Mrs. Min Lurye Mattieson of the International Ladies Garment Workers which portrayed so vividly the needs of this particular area and the assistance which the Federal Government could bring.

I also find myself in accord with the testimony presented to the committee on January 6, 1956, by Irvin F. O. Wingeard, of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security; on January 23, 1956, by Governor George M. Leader, and now today, by Pennsylvania Secretary of Commerce William L. Davlin.

It is heartening to know that at long last the Eisenhower administration, in this year of 1956, has finally espoused the cause for which Senator DOUGLAS, Senator NEELY, and the other joint sponsors of S. 2663 have long fought.

In the President's Economic Report to Congress he indicated a drastic shift in the philosophy of his administration. He said:

"We have also come to believe that progress need not proceed as irregularly as in the past, and that the Federal Government has the capacity to moderate economic fluctuations without becoming a dominant factor in our economy. * * *

"The Government can do a great deal to help people who have been left behind in the on-rush of progress by undertaking special programs for raising their productivity. * * *

"To cope with chronic unemployment which has persisted in some communities, despite the attainment of practically full employment in the Nation at large, a new area assistance program is recommended."

The specific recommendations of the President to help local communities reduce unemployment are stated as follows:

"(a) Establish an area assistance program for aiding communities experiencing substantial and persistent unemployment, and make technical assistance more broadly available to aid urban and rural communities in developing balanced and progressive economies.

"(b) Authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to give priority to applications for aid, in financing needed public facilities, from communities experiencing substantial and persistent unemployment.

"(c) Make benefits under the urban renewal program available for industrial redevelopment of business sections in such communities."

It can thus be hoped that the bill before your committee can receive bipartisan support and be enacted into law at an early date.

My principal purpose in appearing before you today is to urge you to extend the coverage of this bill to include the serious economic situation which confronts the city of Philadelphia and its surrounding metropolitan area. In my judgment we have in Philadelphia a chronic problem of unemployment and economic depression which requires Federal, as well as State and local, governmental assistance. Let me give you the facts:

1. We are, in Philadelphia today, supplying surplus food obtained from the Federal Government to 24,000 households containing approximately 67,000 people, or approximately 3.5 percent of our population. This is an increase of 14,000 households from the September figures. Moreover, the number of households is growing every month.

2. While unemployment in Philadelphia, expressed in terms of a percentage of the labor force, dropped during the fall of 4.9 percent it is rising again, and I am confident that the January figures will show the city as having an unemployment percentage of approximately 6.5 percent. The 1955 average percentage was 6.8.

3. The method of computing these statistics is undoubtedly conservative for Philadelphia. Approximately 20 percent of our labor force works in Philadelphia but lives outside the city limits. The method of computation determines the number of unemployed on an industry basis but the number of unemployed on a household basis. It therefore does not adequately reflect our unemployment. If the figures were adjusted to express the ratio of unemployed individuals formerly employed in Philadelphia the 1955 average would rise to 8.2 percent, the January 1955 adjusted average would be 10.2 percent, and the estimated January 1956 adjusted average, 7.5 percent.

4. In Mr. Wingeard's testimony he estimated there were in mid-December 241,000 Pennsylvania workers totally unemployed. In mid-November there were in the 8-county Philadelphia area (5 Pennsylvania and 3 New Jersey counties), 85,700 unemployed. We estimated that the January figures will show an increase to over 100,000. When it is remembered that the Philadelphia area labor force is around 1.7 million individuals, it can be seen that our employment situation is far from healthy.

The causes of this situation are chronic, not temporary. They can be removed only by combined governmental and private enterprise action which will cost substantial sums of money before positive results will appear.

Like most large metropolitan regions, Greater Philadelphia has a number of disintegrating and unhealthy pockets; neighborhoods where obsolete loft-type manufacturing buildings have been vacated for more spacious sites in the suburbs; areas where low-income families, many of them minority groups from the South, have moved in, headed by individuals with little of the training or skills required for modern industrial employment. We are afflicted with industrial, as well as residential, slums.

Moreover, because of the built-up area of our central city and our increasing traffic and transportation difficulties, it is difficult for private industry or chambers of commerce to find large enough sites with adequate off-street parking to make attractive locations for new industry.

The result is a spreading sore which threatens the prosperity and therefore the taxables of the city of Philadelphia at a time when we need desperately to rebuild and modernize our community in order to take advantage of the great opportunities provided by the industrial expansion of the Delaware Valley, and the Greater Philadelphia metropolitan area.

Our municipal government is aware of this challenge and is pressing forward with a public improvements program as heavy as our tax base will permit. Our 6-year public-improvements program calls for an expenditure of $573,162,461. Included in this huge sum are many millions of dollars for slum clearance, urban development, port and airport development, and such projects as the Food Distribution Center, sponsored by a civic-minded group, the Greater Philadelphia Movement, but requiring over $15 million of city funds to make the program economically feasible.

This Food Distribution Center project will not only redevelop a vast waste and open dump area in south Philadelphia into a thriving commercial center, but will permit the redevelopment of the present Dock Street area, now an unsanitary blight all too close to Independence Hall and the Mall project which the Federal Government is helping to finance.

Mayor Dilworth stated earlier this week that taxes in Philadelphia would have to be raised an additional $30 million in 1957 to provide the level of services necessary to give good government. This increase in taxes would be reflected in an increase in our capital improvement program because the tax base will then be able to support

many badly needed additional projects which had to be postponed to preserve the city's credit, based as it largely is, on the percentage of the tax dollar which goes for debt service. Our city's director of commerce, during my administration, Walter M. Phillips, and his successor, Fredric R. Mann, have completed industrial development plans which will provide the matching funds necessary to qualify for Philadelphia's share of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's industrial rehabilitation program outlined to your committee by Governor Leader on January 23. Specific acreage in the city, a great deal of which is already city owned, is being set aside for this program which we would hope to extend (if Federal funds are available) into the depressed industrial areas mentioned a moment ago.

Accordingly, I submit that Philadelphia comes before your committee having done everything reasonable to help itself in the difficulties I have been discussing.

I think you will agree that Governor Leader's program puts the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on the line as doing its full share to bring economic prosperity to all of the presently depressed areas.

It remains to consider whether the Federal Government is pulling its oar in the boat. I submit that it is not.

As one example let me indicate what is happening to Government contracts in the Philadelphia area. In the year ending July 1, 1954, contracts negotiated by the Philadelpria Ordnance District within the city limits totaled $13,242,600. In the following year during which we were placed in the substantial unemployment category by the United States Department of Labor, and were therefore, in theory, entitled to special consideration, the contracts negotiated dropped to $5,684,700.

Defense contracts for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania dropped from approximately $2 billion in fiscal 1952 to $280 million in fiscal 1954. Pennsylvania's share of total Federal spending declined from 5.1 percent in 1952 to 2.6 percent in 1954.

Just before Christmas the Naval Air Material Center announced a drastic cutback in employment at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The best we could get out of the Navy was a promise that "every assistance will be afforded employees affected in the area to secure alternative employment."

We, in Philadelphia, have been the stepchildren of the Federal Government for almost 4 years.

I recommend that S. 2663 be expanded by appropriate language to include as a depressed area entitled to Federal assistance (upon a showing that the local and State governments involved are making fair contributions to the solution of their own difficulties) any metropolitan area which can show urban, industrial, and residential blight adequate to qualify it for Federal aid under present housing and urban redevelopment legislation. In other words, I recommend that S. 2663 be coordinated with the Housing Acts of 1954 and 1955 in such a way as to create a unified attack on the metropolitan area evils I have been discussing today.

STATEMENT OF MAYOR RICHARDSON DILWORTH, OF PHILADELPHIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MEETING AT WILKES-BARRE, PA., FEBRUARY 10, 1956

The Senate bill under consideration states that "unemployment in certain areas of the Nation is jeopardizing the health, standard of living, and general welfare of the Nation." This was a great step forward, as only a short while before this bill was introduced, the President's Economic Report of 1955, blinded by the general prosperity, stated that "adjustment of depressed areas to new economic conditions both can and should be carried out by the local citizens themselves." Since then, of course, prodded by the Congress, the President has recognized the importance of the problem which the Governor of this Commonwealth, among others, had given a great deal of thought to when presenting his first program over a year ago.

It is only natural that this State's largest city should be most concerned about the unemployment and lowered standard of living which came in the wake of continued depressed economic conditions in a number of areas in the State. Quite aside from the element of sympathy, it directly affects the markets for Philadelphia's goods, and the burden on our citizens and our businesses increases with the increased need for State aid to those unfortunate communities.

But our concern is more direct. Although on the face of it Philadelphia is still prosperous, and though we do not suffer the hardships of Altoona, or Pottstown, or Wilkes-Barre, Philadelphia faces serious economic problems. This puts us in the "gray" area of facing a difficult economic situation without being sufficiently depressed to be at present considered for Federal aid. Philadelphia has many of these economic difficulties in common with some other congested metropolitan regions in the East, like Pittsburgh, or New York, or Boston, and while the city itself bears more of the burden of unemployment and loss of taxables than the surrounding counties, its problems are essentially those of the entire metropolitan area.

Philadelphia's economy has not really been able to fully recover from the 1954 recession. The great diversification of our business and industry kept us from going as deeply into recession, but by the same token, not enough of our industries have participated in the upswing. Unemployment has only dropped from a high of 96,000 in January 1955 in the city itself to an estimated figure of more than 70,000 this past month. In spite of a temporary seasonal improvement toward the end of last year, the 1955 average was about 80,000 or 6.8 percent of the labor force, as against 4 percent on the average in the United States as a whole. If the figure is calculated as a percentage of the city's resident labor force, it becomes an average of over 8 percent.

Nor is this all. Although our employment level has stayed about the same in the last 4 or 5 years (while national employment has increased by roughly 4 million), this even level hides a substantial decline in manufacturing of close of 45,000 workers, and an increase in trade and services by about the same amount. Part of this decline is due to higher productivity, brought about by automation. Part of it is due to the exodus of the textile and hoisery industries to the South—but that only accounts for about one-third of the decline. Given the fact that manufacturing for the national market is the basic economic activity which enables Philadelphians in turn to buy goods from the rest of the country; and that every dollar added to manufacturing generates about $3 income of Philadelphians, it is, indeed, a cause for concern that virtually none of Philadelphia's industries show a substantial recovery from the recession. The prospective increase in manufacturing capacity is not good either; the estimates of manufacturers of their expenditures for plant and equipment in 1956 are 6 percent less than they spent in 1955, the expected expenditures of manufacturers across the Nation is up by 13 percent.

It should be added in this connection that Pennsylvania's and Philadelphia's share of defense orders has recently been lagging in spite of Federal promises to give special consideration to substantial labor surplus areas. Only recently has the carrier contract awarded to the Camden yard of the New York Shipbuilding Corp. broke the persistent draught to a certain extent, but defense establishments located in the city keep laying off workers in spite of the city administration's protestations.

Some of the causes of this entire situation are typically urban problems which have not yet received the national attention they deserve. People in growing numbers have settled around our cities in concentric circles. The city itself has grown around its core in a completely unplanned way. The central city, which should furnish a variety of business, professional, and distributive services to an ever-increasing surrounding region, is hemmed in by obsolete industrial structures and the general congestion of the city with its growing traffic and transportation problem. Crowding and lack of space for expansion do not permit industries to grow as they should, nor services to be accessible as they must be. All this makes the ungainly metropolitan area even less attractive for businesses and for gracious living. The diversity and potentialities of a city make it harder to find single remedies, but for that very reason more imperative.

Philadelphia has done a great deal on various fronts to combat these ills over the last 4 years, as former Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., points out in his testimony before this committee. My administration is committed to careful economic studies of the causes of and possible other remedies for our economic plight. Plans for economic and industrial renewal are being laid. But Philadelphia cannot accomplish the feat of pulling itself out of this precarious situation entirely by its own bootstraps. As economic problems continue, they become cumulative and harder to solve. Over most of the last 18 months we have been a substantial labor surplus area. It would not take too much more to push us the added step into becoming a depressed area.

You will, I am sure, permit me the suggestion that Senate bill S. 2663 should somewhat broaden its definition of "depressed area." The requirement of section 6 that at least 6 percent of its labor force have to be unemployed for at least 3 years is hard to meet. It is particularly difficult for areas which badly need the aid provided under this bill to help them out of a situation which in 3 years may be an almost insoluble major problem affecting, in Philadelphia's case, over 3 million people. It seems unfortunate to have to wait through 3 years of consistent misery before remedial action can be really effective. Also, an area with diversified industry might improve seasonably which is not too meaningful when the long run is considered. (In spite of the average unemployment percentages mentioned above, Philadelphia was taken off the substantial labor surplus area list by the Department of Labor at the end of last year and will now have to be put back.) It is therefore suggested that an average percentage of unemployment over the specified period be the prerequisite rather than a continuous one. And it may be that this committee will feel that for areas beset with peculiarly urban problems the specified time should be reduced to 18 months at 6 percent unemployment.

The specific remedies of bill S. 2663 would be an infinite help for Philadelphia if it could qualify for them. Section 9, which provides for the construction of public facilities, is particularly applicable. Philadelphia has a carefully worked out 6-year capital program of improvement projects which, if speeded up, could materially help the economic situation. Many of these projects create employment directly, as well as indirectly after completion. Yet the city does not have the funds to move them ahead of their schedule. If eligible under the bill under consideration, Philadelphia could present immediately detailed proposals to the Depressed Areas Administrator for consideration under section 9 (b). Likewise, the requirement of a local commitee in section 7 is in line with the way in which this has been handled in Philadelphia, as representative committees of prom-

inent citizens have been called in every time new problems are being approached; this was done, for instance, in connection with putting our urban renewal plans into effect. The city's plans, e. g., to use city-owned land for industrial development has been conceived in this fashion.

Not only the number of unemployed workers in the city, but their composition seems to require greatly increased training, rehabilitation and careful counselling. Many are unemployed because their skills have become obsolete. Others have never held jobs in modern industrial environments, and need a great deal of special advising, training, and vocational education as prescribed under section 15. Better coordination of and strengthening of the services of the State employment bureaus would be most beneficial, as would be the payment of supplementary unemployment compensation (sec. 16).

Beyond that, it may be suggested that some of the remedies proposed in the Report on Low Income Families of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, published 6 months after the introduction of the bill under discussion, be incorporated in this bill. In particular, Philadelphias' small businesses have suffered badly and would need technical assistance, financial advice and credit aids. Failures of small businesses, and the inability of the city to attract sufficient struggling new ventures which eventually grow into large employers of labor, may be responsible for Philadelphia's long-range economic problems to a larger extent than is usually realized.

Philadelphia is struggling hard to get out of the squeeze between economic conditions which require financial help and substantially increased services, and a steadily decreasing tax base. Many metropolitan areas, in which millions of our people live, suffer the same kinds of problems. They are unable to furnish all the means to prevent their slipping deeper into economic difficulties. It is most encouraging that the Federal Government realizes its responsibilities with regard to deeply depressed areas. I am respectfully submitting that unless the urban economic problem is also recognized as a Federal responsibility today, Washington may be requested to help at a time when it will be much harder to improve the situation.

Compulsory Social Security for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD petitions signed by many of my constituents of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that these citizens are asking for the repeal of that portion of Public Law 761, or any other social-security law which contains compulsion for farmers, farmer-employer, or the farm-owner.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of this subject, I am one who firmly believes that all should be given an opportunity to be heard and their views brought to the attention of this Congress. I respectfully ask that the proper authorities, or committee, of this Congress give every consideration to the request contained in these petitions.

Are We Ready To Draw?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of us realize that the bloody war in the Pacific, fought in 1944 and 1945, was really a series of battles to win airbases so that we could eventually pound the heart of Japan?

That thought has occurred to me many times as this Congress has considered the question of overseas bases and appropriations for them. Although an invasion of Japan was planned, we never had to take the step which would have been so costly in American lives. From the bases that we won, we were able to bomb Japan into submission. From the bases that we have built since 1945, we could launch a counteroffensive that would go a long way toward insuring victory, should another war be forced upon us.

This thought was the central thought of a notable speech which Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, delivered before the Chamber of Commerce of Waco, Tex., on February 7. General Twining pointed out that the B–36 was not ready for combat during World War II, even though planning of it had begun in 1941, even before Pearl Harbor. In spite of the bases we won at such cost and at such sacrifice, we could have bombed Japan into submission from this continent if we had had the B–36 and had it in suitable numbers in 1944.

Even though we need overseas bases today to help us preserve the peace, we would not necessarily need them in another war if we had other means of delivering bomb power.

I say if we had other means. We do have other means in the B–52, which is replacing the B–36. We will have other means when an atomic reactor is developed to make nuclear powered bombers possible. We will have other means when the intercontinental ballistic missile—the ultimate weapon—is perfected.

The question is, Will we have these other means available by the time that we need them? Technological advances by the Soviets spur us to plan for the future. The question is, are we planning rapidly enough? Only if we have the means available to stop a war if one gets started can we hope to prevent a holocaust that might destroy our civilization.

General Twining pointed out in his Waco speech that during the Korean war the Communist air forces never attacked our naval forces in the Sea of Japan or the air bases so crowded with our planes that they were easy to spot from the air. The Communist Air Force never attacked us here at home. The reason in both cases was the same: our B–36's and B–47's in the States were ready to go. The question now is, are our B–52's ready to go? Will our ICBMs be ready for launching if they are needed?

Speaking to Texans in language Texans understand, General Twining said:

As long as * * * we can keep our earned reputation of a quick draw and a deadly aim * * * no one is likely to draw on us.

The challenge to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is to make the appropriations that will be adequate to maintain this readiness.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of my colleagues, I extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the address delivered by General Twining before the Waco Chamber of Commerce on February 7, which follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WACO, TEX., FEBRUARY 7, 1956

I always feel like I am coming home when I return to Texas, and I am mighty glad to be here with you tonight. I am not alone in this at-home-in-Texas feeling. I share it with a great part of the men in the Air Force who have also been stationed here.

Texas has always been considered an Air Force State. Out of a total of 153 major Air Force bases in the United States, 27 of them are located in Texas. From the beginning of military aviation during World War I, Texas has been a favorite location for air operations.

Its large percentage of fair weather days and its wide open spaces make Texas especially adapted to flying.

The fine relationship between Texas and the Air Force has been fostered by the people of Texas. Texans have always been forward looking, and are known for doing things in a big way. Your leaders have done much to help keep American airpower strong. Much of the credit for the national security we have gained through airpower must go to men like your Senators, LYNDON JOHNSON and PRICE DANIEL.

Today, the Air Force has some of its most important operations here in Texas at bases like Carswell, Kelly, Bergstrom, and Biggs. Lackland is one of our largest training bases. Randolph, first famous as the West Point of the Air, now is the home of the School of Aviation Medicine—an institution unique in the world.

Texas has added to the air strength of the Nation in another way. The Texas Air National Guard responded during our last emergency to go and fight in Korea. The 136th Fighter Bomber Wing was one of the outstanding air units in the entire Air Force during the Korean war.

Of course, this is nothing new for Texas. During World War II, Texas supplied more volunteers per capita than any other State, and there were more troops training in Texas than any other State.

Waco itself, although better known as the home of Baylor University, has a little publicized aviation heritage. According to local history, James Walker, a Waco lawyer, invented an airplane in 1890. Its design was far ahead of its time, and included fundamental elements which later guided aeronautical engineers. Unfortunately, he was too far ahead of his time. There was no engine, at that time, to propel his airplane.

So by a trick of fate—the lack of an engine, the first flight was at Kitty Hawk instead of Waco.

Nevertheless, Waco became a center for aviation and the development of airpower. Here we are training many young men in the skills that are needed for a modern Air Force. We have found that Waco is a wonderful location for this important work.

Here we have the space we need and the facilities we need. Here we have found friendly, hospitable, and helpful people. You provide a splendid human environment

for the young airmen and officers of the Air Force.

Your encouragement of Air Force activities was instrumental in the decision to reactivate Connally Air Force Base in 1948.

I want to tell you that you can be proud of Connally Air Force Base. I looked over the base yesterday and it is indeed in fine shape. Besides the important training going on here, Waco is also headquarters for General Disosway's Flying Training Air Force.

Thus Waco is the hub of flying training that goes on at 23 airfields which extend from California to Florida.

I mentioned earlier that I had been stationed in Texas. That was well over 20 years ago.

Flying was rather lighthearted then, and so were the pilots. It was hard for pilots to live with the pomp and ceremony typical of the Army in those days. I can remember the rebellion that was going on then against the wearing of cavalry boots and sabers. We were permitted to take off our boots and sabers to fly, but we had to solemnly buckle them back on again when we landed.

We enjoyed our flying in a little different way then. Flying low today means flying below 10,000 feet. Twenty years ago flying low in Texas meant flying about at an altitude of 15 or 20 feet. Texans grew used to the sight of a string of tiny airplanes hopping in sequence over telephone wires.

Once in a while a bewildered stranger would run his auto off the road to dodge approaching airplanes. His complaints were usually silenced by our Texas friends. They convinced the stranger that his fright would betray him as a non-Texan. He was told that to become alarmed at the sight of airplanes marked him as unfit for the new air age.

Texas may have believed in the air age, but in those days the rest of the country remained largely unaware that flying and fliers were important.

Those fliers were important in the same way that the early settlers in Texas were important. They were pioneers of a new age and a new way of doing things.

Many airmen of those days foresaw the true meaning of airpower. With no encouragement, in fact, in the face of deep-rooted opposition, they went ahead to forge new tactics and design new airplanes.

We are all grateful to those men, for they laid the groundwork upon which we eventually won World War II. Airpower came of age during those years of the early forties. Even Army and Navy leaders became convinced that the airplane could no longer be limited to its early functions. The airplane could not be confined to being merely the eyes of the Army and the Navy and longer-range guns for foot soldiers and flotillas.

Actually air forces became the decisive force in combat before we ever used atomic bombs. Atomic bombs did not make airpower dominant, but they magnified its importance and became convincing arguments to those who did not understand.

Even with the weapons of the past, airpower demonstrated its dominance again in Korea. Over there we had only a few hundred fighters and bombers. Most of them were obsolete. All of them were geographically restricted, so that we could not even hit the bases where the enemy had his planes and stockpiles. This was a most inefficient kind of combat operation. Yet with all these handicaps it is well known that the Allied air forces were all that kept us from being kicked clear off the Korean peninsula.

This limited use of limited airpower also enabled the Allied ground forces to push the Communists' armies back. This push was stopped and a line on the ground was stabilized for reasons which had little relation to our military capabilities.

All this is well known. What is not generally understood is that the B–47's and B–36's, like those at Carswell had even a greater effect than the planes actually in combat in Korea.

Consider that our naval forces were unopposed in the Sea of Japan, within easy MIG range. Our frontlines were always easy to identify from the air. Our side of the front looked like a series of busy ant hills. On the enemy side, nothing moved. Our limited number of airbases were so crowded with planes that they were easy to spot from the air.

Inviting as these targets must have been, the Communist Air Force did not attack them. Nor were we attacked here at home. The reason, in both cases, was the same. That reason was our B–36's and B–47's, here in the States, ready to go.

This further points up the fact that airpower is the most influential element in any war, large or small. The dreams of those early airpower pioneers have certainly come true.

Yet even more important than its influence in war is the influence that American airpower has against war. Air Forces are now the prime element necessary to protect our freedom and to guarantee continued national independence.

It is unfortunate that we must devote a large part of our national effort to protecting our freedom. Yet we must, for to the north of us, across the Arctic, lies the Soviet Union. It is the stronghold of the communism that threatens to cover the world.

The United States is the prinicipal obstacle to the Reds in their quest for world domination.

As long as we live in freedom, the Communists must live with failure.

So far, their fear of American airpower has discouraged them from major aggression. For this reason they seek to neutralize our strength in the air. The Reds evidently think that the way to do this is to build a bigger, more powerful Air Force. They are striving mightily to overtake us as the acknowledged champions in the development and employment of airpower.

However desirable it would be to stop this race while we are still ahead, it is impossible. The Communists show no signs of letting up.

For years they have had thousands more combat planes than we. This was, and is, bad, if for no other reason than that they are beating us at our own game—this is, production.

Nevertheless, we were so far ahead of the Communists in quality of our airplanes and equipment, that we felt we had a decisive edge to overcome any challenge.

They are now reducing our quality lead. This is cause for concern. To deter the Communists from brutal aggression, we must be strong.

Keeping strong costs money, in ever increasing amounts. But the cost is not nearly so high as the probable cost of weakness.

You are aware that this is budget time in Washington. The Air Force has again been impressed with the fact that it will not have unlimited funds to spend.

We accept this fact of life as reasonable. Hence, budget time is a time when we must choose between conflicting goals. For instance, should we buy more of today's weapons? Or should we spend more of our money to develop the weapons of the future?

Actually our choice is not that simple or clear cut. We must stay strong both now and in the future. Nevertheless, technological advances by potential enemies always spur us to plan for the future.

To illustrate how this pays off, let us look at the B–36. This airplane is a good example of an early decision that affected our future. Since in its early days it was such a controversial subject, the decision to go ahead on the B–36 was difficult to make.

We started planning the B–36 in 1941, even before Pearl Harbor. At that time, the big question was: Why did we need a bomber that could fly six or eight thousand miles? Not everyone was used to great distances like you are here in Texas.

The Pacific campaign proved the need for an intercontinental bomber. Actually, war in the Pacific was a series of battles to win airbases so that we could eventually pound the heart of Japan. Although an invasion was planned, we never had to take that step which would have been so costly in American lives. From China, Guam, and Okinawa, we bombed Japan into submission.

Right then this became clear. With large numbers of bombers capable of reaching Japan from the continent, the same end could have been achieved without the costly island campaigns.

So we were determined to develop the B–36, even in the face of drastic budget limitations in 1948. To do this required a sacrifice of some of the other forms of airpower.

Eventually what some called the billion-dollar blunder became the backbone of the Strategic Air Command.

The B–36 has justified our faith in it. More than any other one factor, it has dampened the Soviet taste for aggression.

The B–36 is making yet another contribution to the Air Force. As you are well aware, it has for months been carrying an atomic reactor in the Texas sky above you. These experimental flights will speed the day when nuclear powered bombers will add to the deterrent effect of American airpower.

Looking back then, we can see that it was a wise decision to build the B–36. They are now being gradually replaced with a much better airplane, the all-jet B–52. We all hope that the B–52 can do its job just as the B–36 did, that is, without dropping a bomb.

This ability of American airpower to discourage war recalls the Waco nickname during Civil War days. As you know, Waco was called Six-Shooter Junction.

In those days, even peaceful men carried a gun. If a man was known to have a quick draw, and a deadly aim, he seldom was called upon to defend himself in a fight.

Only better men dared to challenge him.

Airpower has replaced the six-shooter and today all of us live in Air Power Junction. As long as we in the Air Force make the right decision and get the support of our Nation's citizens, we can keep our earned reputation of a quick draw and a deadly aim. If we keep our Air Force superior, no one is likely to draw on us.

Irrigation and Power Projects in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the following tables, which I ask leave to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, have been prepared at my request by the International Cooperation Administration, which is the successor to the FOA, which in turn succeeded another alphabetical agency created to slough away American dollars.

These tables purport to show the extent to which our country has been obligated for a total of 139 irrigation, reclamation, flood control, and power projects in some 32 foreign countries, over a 7-year period from April 3, 1948, to March 31, 1955.

Let me emphasize that these tables show only the amounts of money obligated during these 7 years. They do not reflect the totals that will be required to complete many of the projects, and they do not indicate any of the amounts that might be contemplated by our State Department in the giant Nile development project, which we are told is essential if we are to maintain our places in the Near East, or any other works that might be on the drawing boards of the internationalists.

Every American should be astonished by the fact that foreign countries have dipped $288.6 million out of our Treasury to build generating plants, dams, irrigation and flood controls works that enable them to beat our producers in the international markets. Since 1902 when the Reclamation Act became law, the Congress has appropriated less than $2.8 billion for irrigation and power projects in the United States, an average of approximately $50 million per year. In the past 7 years, however, Congress has seen fit to appropriate over $40 million each year for the same projects in many countries with unpronounceable names in faraway places.

These tables should be particularly interesting to Members of Congress who, with sincerity and great ability, oppose reclamation projects that would bring wealth and security to people and communities of the United States.

The tables follow:

TABLE II.—*European industrial projects*[1]*—FOA or predecessor agency obligations for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects by country and project, Apr. 3, 1948–Mar. 31, 1955*

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project	Cumulative total through Mar. 31	Fiscal year 1955 through Mar. 31	Prior to fiscal year 1955
Europe, total	99,155	−1,168	100,323
Denmark: Steam electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Kynby	3,317		3,317
France	18,025	−4	18,029
Extension of the Office du Niger irrigation project in French West Africa	1,191		1,191
Thermal electric power plant at Dechy (120,000 kilowatts)	12,048		12,048
Boiler for steam electric station at Arrighi (100,000 kilowatts)	2,444		2,444
Boiler equipment for steam electric unit at Nantes Chevire (100,000 kilowatts)	1,801	−4	1,805
Boiler equipment for second steam electric station at Arrighi (100,000 kilowatts)	541		541
Iceland	4,861		4,861
Expansion of hydroelectric plant on Sog River	3,891		3,891
Expansion of hydroelectric plant on Laxa River	970		970
Italy	60,946	−1,164	62,110
Steam electric station (50,000 kilowatts) at Genoa	5,510	−159	5,669
Steam electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Palermo	5,730	−336	6,066
Turbo generator with 60,000 kilowatts capacity to serve northern Italy	6,230		6,230
Italy—Continued			
Turbo generator (50,000 kilowatts) at Genoa for Societa Edison, Milan	6,169		6,169
Turbo generator (50,000 kilowatts) near Turin for Societa Idroelettrica Piemonte	6,096		6,096
Steam electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Civitavecchia, Rome	5,608	−502	6,110
Steam electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Naples	6,097		6,097
Steam electric station (100,000 kilowatts) at Piacenza	10,519		10,519
Steam electric station (30,000 kilowatts) at Naples	3,307	−42	3,349
Steam electric plant (120,000 kilowatts) near Tavazzano for STEI	2,580		2,580
Addition to steam electric plant (30,000 kilowatts) at Turin	3,100	−125	3,225
Netherlands: Thermal powerplant (124,000 kilowatts) on the Amer River	3,092		3,092
Portugal: Irrigation and power development in the Sorraia Valley and Plains of Villa Franca	897		897
Spain	7,500		7,500
Thermal powerplant at Burcena	3,750		3,750
Thermal powerplant at Escatron	3,750		3,750
International: Austro-German hydroelectric powerplant at Braunau on Inn River	517		517

[1] FOA European industrial projects are projects which are approved for major construction, modification, rehabilitation, or equipping of plants, installations, or facilities where substantial amounts of integrated engineering or dollar procurement are required.

TABLE III.—*European overseas territories—FOA or predecessor agency obligations for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects as of Mar. 31, 1955*

[Thousands of dollars]

Area and project	Cumulative total as of Mar. 31	Fiscal year 1955 through Mar. 31	Prior to fiscal year 1955
Total	4,312		4,312
Belgian territories: Belgian Congo soil survey	38		38
French territories: French soil conservation program, Algeria	535		535
Netherlands territories: "Eysvoogel plan" land reclamation, Surinam	1,296		1,296
United Kingdom territories	2,443		2,443
Power station, Malta	2,219		2,219
Mid-Clarendon irrigation project, Jamaica	175		175
Construction of reservoirs, British Somaliland	32		32
Antierosion and Reclamation, Cyprus	17		17

GENERAL NOTE.—This program, in which ECA utilized European program funds to finance diredtly specific projects in the overseas territories of European countries, was active in fiscal years 1950 and 1951. This table shows the current status, as of Mar. 31, 1955, of the obligations originally entered into during that earlier period.

TABLE IV.—*Far East program—FOA or predecessor agency obligations for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects by country and project, June 5, 1950–Mar. 31, 1955*

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project	Cumulative total through Mar. 31	Fiscal year 1955 through Mar. 31	Prior to fiscal year 1955
Far East total	77,728	8,558	69,170
Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam	1,960	198	1,762
Irrigation and reclamation	1,364	198	1,166
Thermal power generation	596	----------	596
China (Formosa)	25,101	----------	25,101
Tien-lang hydro power station, Taichung	4,082	----------	4,082
Li-wu hydro power station, Hualien, and east-west tie line	1,478	----------	1,478
Tung-men hydro power station, near Hualien	1,200	----------	1,200
Tien-leng (peaking project) hydro power station	1,200	----------	1,200
Nan-pu steam powerplant, Kaohsiung	7,091	----------	7,091
Wu-lai hydro	457	----------	457
Wushch hydro	142	----------	142
Peipu thermal	844	----------	844
Sungshan thermal	78	----------	78
Penghu thermal	58	----------	58
Lung Chien hydro	----------	----------	----------
Nan-pu thermal, 2d unit	----------	----------	----------
Irrigation and reclamation	259	----------	259
Power transmission and distribution	7,462	----------	7,462
Sun-Moon peaking hydroelectric project	750	----------	750
Korea	37,838	5,788	32,050
Thermal power developments (Seoul, Pusan, Sanchok)	30,000	----------	[1] 30,000
Hwachon hydro powerplant	1,110	[5] 110	1,000
Flood control [3]	748	748	----------
Irrigation and land reclamation [3]	2,930	2,930	----------
Hydro exploratory survey	450	----------	450
Power rehabilitation engineering services	600	----------	600
Thermal powerplant transmission line connection	2,000	2,000	----------
Philippines	7,097	2,402	4,695
Water resources planning development	240	240	----------
Irrigation, pump	1,468	313	1,155
Irrigation, gravity (rehabilitation)	948	948	----------
Irrigation, gravity (new systems)	4,429	901	3,528
Electric power survey	12	----------	12
Thailand	5,732	170	5,562
Irrigation and reclamation	3,683	[4] 170	3,513
Thermal power generation	1,100	----------	[5] 1,109
Power system survey and rural power	949	----------	949

[1] Includes $1.0 million technical assistance.
[2] Technical assistance.
[3] UNKRA field of responsibility prior to fiscal year 1955.
[4] Exclusive of budgetary support.
[5] Project later canceled, funds deobligated.

TABLE V.—*Near East, Africa, and South Asia—FOA or predecessor agency obligations or programs for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects by country and project July 1, 1951–Mar. 31, 1955*

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project	Cumulative total through Mar. 31	Fiscal year 1955 through Mar. 31	Prior to fiscal year 1955
Total for region	107,387	4,446	102,941
Near East	40,670	55	40,615
Africa	5,043	489	4,554
South Asia	61,674	3,902	57,772
Total for Near East	40,670	55	40,615
Greece	12,538	−370	12,908
Thermal electric plant in Eubean Gulf territory (80,000 kilowatts)	7,043	−145	7,188
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution from Eubean Gulf territory station	200	−93	293
Hydroelectric plant (40,000 kilowatts) at Agra on Vodas River	35	----------	35
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Agra plant	84	−37	121
Hydroelectric plant (50,000 kilowatts) at Ladhon	----------	−40	40
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Ladhon plant	139	−44	174
Hydroelectric plant (5,000 kilowatts) at Louros	43	−2	45
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Louros plant	4	−8	12
Owner-engineer services to Greek Government on Greek electric power program	5,000	----------	5,000
Iran	3,863	441	3,422
Golpayegan Dam	137	----------	137
Kouhrang tunnel	66	----------	66
Land use surveys	200	60	140
Karkheh Dam	158	----------	158
Ghanat reconstruction	180	----------	180
Irrigation Bongah	177	66	111
River basin survey	435	140	295
Karaj Dam construction	1,575	175	1,400
Zayande H. Rud Basin	335	----------	335
Yezd deep wells	150	----------	150
Shiraz powerplant	450	----------	450
Iraq	423	----------	423
Range improvement	5	----------	5
Irrigation designing construction	194	----------	194
Irrigation and drainage laboratory	4	----------	4
Water resources planning irrigation laboratory and groundwater surveys	170	----------	170
Water resources utilization	50	----------	50
Israel	162	----------	162
Use of range lands	30	----------	30
Improvement of range lands	12	----------	12
Improvement of range lands and livestock	72	----------	72
Water storage	13	----------	13
Irrigation and irrigation methods	35	----------	35
Jordan	3,471	100	3,371
Yarmouk Jordan Valley	1,193	100	1,093
Range management and ground water development	496	----------	496
General wadis development	388	----------	388
Wadi Duhleil River	12	----------	12
Irrigation development of general wadis outside Jordan Valley	1,382	----------	1,382
Lebanon	1,140	----------	1,140
Litani River Basin investigations	747	----------	747
Water reconnaissance surveys	80	----------	80
Kasmie construction project	241	----------	241
Irrigation	72	----------	72
Turkey	19,073	−116	19,189
Power transmission line from Catalagzi thermal station to the Bosphorus	6,460	−83	6,543
Seriyar hydroelectric powerplant and related transmission lines	12,613	−33	12,646
Total for Africa	5,043	489	4,554
Egypt	4,177	161	4,016
Agricultural drainage	220	----------	220
Drainage investigations and improvements	29	----------	29
Underground water survey	173	----------	173
Photogrammetric Mapping Institute	252	49	203
Aerial photo survey	623	----------	623
Land reclamation and development:			
Abis area	1,719	----------	1,719
Quota area	967	----------	967
Desert range development	143	61	82
Land and water utilization	51	51	----------
Ethiopia	547	325	222
Water resources survey	147	50	97
Well drilling	400	275	125
Liberia	319	3	316
Liberian cartographic service	313	3	310
All other Liberian cartographic service	6	----------	6
Total for South Asia	61,674	3,902	57,772
Afghanistan: Helmand Valley agricultural development	647	----------	647

TABLE V.—*Near East, Africa, and South Asia—FOA or predecessor agency obligations or programs for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects by country and project July 1, 1951–Mar. 31, 1955*—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project	Cumulative total through Mar. 31	Fiscal year 1955 through Mar. 31	Prior to fiscal year 1955
India	49,783	----------	49,783
Ground water irrigation	19,500	----------	19,500
River valley development	10,000	----------	10,000
Ground water exploration	3,500	----------	3,500
Rehand Valley development	11,000	----------	11,000
Madras steam plant	2,900	----------	2,900
Rajasthan thermal station	2,251	----------	2,251
Engineering services to Damodas Valley Corp.	632	----------	632
Nepal	244	----------	244
Sirsia irrigation project	153	----------	153
Rapti Valley survey	12	----------	12
Irrigation from Tilawe	79	----------	79
Pakistan	11,000	3,902	7,098
Land and water resources	50	----------	50
Punjab	277	192	85
Baluchistan Province	130	----------	130
Do	55	----------	55
Irrigation Ganges Kebadak	2,100	430	1,670
Taunsa Barrage	6,000	2,500	3,500
Power and communications: Kamofali water supply and control	750	----------	750
Land and water resources	1,638	780	858

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the backbone of the American economic system is without question, I think, the small-business man. Through the initiative and inventiveness of the small-business man America has grown into the great industrial giant that it is. Because we have had leaders in this field throughout our history, we are in a better position to inspire the free world in the struggle against communism. Without our industrial might, such things as the Marshall plan, point 4, and our other economic assistance programs would not be possible.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the small-business man has his back to the wall today in the struggle to maintain his place against the large corporations. If there be any doubt of the truth of this statement, the statistics of business failures bear mute evidence of its accuracy. In 1945 there were only 809 failures. In 1953 there were approximately 8,862. In 1954 there were 11,086. The latest reports for 1955 indicate that there were almost as many in that year—10,969—as there were in 1954. And this was a year of great boom in the American economy—or at least this is what the economists tell us. Truly, the Nation's small-business men face at least as serious a problem as the American farmer.

Nor are the statistics of failure the only evidence of the threat to our traditional free-enterprise system. Many of us have become increasingly aware of the growth in the size of our already gigantic corporations. Much of this increase has come about through the merger of smaller corporations with larger ones. This merger activity has taken place even between companies in entirely unrelated fields as the larger corporations expand their operations into ever more diversified activities.

Statistics of the Federal Trade Commission show the following trend in the number of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired or merged during the last 30 years. Beginning in 1922, the number of mergers rose steadily from 297 to a peak of 1,216 in 1929. Thereafter the number of mergers leveled off at less than 200 in 1932, and varied within a range from 87 to 419 throughout the forties. However, mergers rose rapidly in 1951, reached 822 in 1952 and stayed at a high level in 1953 and 1954.

The question then arises as to why small business is having such a hard time in keeping its collective head above water in times of supposed prosperity. Put in its simplest terms, the answer lies quite obviously in the fact that small business is small and therefore a much more risky and uncertain affair than the large corporations. This has its most far-reaching effect in the ability of the small concern to secure capital for its operations. The large or giant business only needs to indicate its desires and the money flows in for investors know, or are at least quite certain, that there is little risk. Perhaps the best example of this activity in recent days was the stock issue by the Ford Motor Co. How many small-business men could expect the investing public to respond to a desire for funds in the way that stockbrokers scrambled for Ford stock?

Yet it is almost always the smaller businesses which need capital from outside sources in order to expand operations. Large outfits are able to plow back a certain percentage of the vast profits they make and therefore do not have to go outside their own company for expansion funds. If they want to undertake a really vast program banks are more than glad to loan money at low rates for the security is very good.

In addition, the large corporations are able to siphon off the best of management personnel because they are able to afford much higher salaries for their executive departments based on their ability to earn much greater profits. Under these circumstances, the management of small business becomes essentially unprofitable and these concerns either give up the struggle and go quietly into bankruptcy or, if they are lucky, they are able to persuade a larger concern to buy them out.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it behooves the Government to take whatever action seems necessary to preserve the ability of the small corporations to compete with their larger neighbors. For this reason, I am introducing a bill designed to give some measure of tax relief to the small-business men of the United States. Under this bill, which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and a distinguished list of cosponsors, the tax on net earnings would be reduced from 30 percent, as it presently is, to 22 percent, and the surtax on corporate income in excess of $25,000 would be increased from the present 22 percent to 31 percent.

This bill would have the following effect on corporate taxes: Corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less would have their tax burden reduced by 26.7 percent. A corporation with income of $100,000 would be given a tax relief of 2.7 percent. Corporations with incomes of $500,000 and over would have increased tax liabilities of from 1.1 percent, in the case of a corporation with that income, to 1.9 percent for a corporation with income of $100 million a year. This bill would result in a net gain in Government income of some $20 million. Its benefits to the small-business man would be much, much greater. With the funds which he formerly had to set aside for Government taxes, he would be able to finance many of the increased activities, enabling him to compete on a much more equitable basis with his large competitor. It would enable him to pay higher salaries to his executive personnel. It would enable him to undertake some of the research activities which are the lifeblood of the modern corporation.

The benefits to the Nation are, I think, quite as great. As I stated at the outset, we are a Nation built on the basis of a free competitive economy. Anything which strengthens this economy is to the benefit of all. In addition, we are today leaders of the free world and we advertise the success of our free-enterprise system. If we are to maintain the position and the strength of the free world in the struggle against the alien system of communism, we must maintain our own concepts. This bill is certainly no cure-all, but it is, at least, a step in the right direction.

When GI's Get in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from Newsweek magazine for February 20:

WHEN GI'S GET IN TROUBLE—WHAT IS HAPPENING UNDER FOREIGN JUSTICE?

(Based on latest reports, 81 United States servicemen are being confined in foreign jails after being convicted by foreign courts.

(Nothing like this has happened before in the history of the United States.

(Until recently, the Constitution has always followed the flag. Until now, United States servicemen accused of crimes have been tried by United States courts-martial and, if convicted under United States law, sentenced to serve time in United States jails.

(Why doesn't the Constitution still follow the flag? Were the 81 servicemen convicted after due process of law? Are they being treated humanely?

(These questions are now agitating Congress. To find the answers, Newsweek queried its correspondent in Washington, London, Paris, Rome, Bonn, Istanbul, and Tokyo. Here are their findings.)

There wasn't much doing in the small French city of Orléans that night. United States Army Pvts. Richard T. Keefe of Riverdale, Maryland, and Anthony Scaletti of Pittsburgh had been to a couple of bistros and downed a couple of bottles of wine (and maybe a cognac or 2 or 3), and they were feeling pretty good—but now what? The answer came readily enough: Paris. The two GI's didn't have passes for Paris, of course, but that didn't bother them because they already were AWOL.

And besides, it was a balmy July night (in 1953), and Paris was less than 100 miles away.

Scaletti sneaked back to his barracks and got civvies for himself and for Keefe. The GI's then hailed a cab and started off for the big town. Maybe it was Scaletti who suggested it first or maybe it was Keefe. Anyway, they suddenly asked the driver to stop. When he did, they grabbed him and pulled him from his seat. When he fought back, they knocked him down. They finally knocked him unconscious, climbed back into the cab, and roared away.

Fortunately for the driver, 65-year-old Fernand Henault, a passing motorist found him lying beside the road. He was taken to a hospital, his nose battered and bloody, his false teeth broken, his body a crazyquilt of cuts and bruises. He wasn't able to return to work for a month.

ARREST, TRIAL, AND PRISON

The gendarmes picked up Keefe and Scaletti at Nogent-le-Rotrou as they were hitchhiking back to Orleans. (They had abandoned the cab in Paris.) Sentenced to 5 years, they were sent to a prison at Fontevrault, built in the 12th century as a monastery. At last reports, they were still there, but 6 months had been cut from their sentence and both of the prisoners has been recommended for early parole.

At first glance, Keefe and Scaletti hardly look like martyrs. They committed a stupid, brutal crime, and the punishment they got for it was fairly light. Yet, last week Keefe and Scaletti were a cause célèbre. The reason: They were tried and sentenced by a French court under French law and not by a courtmartial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The French courts got jurisdiction over Keefe and Scaletti under a treaty between the United States and France, authorized by the Senate on July 15, 1953—at President Eisenhower's request—by a vote of 72 to 15. Similar treaties (called status of forces treaties) had been signed with almost every nation in which United States servicemen are now stationed.

Under the Status of Forces Treaties, servicemen overseas are tried by courts martial for crimes they commit on duty, but for crimes they commit off duty, on leave, or when AWOL, they may be tried by a civilian court.

THE OPPOSITION SPEAKS

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and various patriotic organizations have attacked the status of forces treaties, and Representative FRANK T. BOW, an Ohio Republican, has introduced a resolution calling on the President to revise or renounce the treaties. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has started hearings on Congressman Bow's resolution.

Opponents of the status of forces treaties insist that a United States serviceman is entitled to a trial by a United States court under United States laws no matter what he did or where he did it.

What is more, they say, some of the nations in which United States servicemen are now stationed have strange laws and strange ways of enforcing them, and jails which, by American standards, are little better than dungeons. In French courts, operating under the Napoleonic Code, a man is assumed guilty until he proves his innocence. In German courts, a police officer's word usually is taken as gospel, and hearsay evidence is permissible.

The Administration, in reply, argues that no sovereign nation can be expected to renounce the right to arrest, try, and punish people for crimes committed against its own nationals on its own soil. Suppose a group of sailors off a French warship in New York Harbor were to start a brawl in a Times Square saloon and knife a couple of people? ask Administration spokesmen. Would the New York police simply stand by? Or would they arrest the sailors and hold them for trial? The Administration argues further that, in plain fact, United States servicemen stationed overseas, accused of crimes, are not getting an inferior brand of justice or being subjected to cruel and unusual punishments.

WHY THE FUSS?

Overseas, many United States Army, Navy, and Air Force officers find it difficult to understand what the commotion is all about. In Japan, says Lt. Col. Kenneth J. Hodson, speaking for the Judge Advocate General's office, of thousands of United States servicemen accused of crimes while off duty since the Status of Forces agreement went into effect, Japanese authorities waived jurisdiction over all but 325. For the most part, these were men accused of really serious crimes, which had gotten a good deal of publicity in the Japanese press.

GI's arrested by the Japanese, says Colonel Hodson, get Japanese lawyers, the right to a prompt, speedy trial, and a copy of the charges against them. They have the right to cross-examine witnesses for the prosecution with the help of qualified interpreters, and they can communicate with the United States authorities in Japan whenever they feel like it. In addition, they can get a member of the United States Embassy to sit with them and observe whether they are being tried fairly.

Convicted GI's are sent to a prison in Yokosuka, near the United States naval base. There, they wear Japanese-made blue denims and shoes supplied by the United States Government. They occupy small individual cells or larger group cells of two or three. The furnishings include a bed and a chair for each man, a washbasin, a flush toilet, a desk, and a radio. (The Japanese have promised to supply television sets soon.)

BATH A WEEK

The Americans don't have to work unless they want to. They have a library of American books and they can take USAFI courses. (About 40 percent do.) They are permitted one bath a week.

The Japanese have two doctors and a dentist for them, but, if they wish, they can get a United States Navy doctor from the base. They can also be admitted to the naval hospital.

A team of United States officers inspects the jail once a month and listens to complaints, and the prisoners also are permitted to write as many letters as they wish to United States Government officials and to United States Congressmen.

Most of the complaints are about the food, and the United States inspection teams consider them unjustified. The GI's get a diet of 3,500 calories a day. For breakfast: Eggs, vegetables, bread, butter, and milk. For lunch: Ham or bacon, vegetables, bread and butter. For supper: Meat, vegetables, bread and butter. Coffee comes with each meal, courtesy of the United States taxpayer.

SPOTLESS

The British automatically waive jurisdiction over GI's accused of homosexual practices or taking narcotics, so that United States authorities can give them a general court-martial and discharge them from the service. And the British usually waive jurisdiction over servicemen accused of sexual offenses, if the girl involved doesn't have a spotless reputation. In a recent case, involving a girl who bet her virtue against £1 that the British heavyweight, Don Cockell, would beat World Champion Rocky Marciano, for example, the British decided to let the Air Force handle the case on the ground she obviously prized her virtue so little.

This was actually a bad break for the United States airman who bet on Marciano. For the girl was only 13, and under American law he was guilty of statutory rape, a serious offense. In a British court, the airman could have pleaded the doctrine of reasonable appearance, which holds that, if a girl looks old enough, a man is entitled to assume that she is old enough.

TOUGH ON DRUNKS

The British courts are not nearly as harsh toward sex offenders as American courts. On the other hand, they crack down hard on people who violate the traffic laws, and particularly on drunken drivers. They even have a law against being in the possession of a car while drunk. A drunken GI can be arrested just for sitting in a parked car.

The French are lenient toward GI's accused of breaking the law as a matter of Government policy. In a recent case, the French magistrate explained: "The law is one for all, but we could hardly guillotine a soldier whose duty may include dying for us."

The French Ministry of Justice now has an entire section to deal with Status of Forces Treaty cases. It maintains close contact with United States diplomatic and military authorities in Paris. Every court in France has been issued detailed instructions on how to deal with American servicemen. American officers work as a team with the juges d'instruction, the investigating magistrates, and assist them in providing and transporting witnesses both for the defense and the prosecution.

The sentence of 5 years meted out to Keefe and Scaletti, the soldiers who beat up the French cabdriver, was unusual. In most cases involving GI's, the penalties are so light they frighten United States authori-

ties. This is particularly true in crimes passionels. Airman (3c) José Montijo, for example, received only a 6-month sentence for stabbing a Frenchman in a Fontainebleau bistro, because they had been arguing over a girl. Before his trial, he was permitted to marry the girl.

LIGHT SENTENCES

The French can be easygoing even when a woman doesn't enter the case. Cpl. Samuel Brown took an Army truck one night and drove it into a passenger car in the Bois de Boulogne in Paris, killing all four occupants. The sentence: 6 months.

Last year, a total of 10,249 United States servicemen abroad were accused of crimes committed off duty. The foreign governments waived jurisdiction in 6,769 cases. Trials were held by the foreign governments in 3,142 cases, resulting in the acquittal of 225, reprimands for 50, fines for 2,595 (these were mostly GI's who violated traffic laws), and jail sentences for 266. The jail sentences were suspended in all but 120 cases.

By and large, the GI's abroad appear to agree with United States authorities in approving of the Status of Forces Treaties, but a good many don't. Two typical opinions:

An Army captain from Washington: "A man who is part of the military service is sent to foreign countries without his consent, so jurisdiction over him should remain with the service."

A marine sergeant from Iowa: "If you fool with the bull, you're bound to get the horn. And if you have the privilege of breaking the laws of Japan, the Japanese have the privilege to try you."

On Immigration, See G. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, February 25, 1956, issue, entitlde "On Immigration, See G. Washington."

ON IMMIGRATION, SEE G. WASHINGTON

As in previous Congresses, the effort to breakdown our immigration barriers by amending the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act is up for discussion. There are all sorts of arguments, the most usual one being that it is supposed to be unfair to keep anybody out of the United States, whatever the effect of indiscriminate admissions upon our demographic balance.

One could do worse than read what George Washintgon had to say about a selective immigration policy.

On January 1, 1788, Washington outlined the kind of immigrants he would permit to qualify as citizens of the United States:

"Under an energetic general government such regulations might be made, and such measures taken, as would render this country the asylum of pacific and industrious characters from all parts of Europe • • • and would draw the wealth and the wealthy men of other nations into our bosom by giving security to property and liberty to the holders."

On November 15, 1795, as President, Washington was more specific:

"My opinion with respect to immigration is that except for useful mechanics and some particular descriptions of men or professions, there is no need of encouragement; while the policy or advantage of its taking place in a body (I mean the settling of them in a body) may be much questioned, for, by so doing they retain the language, habits and principles (good or bad) which they bring with them.

"Whereas by intermixture with our people they, or their descendants, get assimilated to our customs, measures and laws; in a word, soon become one people."

To George Washington it seemed obvious that the country to which immigrants elect to flee should have an equal right to decide which to admit. And there was more room in the United States of America of 1795 than there is today.

Election Campaign Contributions: Representative Udall's Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the recent intense publicity focused upon the role of lobbyists in making contributions to election-campaign funds has made some Members of Congress feel on the defensive. A distortion of this question in the public mind could do much harm to the prestige of the Congress. I hope that the full-scale investigation which the Senate now promises to undertake will ultimately permit both Houses of the Congress to feel proud of their positive response to the issue raised by the revelation of gas lobbying touching election funds.

Some Members of this body already have reason to be proud of the awareness of the problem which they have demonstrated long before the present furor. Thoughtful proposals have been introduced in the House for amendments to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. Unfortunately, these bills have not received the attention they deserve, but if the present state of alarm induces the House to reexamine the suggestions of the past their authors should receive belated thanks for maintaining our reputation for foresightedness.

One of the neglected proposals which will be rediscovered as this self-examination proceeds is H. R. 7001, introduced by Mr. UDALL, of Arizona. This bill would amend Public Law 591 to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes up to $100 each year used in political contributions to candidates for Federal elective offices. The purpose of this amendment is to encourage more campaign donations from individuals, whose sense of responsibility in public affairs would thereby be heightened, and to discourage candidates from relying excessively upon a few very affluent contributors whose interest in specific issues might be overpowering.

The Udall-Hennings amendment to the election laws is but one step which may recommend itself to the House, but we can be proud that our colleague from Arizona has demonstrated forehanded concern in this matter by introducing this and related proposals during the first session. I should like to include with these remarks an editorial commenting on the Udall bill and other suggestions for dealing with this delicate but very basic problem. The editorial appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956.

The editorial follows:

INFLUENCE ON CONGRESS

The emphatic language of President Eisenhower's veto of the gas bill should give the Senate additional incentive to press ahead with a thorough investigation. The honor and dignity of the Senate require that it expose every aspect of the efforts of the gas lobby to influence the vote through political contributions—both those made recently and those made before the bill was under active consideration.

At the same time, this newspaper hopes there will be widespread recognition that the primary purpose of such washing of dirty linen ought to be to remedy a general condition that cries for rectification. All of us are in a sense to blame for permitting a situation to arise in which the rules for political expenditures and campaign contributions are dangerously unrealistic. The activities of the gas lobby afford merely a flagrant and distasteful illustration of the dependence upon large contributions. Election to public office has become so expensive, and the means of evading the restrictions have become so complex, that honest efforts to campaign within the rules and render a complete accounting are all but impossible.

The Senate need not await a new investigation to know that this is a disgraceful condition that tends to produce a kind of moral corruption even in legislators of the highest probity. Point 1 in effecting a remedy, in our opinion, ought to be prompt passage of the Hennings bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act and revise expenditure limitations. It may be necessary to make some concessions and changes in order to accomplish this. Senator HENNINGS' proposed allowance for campaign expenditures of up to 10 cents per vote in the last election, with a cutoff at $250,000 for senatorial candidates and $25,000 for contestants for House seats, would be an improvement over the present absurd limits of $25,000 and $5,000, respectively. But even the revised allowances would be far, far less than what now is actually spent.

Senatorial campaigns in large States are known to cost as much as $3 million, despite the legal limit. In the recent mayoralty race in Chicago the defeated candidate, who sought to give a forthright accounting, had expenditures of nearly half a million dollars. The $12 million allowed each of the national committees under the Hennings formula of 20 cents per vote in the last election probably would not meet more than a third or a quarter of the total expenditures in the 1956 presidential campaign.

If a satisfactory formula cannot be found for making the permissible limits correspond with actual expenditures, it might be wise instead to concentrate on stringent requirements for reporting contributions. We think it important that the Hennings bill cover primaries as well as general elections. Periodic reporting of actual amounts received and spent during campaigns is the essential thing. Despite the proposed requirement that all contributions of more than $100 be listed by the donors, there probably is no way in which to cover all private activities undertaken on behalf of candidates. But if candidates and their campaign managers could honestly report all direct contributions and the sources, this would do a great deal to eliminate unsavory influence. The public itself would be the best judge of when contributions were excessive.

Two practical additional steps are imperative, it seems to us, to accompany the amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act. One is to enact the separate Hennings-Udall bill permitting donors to deduct political contributions of up to $100 for income tax purposes. This would encourage Americans to respond to their privilege and duty of supporting candidates of their choice, and it should stimulate large numbers of small contributions. The more numerous such contributions, the less any candidate would be dependent on large gifts from firms or individuals seeking favors.

The second step is to amend section 315 of the Federal Communications Act so as to permit television and radio stations to extend free time to major candidates in presidential campaigns without being required to give equal time to fringe or frivolous candidates. With television bills in presidential campaigns now running into many millions of dollars, this amendment would make an enormous difference in the cost of campaigns—and dependence on illicit funds. Radio and TV stations are ready and willing to furnish such time provided that they can be relieved of the burden of giving time in equal amount to the Vegetarians and Prohibitionists. (There were only two real contenders for the Presidency in 1952, but technically there were 18 candidates.) A simple change permitting stations to make free time available to candidates of parties that polled, say, 1 million votes in the last election or could muster 200,000 signatures, would suffice to bring the law up to date.

None of this detracts in the slightest from the vital need for a full investigation by a Senate committee. Congress ought to recognize, however, that whatever recommendations the committee may have can be implemented and supplemented by beginning the chain of reforms now. The whole procedure will go more smoothly and will gain more cooperation if there is acknowledgment at the outset that the basic purpose is not punitive but corrective.

The Facts of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is so much misconception on this matter of foreign aid that I am requesting permission to insert in the RECORD an article from the Commonweal, the issue of February 17, dealing with this question.

It is very revealing and gives the history of the necessity for foreign aid as well as what should be done in the future. I can corroborate the facts as they existed in 1947 prior to the advent of the Marshall plan. I spent almost 3 months in Europe at that time, and it is unbelievable to those who have never seen it, that civilization could have fallen to such a low ebb. That there should be so much poverty, suffering, and distress is difficult to comprehend, and the danger that lurked behind it—Communism—was a disturbing factor then; and there was fear in every heart.

I enclose, therefore, this fine article from the Commonweal.

THE FACTS OF FOREIGN AID—ON THE QUESTION OF FOREIGN AID, THERE APPEARS TO BE A HAPPY CONCURRENCE BETWEEN NATIONAL INTEREST AND LARGER HUMAN VALUES

(By Robert C. Good [1])

Since the end of World War II, the United States has given or loaned (mostly given) $51 billion to the rest of the world. What have we received in return for the outlay, and should the program now be discontinued?

Overseas aid will be the hottest issue of foreign policy in the present session of Congress, but the battle will not be a partisan one. The line which divides big foreign-aid spenders from those who would cut back all foreign-aid programs runs through the middle of both parties. Senator GEORGE MALONE, a Republican, from Nevada, for example, has publicly and without qualification called all foreign aid Operation Rathole. On the other hand, Illinois' Republican Senator EVERETT DIRSKEN, in the most startling aboutface since the onset of Harry Cain's romance with liberalism, declared on the floor of the Senate last summer: "I remember * * * I used to attack this (foreign aid) program with a great deal of vigor. I take it back. Publicly and privately, I take it back." Among the Democrats, the fiscal conservatives from the South will square off against the more liberal spenders of the North. Southerners HARRY BYRD and WALTER GEORGE head respectively the strategically important Senate Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees. Each is on record against the big giveaway.

As a matter of fact, this is the first item to straighten out. "Give-away" is not exactly apropos. Even the most casual look discloses that 10 years of foreign aid has not been given away so much as invested. Whether wisely or not can better be assesesd when the facts are set forth.

Our $51 billion has been spent in 3 sizable chunks. The first and largest purchased the rehabilitation of 17 nations in Europe following the war. The bill for this was about 27½ billion, including postwar relief, bilateral loans and Marshall plan aid. The second segment has been used to buy military strength for the free world at a cost thus far of about 14½ billion. The remainder, about 9 billion, has found its way to the poverty-stricken areas of our world. Though most of this amount has been tied closely to the military programs of a small number of countries, a portion has been used to bolster anemic economies and advance long-overdue economic and technical development.

No one familiar with conditions in Europe after the war could with equanimity question the wisdom of American aid. I spent 1946 and 1947 as a relief worker in Italy, France, and Germany. This was a frightening period when the most elementary supplies were unobtainable except in Switzerland and Sweden, when men counted their wealth in American cigarettes, when a man could sit on the ruins of his house and talk of the inevitability of world war III. Hopelessness was running quickly downhill to final and complete despair.

The war had taken a heavy toll. Low production, inflation, and vanishing bank reserves were producing a mortal illness. In early 1947, industrial output in Germany was only 27 percent of prewar levels. European agricultural production was generally only 80 percent of prewar volume. But during the same period, Europe's population had crept up eight percentage points, putting a further strain on available supplies. For the better part of 1947, the official ration allowed each German was only 1,500 calories a day. Catastrophe in gigantic proportions threatened an entire continent.

Attempts at digging out were stopped by an unprecedented freeze during the winter of 1946–47. The following summer, drought gripped the continent. The yield of grain crops in France fell by 30 percent, the worst crop on record. With each passing month, Europe sank farther into debt. By 1947, the United States was shipping to Europe goods in excess of Europe's ability to pay to the amount of $11½ billion per year. This was called the dollar gap. It was in fact a chasm, and growing rapidly wider.

Bilateral loans were arranged. Britain received over $3 billion from the United States; France, over $1 billion. This move helped momentarily, but the hemorrhage which was draining off Europe's financial reserves was not stopped. Nor could it be until Europe's productive plant had been retooled, the enervating customs restrictions on intra-European trade pried loose, and export levels sufficiently raised to permit Europe to pay her own way in the world. Dean Acheson, reflecting on these bleak years, once observed: "No one had a picture of the completeness of the disruption that had occurred. * * * We had operated on a theory of dealing with hunger, disease, and unrest until 1 or 2 good crops could come in. But the problems were more far reaching, and it grew upon us toward the end of 1946 that we were heading for very bad trouble."

One important source of this trouble was located in Moscow. The Russians were consolidating their gains in Eastern Europe with frightening efficiency. The social and economic chaos of Western Europe promised quick rewards for Communist agitators. Yet we could not afford to lose that area. Crippled though it was, it represented an industrial potential second only to that of the United States.

This is why, on June 5, 1947, Secretary of State George Marshall announced: "It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic healh in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. * * * Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States Government." General Marshall also stressed that the initiative must be taken by the Europeans themselves, and that the program must be a cooperative effort agreed to by a number of European states.

Europe both initiated and cooperated with astonishing speed. The story has it that Britain's foreign minister, Ernest Bevin, heard of Marshall's speech while still in bed and got in touch with the Foreign Office immediately. Statesmen rushed to Paris to draw up estimates of funds needed for full recovery. Upon completion of their work, an emergency session of the United States Congress was called and interim funds were made available. Early in 1948, the legislators wrote and passed a bill which became known as the Marshall plan.

During the next 4 years, $13 billion worth of lifegiving plasma was pumped into the European economic system. The figure as such is probably meaningless to most people, but someone has estimated that at the height of the Marshall plan there were at any given moment an everage of 150 merchant ships either on the high seas with full cargoes of Marshall plan aid for Europe or unloading at European ports. By the plan's terminal date in 1952, industrial production had been increased 40 percent over 1948, agricultural output was above prewar levels, intra-European trade had jumped 86 percent, exports to the rest of the world were up 66 percent, inflation had been controlled and hope restored. In short, at a cost of $13 billion for Marshall aid and more than twice that amount for

[1] Mr. Good teaches international relations at the University of Denver, where he is a member of the staff of the Social Science Foundation.

all nonmilitary aid given since World War II, Western Europe had been saved for the free world. "The American people," observed an eminent British economist, "offered 'a new birth of freedom' not only to themselves but to all mankind."

Before the Marshall plan had completed its work, the Communists started an aggressive war in Korea. Overnight, the emphasis in foreign aid shifted from recovery to rearmament. ERP (the European Recovery Program) became MSA (the Mutual Security Agency).

The accomplishments of this program, though at many points still inadequate, have been impressive. American funds have purchased for our allies over 1,000 aircraft, close to that number of naval vessels, nearly 40,000 tanks and combat vehicles, and over 200,000 transport vehicles. With our help our allies are now bringing into being more than 180 divisions, nine times the size of our establishment, with air squadrons and combat vessels roughly equal to that of ours.

We have mustered for our mutual defense the combined strength of well over 30 nations. The price tag for military aid since World War II is in the neighborhood of $14½ billion, a gigantic sum but considerably less than 10 percent of our own military budget for the same period. It is important to point out that our allies themselves are absorbing the greater part of the cost. For example, the NATO governments put up $3 of their own for defense for every dollar received from the United States.

The remainder of our $51 billion investment, about $9 billion, has found its way to the underdeveloped areas of Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America. These depressed areas contain two-thirds of the free world's population, raw materials crucial to the free world's economy, and possibly a decisive voice in determining the free world's fate. Their problems are simple and primordial. Health: life expectancy is fixed at an average 36 years, while in some localities every second baby dies in infancy. Food: diets for many are fully one-fifth below the minimum needed for normal activity. Illiteracy: 70 percent cannot read or write. Primitive techniques: the average income per year is 35 to 80 dollars—40 times less than that of an American.

New political currents are today penetrating the stagnant backwaters of the underdeveloped parts of the world. The past 10 years have seen the emergence of a dozen independent nations, all in Asia, the Near East, and Africa. Independence has shaken ancient lethargy. Levels of discontent and unrest are rising. It is no longer enough to maintain the status quo. Political unrest and the appeal to radical solutions can be allayed only by satisfying the demand for a better, more secure, more wholesome life. This is what President Eisenhower had in mind when he spoke of "a declared, total war * * * upon the brute forces of poverty and need."

So we have invested $9 billion in the underdeveloped areas. A very large share of this amount has been going recently to a very few states: South Korea, Formosa, free Indochina. It is being used to bolster the economies of these states, thus making it possible for them to support armies quite out of proportion to their size and economic potential. Over a billion dollars has been appropriated for the programs of international organizations dispensing relief and economic rehabilitation in the depressed areas. The remainder has financed economic-development and technical-assistance programs in some 60 nations around the globe.

It is difficult to know how to assess the results of these programs. Certain figures look encouraging: 2,700 technical-assistance experts at work overseas; over 40 American universities under contract for technical-assistance projects; some 5,000 leaders and future leaders from depressed areas brought to the United States during 1955 to observe techniques. But take these figures and divide them by 60 countries and the accumulated poverty of countless centuries and the result is but a fraction of the actual need. This is not exactly Mr. Eisenhower's declared total war; it is more like a backwoods skirmish.

However, pilot experiments indicate that limited battles can be won. "In Brazil," one report reads, "life expectancy in 17 cities of the Amazon Valley has been raised from 37 to 47.7 years in a decade." It is estimated that cooperative health programs have affected more than 25 million people in Latin America alone. In Iran, 20,000 teachers and potential teachers were trained under a cooperative educational program in just 2 years. In Libya, the encroaching desert was pushed back; in the Sudan, a locust plague was stopped; in Thailand, millions of dollars worth of roads and railways are under construction. But it is not the past accomplishments that count, so much as the future possibilities to which these limited successes point.

The entire question of foreign aid will soon be debated in Congress. The President has asked for $4,900,000,000 more to keep the program going for another year. Here are a few perspectives on this question which should inform the coming congressional debate.

The Administration has explained that if the foreign aid program is to be maintained at its present level, considerably more money must be appropriated this year than was last. This is because the foreign aid program for the past 3 years has been living off the fat accumulated from 1951 through 1953 when expenditures were considerably less than appropriations. This excess has now been greatly reduced. In actual fact, since 1953 the Government has spent $3.3 billion more for foreign aid than was appropriated for these same years. Last summer, for example, Congress voted $2.7 billion for fiscal year 1956. But by the end of fiscal 1956 we probably shall have spent $4.2 billon.

The Administration has been something less than prudent to have allowed this situation to develop. Nevertheless, the fact remains that with the pipelines now beginning to run dry, Congress will have to appropriate this year about $2 billion more than it budgeted last year simply to maintain our programs at present strength. In the light of this, Senator George's recent statement that "sentiment has been growing in Congress to trim economic aid way down" is hardly encouraging. Nor is the past record of Congress which consistently has cut back the Administration's requests for funds. During his 3 years in office, President Eisenhower has received for overseas aid $1.8 billion less than he requested.

The figures in this area are deceptive. It has been widely stated that of last year's $2.7 billion appropriation for overseas aid, $1.6 billion was to go for economic aid. It has also been stated frequently that most of our aid is now going to Asia and the Near East. Strictly speaking, this is true. What the figures conceal is the fact that almost $1 billion in economic aid was appropriated for "defense support" program, and that the lion's share of this $1 billion is allocated to South Korea, Formosa and free Indochina.

"Defense support" means economic aid, but its purpose is to fortify the economies of countries whose large military establishments are beyond their ability to support. This kind of aid is thus tied to military objectives, which means it is applicable only for those countries willing and able to establish military alliances with the West. There is nothing wrong with this except that there is precious little cash left over for the 30-odd underdeveloped countries which do not qualify for defense support aid. In fact, what was left over for economic development and technical assistance from the last appropriation was considerably less than half a billion dollars.

The wisdom of the policy which gears so much of our economic aid to strictly military objectives must be measured against the new reality of international politics today, namely, the Soviet Union's recently inaugurated economic offensive directed toward the depressed parts of the world. It remains to be seen how wise and how effective this offensive will be. But this is hardly the time for the United States to consider withdrawing from the arena.

The reason for economic aid is not to buy military alliances, but to produce greater economic and social stability in areas of the world where social unrest creates vulnerability to Communist infiltration. Viewed in this light, the new "Northern Tier" alliance along the Soviet's southwestern frontier, and composed of Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, might more fruitfully be made the instrument of economic development rather than military strength.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower declared that free governments in the underdeveloped areas needed "assurance of continuity in economic assistance for development projects and programs which we approve and which require a period of years for planning and completion." This is commonsense. Egypt's Aswan Dam project on the upper Nile is a nice example. It is estimated that it will take at least 10 years to complete.

There has in fact been considerable continuity in our overseas aid program during recent years. Despite large variations in appropriations and frequent threats to liquidate the whole thing, we have been spending annually between 4.2 and 4.8 billions for foreign aid. What is now needed is to begin preaching what we practice. We must give the assurance that this continuity is a recognized part of our policy.

When the discussion turns to the work of the U. N., it should be noted that the technical assistance program of the U. N. and its specialized agencies is doing much the same thing as the program of our own Government. But the difference is that the U. N. works at the level of multilateral, international cooperation. Therefore its programs are free from the accusation, no matter how false it might be, of imperialistic intervention in the domestic affairs of states being helped. This allows economic aid to be carried on in countries which are reluctant, for a number of reasons, to accept United States aid directly.

Again, remembering that our objective in many underdeveloped areas is not to buy military alliances but create conditions of stability so as to prevent Communist infiltration, it is entirely in our interest to support the U. N. program. For 1956 our contribution is $15.5 million, a sum that represents well over half the total U. N. budget for technical assistance. Understandably, we are reluctant to contribute more until such increases as we might give are matched by other participants. However, the possibility of such all-round increases might well be explored further.

Finally, one would hope that the simple humanitarian argument will not be absent from the coming congressional debate. A nation cannot afford to sacrifice the national interest in order to serve humanitarian motives. But on the question of foreign aid, there appears to be a happy concurrence between interest and larger human values.

Before swinging the ax at our overseas-aid program, and before demanding huge tax reductions, we would do well to reflect on the magnitude of our material wealth and our good fortune in a poverty-ridden world. Arnold Toynbee has suggested that our age may well be remembered not for its horrify-

ing crimes or its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first age since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race. This session of Congress might ponder the challenge contained in the famous historian's surmise.

One Way of Solving Homes for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest for February 1956 contains the following interesting article on new methods of housing the aged:

HOW TO RETIRE ON $20 A WEEK
(By William S. Dutton)

How can one retire and live decently on less than $20 a week? That is one of prosperity's mounting problems, faced by two-thirds of all Americans over 65. Now, suddenly, some of them are finding an answer that might be a tale from the Arabian Nights—except that it is true.

In the thriving suburban area southwest of Philadelphia is Riddle Manor, built in the early 1900's by the late Samuel D. Riddle, owner of the famous race horse Man o' War. He lavished more than a million dollars on the mansion's luxurious appointments and its 13 acres of wooded grounds. In 1952 this estate was put up for sale, and although the price finally dwindled to $50,000, the problem of maintenance was enough to awe most potential buyers. Then along came a Philadelphia real-estate appraiser with a bold idea that may well prove to be one of the social discoveries of our century.

Riddle Manor is now the home of 55 retired men and women of limited income. Indeed, not having a lot of money is one requirement for living there; the old folks handle the upkeep problem by doing most of the work themselves, and have fun doing it.

Besides low income there are only 3 admission requirements. First, the applicant must intend to make his permanent home at the manor, though anyone dissatisfied may leave (fewer than 1 percent do). Second, he or she must be free of communicable disease or mental illness and be able to attend to ordinary personal needs. Third, conduct is expected to be socially acceptable.

Rates at the manor are from $15 to $25 weekly, depending on accommodations. There is no other financial obligation. As yet no one has been turned away solely for lack of funds. Extra money toward room and board can be earned simply by assuming a few chores which are no more strenuous than those usually done at home. Otherwise, the only mandatory work at Riddle Manor is care of one's own room. Meals and privileges, which include the right to have occasional friends in to dinner at no extra charge, are the same for everybody, regardless of rate. Only first-quality food is served, and it is professionally prepared. A doctor is on call day and night, and if guests become seriously ill arrangements can be made with good nursing homes and a hospital nearby. In short, money has ceased to be a worry at Riddle Manor. And so has loneliness.

The incredible part of it is that Riddle Manor is earning a profit. I have examined its books and talked with amazed bankers. It is a business, beholden to no charity or special benefactor. Its guests are its income, and its owner-management pays full taxes. And the property is being steadily improved out of income. Recently, for instance, 5 new rooms, each with new furnishings, have been added.

The genie of this magic is Charles S. Lavin, 58, who makes no claim to doing magic. He is content that his friends are beginning at last to grant that he is sane.

"My toughest job," he told me, "is convincing people that what I'm doing can be done."

Riddle Manor, now owned by Lavin's friends, Dr. and Mrs. J. D. Rapp, is only one of his bold projects. Four others, even larger ventures are now operating under the plan, and a nationwide chain of retired folks' estates and hotels is contemplated as fast as desirable places can be lined up.

Here is Brookwood, in the lovely countryside ner Media, Pa. Its huge frame-and-stone house with 37 acres on a wooded stream had stood unwanted and neglected for 5 years. Today, in its setting of broad lawn, great old trees, and neat asphalt driveway, Brookwood resembles an exclusive suburban hotel, trim with new paint and room, power-run dumbwaiters, and modern heating plant. As I drove up I heard the notes of a piano and voices singing a familiar old hymn; the Golden Age Club was holding choir practice. More than 100 seniors are enjoying their ease here on incomes averaging $70 a month, and its books also show a profit.

Then there is the Boulevard Hotel in Miami Beach. This once-fine hostelry was going to seed, outdated by glamorous new multi-million-dollar hotels on the ocean. With its paint peeling and its pillared lobby threadbare, the Boulevard was sold in 1954 at a giveaway price: $340,000. Now it is like a new hotel, and some 200 retired men and women from as far away as Maine and Oregon have moved in, doing away with bellboys, porters, chambermaids, and tips.

A retired meat buyer itching to be busy again, took over management of the dining room and kitchen. Grandmothers who had been expert office workers took over the front desk, and an ex-accountant from Cleveland assumed charge of the books. A retired barber who had once prettied up theatrical stars reopened the beauty shop, and a charming little lady from Key West keeps the flower beds abloom in the 2-acre private garden.

This is no side-street hotel. It is a 7-story, fireproof structure of 220 outside rooms overlooking the Bay Shore golf links and a district of fine old homes and lawns. It boasts a swimming pool, cabañas, and sundeck. The Boulevard once commanded rates of $15 to $25 a person per day without meals. Those are now the weekly rates with meals. Yet the hotel began paying a profit its first year, after 125 guests had registered there for permanent residence.

Charlie Lavin does not pretend to be a hotelman any more than he does to being a maker of magic. He is a quiet, well-built man, usually in shirt sleeves, and doing something for somebody. I found him at the Hotel Monterey in Miami Beach, which he had just bought at the distress price of $70,000. The place was empty, and its adjoining garden was high with weeds.

"But look at that sunset," he exclaimed, pointing to the shimmering blue-and-gold waters of Biscayne Bay just beyond a palm-dotted park. "That alone is worth $70,000."

The time was October 1955, the low point of the Florida beach season. On November 1, repaired, repainted, scrubbed, and polished, the Monterey reopened with 33 retired guests to begin its new career. Some of the Boulevard people came over to wish them Godspeed. So did Benjamin Mandell, who owned the Westview next door, a dignified hotel of 119 rooms, facing the same park, bay, and sunsets.

"I think you know my aunt," Mandell said. "She is a retired physician of 82. She believes so firmly in your ideas on keeping old folks happy that she, too, has moved to the Boulevard. Wants to be independent."

Lavin smiled. "All of our people do."

His neighbor was studying the bay and sunset. "Maybe you'd like to manage the Westview. Apply your ideas and run it as you wish. Pay me something if you make a profit, nothing if you don't. Write your own contract."

The Westview may soon be No. 5 in the golden-age chain and, as Charlie Lavin's fame spreads, he is beginning to receive similar offers from all over the country.

Lavin began his career as a real-estate salesman in Philadelphia, progressed to mortgage broker and then to appraiser for an insurance company. Meanwhile he accumulated a wife and six children, a home, not much money but a wealth of experience.

Not all of the experience was happy. More and more he came up against the problem of retired people trying to make small fixed incomes meet rising costs. A rash of boardinghouses were appearing on shabby streets into which old folks were crowded to the limit the law allowed.

One evening Lavin came home sick at heart. His work that day had taken him into a house where 15 aging men and women shared a single decrepit bathroom. There was hardly room to walk between the beds, and the place reeked.

"I believe in America," Lavin told me. "It's been good to me and my family. But that night, thinking of those old people ending their days in that filthy dump, I wondered."

He began studying America's retirement problem and found that it is not a pretty one. Latest census estimates reveal that almost 14 million persons are 65 or older, and 65 percent of them have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Nearly 3 million are living alone or with nonrelatives, and about 3 percent are in institutions.

"That only begins the problem," Lavin said. "Around 47 million of us are over 45 and would be in a tough spot if we had to look for another job. Call it our Act III."

The urge to find a happy ending to that act for the average citizen would not let him sleep nights. The first glimmering of a plan came one December day in 1947 when he was asked to look over Brookwood. The grounds were a tangle of head-high brush and the old abandoned mansion had a haunted air. "But structurally it was sound," Lavin said. "It was like those folks in the boardinghouses, just needed some new clothes, a haircut, and a chance. I imagined them roaming those 37 acres."

That Sunday he coaxed a few friends to inspect Brookwood and outlined his scheme to use the retired estate to house retired people. "Look, Charlie," said one man, "this ghost-trap isn't worth 50 cents, let alone $50,000. Don't be a sucker."

But Charlie Lavin, then 50, was not to be discouraged. Against all advice, he converted his life's assets into cash or credit and bought Brookwood. He, his wife, and son Bob (Brookwood's manager now) moved in and set about making the huge old house livable again, an accomplishment almost as fantastic as the venture itself. Lavin hired eight boys from the nearby Williamson Trade School who were eager for practical experience. "The boys," Lavin says, "were the first people outside my family who didn't think I was crazy."

The Lavins haunted the furniture auctions. They bought the best they could afford, and worked into the night getting the truckloads of beds, bureaus, chairs, and rugs in place. Finally Brookwood began to look like a home again, and in March 1948 a classified ad appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer:

"Dream home for retired people. Beautiful country estate near Media, $50 to $60 monthly."

The first applicant was Henry Ferris, a former automobile and boat salesman who had lost a leg in an accident, along with his savings and his job. But he had a piano that he had kept despite all reverses. "I'll lose the other leg rather than let my piano go," he said over the phone.

Lavin sent a truck for the piano and paid for the moving. The ancient instrument stands today in the main hall of Brookwood, a prized common possession. The hymnals are all faiths are piled on its top. Around it Ferris built up the Golden Age Choir of 35 voices. Three years ago they sang—Jew, Catholic, and Protestant as one—at his Quaker wedding.

Brookwood's buildings alone, improved yearly out of income, today have an insurance valuation of $225,000. All but a few of its first year's guests are still there. Four are now in their nineties; the average age of all guests is 79.

Charlie Lavin hopes that others will adopt his plan. It is applicable, he points out, to countless hotels and estates now classed as "white elephants." One requirement is that the property be pleasantly located and not too far from churches, shops, and other centers of community life. The last thing retired people want is isolation and stagnation, Lavin said; then added with pride that the Boulevard alone had five marriages in its first year.

Another requirement, if the plan is to be financially secure, is that the property be large enough to provide generous living space for at least 100 guests—although that capacity can be attained gradually, as is now being done at Riddle Manor. A primary requirement, of course, is that the purchase price be rock-bottom.

But the big saving is made by everybody's sharing in the work and taking pride in doing so. The seven-story Boulevard, serving more than 600 meals daily, is operated by two cooks and two general-maintenance employees, and 18 guests who earn $10 each per month for part-time services. Other guests, accustomed to home responsibilities, are eager volunteers, and almost any type of skill can be mustered among them to meet specific needs.

Lavin has achieved the rare triumph of a morale that is "all for one, and one for all." A retired postal worker drew me aside to say: "This is wonderful. I didn't believe it could be true when I first heard about it. My wife and I took a room on trial, and held onto our home in Connecticut. Now we've sold our home. We're here for keeps.

"You know," he added, "just being here make a man feel good. This is the beginning of something that our country will gain by; it rounds out the American dream. And we are making it work."

Edward Hubert Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country have sustained an immeasurable loss in the death last Saturday of Mr. Edward Hubert Butler, editor and publisher of the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News, and president of WBEN.

Throughout his long life, Mr. Butler's capacity for leadership of the highest order was demonstrated in many fields, and his profession, his community and his country were enriched by it. A newspaperman, with a deeply-felt sense of the responsibility of a free press in a free country, he served as president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and as director of the Associated Press, while building the Buffalo Evening News, and its associated enterprises in radio and television, into one of the most distinguished newspaper properties of this country, and for that matter, of the world. Meanwhile, he gave himself unsparingly to his community and his country, serving in innumerable capacities in civic, educational and philanthropic undertakings. For 38 years he served as a member of the board of the New York State College for Teachers, in Buffalo, and his gifts to, and support of the University of Buffalo won for him the Chancellor's medal, in 1953, for his civic patriotism and public service.

Honored by many organizations and by three foreign countries—Poland, France and Italy—it is perhaps most appropriate at this time, as we celebrate Washington's birthday, to recall that, on May 20, 1955, he was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal of the Freedom's Foundation, for his "continuing efforts in bringing to News readers through numerous projects and activities a realization of the importance of maintaining American traditions and the significance of this country's mission to bring about a greater understanding of freedom."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, of February 20, in tribute to Mr. Butler:

EDWARD HUBERT BUTLER

No one who has grown up in western New York as a reader of this newspaper has to be told what kind of a citizen Buffalo has lost with the death of Edward H. Butler.

In everything that the News stands for; in every civic cause it has fought for; in every cultural, educational or philanthropic endeavor it has pushed; in the kind of newspaper it is; in the journalistic standards it seeks to reflect; in the convictions on great public issues it expresses—Mr. Butler's great personality and his lifelong dedication to community service are mirrored.

For any of his associates to attempt an objective evaluation of the man whose name has appeared for nearly 42 years at the head of this column as editor and publisher, would be at once impossible and superfluous: impossible because we have been too close too much a part of the institution he built to its present stature; superfluous because our professional pride in being identified with his kind of newspaper is self-evident from the long association most of us have had with it. The News has always been "Mr. Butler's paper," but he made it much more than that. There was no one at The News, he liked to say, who worked for him; rather, we all worked with him for the News.

What we are as a newspaper is only part of what Mr. Butler was as a person. So boundless was his energy in the early and middle years, and so continuous and far-ranging his interest in community affairs and his concern for people, that merely to list his extracurricular activities and affiliations would fill these columns to overflowing. Yet to any discerning reader, it can fairly be said that the truest image of the man was on view daily in the News.

Mr. Butler held strong convictions on many public questions; these columns have long reflected them. He also had a vast tolerance for other people's opinions; this newspaper has reflected that, too. He was a deep believer in the fundamentals of American freedom, a patriot in the broadest sense. He was a prime mover in scores of fights for community progress, civic reform, honest government and social betterment; no reader will need to have them enumerated. He was motivated by a deep religious faith, with its accent on good works and human dignity and brotherhood; to the extent that we are in fact a community of good neighbors, of broader tolerance and brotherly understanding than when he was young, Mr. Butler's active part in every campaign to make it so will not soon be forgotten.

The son of the founder of the News, Mr. Butler was trained to the role of publisher and editor. But it was a far thinner paper then; an institution well begun, but with its greatest years of growth yet to come under his leadership. As newspaper technology grew in complexity, Mr. Butler saw to it that the News kept pace with the times. When radio promised to get the news more quickly to the people, he was among the first publishers to experiment with that. When the TV age was dawning, he helped it through its infancy and for several years the News station, WBEN–TV, was the only one operating in this area.

As publisher and editor, Mr. Butler was both businessman and newspaperman. He demonstrated the businessman's judgment and administrative capacity to build his enterprise on a strong economic foundation; he also had the newspaperman's sure instinct to recognize that reader confidence is a newspaper's priceless asset—something that must be justified to be gained and must be consistently merited to be retained.

To those who knew him most intimately, the personality traits they will remember longest were his never-failing friendliness and courtesy; there was a personal warmth to this man that surpassed ordinary thoughtfulness and considerateness, a love of people that only mellowed with the years. He had that rare capacity for friendship that added a measure of brightness to countless thousands of the lives he touched, either closely or with some casual, half-forgotten kindness.

But it is as Edward H. Butler, editor and publisher of the Buffalo Evening News, that his life will be appraised and he will be remembered, and he would want it so. For it was to the News—and through it, to the service of his community, his country, and humanity—that his heart and soul were dedicated.

"I have preferred," he once said, "to be known to the public through my newspaper, and through it I have attempted to put into practice those things which I believe to be sound and true, and for the advancement of our country, our world neighbors and all of our people in this community where we work and live. * * * If we can contribute to an increase of friendship and understanding and good will among the nations of the earth as among the peoples of our city, we shall have rendered humanity a great service."

Mr. Butler built the News and its sister-enterprises—WBEN, WBEN–FM, and WBEN–TV—to what they are today. Now he leaves their surviving caretakers with a great tradition and a greater obligation. In the spirit of trusteeship and dedicated community service with which Mr. Butler infused the News, we shall do our best to carry on.

"Bloopers" Bad for Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recently had occasion to mention on the Senate floor that the editor of the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., had written editorials which I considered to be unfair and unnecessarily critical of my motives in commenting on the Dulles brink-of-war controversy. I am happy to say that this editor has within the last month been responsible for some constructive and helpful editorials on this and other aspects of the conduct of our foreign policy.

On January 31, 1956, in an editorial entitled "'Bloopers' Bad for Public Relations," the editor discussed the recent forays of the Secretaries of State and Agriculture into the magazine field. The editor says very much the same things that I had said earlier on the same subjects. I ask unanimous consent that his editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BLOOPERS" BAD FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

The old saying, "Oh, that mine enemy should write a book," will be recalled with regard to the recent difficulties into which both Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson were plunged as the result of recent magazine articles.

It is not necessary for a member of the Eisenhower administration to write a book—he needs only to endorse a magazine article, which regrettably in these two cases was not even read in advance by the Cabinet officer concerned.

Secretary Dulles has drawn sharp fire and criticism for the article in Life magazine regarding his brink of war phrase, and Secretary Benson was forced to apologize for an article appearing in Harper's, which critics charged belittled the farmer.

The slip by Secretary Benson is perhaps understandable. An aid approved the Harper magazine article without submitting it to the Secretary. Mr. Benson promptly and forthrightly accepted full responsibility, apologized for the slip and disavowed the sentiment expressed.

With Secretary Dulles, however, the widely discussed and criticized Life article is less understandable or excusable. The State Department has a particular responsibility to consider carefully the import of such statements, both at home and abroad. Mr. Dulles refused to discuss the article at length on the grounds that to do so "would make of it a state paper."

That being true, and it is true, there is all the more reason why such articles and interviews should be more carefully scrutinized and should be held to the minimum. Otherwise there will be a tendency by both officials and peoples abroad to lose confidence in the sound judgment and integrity of our foreign policy.

From its inception the Eisenhower administration has appeared inept and amateurish in this matter of public relations. During the first few months, or even years of a new administration, this is understandable. Now, however, after 3 years in office, it is time that a more considered and responsible policy was in operation in all departments.

The public is entitled to full information on the operations of the Government, but this information should be carefully prepared and weighed before it is released. Irresponsible statements of the kind we have had from two departments during the past week, statements which either have not been read, or have been only sketchily checked by aids and underlings, indicates a lack of responsibility in high places which is not conducive to public trust and confidence so essential during a critical period such as that which we are now experiencing.

Use by the Nation's Hospitals of Ford Foundation Grants for Antidisaster Preparations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read the February 16, 1956, issue of the magazine Hospitals, Journal of the American Hospital Association.

Its contents are devoted largely to an analysis of the tremendous advances and opportunities made available to the Nation's hospitals by virtue of the welcome Ford Foundation grants.

In a lead article in the issue, Dr. James P. Dixon, commissioner of health of Philadelphia, points out that the Ford grants are "an investment in leadership," a great opportunity for the trustees and administrators of the 3,500 voluntary, nonprofit hospitals to serve their communities now and in time to come in ever more complete and effective ways.

One of the articles in the symposium relates to a phase of hospital service in which all of us are naturally interested. That is the capacity of the Nation's hospitals to prove adequate for any emergency which may come because of national, State, or local disaster.

The hospital is, of course, a key unit of the Nation's civil defense program. Upon the hospital's ability to withstand the impact of any havoc, whether it be in the form of enemy attack or flood, tornado, earthquake, or fire, depends much of the future well-being of our citizens.

I send to the desk the text of this particular article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I hope that it may help spur the thinking of other community leaders in cooperation with Red Cross, military, civil defense, law enforcement, and other experts to plan adequately against the possibility of disasters.

I commend the other contents of the February 16 issue of Hospitals to the attention of my colleagues and the public as a sure indication of the deep interest of the Nation's hospitals—in the Badger State and elsewhere—in ever more effectively serving our people, both as regards their regular and emergency needs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISASTER PLANNING—HOSPITAL AND COMMUNITY NEEDS AND THE FORD GRANTS

(By Charles V. Wynne [1])

One of the ways Ford Foundation grants can be used effectively is in the purchase and installation of services which a general hospital should have to be self-sufficient in any disaster, under all conditions short of complete annihilation. In order to be self-sufficient, the hospital must have the obvious facilities for plant operation. However, other facilities are also needed for smooth operation and efficient service during a crisis, such as adequate emergency and accident treatment areas, proper location of admitting offices, adequate storage space, and provision for stepped-up use of facilities ordinarily not required in day-to-day hospital operation.

The organization of a hospital is, by nature, geared to meet emergency situations and it seems elementary to discuss the installation and the alteration of facilities to meet these situations more efficiently. However, recent flood disaster experiences, especially in Connecticut, have clearly shown that these services are needed. Following this disaster, administrators from those hospitals involved held a critique. In the discussion, it was pointed up that hospitals have a right to expect provisions for such extraordinary needs to be financed in some manner other than from money realized from charges to patients. Hospitals now have an opportunity, through the Ford Foundation grants, to improve hospital service to the community by giving attention to planning for disaster.

WATER STORAGE

Water becomes a problem when there is either none or too much of it. In the recent disaster, flood waters contaminated the sources of water supply, eventually resulting in the hospital having no potable water. A hospital can provide a convenient alternate source of supply by installing its own wells with a storage capacity adequate for its needs to provide sufficient gallonage per minute, hour, or day, to provide the entire requirements of the hospital on a demand basis. It will be more practical, however, to provide storage areas for this water with a proper chlorination plant attached to it. It would also seem practical to design the facility so that at the proper time the city supply could be terminated and the hospital source started.

In discussing this matter with hospital administrators who are in the process of planning additions to their hospitals, it was unanimously agreed that such a facility was not only necessary but that storage of water could supply other needs in addition to standby service for the hospital. For example, an enclosed reservoir could be used as a swimming pool for the school of nursing and, on demand, could supply adequate water for special purposes in the hospital.

Several storage methods suggest themselves immediately: either underground or above ground, in concrete or in steel tanks, providing a flow by gravity or by pressure. These are details, naturally, which must be worked out for each individual hospital. No one can deny that it is a highly necessary facility and that it should be high on the priority list when thinking of spending this money for disaster planning.

STANDBY EQUIPMENT

Another important service vitally needed in a hospital is provision for standby light and power. In the day-to-day management of hospital service there seems to be too little attention given to this matter. How-

[1] Charles V. Wynne is administrator of the 356-bed Waterbury Hospital, Waterbury, Conn.

ever, increasing differences in expected weather conditions have made all of us aware that hospitals must have this service. It is not sufficient to have a standby generator—be it gas, gasoline, or oil driven—to provide service in certain parts of the hospital while waiting for the commercial utility companies to put the hospital back in operation. When disaster strikes, it comes with a jolt, and the "certain" places previously planned for light and power are usually not the areas where service is desperately needed. It seems more practical to have the hospital need for light and power met by complete emergency standby service so that the entire electrical power load is provided at a moment's notice. Consideration also should be given to proper lighting of stairways and corridors, in addition to planning adequate lighting for outside facilities of the hospital, notably the parking areas, entrances, and exits.

Hospitals should have boilers fueled by both coal and oil. When disaster strikes, there may be a distinct shortage of fuel oil or coal. Provision for both types of boilers will keep the hospital in service at all times. Sufficient storage area for both coal and fuel oil should be made at the same time so that the hospital can continue its service uninterrupted for considerable periods of time. The experience in Connecticut definitely shows that boilers fired by coal and oil place the hospital in a position to render community service on demand.

Another problem, not ordinarily thought of except in time of disaster, is the matter of maintaining adequate communications. When disaster strikes, it is necessary to disrupt some services and step up others, to rearrange headquarters and to organize facilities to meet the situation. On the nursing divisions, especially, the intercommunication system between the nursing station and the patient's bedside proved helpful in our flood crisis. Similar equipment between areas such as the hospital lobby and the emergency room, the admitting office and the emergency room, pharmacy and the emergency room, and the general storage area and the emergency room would have proven to be valuable. For instance, in our hospital, the chief of staff made his headquarters in the emergency room and the administrator established his in the front lobby. Both could have been in closer contact had there been provision for intercommunication between the two points other than the telephone. Such a system would serve a purpose in day-to-day operation and would become vital when disaster strikes.

Careful consideration should be given to the location and design of the emergency room. It should be located to facilitate admitting, detaining, treating, and discharging patients. When casualties arrive at a hospital, it makes sense to have plans which permit an orderly flow of patients from (1) an admitting point controlled by a nursing station to (2) a treatment area and then (3) a detention area or an in-patient division. Close proximity of the emergency room and the admitting offices form a unit which can work exceedingly well in a crisis and provide day-to-day service on an efficient basis.

HELIPORT PLANNING

While planning for interior alterations or new construction is important, it is just as important to plan the outside area of the hospital so that efficient and direct facilities for transportation and discharge are available. One problem rarely thought about in the planning of outside facilities of the hospital is a heliport. In the past flood disaster crisis, this hospital, by virtue of having planned rather extensive parking areas, was able to set up a heliport which permitted delivery and discharge of patients, supplies, and equipment which would not have been possible otherwise. Heliports should be planned sufficiently close to the hospital so that patients and supplies can be carried to it, if necessary, or transported by vehicle, if desired. It should not be located so close that the rotors of the helicopters push in the windows or blow all the dust and dirt from the parking areas through open windows. Having a heliport on top of one of our buildings did not make sense to us because it meant difficulties in transportation through the buildings.

The experience of our hospital and other hospitals during the recent disaster has indelibly impressed us with the need for the services described in this article. The needs for these services are known to exist but it takes a flood, earthquake, or tornado to make people aware enough of their need to take action. In planning for disaster, the community has the right to expect that lessons learned in previous crises serve as a basis for services they are willing to underwrite. With additional funds available, such as the Foundation grants, there is every reason to believe hospitals will improve their services by giving attention to the facilities required for serving their communities in times of disaster.

Could Any Test Be More Difficult?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial about President Eisenhower from the Redwood City (Calif.) Tribune of February 18, 1956, entitled "Could Any Test Be More Difficult?"

COULD ANY TEST BE MORE DIFFICULT?

If President Eisenhower survives the ordeal through which he must pass in the next 2 weeks, he ought to be fit for anything.

In that time he must make a decision which will affect the course of history.

This is not to say that he is either indispensable or inevitably right. It is merely to recognize the fact that the President of the United States is in a position so sensitive and so powerful that his personality, his way of doing things, his ability to swing others into line with him, his ability to prevent some things from happening and to cause others to happen—all these set off chain reactions throughout the world.

If Mr. Eisenhower decides against running, other methods and another personality will control and different reactions will be set off. He must feel that his own approach has been fundamentally right; otherwise he would be a man with no faith in himself and the God to whom he consistently turns for guidance.

If he decides to run, is elected, and then is stricken while in office, the consequences would be far reaching. Would they be disastrous?

Now that the doctors have spoken, we are told, he must make his choice alone with his judgment and his conscience. If that were possible, it would be easier. But he has to make it under crushing and bewildering and conflicting pressures. He must make it amid the shouting of major and minor prophets, the cheers of those who expect of him miracles beyond any man's power, and the warnings of those who see only danger unless he steps aside.

A man who can withstand all this without breaking need not be greatly intimidated by anything that lies ahead.

Colonialism and Liberalization of Our Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editor of the Mankato Free Press has recently written editorials on the issues of colonialism and the liberalization of our immigration legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mankato Free Press of February 10, 1956]

AGE OF COLONIAL REVOLTS

The present age may come to be known as the age of colonial revolts. Egypt, India, Burma, and Ceylon have freed themselves from Great Britain. That power has found it expedient to grant home rule to Malaya and the Gold Coast of West Africa. The Sudan is setting itself up as an independent state. France has fared no better, having lost Indochina, and apparently being on the way to losing North Africa as well.

Now an assertion of the forgotten men has manifested itself in France's Pacific colony of New Caledonia, known to most Frenchmen chiefly as a penal colony. The Melanesian population has received the political recognition of being granted membership in the French Parliament. Now the natives and poorer French settlers have joined in electing Maurice Lenormand, a Frenchman with a Melanesian wife, to Parliament on a platform resembling that of our New Deal.

The old-established interests do not like it, but they will do well to make considerable concessions. The Pacific islanders are on the march, like the native population of British Asia, French Africa, and Indochina.

[From the Mankato Free Press of February 11, 1956]

LAW SHOULD BE LIBERALIZED

The United States has completed the most prosperous year in its history. Employment has been at an all-time high. According to President Eisenhower, this unprecedented prosperity will continue. Yet the United States continues to bar admission to all but a few of the thousands seeking life here.

The refugee-relief program, passed in 1953, provides for admission of 209,000 foreigners. To date, hardly more than 51,000 have been admitted, and the program terminates at the end of this year. This is unbecoming the most prosperous Nation in the world. Particularly for one facing a constantly mounting labor shortage in many fields.

One reason for the program's failure is the stipulation that every refugee or refugee family entering this country must have assurance of a specific job by a specific employer. These assurances are unavailable in sufficient volume, not because of unemployment here, nor of lack of need for the skills possessed by these refugees, but because of misunderstanding and even reluctance of individuals to provide such a guaranty. This deficit could be made up quickly if voluntary agencies were permitted to sign employment assurances, as they were in the days of the displaced persons program.

This is a Nation of refugees, yet the present law, in effect, works to hamper the admission of refugees. Congress certainly should liberalize this law according to President Eisenhower's recommendations, remembering that the richness of individual talents and the unity of diversified cultures has brought America to its strength.

Upper Colorado Storage Project Scheme Defies Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River storage project bill, H. R. 3383, is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955.

If ever a piece of water resources legislation cried for processing under the procedures the Presidential advisory committee recommends, this is it. This would involve an application of benefit-cost principles which would give a more realistic appraisal of the benefits and detriments of this project; and ultimate review by an independent Board of Review which should give the Congress a correct picture of the highly controverted engineering and financial details of the proposal.

Compare just two of the statements of the Presidential advisory committee with the facts of this project:

1. Use of excess revenues:

* * * * *

The committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived. However, it should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenue to aid projects which are in no way related to the facility producing the excess revenues amounts in reality to the operation of a Government facility to obtain a profit to be used for other purposes, and there are obvious limits beyond which such a policy cannot be justified (report, pp. 33–34).

The participating projects to be benefited by the anticipated power revenues are connected in no other way with the power dams. Each one of these irrigation ventures could be constructed without the storage dams. No water impounded by these dams is to be placed on the land. Yet 88 percent of the cost of these irrigation projects is expected to be repaid from power revenues. If such a percentage does not exceed obvious limits, what would? The precedent in this bill would be so enormous for this type of subsidy that we may as well forget a national water policy on this score.

2. Payment of interest:

* * * * *

The Committee recommends that as a general policy interest be paid on all Federal investment subject to repayment. In making this recommendation the Committee recognizes that the provision of interest-free Federal funds for irrigation does not conform to this policy. The Committee believes, however, that this provision should not be eliminated but rather that interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost, as should all nonreimbursable items in all projects (report, p. 34).

The Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that the project recommended by the Secretary—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams and 11 participating projects—"would result in a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000 in the year 2032."

This staggering figure has been variously estimated by other sources to run as high as $4 billion, depending on which of the many over-all project plans may be under consideration. In any event, consider the Bureau figure as a minimum. This is not included as a project cost as the Presidential Advisory Committee now recommends. It was brought out only by determined questioning. It gives some idea of the true cost of the project to the taxpayers.

Glossary of Terms Used To Keep the Wheels Turning in Government and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following glossary of terms used to keep the wheels turning in Government and industry:

Program: Any assignment that cannot be completed with one phone call.

Channels: The trail left by interoffice memos.

Coordinator: The guy who has a desk between two expediters.

Consultant or expert: Any ordinary guy more than 50 miles away.

Under consideration: Never heard of it.

Under active consideration: We are looking in the files for it.

Conference: Where conversation is substituted for the dreariness of labor and the loneliness of thought.

Committee: A means for evading responsibility.

Board: First, made of wood; second, long and narrow; and, third, sometimes warped.

Reliable source: The guy you just met.

Informed source: The guy who just told the guy you just met.

Unimpeachable source: The guy who started the rumor originally.

Make a survey: Need more time to think of an answer.

Note and initial: Spread the responsibility.

Clarification: Fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground.

Check the files: Ask the janitor to look through yesterday's sweepings.

Finalize: Scratch gravel to cover errors.

Magnesium in Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a great area of untapped mineral wealth lies in the northern Cascade Mountains of the State of Washington. In the vast olivine deposits of the Three Sisters Mountain, in Skagit County, lies an olivine deposit estimated to contain enough magnesium oxide to produce 500 million pounds of magnesium metal a year for 500 years.

A new process for producing magnesium metal from the olivine has been developed by a University of Washington graduate student, Kermit Bengston, which might well result in a practical method of manufacturing and selling this magnesium at a lower cost than aluminum. I include an article from the Seattle Times, of February 5, 1956, describing Mr. Bengston's process:

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT'S PROCESS GETS MAGNESIUM FROM SKAGIT ORE

A process for producing magnesium metal from the vast olivine deposits of Three Sisters Mountain was reported today in The Trend in Engineering, University of Washington technical publication.

Kermit Bengston, graduate student in chemical engineering, reported the results of work begun 9 years ago and now approaching conclusion.

If a new method of treating granulated olivine with chlorine gas proves feasible on a pilot-plant basis, Bengston said, anhydrous magnesium chloride "could very probably be obtained at less cost than by the present commercial process and certainly with greatly reduced capital investment."

Magnesium metal is now obtained principally from sea water, with magnesium chloride the next-to-last step.

An electrolytic process, similar to that used in the production of aluminum, is the final step in converting the magnesium in the sea-water test. A similar last step would be used in Bengston's process.

University of Washington mining and chemical authorities long have regarded the Three Sisters formation, in Skagit County, as a storehouse of fabulous wealth, awaiting an economically feasible process for magnesium extraction.

The mountain formation, 10 miles long, 2 to 3 miles wide, and rising to a 6,700-foot elevation, is almost solid olivine, an ore containing 49 percent magnesium oxide.

It has been estimated that the mountain could produce 500 million pounds of magnesium metal a year for 500 years.

"I haven't worked out this figure myself, but after climbing the South Sister I can believe it," Bengston said.

The olivine ore also includes "lenses" of chromite.

Bengston's method involves "fluidizing" the olivine ore. This means granulating the rock and using gas to keep the ore particles in motion, as if they constituted a liquid.

The gases used in the process are chlorine, to form magnesium chloride, and carbon monoxide, to absorb oxygen released in the reaction of the chlorine with the olivine.

Bengston began his work on olivine in 1947 as an undergraduate. It was interrupted in 1951 when he went into the Navy. He resumed his project in 1953.

His research has provided theses for his bachelor's and master's degrees—and a patent on his process.

The final steps of his project will be the basis of a doctor's thesis—"and perhaps a practical method that will permit magnesium to be manufactured and sold at a lower cost than aluminum," Bengston said.

Look It Up and Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, a timely editorial appeared in the December 8, 1955, issue of the Crockett Democrat, published in Crockett, Tex. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial:

LOOK IT UP AND THINK

Now that the campaigns are under way we have started hearing the sneers of the people regarding politicians.

That, to us, is maddening.

Webster defines politics thusly: The science of government; that part of ethics which relates to the regulation and government of a nation or state for the preservation of its safety, peace, and prosperity.

Mr. and Mrs. Houston County, stop and reread that if you please.

There are lots of candidates for office, but they are only the figureheads, to be elected by you, to administer the various offices of your government.

Don't you dare sneer and call down the wrath of your household on their heads. They are politicians, because they want to hold the important jobs that political office gives them.

You may or may not have had the guts it takes to enter a campaign, and too many of you stayed away from the polls in the past, and there is no reason to think you will vote this year.

You are in politics, if you value the air you breathe. If you or your sons, or your fathers, or grandfathers ever took up arms in defense of the United States. That was politics—violent politics every time they pulled the trigger of an M1, but don't ever sell politics short.

You who live in the freedom of Houston County are in politics, whether you vote or not. You are interested in politics because the Government has made it possible, through wars and trading, for you to be in politics.

Don't, please don't, in the coming months say anything derogatory about politicians per se. A personal like or dislike of a candidate in politics. Express yourself, especially at the polls, but don't ever sell politics or politicians short.

Some people like to farm, some like to run newspapers, some like to fish for a living, all have a place in the world and you, Mr. and Mrs. Houston County, are in politics every day of your lives.

Don't sneer—cheer.

It is refreshing to have some people brag because they are politicians. They usually are not the psuedostatesman that sits on the courthouse bench and pokes fun at every candidate.

American Policy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a memorandum from Mr. I. L. Kenen, executive secretary of the American Zionist committee for public affairs. It is a most interesting comment on the reply of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the declaration of recent date signed by so many Republicans and Democrats. I believe that this analysis by Mr. Kenen deserves the thoughtful consideration of all of us. Therefore, it is included for the information of the Members:

MEMORANDUM ON THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S LETTER OF FEBRUARY 6, 1956, ON AMERICAN POLICY IN THE NEAR EAST

In his letter of February 6, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has categorically declared that "the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel." Moreover, he concedes that the Arab States may attain military superiority over Israel. In fact, he says, their population preponderance and the availability of huge Soviet arms supply could make the arms disparity impossible to offset. Thus our Government recognizes Israel's danger and its own responsibility for helping to meet it.

This appears to be an irrefutable argument for granting Israel's request to purchase arms, but to our great regret the Secretary of State does not reach that conclusion, although the original Israel request has been pending 4 months and was promised sympathetic consideration by the administration last November. While Mr. Dulles does not exclude the possibility of arms sale to Israel, he believes that the main solution lies in (1) action by the United Nations; (2) implementation of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 by which the United States, the United Kingdom, and France declared it a policy of action to deter aggression, and, finally, (3) establishment of friendly relations between Israel and her neighbors.

Diplomats of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have begun discussing the measures that might be taken in the event conflicts break out anew. These conversations are an outgrowth of the Anglo-American talks held here last week.

No concrete proposals have been formally announced, but newspapers have published divergent reports:

1. It has been suggested in some quarters that the force of U. N. observers might be enlarged. However, this would not in itself deter infiltration or aggression, and U. N. authorities do not regard it as an effective answer to the problem. At best, this is of purely local significance.

2. It has been rumored that the three Western Powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, would undertake to commit forces in the area to halt aggression by either side.

It is not clear whether the powers would undertake this police action (a) under the authority of the U. N.; (b) on their own initiative; or (c) by virtue of treaties with the states directly concerned.

If the great powers were to rely on U. N. authorization, the U. S. S. R. might veto any positive action to defend Israel. Moreover, it will be recalled that in 1948, when both the United States and the U. S. S. R. were united in the U. N. Security Council in the effort to halt aggression in the Near East, it took all of 30 days and 4 orders to cease fire before the U. N. could force the Arabs to a truce. One may speculate on the fearful destruction that could be visited on Israel if the Security Council were immobilized and Israel had no weapons to counter the swift and modern equipment now in Egyptian hands.

On the other hand, it will be unprecedented if the great powers were to act without U. N. sanction or, in the alternative, without the agreement of the states directly concerned. This could set a dangerous example for other powers to act on their own initiative in the Near East or in other parts of the world.

In addition, it would be a reversion to the 19th century, and all Near East countries, which have waged an ideological war against imperialism and colonialism, would doubtless resent a status reducing them to protectorates or wards.

It would seem, therefore, that the logical method of establishing some kind of machinery to keep the peace would be through bilateral or multilateral treaties in the region by the terms of which the countries of that area would receive guaranties from the great powers to respond to their appeal in the event of aggression against them. Such treaties could be negotiated within the framework of the United Nations Charter and would be completely consistent with the regional defense systems which have been negotiated in other parts of the world and which today knit together 44 countries.

Accordingly, it seems to us that our Government should now consider negotiation of such security treaties with Israel and other countries in the Near East that want them. We continue to believe that it would be a fatal mistake to defer such pacts until after Arab-Israel agreement is reached on boundaries and other issues (a proposal which Mr. Dulles has renewed in his letter to the Congressmen).

It is reported in Washington that the current discussions will come to a head within a month. If no firm decisions can be reached within that time, the dangers in the area will doubtless increase. Meanwhile, Arab arms superiority mounts every day as Soviet arms pour into the area while Israel's arms request is stalled.

The foregoing review of the difficulties now confronting Western statesmen shows the complexity of the problem. It underlines the urgency of immediate and effective action to deter aggression; that is, to let Israel have the weapons it must have to defend itself. For treaties and guaranties, even if they are finally negotiated, are no substitute for arms, as democratic Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries learned in 1939. With the greatest of good will and the most effective guaranties, there is real danger that an exposed and ill-armed Israel could suffer terrible destruction and loss of life before help could come, if enemies attacked her and she did not have adequate weapons to bear the brunt of the assault.

Thus, there is danger in continued delay. Mr. Dulles has stated that the preservation of Israel is part of the United States foreign policy. Our Government must enable Israel to do what she can to preserve herself.

We believe this is vital if communism is to be blocked in the Near East. We believe it to be crucial to the best interests of the United States and the free world.

I. L. KENEN.

As a Farmer Views the Farm Program and His Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following letter from Grant Trenbeath, a farmer at Neche, N. Dak. I know Mr. Trenbeath as a practical, hard-working farmer, and an independent thinker. His views, as offered here, are in contrast to so many we have heard which are represented as grassroots thinking:

Ninety-percent supports for wheat are necessary for the coming year, if acreage restrictions are imposed to the degree present surpluses can be reduced. Ninety-percent supports necessary as a stopgap until we see how effective the soil-bank program will be.

Ninety-percent supports are not the solution to a long-range farm program. As Ole Flatt stated, "It can only be a steppingstone but never a cornerstone."

There never were two greater crimes committed against the American farmer as those that took place in the past 6 years. First allowing 90-percent supports to continue, without acreage controls, and watching surpluses mount; and secondly, when acreage quotas were applied the Congress did not restrict acres even close to what was necessary to curtail surplus growth. Now we are faced with a serious situation, with the majority of the farmers reasoning, not looking for a long-range solution to get out of the public trough, but grabbing for the best plan that assures them the most out of it.

As I mentioned at the Grand Forks meeting, we along the Canadian border are very aware of a situation we believe needs correcting. The Canadians developed a good variety of hard red spring wheat, much in demand prior to this year, but in adequate quantity within the States from last year's crop, to take care of all necessary seeding this spring. The Canadian farmers are willing to clean, bag, tag, treat, and transport this variety into this country cheaper than the American farmer can prepare his own wheat, of the same variety, for seeding so he is leaving it under CCC loan or selling it on the market.

Here is what is taking place. The annual commercial wheat import quota from Canada is 795,000 bushels at a duty of 21 cents a bushel. But registered seed if color treated so it will not get into commercial channels, may be imported in unlimited quantity at an import duty of 5 percent of the cost (in the case of wheat between 10 cents and 11 cents a bushel). Since November 1, 1955, until January 31, about 800,000 bushels came into the United States in this manner in the district comprising North Dakota and one county of Minnesota. At this rate, by April 1, it is probable that 1,500,000 bushels will be imported in this one district alone, not including the rest of Minnesota and east and also Montana west. This is all hard red spring wheat that is indirectly competing on the open wheat market, being financed by the CCC and storage being paid by the United States Government. Plus the fact we are losing 10 cents a bushel import duty, on a commodity in great surplus within the United States. This situation needs immediate attention as it will continue into another planting year.

The greatest deterrent in making any farm program workable are the large surpluses. Parity should be achieved in the open market and not as a direct subsidy from the Government. The new soil-bank program will insure the United States against food shortages in case of drought and war emergency in the soil and not reflect as a drag in the commodity markets.

We, therefore, believe present surpluses should be disposed of immediately, even at a great loss, to make the new program effective. Even if the soil bank succeeded in reducing acreages on basics 15 to 20 percent a year, at best it would be 6 or 7 years before surpluses could be eliminated, in the case of wheat. During this time the costs to the Government in storage and direct subsidy will be tremendous and the farmer still demanding more, so it would be realistic for the Government to take its loss in stocks on hand rather than spending twice the amount in making the new program work and then probably not succeeding.

The farmer has got to realize he must not continue to place himself on a higher pedestal in his demands on the Public Treasury. Other segments of the United States economy will be entitled to the same consideration and we will have a completely socialized economy. We must be leaders in getting every segment of the economy away from the public trough. If we continue as in the past, the public could rise up and stop this increasing Government subsidy to the American farmer and we could lose the farm evernormal granary. What then?

We have just received the working details of the new soil bank. It appears to us, here, the big money was placed on the wrong horse. Less money should be paid in the conservation reserve and more on the acreage reserve.

The sole purpose of the program is to create a stop-gap voluntary incentive for the farmer to reduce his plantings in the basic commodities, in surplus. The very opposite will be achieved. Every farmer you talk to here, plans to participate heavily in conservation reserve, but still plant his full quota of wheat. In some of the less-productive areas they will place the whole farm in the conservation reserve, excepting that portion required to plant and summer fallow for the next year, their whole quota of wheat.

If the new program for the rest of the country corresponds to the figures here its purpose will be defeated.

GRANT TRENBEATH.

La Prensa and El Tiempo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald under date of February 4, 1956, entitled "La Prensa and El Tiempo," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA PRENSA AND EL TIEMPO

After 5 long years of suppression La Prensa once again is appearing as a free newspaper in Buenos Aires. The case of La Prensa during those 5 years became a symbol throughout the free world of the effort of totalitarianism to grind all independent thought under its boot. The valiant fight of La Prensa's exiled owner, Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz, did much to alert other peoples to the fact that press freedom is intimately connected with all other freedoms. La Prensa's editorial on its reopening is a powerful statement of the responsibility of independent newspapers to help maintain freedom by reporting the truth and commenting on public affairs. We know that it will never waver in this purpose, and we trust that it now will have a fruitful role in the rebuilding of a happier Argentina.

Contrast this reaffirmation of freedom with the lamentable situation in Colombia, where the iron arm of the Rojas Pinilla dictatorship is reaching out to crush more free newspapers. For more than half a year the voice of the once great Tiempo of Bogota has been silent. Two other opposition papers, El Espectador and Diario Grafico, have been closed as the result of governmental action. Even as there is discussion of a new press law which would forbid governmental censorship or suppression, a Conservative newspaper, La Patria of Manizales (which had supported the Government but ventured to criticize certain measures), has ceased to appear because of censorship. More and more the events in Colombia are beginning to resemble those in Argentina under Peron. It is perhaps pertinent to remind Gen. Rojas Pinilla of what happened to Peron.

Profits Without Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the egg and poultry industry has been a stanch advocate of keeping governmental controls out of its business. Its members have opposed controls and subsidies and have worked out an active program of promotion, self-regulation of production, and quality improvement.

The following editorial which appeared in the Seattle Times, I believe is a convincing testimonial to the success of this segment of agriculture:

WASHINGTON EGG AND POULTRY FARMERS HAVE PROFITABLE YEAR

Although Washington State farm production in general dropped last year by about 10 percent as compared with 1954, one branch of agricultural activity prospered and did a volume of business that set a new record. The Washington Cooperative Farmers Association, which represents some 45,000 farm-family members, reports a business volume of more than 51,300,000 for 1955, and an operating margin of $2,935,769 which is distributed to the association's members. The State's egg and poultry farmers had a substantially more profitable year than their colleagues in some other segments of the farming industry.

Washington agriculture in 1955 generally felt the effects of the price squeeze and the curtailment of wheat acreage. Weather conditions dealt severe blows, too, notably to the western Washington strawberry and oat crops. The State's overall egg production was slightly down, but Harry J. Beernink, general manager of the cooperative association, has advised his members that its 1955 egg receipts were up 14½ percent.

The State egg and poultry farmers enjoy many advantages over other phases of agriculture. They have a populous and growing local market which is seldom adversely af-

fected by foreign competition and complex world economic problems as is the case, for instance, with grain. Through their cooperative association they enjoy the benefits of a vigorous advertising program and extensive scientific research in marketing methods, feed, nutrition, and fertilizers that enable them to improve and dispose of their products. The association plans an advertising budget of $450,000 for 1956.

The Washington Cooperative Farmers Association has a continuing program to encourage farmers in eastern Washington to raise more corn and grain suitable for poultry feed. During 1955, the association paid $1,350,000 in freight charges to haul corn from the Middle West. It costs $1,000 to bring a single 50-ton freight car of midwestern corn to the association's mills in this State. If eastern Washington farmers would increase their feed crops materially, both they and the State's egg and poultry raisers would profit thereby.

The Washington Cooperative Farmers Association makes a substantial contribution to the State's overall economy when its members flourish. In providing jobs and in the purchase of supplies and transportation, its activities are reflected favorably in every business field. For example, in 1956, the association plans a $350,000 program of new construction and building modernization. The State always benefits whenever any of its agricultural enterprises thrive.

CIO Union and Its Lobby Against the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, on February 21, 1956, contained an editorial which should be brought to the attention of the Senate which apparently is going to investigate all phases of the natural gas bill lobby situation.

As the Tribune points out, one of the facets of the investigation should be to determine how much influence contributions of the CIO labor union had in shaping the thinking and voting of some of the most vociferous opponents of the natural gas bill, who apparently received huge campaign contributions from the CIO union which opposed the gas bill.

The editorial is as follows:

CERTAIN SENATORS AND THEIR BACKERS

Mr. Eisenhower vetoed the bill to free independent natural gas suppliers of Federal control, notwithstanding his belief that the legislation was needed and that it was in the national interest. He took this contradictory action because he saw evidence in the fact that an oil company lobbyist had offered a $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator CASE, of South Dakota, that an "arrogant" attempt had been made by "a very small segment" of the natural gas industry to interfere with governmental processes.

After Senator CASE brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, a special committee was appointed to investigate. Another committee is commissioned to study the whole problem of lobbying and campaign contributions.

Mr. CASE did not accept the money for his campaign. He had previously been understood to be in favor of the bill to free natural gas from control. After he informed the Senate of the offer of campaign funds, he voted against the measure. Yet, in his testimony before the investigating committee, he refused to say that he felt that any improper influence had been attempted. He said that he was not alleging a bribe, that "there was nothing proposed to me in this matter," and "there was nothing promised." The apparent effect of the offer was merely to change his own vote.

"Liberal" Democrats are trying to make a great deal of this incident and imply that "the interests" buy and sell influence on the Senate floor. A majority of Democrats who voted in favor of the bill, which passed the Senate 53 to 33, even after CASE had made his dramatically timed announcement.

But the "liberal" Democrats are in none too happy a situation. Representative WINT SMITH, of Kansas, has called attention to the fact that numerous prominent liberal New Deal Senators are in the habit of accepting much more substantial contributions to their campaign chests from such vested economic interests as unions, and, by the rule the liberals seek to apply in the Case affair, these Senators should be regarded as equally beholden to the donors. Also, if the oil company which offered support to Senator CASE is to be considered suspect, so equally, are all other donors.

Thus Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a self-knighted Galahad who led the fight on the natural gas bill with a 4-day harangue, is cited as having received $30,500 from labor organizations in his 1954 campaign for reelection. This is 12.2 times as much money as was tendered Senator CASE; so, if an inference of impropriety is justified in the one case, it must be assumed that the unions wanted, and expected, 12.2 times as much from Senator DOUGLAS as the oil company sought from Senator CASE.

The unions contributed on a similar scale to such other pets as Senators NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and MURRAY, of Montana, who, with Senator DOUGLAS, always vote the way the the union bosses see things. Is it not justifiable to conclude, then, that in large areas of legislation the votes of these Senators have been signed, sealed, and delivered in advance to the union bosses who possess such substantial equity in them?

New Low in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the editorial entitled "New Low in Politics," which appeared in the February 16 issue of the Danville Commercial-News.

I have been very much distressed that politics is being played with this extremely important farm problem. The bill as reported by the Democrat-controlled Agriculture Committee will gravely injure the Illinois corn farmers:

"Atrocious * * * as bad as can be!"

That is what Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, Democrat, has to say about the farm bill reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee, of which he is a member. Under the leadership of its chairman, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, the committee would restore rigid high support prices. ANDERSON knows they won't work, because he was Secretary of Agriculture in the Truman administration.

In spite of the fact that ANDERSON has warned his party repeatedly that rigid supports which stimulate production have had their chance and failed, ELLENDER has plunged all out for high supports. Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson has warned Congress and the Nation that if ELLENDER's bill is passed the President surely will veto it.

"Then," retorts ELLENDER, "there won't be any farm bill."

We hope the public, and especially farmers, will take note of that statement, which we think sets something of a new low in peanut politics.

ELLENDER apparently is motivated by 2 or 3 selfish and narrow objectives. He can't get away from the idea that this is an election year and that partisan politics come first. He wants high supports and easy Government money for cotton and peanut growers under a program which stimulates production of these items, already a drug on the market.

The President has proposed a soil bank plan under which farmers would receive incentive payments to retire land temporarily from production. The soil bank is included in the Ellender bill because the committee apparently could find no major fault with it.

La Prensa's First Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "La Prensa's First Editorials," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA PRENSA'S FIRST EDITORIALS

On March 12, 1951—after the great Argentine newspaper La Prensa had been shut down by the totalitarian Peronistas—we printed an editorial on page 1 entitled "Buenos Aires Papers Please Copy" in which we offered La Prensa space daily to print its editorial voice, until it could again be heard in Argentina.

The exiled owner, Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz was unable to furnish it; not only was it impossible to get free comment through Peronista censorship; such comment, if written, would have endangered Argentine writers who had been silenced. Refused passports, they were actually prisoners in their own country, in or out of jail.

Now Peron has been deposed, and La Prensa has been returned to its rightful owners.

Therefore, it is with a special pleasure that 5 years after our offer was first made, we publish the editorials below. They are La Prensa's first, published today as it resumed it proud career as a free newspaper.

Five years ago, the voice of La Prensa in Washington would have dramatized the dangers of nationalistic totalitarianism to the conference of North and South American foreign ministers then about to convene here

to discuss the problem of hemispheric defense.

Today, the voice of La Prensa can dramatize to our State Department—and to us all—the wisdom of never compromising with the devil.

Five years ago, we said "* * * an idea cannot be shot, or bombed out, or hung to a lamp post. Even an evil idea * * * Hitler was finally buried under a most fantastic holocaust of bombs; Mussolini came to an obscene and terrible end, hanging upside down from a street lamp." Peron, luckier than his spiritual brothers, today perches in a Panama hotel, living off his thievings, still plotting and spouting lies.

But whether or not dictators die or are deposed, totalitarianism does not die, and we are naive if we suppose it.

Mankind's struggles for political and economic security and individual safety are unending. Over the centuries its gains are small, and bitterly won.

Reopened, free La Prensa is today a citadel retaken, a symbol and a warning that the stubborn vitality of good can prevail only if men who are dedicated to political decency, who stand for the right to honestly criticize government, who stand to tell the truth as they sincerely see the truth—stand together, wherever they may be.

FOR DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

After more than 5 years of forced silence we return to take our place in journalism. We return to renew our labor in service of the Argentine nation and for the democratic ideals and liberties which we have unwaveringly defended.

Our voice was silenced for having stated the truth in our news columns and for thinking the truth and expressing it editorially.

For several years we had edited our newspaper without knowing whether the edition which we were putting out might be the last or the next to the last.

Then, January 25, 1951, the blow was struck. It had been carefully prepared. It was disguised in the garb of a union conflict. Initiated with a list of demands presented in the name of workers who did not form even part of La Presna's personnel, and with obvious official machination, publication of this newspaper thus was made impossible. The three branches of government cooperated to plan and execute what to the country and the world was presented as the expropriation of La Prensa. That is what the congress called it when it voted it.

But it was actually closure and confiscation for defending freedom.

Then, outrageously using our name, and using our plant, a newspaper was published which the people always knew to be a fraud.

The tyranny prolonged itself for as long a period as it was able to support itself, and then the best happened.

After 12 years of dictatorship and a little more than a century from that glorious deed, a new liberating revolution has put Argentina again on the road to its redemption * * * If the disaster of 12 destructive years of despotism and ineptitude exceeds even the worst expectations, our country still has the necessary elements under a regime of freedom and of individual guarantees to rebuild.

The recapture of liberty and the enjoyment of the essential rights of man repay these efforts. They are worth the sacrifices necessary to put our country back on the road to rehabilitation.

This common task will be historic. It will mark the start of a new era. And La Prensa, which was first published when the first definite struggles began for that which we call national organization after the consolidation of the Argentine union, will take part in this task without wavering. With concern for public good as from its first hour and during its whole existence, La Prensa will be published in the service of truth, justice, culture and progress, and, always, in defense of freedom.

THREE QUESTIONS

For more than 81 years, the Nation's life was reflected, justly, in the pages of this independent newspaper. They formed a written day-by-day history—true history written almost at the moment the events occurred.

After January 26, 1951, this history of the Argentine people, chronicled and commented upon in our columns, was stopped.

On that date violence at the service of infamy changed the written history into absolute silence.

After more than 700,000,000 copies—at the rate of some 400,000 papers daily—the honest Argentine chronicle started in October, 1869, could not be printed. From our collections are missing events of the last 1833 days, the cruelest of the recent tragic years suffered by the Argentine people * * *

Present Argentine generations and those to come will feel urgent need for answers to questions emerging from the Argentine drama:

What is the extent and depth of the destruction suffered by our country?

How, in a country with our culture and democratic tradition, is such a constitutional catastrophe possible? How can such a rule by force be implanted? For that is what it was—rather than a system of government which stopped our national progress. It was a repetition of regimes which caused the last war.

How, finally, can the principal moral and material damages caused during the unlucky cycle be repaired most quickly and—

How can anything even remotely like this tragic period be prevented from ever happening again in Argentina?

Little by little the whole truth is being learned. The people should not be long in understanding—we are sure—that the devastation was carried out by means of three equally sinister methods—lying, bribery, and fear.

Some were deceived.

From others, guilty complacency was bought.

And terror annulled the honest reaction of many.

There was a false key to open the door to the land of such fiendish methods. The false pass key was suppression of freedom of expression. When this happened, almost an entire people were made blind, deaf, and dumb.

Any community thus restricted in its information, in passing judgment, and in forming its thought is put in such condition that it can be carried along tortuous roads to the most dangerous extremes. The truth of this statement is clear not only in the Argentine experience—the tragedy of other peoples also corroborates it.

Why Go to School?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the question is often posed by young people in America, "Why go to school?" In some instances the full outline of answers is difficult to give, and even more difficult to sell to the youngster.

It seems to me that Mr. Joseph Paul Bitzer, the faculty adviser of the journalism students in the Lemmon, S. Dak., High School, has put the advantages of going to school in concise and succinct form in his article, Why Go to School, which appeared in the Lemmon Squeezer, the high-school paper.

So that other instructors and other students may have the benefit of this well-written article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY GO TO SCHOOL?

(By Joseph Paul Bitzer)

You are now going to school. To be more exact, you are attending one of the many public high schools in the United States. Your school is similar to each of the other schools, and again, it is different from the others. No 2 schools are exactly alike, the same as no 2 persons are the same. Many of you may be wondering just why it is necessary to spend so much time in school. Many of you may believe that some of the time is well spent, and some of the time is wasted. Many of you are probably wondering, "Just why do we go to school?"

First, you are living in a free country, and the people who were here when the place known today as the United States decided that in this new free land, everyone should have an opportunity to have an education, to be able to learn for himself, and in turn become a better citizen. One could also say, to fit in with the conditions of life as they are where you are living, and when you are alive. So you will be able to do your part in making your community, and in turn your State, and country, a much better place in which to live. By being able to do your part well, you in turn should be able to live a more happy, prosperous, worthwhile life. And if most of us were able to do this for our country we would have a better place in which to live. And to continue, if all of the human beings existing on the earth were able to have your opportunities, what a wonderful world it could be for everyone.

Now, let's go to the school. Our own Lemmon Public High school. Before it was mentioned that it was similar, but also different from the rest throughout the United States. It is true that our school is not as large as some of the schools in the big cities. Students going to schools in the larger cities have many opportunities which you could never expect to get in your own place of learning.

Many of you may have been in a big city school system, and you may miss some of the opportunities you had at that particular place. Then, you at Lemmon High have many opportunities which students in other places would love to have. Considering everything, it is all good public education. Whether you are in a school the size of Lemmon, a high school having an enrollment of 2,000, or a high school with an enrollment of 50, each place has something which is good, and something that only this particular school can be proud of.

Next, let's take a look at some of the courses or subjects and we will also consider the extra-curricular activities. Many of you may wonder why you are taking certain subjects in high school. There are two main reasons: one because the State laws specify that these courses must be taken, and the other reason, because the members of your school community believe that they are for your benefit. Extra curricular activities are usually the result of interest on the part of the students, and what the public considers good for the community.

Some of the subjects you study will help you earn money in actual life; others will make life more pleasant for you, and others will prepare you better to fit in with your fellow human beings. It is true that you may be taking courses which will never benefit you, or perhaps you may think so now, and perhaps this way for many years to come, but if the course helped you to think, and opened your eyes to something you would never have considered on your own, it may be doing you more good than you may realize now.

High school students have an opportunity to prepare themselves for college, and for those not going to college, to prepare themselves for actual life.

Extracurricular activities are excellent. It is often true that a student learns more from extracurricular activities than studing the regular formal subjects. Could it be that if the present extracurricular activities were required for credit, and your present courses such as English, history, etc., were extracurricular, that you would take more interest in them.

While going to school you should learn to think for yourselves, but you should also have the patience to do what you are told to do while a student. You may consider the information given you as foolishness. You may resent taking orders and often not having an opportunity to fight back, but in the long run, you may find it to your advantage to listen, form your opinions while a student, and then express yourselves when your education is completed. This does not mean that you are not to express your opinions, but before you condemn a subject, a person, etc., sit through the discussion and when you are no longer a student and when you are a leader, do what you consider best.

It is surprising how much sense certain supposed to be ridiculous things make in later years. There are usually reasons for what you are doing in school and again, it may be a good idea to do them to the best of your ability.

So in closing, we can answer our question, Why do we go to school? by knowing that when we go to school, we have an opportunity to prepare ourselves to fit in with the conditions of life as they are in our particular time and community. Students going to school are working for themselves. They are working to prepare themselves to be better human beings and this means that the future of today will be responsible for an even better tomorrow.

Lincoln Day Speech by Hon. Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine, at Keene, N. H., Before the Cheshire County Republican Organization

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a copy of a speech given by my good friend and colleague, Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine, before the Cheshire County Lincoln Day dinner held in Keene, N. H., on February 16, 1956:

As Republicans we meet here tonight to celebrate the birthday of a martyred President, and, in so doing, may well consider, for a time, those virtues which he represented. To know those virtues, and to appreciate them, is well. It is not enough.

Abraham Lincoln had an understanding of human nature and a standard of values uncommon to any walk of life, and certainly not often to be found in a President. He was temperate in all things except, possibly, his love of man and his hatred of unnecessary suffering. In an Executive, these things are desirable. They are not enough. Sensitive as a child, he had the rugged strength of your mountains. He was intellectually honest. Morally he was brave. That is enough.

His early failures, his lack of formal education, and his comparative povetry marked him as what one of our major political parties would refer to as "a common man." But for himself, and for all other Republicans—all Americans—he would assert, with Dean Alfange: 'I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to guaranteed existence, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for a beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done.' All this is what it means to be an American."

Lincoln was born in 1809—21 years after New Hampshire came into the Union—when my State of Maine was still a part of Massachusetts, and this Nation had been in existence only 33 years.

Americans then had all the enthusiasm, vigor, and fearlessness to attempt the seemingly impossible that we recognize in our United States Marines today, and the same amazing ability to accomplish it. The world looked at us with dubious eyes, critical of our unorthodox ways, and with no conviction we would come to other than a bad end—and that speedily.

Lincoln believed that to know what is right is not enough. To dare to do what is right is. Throughout his Presidency, he looked upon our Republican Party as the organization best capable of conducting the affairs of the Nation fearlessly and effectively, and on February 27, in a public address, warned against "groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man."

Believing that "He who does something at the head of a regiment will eclipse him who does nothing at the head of a hundred" regiments, his idea of political potency was not to nominate a man because that man would be easy to elect. His philosophy dictated that you find the man who stood for the things in which the party honestly believed, and an army of eager campaigners would arise and exert the necessary energy to elect.

Lincoln was unique, in looks, in personality, and in thought. He has become the symbol of this Nation. He did not write the words, but he of all of our countrymen believed so implicitly that "all men are created equal" that he was willing to trust in God to uphold his stand, and so staked his future and that of his country on that proposition.

Those fishermen and traders who were the early settlers of New Hampshire had those qualities which made possible the breaking away from the known perils and persecutions of the Old World and the setting up of a new organization of States—the knowledge of the past and the vision of the future that inspired those who wrote our Constitution—and such qualities were reliable governors to assure that progress would be steadily upward. Our real danger, from the outset, was that we would travel so far so fast that we would lose sight of the reasons for the grand attempt. It is so easy to forget.

One whose ancestors claimed New Hampshire as their home claimed acquaintanceship with a man who often proclaimed "I know a lot. I just can't remember it." Abe Lincoln would have appreciated such a story.

He is the all-American of all the years. He knew hunger for food, but it was learning for which he thirsted. He toiled and suffered, and he knew defeat intimately. For long years every hope seemed vain, but he perserved in efforts to improve himself and to make the world a better place in which others could live. He might easily have found bitterness in his hard wrestlings with fate, and found excuse, as others have, for settling for the cheap rewards paid to those who practice political expedience. But providence was trying the right man. One who, although beaten to his knees, always staggered back to his feet, and, with eyes raised, pushed forward, would be a worthy trustee for the liberties of a people.

It was almost exactly 100 years ago, at Peoria, that Lincoln said, "If there is anything which it is the duty of the people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Here tonight, we should ponder well whether we have been alert in this regard; whether, as individuals, we have been willing to assign our rights and obligations to our own Government; whether, as a Nation, the preservation and perpetuity of our liberties and instiutions has been or is being delegated to others.

While Lincoln concerned himself with preservation of our Union, Marx and Engels preached the doctrine of Communist statism and control over the individual, advocating a new and evil system of government and society in the guise of assisting and elevating man.

Communism exerts force, and utilizes a fifth column. Socialism practices a stealthy political maneuvering. Such procedures are as foreign to the Republican Party, as they were to Abraham Lincoln. Such leadership of the world's freedom-loving peoples would never have permitted the deathly cold hand of communism to clutch and hold Eastern Europe and most of Asia as it does today nor have permited the filching fingers of Socialism to perform a sleight of hand on most of the rest of the world, so that the powers of the people became the powers of government itself.

Lincoln neither feared nor disdained wealth. Like each of us, he probably had a wholesome respect for something he had little of. He did not try to discourage its accumulation. At Cincinnati in 1859, and the following year in New Haven, he publicly proclaimed his conviction "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interest should, after a while accumulate property, and, after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right. I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. What is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free, to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So, while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humbliest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

Certain self-styled "idealists" would label profit as immoral. But they mistakenly assume that financial is the only kind of profit, or that that is the kind that is immoral.

Few persons and corporations can be persuaded to risk capital and few individuals will exert great personal effort without some promise, however remote, of reward of one kind or another. It is through profitable management that plants are expanded, more work provided for our citizens, and an ever higher standard of living enjoyed by all.

In every country where initiative and incentive have been restricted, and success penalized, the standard of living has been lowered, and frequently only grants in aid by this country have kept their citizens alive. Communists and Socialists, alike, decry profits, taxes, and individual freedom. But a government that carries on the business of a nation (as Communist and Socialist Governments do) receives the profits, makes the decisions as to what part it shall keep in lieu of taxes, and takes from the individuals their freedom. We know that profits make living possible. Taxes make governments function. But individual freedom is what makes both living and government desirable.

Those who advocate centralization of power have made few converts from among Republicans, for, as a party, now as in Lincoln's time, we are firm for a strong Union of strong States. Similarly, those who would subvert our Constitution, or make of it merely an exhibit for the archives, substituting some world charter as our rule for operation, are certainly a small minority in our party.

Lincoln was truly "of the people" as he was "for the people." While we can readily believe that his impulses were all good, he was not impulsive. He was a thoughtful man, and acted only upon mature reflection. His conduct and record would seem to refute the idea that statecraft is something to be schooled in, and diplomacy the "dexterity and artfulness of securing advantages without arousing hostility." He was not artful. He overcame the weakness and meanness of his associates by his infinite patience, complete honesty and magnanimity. He was never unduly concerned with the future and fortunes of Lincoln, but he cared passionately that America should be a place where a humble man might find opportunity for happiness—where the courts should be truly temples of justice for all—where people like himself might find possibilities for service, happiness and, even as he did, immortality.

He took his position and his duties seriously. Himself he did not. He was never what we call a "stuffed shirt." His critics decried his lack of what they termed dignity. But Lincoln would be the first to say that for sheer dignity nothing can surpass a body ready for burial.

In all his utterances, witty or serious, Lincoln spoke as the great majority of all good Americans would had it the gift of words. He put into words what many of us strive desperately and despairingly to state as our philosophy of living. Now, 99 years after his death, undimmed by time or the momentary bursts of brilliance from the meaner achievements of the politically expedient, at home and abroad, his name and memory live on.

Republicans created our national banking system; built up the Nation's credit; and made our currency, based on gold, the world's soundest. We demanded respect for our flag and our nationals the world over—the safety of our citizens was guaranteed while they were on the high seas or abroad.

Republicans passed the first Civil Service Act in 1883, and revised it to provide equal pay for equal work.

The Department of Labor in 1884, Commerce in 1903, the Patent Office, Weather Bureau and Postal Savings System all were established by the Republicans, and it was our party that created the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Lincoln recommended establishment of a Department of Agriculture in 1862 and the same year passage of the Homestead Act provided farms for our people and opened the West to settlement. Later, the Morrill Act provided land for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, such as our University of New Hampshire.

When Lincoln became President, the Democratic Party had been in power for many years, and every patronage job was filled with a Democrat. Republicans then, as now, besieged the White House, demanding appointments. One day a Senator, calling on the President, noticed his dejection and expression of anxiety and said, "Mr. President, has anything gone wrong? Have you heard bad news from Fort Sumter?" The President, still solemnly, replied: "No! It's just the postmastership at Jonesville, Mo."

Our Republican Party is situated today much as it was then. Grave problems face our Nation. Any delegation of our duty and responsibility to try to solve them to another political party is an act of cowardice of which we'll never be guilty. Am I right?

A few short years ago a famous American pondered the question as to whether or not he would be a candidate for the office of President of the United States. Over many years he had worked closely with his Government. One major party had urged him to be their condidate. He gave the matter most serious, and, I am sure, prayerful thought. I believe he looked back over American history and thought in terms of the great men and the things they believed, and the standards that they established. I believe he looked over our great system of political parties. He had never joined one, so he looked objectively. He thought of Jefferson, but concluded that the principles laid down by that great statesman were not those of the leadership of the Democratic Party today. Few men had had the privilege to observe more closely the workings of the Truman administration—its policies—and those in authority. He wanted no part of it. He chose the party of Lincoln, and with the encouragement of you folk in New Hampshire and others across the country became a candidate and was elected President of the United States. That man was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The leader of the greatest armed might in the history of the world has proven himself the greatest President and world leader we have known in generations.

Nearly 4 years of his leadership are now a matter of public record.

It is a record that renews our faith in America; that proves we can enjoy peace, prosperity, and fiscal integrity, and look upon government as a servant and not the master of the people. We find in public office those who look upon administrative and elective office as a public trust and not just a part of the Pendergast or Hague machines or a part of Tammany Hall. We expect loyalty, justice, and equity, and want no more Hisses or Caudles. This type of government has brought encouragement to our people, renewed our faith in ourselves, and furnished a basis for trust and confidence in representative government.

A great American tonight turns over in his mind the problems and issues associated with another great decision. Again he considers the matter seriously and prayerfully. A matter of party is not involved. He knows which party has helped him build for a greater America. He will make the decision and map the course, and to each of us passes the responsibility of getting out and working in the coming campaign—electing a Republican President and a Republican Congress. To do less will put us back on the road to Trumanism. To those who would do that the road signs should read, "Dangerous; proceed at your own risk."

Daniel Webster has said that "duly performed or duty violated is still with us, for our happiness or our misery." Well, freedom and the future are not for fumblers.

Covered Bridges in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial on the subject of the 142 covered bridges on the Pennsylvania highway system. The editorial appeared in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of February 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-TWO COVERED BRIDGES

In this day of high speed motor traffic, the day of the covered wooden bridge is numbered—there are only 142 of the picturesque structures on the State highway system, Secretary Joseph J. Lawler said today.

Since World War II there have been 359 covered wooden bridges on the system, but floods, gales, and old age have claimed 217 of them on replacements. The department shies away from putting a roof on any bridge and except in a few isolated cases all bridges built by the State are now made of steel.

The department has never built a covered wooden bridge, the accumualtion of them having come about through action of a series of legislative bills, which transferred ownership of the bridges from counties, boroughs, and townships. Many counties and townships have off-system bridges.

Most of the bridges in use today were built of spruce or pine with hemlock being used in a few. These timbers were selected because they were readily available in the neighborhood and because native spruce, pine and hemlock provided the longest timbers. In many bridges the original deck and superstructures are still in place. Stone, quarried or cut in areas adjacent to the bridge was used in the piers, which usually were set on a bed of gravel in the stream. Wrought-iron nails and wrought-iron angle braces made in local blacksmith shops were used in some of the bridges. In others wooden pins were used to tie the structure together.

The roof and closed sides were put in place to save the plank floor from rotting and the department's chief maintenance item on the bridges today is repairing these sections of the bridges.

Greene County has the greatest number of bridges on the State system with 20; Columbia County has 17; Bedford and Lancaster Counties each have 14.

The oldest bridge, according to department records, is that over the Tulpehocken Creek in Spring and Bern Townships, Berks County built in 1834, while the second oldest is over the Conewago Creek in Butler Township, Adams County, built in 1836. Old timers claim that most of the bridges in Lancaster County are much older than that, but no dates for them are available.

Only 3 of the bridges, 1 in Indiana and 2 in Perry County, are posted to carry 15 tons, while one in Adams and Cumberland Counties is posted for 10 tons. Posted weights for the balance of the bridges range from 1½ tons to 7 tons with the majority of them being able to carry 3 tons.

Remaining covered wooden bridges on State highway system by county are as follows:

Adams 11; Bedford 14; Berks 2; Bucks 4; Chester 6; Clinton 1; Columbia 17; Cumberland 8; Dauphin 4; Erie 2; Greene 20; Indiana 2; Juniata 6; Lancaster 14; Lehigh 2; Lycoming 1; Northhampton 1; Northumberland 1; Perry 8; Snyder 2; Somerset 4; Sullivan 1; Washington 9; and York 2.

Nothing New Under the Sun—Upper Colorado Storage Project and Hoover Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, no great venture was ever undertaken by this country of ours but what timid souls and others not so timid but for varying reasons, have shuddered and cried out with dismay at what was being proposed. It was so in the development of the lower Colorado River which was initiated with the construction of that great manmade reservoir of water and power, the Hoover Dam, formerly known as Boulder Dam.

The debates in Congress on the Boulder Dam act are replete with warnings that the construction of this great work was "preposterous," "dangerous," "indefensible," "absurd," and as one good Senator put it "likely to lead to the most tremendous man-made catastrophe in the history of the human race." At another point he said that it was "a menace to the lives of thousands of people which might result in the greatest manmade disaster in history."

And so it is with the upper Colorado River storage project shortly to be considered by the House. On February 6, in the Appendix of the RECORD, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], has an insertion with respect to the upper Colorado River entitled "The Greatest Engineering Blunder in Our History." In that insertion he tells us that last summer he hopped down into the depths of Glen Canyon, in a helicopter, and in no time—with the aid no doubt of a gunnysack in which to collect his samples—he found devastating evidence against the upper Colorado storage project. He found that both the Colorado River, and the San Juan River a hundred miles away, were covered with Chinle, which Chinle when touched by water dissolves, so he warns us; and, says he, the Glen Canyon Dam would be not a mighty reservoir of water and power, but a "billion dollar mud puddle."

But that is not all he found. Notwithstanding studies made by able engineers who have studied the project for years in thorough detail, and at great expense, the gentleman from California for the first time discovered that there were two gaping subterranean caverns, so huge they can hold 350 million acre-feet of water, or, as he says, "26 years flow of the whole Colorado River," and, he gravely tells us, that is where the water will go.

So it was with Boulder Dam back in 1928. Of the Senator who warned of Boulder Dam being equally disastrous back in 1928, the venerable California Senator, Hiram Johnson, said in the great Boulder Dam debate:

He knows more than all the engineers who have examined this project; and he, with his technical skill, with his ability as an engineer, with his knowledge of earth strata, with his infinite variety in dealing with dams, with his constructive genius—he says * * * that this can not be done; and, therefore, his ipse dixit having been uttered, it must not be done.

After reviewing what he described as the 40-page 2-day speech of the Senator in question, Senator Johnson concluded with these words:

And so I say to the Senator * * * and others, who, from one motive or another, follow him, and those he follows: Fear not; this dam can be built, and, under the providence of God, will be built. It will be another milestone in progress and achievement, another tribute to American ability, skill, and courage.

And, of course, as everyone knows, the development of southern California, initiated by the building of Boulder Dam, more than fulfilled the predictions and the hopes of that great Senator and the sponsors of that project. It would have been disastrous for this country if the agricultural production, and the hydroelectric and industrial production, which resulted from the enactment of that bill, had not been available to America during the last war.

On the House side during the Boulder Dam debate, this is what was said:

From a Member from a northeastern city, and a very fine and sincere Member for whom I have the greatest respect, at page 9784 of the RECORD of May 24, 1928:

This bill proposes to irrigate 500,000 additional acres of land that is not now being irrigated, and the land is so highly productive that it will very materially work to the injury of agriculture through the competition it will involve.

They talk about bills to improve the agricultural situation, and then they bring in here bills which are designed to hurt the agricultural situation; bills which will make the situation a great deal worse than it is now.

Is it not about time that those Members representing agricultural interests and who have the interests of agriculture at heart shall put a brake on this type of legislation and decide that the Government shall not, by the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, try to make worse and worse the agricultural situation?

And from another northeastern Member, at page 9978:

The farmers are crying for relief from overproduction, but still we go on reclaiming more lands for agricultural production. * * *

I am opposed to constructing a dam that will constitute a menace. The proposed dam would be at least 675 feet high from the bedrock. That is four times as high as Niagara Falls. It is 120 feet taller than the Washington Monument.

He predicted the dam would not hold, and he said:

It is appalling to think what destruction would follow in the wake of such a wall of water as would follow the breaking of the proposed dam. The territory is subject to earthquakes.

From a western Member, at page 9500:

I have opposed it because it is entirely unsound in its economic aspects and will mean the loss to the Federal taxpayer of every dollar expended upon it. * * * I have opposed it because it is based upon an engineering scheme so absurd, so dangerous, so badly conceived that it can only be called preposterous.

And again at page 9502, he said:

Let us pause for a moment in order that we may hear from the people of Imperial Valley. Under date of February 5, 1927, the vegetable growers of Imperial Valley wrote me, in part, as follows:

"The only people who would benefit from this legislation are the real-estate speculators. There is no sense in bringing more land into cultivation when 90 percent of the farmers in the Imperial Valley cannot now make a reasonable earning on their investment. Any new land brought into bearing can only be used for producing such products as we now produce on the land under cultivation and on which we are unable to make any money."

And there is still another of their basic representations which they must know is not true, and that is that this project can be paid for through the sale of electric power. * * * They know that the Federal Government will lose every cent of capital it puts into this project.

Many more such arguments were echoed back in 1928. But even as the sponsors of Boulder Dam and the lower basin had faith in 1928, and as they have seen their faith fully justified by history, so we who believe in the upper Colorado storage project have faith in the wisdom of this Congress, and we have faith that, as Hiram Johnson said of Boulder Dam:

It will be another milestone in progress and achievement, another tribute to American ability, skill, and courage.

And, may I add, foresight.

Why Irrigate Poor Land First?—Another Ridiculous Feature of the Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ridiculous arguments being advanced in favor of the upper Colorado River storage project is the project's alleged benefits to our Nation's agricultural program. The project would supply irrigation water for high-altitude land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Let us see just how ridiculous this argument is.

THE PROJECT WOULD GROW CROPS ALREADY IN AGRICULTURAL SURPLUS

Because of a surplus of agricultural products and depressed prices for such products, the Congress is now considering a soil-bank proposal which would take 40 million acres of agricultural land

out of production at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers.

Inconsistently, the upper Colorado River storage project would put new acres into production—also at a large cost to the taxpayers per acre.

Surplus agricultural products already being supported by the Nation's taxpayers—without considering the new costs of the soil-bank proposals—include corn, cotton, wheat, butter, oats, butter oil, cheese, dried milk, wool, rye, barley, dry beans, cottonseed oil, grain sorghum, hay and pasture seeds, and soy beans. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

Reports of the Reclamation Bureau reveal that all of the types of crops which would be grown on each of the proposed projects in the upper Colorado River project are already surplus agricultural crops being supported by the Nation's taxpayers. The crops to be grown on these projects will be largely grain and forage crops for dairy cows and sheep which will produce butter, milk products, and wool which are already in surplus and under Government subsidy and in storage at a fantastic cost.

THE PROJECT WILL SERVICE, FOR THE MOST PART, ONLY MARGINAL AGRICULTURAL LAND

The Nation's taxpayers would be forced by the upper Colorado bill to spend hundreds of millions on irrigation projects which will supply water for farmlands of relatively poor quality. The projects will service for the most part only marginal agricultural land much of it at high altitudes suffering frosts each month of the year and having a short growing season at best.

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under the upper Colorado bill, will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre according to figures of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than $100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

There exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.

Contrast the upper Colorado's plan for irrigating marginal high-altitude land at a cost of $3,000 to $5,000 per acre—to produce land which will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre even when fully developed—with the fact that there are at least 20 million acres of first-class land on existing farms in 19 States of the Middle West, South Atlantic, and southern States that can be placed in production at any time they may be needed at a fraction of the cost. And remember that even much of this first-class land is not "needed" under cultivation in this era of agricultural surpluses.

The Department of Agriculture reports that there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage. Such land is available in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Development costs in these States would be from $60 to $100 per acre for such land—compared with $3,000 to $5,000 per acre for land to be developed by the upper Colorado irrigation projects. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

MOLEY ARTICLE

The ludicrous picture presented by these bald inconsistencies has been well described by Mr. Raymond Moley in his regular column Perspective, in Newsweek magazine, in an article entitled "New Acres for Old" in the issue of February 6, 1956.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and the taxpayers of our Nation:

In the President's state of the Union message, separated by only a few sentences are two recommendations: "I shall urge authorization of a soil-bank program to alleviate the problem of diverted acres and an overextended agricultural plant * * *" and "I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

This means that the President is asking Congress to take out of cultivaiton an immense number of acres at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers, and on the other hand to bring into cultivation or to increase the productivity of over a million acres at a cost in the upper Colorado project of as high as $5,000 an acre and in the Fryingpan-Arkansas project of about $1,400 an acre.

This continues the mad cycle which has been going on for years: The Agriculture Department laboring to curb production, and the Interior Department just as zealously trying to increase production. Of course, this makes no sense. But lots of things in politics make no sense and are paid out of the sweat of the taxpayer's brow.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the gigantic upper Colorado project was presented to Congress by the administration and the Hoover Commission was setting to work to look into all and sundry water conservation projects, the President appointed a committee on the general subject, composed of Secretary McKay, chairman, and the Secretaries Benson and Wilson. This committee has just submitted its report.

In the first place, the report recommends that State and local governments should share the cost of water projects. But the President in his message recommends that the two projects named above be wholly Federal.

Next, the committee recommends that there be set up "an independent Board of Review * * * to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President." If any such board were to report independently and factually on these two projects, it can be taken for granted that no President would dream of recommending them. As it happened, the pressure for these projects came from interested Members of Congress and bureaucrats anxious to spend more and more tax dollars. The congressional committees that considered them are stacked with Members from the beneficiary States. In the case of the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 500), only one Member came from east of the Mississippi, and he represents a State paying a relatively small percentage of the taxes involved. One might as well have a plaintiff pick the jury which would pass upon his claim.

The other notable recommendation is that while the old practice of charging water users on irrigation projects no interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government should be continued, nevertheless interest should "be shown clearly as a Federal cost." This means that when a project is presented to Congress, all the cards would be laid on the table. Hitherto the interest charge has been one of those things that the interested parties never chose to mention. Only occasionally a stalwart champion of economy has pried that cost out of the Bureau of Reclamation.

That interest charge is very important. Since no project except 1 or 2 has been paid for by the water users within the 53 years since Federal irrigation began, the interest charge runs to twice to three times the original cost.

Immediately after the President made the report public, a Congressman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, shouted his disapproval and in so doing let a cat as big as a mountain puma out of the bag. He said that "if they did not favor the elimination of the interest charge immediately after adding it to the cost of construction, there wouldn't be a reclamation project in the United States that would be economically possible."

In short, if the real cost plus interest were considered, none of the presently proposed irrigation projects would stand scrutiny.

That is exactly what I have been saying in this space for 2 years.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, if the next 25 years are as dry in the western part of our country as the last 25, it will take the whole quarter century to fill the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. Since the financial feasibility of the upper Colorado River project depends upon the power production of this dam there should be no authorization of such a proposal until the question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact is

settled in the United States Supreme Court where the issue is now pending.

Article 3 (e) of the Colorado River compact provides:

> The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

The power production at Glen Canyon Dam therefore depends on whether or not the upper basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right as against the lower basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if the lower basin needs it for domestic and agricultural uses.

Article 4 (b) of the Colorado River compact provides:

> Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electric power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

Governor Johnson, of Colorado, in his statement to the Senate hearings on this project said:

> Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water (over and above the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin) for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs (Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs) must be released.

Governor Johnson further stated that:

> Under the seven-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico before they can use one drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the seven-State compact was ratified.
>
> In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Is it not foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Glen Canyon Dam on a question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact which may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is now pending in that Court? Plain commonsense demands that all consideration of this bill await the Supreme Court decision.

This bill is scheduled for the floor during the week beginning February 27.

My statement is based on information contained in the minority report on the bill.

The Hoover Commission, in its bipartisan study of reclamation projects, reports that in the water-resources field, five conditions must be found necessary for the success of reclamation projects:

First. They must have technical feasibility.

Second. They must be sound financially.

Third. They must have fertile soil capable of agricultural production over long periods of years.

Fourth. They must have adequate and suitable water supply.

Fifth. There must be farmers available who are interested in and enthusiastic for irrigation agriculture.

Relating these to the project before Congress, the record shows there is question as to the technical feasibility of the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam; the financing is wholly unsound; the soil by and large is of dubious quality, and the water supply is actively in litigation in the Supreme Court.

The Commission further found "experience shows that the farmers alone cannot bear the whole cost of irrigation projects."

Conceding this, would it not be a proper inquiry for Congress to determine what the farmers should pay? Should they pay only 12 percent, as this bill allows? If so, who should bear the balance of the cost, local area residents or the taxpayers in every corner of the Nation?

The Hoover Commission makes a suggestion on this score—that the beneficiaries (including States) contribute at least 50 percent—which may well be forgotten if the "hydro-headed" monster now before Congress becomes law.

I believe that the people are entitled to and will demand a thorough consideration of the Hoover Commission recommendations in the light of this boondoggle project before the Congress. This project goes against every one of the five conditions which must be met before any reclamation scheme can be successful.

It is an attempt to deprive the taxpayers in every part of the Nation of money during the next 100 years which has no business being spent even in 1 year.

Don't Let Them Sell Us Up the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement relative to the upper Colorado River storage project bill.

Federal Reclamation Program Makes Tremendous Contribution to the Economic Development of Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal reclamation program has had a tremendous impact on the southern part of my State of California. The largest Federal development is the Boulder Canyon project, including the Hoover Dam, Imperial Dam, and the All-American Canal system. This project took 20 years to build and represents an investment of approximately $350 million. The contribution of this project to the economic development of southern California has been tremendous. The availability of low-cost power has been a big factor in the rapid growth of industry as well as the rapidly expanding population. The water supply for about half a million acres has been firmed up and water made available to a considerable amount of new land. The value of this development has been particularly apparent during 1954. Nineteen fifty-four would have been the first of two successive critical drought years were it not for the water stored behind Hoover Dam. Because of the availability of water one-half million irrigated acres produced over $115 million in agricultural products during 1954.

Sometime ago I requested the Interior Department to furnish the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee information describing accomplishments of specific reclamation projects. The information on several of the projects has been received, the latest being on the All-American Canal system.

For the information of Members of the House, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Commissioner's transmittal letter, which sets out some of the highlights of this report on the contributions of the All-American Canal system to the economic development of the area which it serves. The letter follows:

> UNITED STATES
> DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
> BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
> *Washington, D. C., February 15, 1956.*
>
> HON. CLAIR ENGLE,
> *Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: Responsive to your request that this Bureau submit information describing accomplishments of specific reclamation projects, we are pleased to transmit herewith two copies of an additional report recently completed entitled "Report on Contributions of the All-American Canal System, Boulder Canyon Project, to the Economic Development of the Imperial and Coachella Valleys, Calif., and to the Nation."
>
> Briefly, the All-American Canal System includes Imperial Dam and Desilting Works on the Colorado River about 18 miles northeast of Yuma, Ariz., a system of main canals to the Imperial and Coachella Valleys, Calif., and an underground distribution system to serve about 75,000 acres in the Coachella Valley. Irrigation water through this system was first supplied to the Imperial Valley in 1940, and to the Coachella Valley in the latter part of 1947.
>
> Some of the highlights of the report are as follows:
>
> 1. Imperial Valley:
>
> A. The value of crops and livestock produced increased from $26.7 million in 1940 to $129.6 million in 1954, or by 4.8 times. During this same period the index of prices received by farmers increased only 2.4 times.
>
> B. Total agricultural production in railroad carlot equivalents increased from 53,000 in 1940 to 109,000 in 1954.

C. Acreage irrigated increased by 38,000 acres from 414,000 acres in 1940 to 452,000 acres in 1954.

D. Production of electric power from hydroelectric plants constructed and under construction on the All-American Canal would require consumption of about one-half million barrels of fuel oil annually if this power had to be produced from oil-fired steam plants.

E. The assessed valuation of Imperial County increased from $36,175,000 in 1940 to $72,611,000 in 1954.

F. The volume of retail trade in the Imperial Valley increased from $23.7 million in 1939 to $104.3 million in 1953.

G. In 1954, nearly $2,300,000 was collected as a result of the California State retail sales tax levy, and the property tax levy produced nearly $5 million.

H. Fruit and vegetables equivalent to over 42,000 railroad carloads were produced in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in 1954, with shipments to almost all the 48 States and Canada. A large portion of these important foods was shipped during the winter months to supply the off-season demand.

I. Increase in population, car and truck registration, building permits, postal receipts, and other economic indicators reflect the beneficial effect of an assured water supply through the facilities of the All-American Canal system.

2. Coachella Valley:

A. The value of crops and livestock produced increased from $13.1 million in 1947 to $25.3 million in 1954, or by 1.9 times.

B. Agricultural production in railroad carlot equivalents increased from 8,420 carloads in 1946 to over 14,000 carloads in 1954. The acreage irrigated has increased from about 20,000 acres in 1946 to more than 50,000 acres in 1954.

C. The assessed valuation of the Coachella Valley County Water District which encompasses the service area has increased from $12.9 million in 1947 to $42.7 million in 1954.

D. Prior to the availability of Colorado River water, good quality raw desert land in the Coachella Valley could be purchased for about $30 per acre. In 1955, these same lands, developed for irrigation of field crops, were valued at about $500 per acre, an increased valuation of about $14 million for the 30,000 acres of new lands irrigated.

E. Similarly with the Imperial Valley, but to a much higher degree, the various economic indicators such as population increase, postal receipts, utility connections, building permits, and bank resources reveal the tremendous economic growth of the area since water became available through the facilities of the All-American Canal system.

Any comments or suggestions you may have regarding the attached report will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

E. G. NIELSEN,
Acting Commissioner.

New History of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the RECORD the fourth installment of the New History of the Democratic Party. The first installment was inserted by myself in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1956, page A531; the second and third installments were inserted the same day by Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., and Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, respectively, on pages A533 and A534.

The articles to date point out specifically the advantages of the Democratic Party for Americans. It points out that the Democrats are the true liberals, and that the Democratic Party understands not only the underdog but also what makes the big money man tick.

We are presently driving more quickly than ever toward a socialistic state. Big business is getting bigger and small business is disappearing. This disappearance of the middle class has been the downfall of many nations in Europe. I pray to God that Italy, France, and England should not become the prototype for America.

The article follows:

PART 4—NEW HISTORY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—WOODROW WILSON MAKES AMERICA A WORLD LEADER—REFORM AT HOME AND WAR ABROAD

For the 16 years following his first race for the Presidency in 1896, William Jennings Bryan was his party's acknowledged leader. And though he lost three times for the Presidency, the influence of his cause spread beyond his own party. In the opposition ranks, it inspired a new breed of Republican, which called itself, at various times, Bull Moose or Progressive. Its aim as expressed by Republican William Allen White, included "cleaning up local politics, ending the wholesale buying of State legislatures, and giving a new chance to the economic underdog." The names of their leaders are well known: Robert LaFollette, of Wisconsin; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; and, of course, the leader of the Bull Moose Party, Theodore Roosevelt. These men were true followers of Lincoln, but the rest of the Republican leadership, known as the Old Guard, fought them as much as they did the Democrats.

Under Bryan's leadership in foreign affairs, the Democrats opposed much of the imperialism arising from the war with Spain. Many Americans thought it great sport to shake the Big Stick at the small nations of South America. Republican foreign policy reversed the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine by declaring that, although Europe could not interfere in South American affairs, the United States could. These actions caused a resentment among our Latin American neighbors that still colors their view of the United States. But the basic sympathies of the Democrats were opposed to taking this advantage of the people of weaker nations.

The Democrats worked on more than just the national level during these years. The campaign of 1896 had invigorated the party on the State and local level as well. In the West and South, Democrats listened to stump speakers, voted in primary elections, and burned bonfires on election night. Democratic State administrations served as testing grounds for railroad regulation, minimum wages, and many other programs later to be adopted by the Federal Government.

With the quickening of immigration, the Democratic organizations of the large cities had a special task: to cast new citizens in the mold of the Republic. Millions of immigrants were streaming into America each year. Democratic ward leaders found them living space, helped them secure their citizenship, brought them food and coal when times were hard. True, the immigrants gave their votes in return. But there were other reasons for these services. The ward leaders had been immigrants themselves, not too long ago. They knew that, with a little help, these foreigners could become worthy Americans.

One of the marvels of America is how these different ethnic groups, whose countrymen were fighting each other so bitterly in Europe, could live beside each other in the great cities in peace. Much of the credit must go to the understanding help of the politicians.

The tireless work of Bryan and his followers bore fruit in 1912. A split in the Republican Party between the Old Guard and Progressives allowed an easy Democratic presidential victory. The President-elect, Woodrow Wilson, pledged himself to remedy the evils exposed by earlier Democrats. As he said in his inaugural speech:

"We have been proud of our industrial achievements, but we have not hitherto stopped thoughtfully enough to count the human cost, the cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, the fearful physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children upon whom the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen. * * * There can be no equality of opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politics, if men and women and children are not shielded from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they cannot alter, control, or singly cope with."

As President, Wilson put the strength of the Federal Government behind improvement of the life of the common man. He believed, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves."

Applying this philosophy, Wilson's Democratic administration built an impressive record of achievement. The Federal Reserve Act took the control of the Nation's currency, which had been centered in Wall Street, and dispersed it among 12 regional Federal banks. The Clayton Act attacked monopolistic trade practices, and expressly declared that "the labor of human beings is not a commodity or an article of commerce." An income tax law was passed, to distribute equitably the burden of running the Government.

The dreams of the reformers of the 1890's had been realized.

Also during Wilson's administration, women won the right to vote. This doubled the size of the electorate and destroyed the last artificial barrier on the road to full citizen participation in government.

But impressive as were Wilson's achievements, history will remember him as a leader of the world. For in this broader task, his idealism and eloquence, his ability to plumb the moral reserves of the people, found fullest expression. America had been lucky. An ocean had isolated her from the continual strife in Europe, allowing her to develop in peace. But now that she had grown large and powerful, as the world's most successful democracy, she was destined to lead the cause of democracy in the world.

Wilson did not want to enter the First World War. But with the German forces overrunning peaceful nations and sinking American shipping, the time came when, in his words, "the right was more precious than the peace."

To achieve victory, the country equipped a large army, mobilized the home front, and greatly enlarged Government services to coordinate the war effort. But, according to historian Mark Sullivan, "the largest single factor in the war was the mind of Woodrow Wilson." Wilson's thoughts and words were weapons. In the most discouraging days of the war, they gave the Allied Nations fresh awareness of a reason for their sacrifices.

During this period, Wilson gave classic expression to the principles of Democratic Party foreign policy. "The national interest would best be served," he said, "by the attain-

ment and preservation of world peace." He knew that just as war arose out of ill feeling between nations, peace could only be based on mutual understanding and mutual respect. To achieve this, he proposed a League of Nations, where each country would have a voice is settling international differences.

But beyond the elimination of war, Wilson had the vision of the world becoming more democratic, not by force, not by economic coercion and dollar diplomacy; but by the strength of the American example. This was the hope behind Wilson's 14 points, a series of peace aims which not only shortened the war, but made Wilson the greatest leader for peace in the world.

To make his vision a reality, Wilson went to Europe at the close of the war to help construct the League of Nations. But when he returned, he found Congress, controlled by isolationist forces, unwilling to accept his plans. So Wilson toured the Nation, carrying his fight for the League to the people. "If the League were not approved," he warned, "I can predict with absolute certainly that within an other generation there will be another world war." But too many people would not listen. Wilson lost his fight, and in the process, his health and strength as well. He returned to Washington a broken man, comforted only by the pioneer's knowledge that history would show him to be right.

Comments of Mr. Ray Henle, Editor in Chief of the News Program, Three-Star Extra, in Connection With the United States Delegation's Visit to Brazil for the Inauguration of Their President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the excellent comment of Mr. Ray Henle, gifted editor in chief of the famous NBC news program, Three-Star Extra.

One of my friends, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, is mentioned in this national broadcast as a member of the United States special diplomatic mission to Brazil which was headed by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Mrs. Nixon. As Mr. Henle points out, Vice President and Mrs. Nixon have been most effective envoys of goodwill in their visits to foreign lands.

Dr. Thorning, who resides in the Free State of Maryland and is a specialist on inter-American affairs, reports that the success which the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon enjoyed in the Far East and in the Republics of Central America and the Caribbean has been repeated, with exceptional brilliance, at all the ceremonies held in Brazil in connection with the inauguration of our good friend, President Juscelino Kubitschek. Dr. Thorning adds that the other members of the United States delegation were tireless in their efforts to show an interest in, and deep devotion to, the people and the Government officials of the great Republic of Brazil.

It is worth noting that, upon the return of the United States delegates to the United States, they were the guests of honor in the Brazilian Embassy at a reception sponsored by Ambassador Joao Carlos Muniz and Mrs. Muniz, both highly respected leaders in the diplomatic corps of Washington.

I am both gratified as well as encouraged to see that such a keen observer and good reporter as Mr. Ray Henle sensed the importance attached to the composition of the United States delegation by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Not long after the broadcast on the Three-Star Extra program, the United States delegation was described, editorially, in the New York Times as impressive; in the Brazil Herald as brilliant; and in the Washington Star as distinguished.

The news broadcast follows:

THREE-STAR EXTRA BROADCAST, NBC,
JANUARY 24, 1956

In connection with reporter Ed Tomlinson's reports on conditions in Latin America, the United States is losing no opportunity to make a strong diplomatic gesture to Brazil, our long-time good, strong arm in defense of this hemisphere.

Brazil's new President, Jusceline Kubitschek, will be inaugurated on January 31. This Government is sending a top-notch, very powerful delegation to attend the ceremonies.

Our delegation will be headed by Vice President and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, whose skill on the international front has been amply demonstrated.

Also on the delegation will be Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, USMC (retired), new Chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board; Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth; and Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, one of our strongest links with Latin America, generally.

Also Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey, and THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island, and Chairman JAMES P. RICHARDS, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and Representative JOHN VORYS, of Ohio.

It's a mark of unusual respect to the great South American Nation of Brazil; and one that will undoubtedly be noted with pleasure by all our sister Republics of this Western Hemisphere.

Jim Farley on Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in Nyack (N. Y.) Journal-News on Febrpary 15, 1956:

JIM FARLEY ON LINCON
(By Frank Ernest)

I've read a lot about Abraham Lincoln, I've heard a lot about him on radio programs, I've heard—second hand through a friend who back in the past was a drummer who used to make Rockland County his territory—about Lincoln's stories, but most of all, I have learned a lot since Saturday about Lincoln's place in the field of politics.

And, in its comparison to present days, I have learned it through the greatest politician and one of the greatest men of our times. Speaking at the annual dinner of the Peekskill Lincoln Society at Bear Mountain Inn last Saturday night, former Postmaster General James A. Farley, a real Demorcat if I ever met one, paid a tribute to Mr. Lincoln that Republican audiences throughout the country might well applaud. In this brief space, I have room only for excerpts of what Mr. Farley said and, therefore, I shall, let him take over:

"One of the proofs of Lincoln's greatness is that he does have something to say to everyone high and low, rich and poor, no matter what his occupation. Most of us who have briefly emerged in the national affairs will swiftly pass. Great men do not pass; and Lincoln was one of these."

And then he speaks of Lincoln's friend, William Henry Herndon, who was angry at seeing Lincoln made into a legend. "For this reason," said Mr. Farley, "Herndon spent the later years of his life in bringing together everything he could find about Lincoln, good or bad, big or little. As a result, we have not a picture of an angel in a church window, but a knowledge of the man, great enought to give inspiration to every American; a Lincoln so human that every one of us feels he has had him for a friend. Not many men in history could pass that test."

POLITICAL LEADER

"I do not know that Lincoln's principal significance is as a politician, but that certainly was one of his great contributions and its worth thinking about in these times.

"Being a first-class political leader, Lincoln had the wisdom to call in and consult all sorts and kinds of men. Again, with fine political instinct, he frequently allowed his visitors to believe that they were really initiating the policy of the country. * * * Only later, as the whole truth comes out, have we discovered that it was Mr. Lincoln who made the policy, though he was humble enough and adroit enough to allow lesser men to believe that they were running the Government."

Mr. Farley then went into the misunderstandings the people of the country had of Lincoln. Some of them thought him weak, some thought him indecisive, some only considered him as a "country bumpkin" and some in his own country actually hated him.

"Mr. Lincoln," said the greatest politician of our times, "is thought of frequently as a war President. Yet the policy which has made him great in American history was his persistent use of political methods. He was convinced that wherever political measures could be used, force might be avoided. He stuck to this both before and in the middle and at the end of the Civil War.

"It seems to me at least possible that if Lincoln had taken office immediately upon his election in November 1860, instead of having to wait until March of 1861, the Civil War might possibly have been avoided. The reason I think so is this: Passions were running high in 1860 and the only chance of avoiding the Civil War lay in bringing together, by political methods, the moderates, both of the North and the South. But during the months between election and the inauguration, a President-elect cannot do very much to guide political movements."

CAN'T BE PROVED

"No one can prove a historical might-have-been, but having had some contact with politics, I really wonder whether Lincoln's very great gifts in handling politics and politicians might not have been able to bring about a solution by political methods instead of war."

Mr. Farley then spoke of how Lincoln was attacked in really blasphemous terms and continued: "In a democracy like our own, our entire national life is a vast cooperative scheme. To the technical politician, extremism is not only a blunder; it is a crime.

I think Lincoln taught us this and though, from time to time, some may forget, the country as a whole has learned its lesson.

"In this year of 1956, we see a world where group still fights group, doctrine clashes with doctrine and nations engage in cold wars. Nevertheless, even in this mad disorder, the United States has steadily preserved the ideal of good will, of moderation, of justice. * * * We are able to attack social problems which often are bitter in the extreme and still find a way of moderate commonsense toward an ultimate goal of progress. * * * Without trying to usurp the place of the historian, I think I may say that we owe this in a great measure to Abraham Lincoln."

"The Union was saved, with God's help, for all time. * * * The bond was forged faithfully and well. In its time, it has overcome the peril from within and, now we see that it is no less stanch and true against the peril from abroad. That is our legacy from Lincoln and our blessing from God."

That, in part, is the tribute from one of our great men of today to one of the greatest who ever lived.

Hoboken Dentist's Way of Life: He was Always Giving Someone a Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an item from the Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N. J., regarding the recent death of Dr. Menelaus Pappas, of Hoboken, N. J. Dr. Pappas, although young in years, filled his life with good deeds and was highly esteemed in all religious circles. His early death was a sad loss not only to his family but also to the community where he did so much for his fellow men.

The article follows:

HOBOKEN DENTIST'S WAY OF LIFE: HE WAS ALWAYS GIVING SOMEONE A BOOST

(By Gene Flinn)

A group of youngsters were running through the streets of Hoboken, playing "follow the leader." One of the smaller youths was left behind when confronted with a fence too high for him to climb.

An older boy—a short, but stockily built lad—retraced his steps and helped his younger playmate over the fence.

"That's the way Dr. (Menelaus) Pappas was all his life—he was always giving someone a boost."

In this manner, Joseph Hanrahan, Hoboken attorney and source of this anecdote on the boyhood days of Dr. Pappas, described the man, whom he had known all his life.

"It was the same way when someone was hurt at play," Hanrahan added. "Mimi—we shortened 'Menelaus' to 'Mimi'—was almost always the first one at the side of an injured playmate."

In his student days Mimi was captain of the St. Peter's College basketball team.

"He would seldom get many points—maybe six a game—because he'd rather pass than shoot," a former teammate said. "But while he was not outstanding, he was a man you had to have on your team because he had wonderful spirit and always kept his head when the going was rough."

"Mimi was a 'steadier'; in life and on the basketball court he could make people laugh when they were getting too serious," Louis Rovelli, also a lifelong friend of the dentist, declared at the Bosworth Funeral Home last night.

When World War II broke out, Dr. Pappas, who had completed his internship at the Jersey City Medical Center, served with the 24th Infantry Division in the Pacific theater and was discharged with the rank of captain.

His years in the service stimulated his sympathy for his misfortunate buddies—the paraplegics.

"Once when Mimi was on a committee to raise funds for the paraplegics the group was summoned to a social designed to increase interest in the drive," a friend declared. "No one realized it at the time, but Mimi had organized the affair and paid the bill on his own."

A devout member of St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church in Jersey City, where he had been vice president of the board of trustees, Dr. Pappas was also highly esteemed in Catholic, Hebrew, and other religious circles.

Besides the many floral wreaths—six coaches of flowers were at his funeral today—scores of mass cards were sent to the relatives of the Hoboken dentist. Sisters from the Academy of the Sacred Heart and St. Mary's Hospital (he had been on the hospital staff) were constant visitors to his wake.

Jewish leaders—Dr. Pappas had been Christian chairman of the Hoboken United Jewish Appeal—announced that five trees are to be planted in Israel in his name.

Although a bachelor, Dr. Pappas, who died on Christmas Day in his 44th year, understood the ways of children—especially when they approached his dentist's chair.

"The first time they came they were frightened," his brother, James, a Hoboken attorney, declared. "But once they got to know him it was a different story. Sometimes the parents of these children became his patients because of the confidence he had instilled in their youngsters."

Children were not the only ones who sent him patients. Dr. Pappas had advised his friends to send people to him who could not afford to have their teeth fixed—in keeping perhaps, with his habit of always giving someone a boost.

Labor Never Had It So Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column by Gould Lincoln entitled "Labor Never Had It So Good."

The gains which the workingman and the average family have made under the Eisenhower administration disproves the accusation that this is a "big business" administration:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

LABOR NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD

American labor is better paid and has more jobs than ever before. This has happened during the Eisenhower administration—a Republican administration. Take a look at the labor situation in this country today. Approximately 65.5 million workers have jobs. Unemployment, by official count, is 2,471,000. It is a million less than last year. Average weekly earnings of factory workers are $75.76, nearly $5 more than last year. Labor-mangement disputes have been settled through free bargaining methods, with the Federal Government keeping hands off, except in an advisory and conciliatory capacity. Loss of wages through strikes has been kept way down.

This record of labor gains may be responsible for the violent onslaughts on the Eisenhower administration by Democratic leaders, and some of the union labor bosses, who are the allies of the Democratic Party. It could be they are scared, fearing that labor, when it comes time to vote next year, may take cognizance that the workers are better paid, with more jobs and fewer unemployed. It could also be that the Democratic leaders, and the labor bosses, will have a difficult time persuading the workers to vote only for Democratic candidates for office, from President down.

WITHOUT BASIS

The attacks on Mr. Eisenhower and the Republicans as enemies of labor are raucous and without solid basis. Take, for example, the charge widely broadcast in a Labor Day statement by Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler that a member of the Eisenhower Cabinet, Secretary of the Interior McKay, is engaged personally in a union-busting drive, in connection with a strike at the McKay automobile agency in Salem, Oreg. Mr. Butler was repeatedly told before he issued the statement attacking Mr. McKay that the Secretary of the Interior had completely divested himself of all part in the policies and management of the McKay agency when he came to Washington to serve in the Cabinet. That, however, did not in any way cause Mr. Butler to hesitate. His statement said: "Labor Day, 1955, marks the first Labor Day in the country's history when a member of the President's Cabinet is openly conducting a union-busting drive."

Former President Truman, delivering a Labor Day speech in Detroit, declared that the Republican administration is afraid of labor because of what it will do in the elections next year. What it looks like, however, is that the Democratic leaders and the labor bosses are afraid of what the rank and file of labor will do in these elections. So they continue to rant against the Eisenhower administration, charging it is run by big business and that it believes in good times for business. It is clear that good times for business mean also good times for labor. The fact that labor and management have been getting together in a peaceable manner to adjust differences, including demands for increased pay and for annual wage agreements, appears to have sent cold chills down some labor leaders' backs.

CLASS APPEAL

"We are aghast and appalled," James B. Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer, said, "at the self-serving, greedy tactics of the present administration keyed to the belief that 'what's good for business is good for America,'" in another attack on the Eisenhower leadership. How Mr. Carey, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Truman are going to convince the workers that their charges are honest and factual is not clear. They are, of course, just another attempt to stir up one class against another. It seems, indeed, a terrible calamity—in the eyes of the Democratic leaders—that labor has prospered under an administration headed by a Republican President.

Labor in this country has more to be thankful for under the Eisenhower administration than wages and employment. It has seen the fighting in Korea brought to an end, with no more American boys—sons of labor and of all other circles—killed and wounded on the battlelines. It has seen Mr. Eisenhower take a leading part in the

drive for world peace. It has seen prosperity in this country without a war, which has not happened in more than two decades. These are factors, too, which may have an effect on the elections next year.

Territorial Waters Question Touchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Freedom of the Seas." In my remarks I discussed a recent resolution on Territorial waters adopted by the Inter-American Council of Jurists at Mexico City. The Council of Jurists is a technical agency of the Organization of America States.

This matter is given further treatment in an article appearing in the San Diego Union on February 17, by David Hellyer, the able inter-American editor of that paper.

The article throws additional light on a technical subject, but one which is of importance to our people and economy. I know that Members of Congress will be interested in Mr. Hellyer's comments.

The article follows:

DAVID HELLYER SAYS TERRITORIAL WATERS QUESTION TOUCHY

San Diego's economy is bound to feel repercussions, in time, of action taken in Mexico City early this month on the touchy question of territorial waters.

Delegates to the Third Inter-American Council of Jurists there passed a resolution recognizing the right of each nation to set its own territorial limits at sea. Fifteen Latin American states supported the resolution, which was drafted by Mexico. The United States, which held out for recognition of the time-honored 3-mile limit, cast the lone opposition vote. Five nations abstained.

The Latin Republics have long been hypersensitive on the subject of nonintervention. They have upheld aggressively the principle that each nation has the right of self-determination—a principle strongly supported by the United States as well. But the Latin nations in their zeal have at time felt they must stand together against the Colossus of the North. This appears to be one of those times.

William Sanders, United States delegate to the council, told this writer in Mexico City that he considers the resolution a strictly political document. Sanders argues that the council exceeded its assigned task as an advisory body of the Organization of American States in fostering a political document rather than a technical study.

Sanders furthermore contends that the resolution is "contrary to international law" in several particulars. But, he says, it will have absolutely no legal effect. Mexico attempted to phrase the resolution in such a way as to give the action the status of a formal declaration, if not of law. But Sanders succeeded in putting through an amendment which reduced the resolution to the status of a "preparatory study." It is in this guise that the resolution will be discussed next month at Ciudad Trujillo, when the OAS holds a special session in the Dominican Republic's capital.

Mexico is highly sensitive on this territorial waters business at the moment because of what she alleges to be pirate activity by United States fishing vessels in her waters. So Mexico emerged as the spokesman and champion for other powers which earlier had taken the limelight on the matter: Ecuador, Peru and Chile.

What action the American states will take on the resolution cannot of course be predicted accurately. But the battle lines seem clearly formed. If the forces continue alined as they are now grouped, the Ciudad Trujillo meeting could produce a definitive statement on maritime territorial limits which would support the majority view expressed in Mexico City.

This could have farreaching effects on San Diego's fishing fleet, and hence on the local economy. If the other American republics should band together against the United States, we might see nations of this hemisphere claiming as much as 200 miles to sea as their maritime limits. Chile, Ecuador, and Peru already have jointly declared their jurisdiction over 200-mile zones fronting their shores.

This whole matter of territorial waters is a highly technical one. Hence its great importance is likely to escape the average citizen.

But at stake is a freedom which the United States has always stood ready to defend, with arms if necessary: freedom of the seas.

Bombs Can Never Raise a Flag on Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial from the Florida Times-Union of February 19, 1956, entitled "Bombs Can Never Raise a Flag on Iwo Jima." This excellent editorial emphasizes the essentiality of a balanced defense force if our Nation is to have actual military security:

BOMBS CAN NEVER RAISE A FLAG ON IWO JIMA

The mock atomic invasion of Iwo Jima now in progress in the Pacific is doubly significant.

These maneuvers look back 11 years to World War II and one of the bloodiest battles of the Pacific campaign. They mark a hard-won victory, symbolized by the famous raising of the American flag on Mount Suribachi, which cost the lives of more than 4,500 Americans and 20,000 Japanese.

But, at the same time, these anniversary maneuvers look forward to battles that might have to be fought in a future war. And to this end they include the simulated use of the latest weapons of war, including atomic bombs and shells.

Therefore it is important to note that the forward-looking mock invasion of today is not fundamentally different from the actual invasion in World War II.

The air power and the fire power now available for an amphibious landing do dwarf anything available 11 years ago. But now, as then, the actual invasion of Iwo Jima requires men who can land and fight for possession of the island.

This fact stands out in the current maneuvers because it directly contradicts the popular notion that superweapons have made foot soldiers all but obsolete.

Today the man in the street and the man in high office is all too eager to believe that long-range bombers, guided missiles and nuclear bombs make it possible to knock out an enemy with the flick of a switch and without the bothersome and bloody business of men fighting face to face for the possession of hills and beaches. These flights of push-button fancy conjure up reassuring pictures of, not islands, but whole continents lying prostrate and helpless after one mighty blow of the bombs.

But the mock atomic invasion of Iwo Jima should make it obvious that the fundamental principles of war have not changed. One need only ask, if our military men regard thousands of men to be necessary to take one tiny island, how many men will be required to seize and hold an entire continent?

A Revealing Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct to the attention of our colleagues to Mr. Walter Lippmann's column on administration policy which appears in the New York Herald Tribune for February 21, 1956. The column follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
A REVEALING BLUNDER

The affair of the Saudi Arabian tanks is a ludicrous but damaging example of what can happen in a big and complicated Government when it is not clearly led and firmly administered from the top. For months, this Government has been faced with the dangerous problem of arms shipments to the Middle East. On this subject there has recently been a conference at the highest level between the President and the British Prime Minister. There have been many pronouncements about arms for the Middle East. How then could it happen that the State Department had forgotten about its own approval of the sale of the Saudi Arabian tanks, that the Defense Department was operating without realizing what a mess the shipment of these arms would now cause, once the facts became known.

The reason for this incident must be that there is no high policy for the Middle East which comes from the top and is administered all the way down the line from the policymaking officials to the operating officials. The President has not, of course, been truly in command, certainly not since his illness, in fact not really since he went to Denver last August. Yet it is only the President who can effectively coordinate two great departments like State and Defense. He can coordinate them only if at Cabinet meetings and elsewhere he makes the heads of these departments understand clearly what the policy is. It is only too obvious that nothing of the sort has happened during the past 6 months, or could have happened.

The lack of a high command has been aggravated by the way Mr. Dulles conceives the office of Secretary of State. He thinks of himself as a roving negotiator, who represents the President's constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs. He works

out high problems by personal negotiation, and then leaves the policies to be administered and operated in his absence by officials who do not know at first hand what they are. Mr. Dulles is not in Washington long enough or continuously enough to command the operations of his department. The effect, as the Saudi Arabian tanks illustrate, is to leave the immediate business of the Government to be operated by bureau chieftains on their own notions without overhead directions from the top.

The administrative confusion is not the only, or indeed the most serious, consequence of the way our affairs have been conducted during the past 6 months. There has been nobody at the top whose business it has been, or who was able, to face up to the new Soviet challenge which has confronted us since the first Geneva meeting. The President has been too ill to deal with it, and Mr. Dulles has been too preoccupied with his travels, his negotiations, and his speeches. In these past 6 months we have suffered the biggest and most serious setback since the Communist victory in China.

The fundamental cause of the setback is that the Soviet Union has been developing a new foreign policy since Geneva whereas we have remained frozen and inflexible in the policy of the pre-Geneva period. That is why there is scarcely a country from France and Italy and Germany and Greece to India and beyond where the pro-Western and pro-American parties and politicians are not in trouble. With nobody at the top in Washington who can and will take new decisions, our diplomacy is almost everywhere fighting unattractive rear guard actions.

It would be interesting to know who in the high places where decisions can be taken has been putting his mind on the speeches delivered last week at the Communist Party congress in Moscow. They are very long speeches. But they are exceedingly important. Their common theme is that within the Communist world they have an industrial system which is, in terms of national power, not only in arms but also in the means of capital development, already reaching equality with the West. The Soviet leaders have been declaring that the rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union surpasses that of all countries, and that, therefore, they will become a more and more formidable competitor in the economic and political markets of the world.

I do not know whether all the statistics that were put out last week are correct. But the world will not doubt the great fact that the Soviet Union is now the strongest power in Eurasia. It is this economic fact which accounts for the extraordinary tone of confidence that pervaded all the speeches made in Moscow last week. It also explains the ideological and political declarations about how Krushchev and his people expect to win the cold war without revolutionary violence. They believe that in the competition with us for influence in the uncommitted countries, they can make more attractive offers than we are likely to make.

Even if they cannot offer as much economic aid as we could, they will be able to offer more than Congress will allow us to offer. Moreover, whatever they offer, they can offer on terms which are politically more attractive than the terms which Congress insists that we should impose.

They are in a stronger bargaining position in the uncommitted nations. For they do not ask, they do not need to ask, for military pacts or their equivalent. They are able to identify themselves with the popular longing to remain unentangled. What is more, in the underdeveloped countries, which are by definition without capital resources, the governments must necessarily play the principal role in capital formation. This suits the Socialist ideology of the Russians. It runs at cross purposes with our own anti-Socialist ideology.

The new challenge of the Soviet Union is very formidable indeed. If we are to meet it, we shall have to reverse ourselves on a number of things which are strongly believed in here. We shall have to be willing to export capital on a considerable scale. We shall have to be willing to do that without insisting on military terms, without penalizing political neutrality, and without expecting the underdeveloped but old and crowded countries to adopt all the principles of the American free-enterprise system. We shall, in other words, have to be willing to contribute capital to countries, which, as neutrals and as Socialists, will be unlike the United States.

The alternative, I believe, is to go on losing our influence in the uncommitted world.

Salute to Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is one among us who is not conscious of the fact that we are in the midst of the annual observance of Brotherhood Week. In the newspapers, theaters, and pulpits of this great land, this wonderful thought—launched by the National Conference of Christians and Jews—has been spread.

It has been reassuring to observe the response of the people of this Nation to the appeals of religious and lay leaders of all faiths. I am sure many have realized that this week is a time for stocktaking and soul searching; a time for rededication to democratic principles and to the principles of our religious faiths.

To me Brotherhood Week is America's positive answer to the greatest challenge of our times—that is, if the human race is to survive there must be established a firm foundation of understanding and brotherhood around the globe. It seems to me that we can make the most significant contribution in the history of man if we can create an atmosphere of brotherhood and love in our world to replace the present aura of distrust and fear.

It is my hope that this week will form another link in what may eventually become part of a powerful chain, not only in the United States, but throughout the world, that will embrace men and women of every race, creed, and color, who will live side by side in a spirit of mutual respect.

Let us all join together and march in that procession which must someday lead us to ultimate victory over the forces of disruption, bigotry, and intolerance. Let us show the world that we Americans do not seek to destroy the beliefs and practices of those not in our own particular faith, but we believe there can be created a genuine spirit of brotherhood among all faiths if we but have the will and patience to bring it about. And let us never forget that in the principles of our religious teachings lie the hope and salvation of this world in which we live.

Republican Economics and the Vicious Cycle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Castro County News, published at Dimmitt, Tex., in the district which I have the honor to represent, is excellent:

REPUBLICAN ECONOMICS AND THE VICIOUS CYCLE

Time magazine this week came up with an interesting little article. This story concerned with national economy, said in effect that a different ideology was evolving concerning our economic situation.

This article pictured 4 graphs, all but 1 slanting upward from left to right. The gross national product was depicted as climbing from $262 billion in 1949 to $357 billion in 1955. Average weekly earnings have apparently climbed from an average of $50 to $80 in the same period, and wonder of wonders, the consumer price index has risen only 12 points. A beautiful picture of a booming economy. We will take up the fourth graph in a moment.

The Republicans are assuming a different theory of economy. Time said the Democrats were intent on giving equal shares to everyone of a static economic pie when they were in office. But now the picture has changed, viz: The Republicans are sitting back and letting the economy climb and climb and climb. They are concerned with keeping everybody's graphs going upward at the same pace in an expanding economy.

But now we come to the fourth graph. It shows the farm price picture 42 points off of 1949. Time goes on to laud the Republicans for their deep, deep concern for the farmer. A fine bunch of people the pro-Republican magazine says. Just look what they are going to do: Ike will keep all the graphs parallel (and do it with 90 percent parity, apparently). This child-like faith in a system of politics and political control is not very laudable in our opinion—especially when simple economic principles say one major group cannot lag behind for long without bringing on a general depression.

We've been listening since last summer when the rumblings of discontent became more evident than ever before concerning the promises of our national farm and political leaders. There have been many bags of hot air, speeches, and thousands of printed words on the future and sure-to-come heyday of the American farmer. But the actions we've seen are the same old operations set up by the Democrats that haven't yet been curtailed by the Republicans.

The latest farm program is nothing but a gilt-edged farce, filled with words calculated to soothe and relax—words, which, if they came true, would add another Government giveaway program to those already in force and would not help our farmers at all. Ike's farm plan says we'll be benevolent and give everybody something for nothing. Each farmer will receive many hundreds of dollars for letting a portion of his land lay idle. Dear Mr. President: It takes many thousands

of dollars to run a farm. A lot of farmers in Castro County went further in the hole this year than twice the amount proposed as payment for idle acres—and they did it on good crops. And besides that, most farmers are normal, independent people—they want to work for what they get.

We hear a lot of talk about a surplus from Farm Secretary Benson. And who is to say we have a surplus? In broad general terms, we are one cotton crop ahead ordinarily and a little more on wheat. Because one man is afraid—and apparently wishing we were 1 year behind in production instead of ahead—every farmer in the county is hurting. And economic hurt is about as painful a sensation as can be found, especially when the people we hire to take care of such things fall down on the job.

We are not an economist, nor do we pretend to know more than anyone else about farm or any other national current problem. But it doesn't take an expert in the Kinsean Theory of Economics to see the relation between industry, labor, the farm and consumers. Just let the farmer fall behind for a few years without breaking even. First he can't buy new farm machinery, then that industry cannot buy steel, because it can't sell production. Steel then lays off workers who can't purchase without a job. Their purchasing power, along with the farmer, is taken out of the economy. The luxury item producers lay off workers, who join the others and the cycle runs the gauntlet, taking more and more every time it comes around until utter chaos exists as it did in 1929. Is Republican history beginning to repeat itself? Everything depends upon the consumer. Our every national industry is geared to the needs of the consumer and the Nation's farmers comprise a major consumer section. Economics are funny. Things have a habit of snowballing in either direction. Prosperity builds prosperity and recession builds recession unless emergency props are applied.

Time magazine had a thought-provoking article. It was written, however, not to cause the reader to think. This magazine is like hundreds of others who today are thinking how much nicer it is to have a counterfeit $10 Republican bill than a sound $5 one of a Democratic trademark.

We were pleasantly surprised when we noted that 2,250 people in Castro County received their poll taxes this year. This is a 400 increase over the previous highest figure. We hope this is an indication that many of our county citizens are eagerly awaiting the November general election. It is a healthy sign that will go a long way toward keeping ours a healthy county.

Upper Colorado Project: More Cost, Less Acreage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 20 million acres of undeveloped land are available in areas with adequate rainfall for crops. These acres can be developed and fertilized for a portion of the cost necessary to bring into cultivation the arid acres of the upper colorado area project.

The Bureau of Reclamation presented cost figures for initial participating projects. Costs allocated to irrigations varied from $210 to $794 per acre, or an unweighted average of over $400 per acre. Little of this land even with sufficient water would command a fair market value as high as this. Costs estimated for some 22 other possible participating projects, on the basis of only partial investigation, run as high or higher, and up to $1,530 per acre in one instance. We deem these costs excessive and economically unsound.

There exist at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.

The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage. Development costs would be from $60 to $100 an acre for such land. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

Fifty-two

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of our colleagues, the following editorial on the Fifty-two Association which appears in the New York Times for February 22, 1956. The Fifty-two Association of New York, Inc., is a nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpolitical organization which since 1945 has been keeping its pledge, that "the wounded shall never be forgotten," with outstanding programs of entertainment, job assistance, hobby programs, adapted sports, and other special rehabilitation services for hospitalized servicemen and veterans.

FIFTY-TWO STILL AT IT

That group of volunteer business and professional people around town called the Fifty-two Association is now in its 12th year, entertaining servicemen at hospitals and camps and helping to place veterans—especially the disabled—in jobs. "The wounded shall never be forgotten" is its slogan; it was born out of the Second World War. A dozen years later it is still at it. Hospital patients are visited from Boston to North Carolina. Last year more than 20,000 servicemen and veterans were entertained at 275 parties. This April the New York and Chicago chapters sponsor their eighth annual national wheelchair basketball tournament demonstrating that ability, not disability, counts. Fifty-two, a member of New York's Welfare and Health Council, fortunately has a long memory.

The Scientific Manpower Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a series of articles from the Washington Post on the scientific manpower shortage. The articles, dated February 20, 21, 22, and 23, respectively, are as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956]

NEW IDEAS DIE UNBORN—SCIENTIST NEED EXCEEDS SUPPLY

(By Nate Haseltine)

(First of a series)

"Best bet today—country life at city pay."

"Rare opportunities for well qualified individual gifted with imagination and inventiveness. Salary up to $12,000 with excellent growth potential in nationally known company manufacturing stable line of equipment."

"Modern benefits program * * * relocation expenses paid."

"Relocation allowances, liberal employee benefits, ample housing in beautiful suburban country type area tuition refund program (nine graduate schools in area of plant)."

"We need a couple of junior engineers who are ready for heavy responsibilities. We are expanding in electronics, need top talent and will pay top prices."

"Where exploring minds find full outlet."

"You can obtain your M. S. or Ph. D. at company expense."

The above are excerpts from advertisements appearing in the Nation's newspapers, week after week, as industrial firms and scientific laboratories bid for engineers, scientists, and other trained specialists.

Salaries are seldom mentioned, but occasionally you'll see a price tag. Like "design engineer * * * $12,000" or "mechanical engineer * * * $12,000" or "junior engineers * * * start at up to $10,000."

Today, college engineer and science graduates can expect a choice of at least six jobs, all with starting salaries which, until recently, where those commanded by scien-

tists or engineers after 10 years' working experience.

Suddenly as though without warning—though warning was there—the Nation got caught hard in a serious shortage of scientifically trained personnel.

Why?

There are a lot of little reasons. Some who have studied the situation seriously say too much emphasis has been put on little reasons. Such as the oft-repeated and convenient charges that schools today aren't teaching science as it was taught when father or grandfather were boys.

Or that the draft has been diverting the Nation's youth from scientific pursuits. Or that science teachers have been lured by higher pay nonteaching jobs, thus undermining the foundations needed to assure future crops of scientists and engineers.

LITTLE REASONS

These are important but little reasons, contributory only in a small degree to the real cause. Those seeking ways to correct today's plight agree that America's economy, even the old American way of life, was lost in the tremendous advances in scientific and technological developments necessitated by World War II.

The country unknowingly stepped across a threshold of that age. It wasn't so much that schools were turning out fewer graduates of scientific bent; it was the suddenly increased need for more and more of them.

The scientific manpower shortage today is real. It is serious. Some say it is downright critical, and unless alleviated quickly may cost the United States its leading role in world power, perhaps even its existence as a democracy.

Howard Meyerhoff, chief of the Scientific Manpower Commission, says the "most conservative" estimates he can now make is that there are 7,500 unfilled positions requiring scientists, and 15,000 unmanned engineering jobs.

It is anybody's guess, Meyerhoff says, just how many thousands more could be used if today's actual needs were met. Industry after industry, he noted, has shelved planning for even attempting scientific projects simply because there would be no one to staff them.

Research projects of great promise are born and die on the drawing boards. Others are stillborn in creative brains. Still others have never been conceived because scientists are kept too busy to let their minds explore.

Automation—where machines control machines—is still beyond sight, according to Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. There just aren't enough scientists, engineers and technicians to fit together all of automation's pieces.

MAN STUMBLED

The scientific age opened, and man stumbled at the entrance.

"Man has achieved a theoretical breakthrough of such proportions that every fiber of his skill and ingenuity will be strained merely to exploit a portion of what has already been revealed," says John Jay Hopkins, chairman and president of General Dynamics Corp.

Hopkins blames the American educational system, in part, for the unpreparedness. The educational system, he charges, "has been overrun and left behind by successive tidal waves of technological advance."

These are the onrushing, engulfing waves of atomic fission, applied solar energy, electromagnetic antigravitational developments, electronics, radioactivity, and the looming development of controlled atomic fusion.

James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, sees the present crisis as not just a shortage in scientific manpower in numbers but also in quality. It is a shortage, he said, of high intellectual talent adequately educated and in the right place. It is a shortage of specific skills adaptable to specific areas.

For one thing, Killian says, too many young people of exceptional intellectual ability drop out of our educational system before they have achieved an education which exploits their abilities.

Any good strategy for building up an adequate degree of scientific manpower, he says, must be related to identifying, encouraging, and more fully educating the top talent of American youth.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 21, 1956]

SCIENTIST LACK IS FELT HERE

(By Nate Haseltine)

(Second in a series)

Perhaps nowhere else in America are scientists and educators paying more attention to the Nation's scientific manpower shortage than here in Washington.

It is from here that the Defense Department channels its contracts to Federal agencies, industrial firms, universities and scientific laboratories throughout the country.

It is in the Defense Department that the full force of the shortage of engineers, physicists, chemists and mathematicians (to name only the most scarce) is most evident.

It is here, in Washington, to the National Academy of Sciences, that the Government sends its scientific problems for solution—be they wartime or peacetime problems. The academy is the headquarters and workshop for the Nation's top scientists.

Today's prime scientific problem, academy officials agree, is not only how to go about putting a man-made moon in an encircling orbit around earth. It is not only how to build atomic reactors to power ships and planes or heat, aircondition and power future cities. It is not only this country's dwindling natural resources.

It involves and affects all of these.

Today's top scientific problem concerns the Nation's human resources, particularly the resources of scientific and technical personnel.

In words of Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, chief of the Atomic Energy Commission's Naval Reactors Branch, the critical question is: "How can we provide the trained men and women needed to maintain the momentum of our rapidly expanding technical civilization?"

It is not education's fault, alone, Rickover says. It is the failure of almost everyone to recognize the impact of the 20th century scientific revolution and to take necessary steps in time.

Today that impact is being recognized—at the higher levels of Government, industry, and education. It has not filtered down yet through school administrations and into the homes, where eventually it must be recognized if its challenge is to be met successfully.

Regardless of the cause, the correction of the Nation's scientific manpower shortage is dependent upon the American educational system.

The secondary schools simply must provide more and better science teachers, more and better science courses, more and better student selection and guidance, and more opportunities for capable students to enter colleges to complete scientific education.

Leading educators readily agree to these premises for a solution. But they contend that the educational system is not geared to such selectivity, and question whether it should be. They see no justification to oft-made proposals of higher pay for science teachers—without similar pay increases for all teachers.

Some well-intentioned educators have said that there is really no need for high-school classes in such subjects as chemistry and physics. Just graduate students with a sound education in mathematics, and they'll be able to grasp chemistry and physics in college, they say.

What these educators overlook, or at least gloss over, is the fact that student interests are developed largely before college age. Take chemistry and physics out of the high schools, and you dam off the spring that nurtures future scientists.

The scientists who fathered most of today's advances were products of past educations where more stress was placed on science subjects at the high-school level. Nowhere is this more evident than in physics.

Prof. W. C. Kelly, of the University of Pittsburgh, made a special survey on the subject of physics teaching in the secondary schools of United States.

He found that in 1895 almost one-fourth (23 percent to be exact) of all high-school pupils were enrolled in physics classes. By 1952, the last year for which he was able to obtain full reports, a bare 4.3 percent of high-school students were enrolled in physics.

Physics enrollments, he reported, have declined steadily for the past six decades.

An obvious reason for the decline, Kelly admitted, was that the student of the nineties had fewer studies to choose from.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 22, 1956]

PRIVATE INDUSTRY VIES WITH EDUCATION—SCHOOLS LACK SCIENCE TEACHERS

(By Nate Haseltine)

(Third of a series)

Washington and its environs has its exceptions—some good secondary schools where capable science teachers enthuse and prepare students for science careers.

To name a few, there is Woodrow Wilson High School here: Washington and Lee Senior High in Arlington, and the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High in Montgomery County.

But even the better schools hereabouts lack enough qualified science teachers and guidance counselors.

The situation that exists here exists, generally, throughout the secondary schools across the country. It is at its poor best in metropolitan and consolidated school areas; it is at its bad worst in the rural areas.

Scientists, engineers and educators agree that today's schooling opportunities just are not geared to meet today's and the future's demands for more and more scientists and engineers needed to man the scientific age this country has entered.

In the Washington area there are about 340 working teachers of biology, chemistry, physics and general science. More than 90 percent of these are qualified by admittedly low qualification standards.

If you accept—as many scientists and some educators recommend—a minimum qualification of a bachelor of science degree, only about 1 of every 3 of these teachers would qualify. A good science teacher need not necessarily have that degree, but it helps.

A less publicized point of alarm is that almost all the degreed science teachers here got their degrees before World War II. This means that most postwar, science-educated teaching graduates with B. S. degrees simply are not taking science teaching jobs. They're lured by industry's better-paying positions.

The assumption is borne out in a report of the research division of the National Education Association. A portion of that report showed what proportion of students who prepared for teaching actually held teaching positions 1 year after college graduation.

The statistical breakdown is most significant in the science education category. It showed: Of those graduates who had majored in chemistry with intent to teach the subject, only 36.1 percent were teaching chemistry the following year; in biology, 45.4 percent remained to teach, and physics retained 51.8 percent of its crop.

Scientists say that even more significant statistics could be compiled 3 to 5 years later. Such a survey, they said, would show that many more of the new teachers of chemistry, biology and physics (mostly young men with new family obligations) would have left teaching for work in industrial and scientific laboratories.

Some steps have been taken to reverse the trend of science teachers leaving education. Admittedly progress in this direction is piecemeal. Other steps are being taken to encourage more capable students to study for science teaching careers.

Perhaps the most effective push in the right direction has been the snowballing interest of high school students that is promoted by science fairs and science talent searches.

In the Washington area last year some 5,000 junior and senior high school students prepared special scientific projects to exhibit. Only 500 could be displayed for lack of exhibit space in the final competition here. This year the fair sponsors plan to set up four such fairs to better give everyone a chance for winner honors.

The Science Fairs as well as the Westinghouse Science Talent Searches are promoted on a nationwide basis by Science Clubs of America, with headquarters here.

One new boost to science education, the so-called Arlington plan, is still in its infancy here, but may become a model for the Nation. It is designed to make the science teacher better schooled for his job, and his job more attractive.

Named for nearby Arlington where it is being started, the plan sets up a community fund to underwrite costs of postgraduate courses for employed teachers. All teachers in the school system are eligible, but priority is given mathematics and science teachers in junior and senior high schools.

All colleges and universities serving the metropolitan area here are cooperating by setting up new courses to meet the teachers' educational needs. The plan has the initial sponsorship of the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council and the aid and cooperation of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

As the program continues, it will be administered by a board of trustees. Serving on the board will be responsible representatives of participating universities, parent-teacher groups, business executives and outstanding civic leaders.

There are other drops, too numerous to give individual credit. Many of the Nation's largest industries are offering summer jobs to science teachers; some are sending their scientists into school systems as part-time science teachers.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1956]

SCIENTISTS SEEK END TO ENGINEER SHORTAGE

(By Nate Haseltine)

(Last of a series)

The Nation's educational system must be shifted into a higher gear, and provide a college education to every capable high school graduate.

This is an ideal voiced by serious scientists concerned over the system's failure to provide enough engineers and scientists to man today's scientific and technical age.

They don't ask that every student be channeled into science and engineering courses. They believe that the loss of scientifically capable students to college training today has been the cause of today's and the future's scientific and engineering shortage.

Today, less than half of the students capable of getting a college degree ever go to college.

Some 60 percent of the best students in the Nation's high school graduating classes do not go to college. This represents a tremendous loss of some 250,000 students.

Half of the students who do enter college do not graduate. And for every high school graduate who eventually earns a doctoral degree, 25 others with the intellectual ability to do so do not acquire degrees.

Today's real educational need, scientists and educators appear to agree, is for a concerted effort to identify, encourage and more fully educate the top talent of American youth. Most immediately, the scientists say, today's sagging emphasis on science courses in secondary schools must be shored up, and the unfilled science teaching posts must be manned.

Also advocated by the scientists and many educators are accelerated training courses for gifted students. If the public schools can set up special classes for those who for physical or mental reasons cannot keep pace with class averages, similar special classes for outstanding students can be incorporated into public-school systems.

The mathematics teachers there found that in a school of several thousand students they could select 25 bright ones in each freshman class who could work much faster and harder than the others. In 4 years the entire program covers elementary, intermediate, and advanced algebra; plane, solid, and analytic geometry; trigonometary, and a touch of calculus.

It's a tough course, but here is what Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, has to say about tough courses:

"The people who established this country and pushed its frontiers across 2,000 miles of wilderness were men and women of endurance and tough moral fiber. They were not afraid to expose themselves and their children to the incredible physical hardships of wild terrain and primitive living.

"Now the frontiers are those of the mind.

"Are we to shrink from equipping our children with the intellectual toughness and vigor needed to meet the challenges of a technological age? Or are we to assert that the hard subjects, such as languages, and logic, and math, and physics, and chemistry are too much for them? It would be strangely incompatible with our heritage if we should."

Actually, one of the deterrents to students signing up for science courses in high schools is the unwarranted and too general impression that science study is impossibly hard for any but the specially gifted brain. Advanced mathematics, physics, chemistry, and the like are not that tough.

There are other false impressions that make students shy away from scientific studies. These include anti-intellectualism, a disdain and distrust for the learned man. Then there are the antagonisms from falsely based feelings that science and engineering are materialistic and antihumanistic.

Scientists will get their best boost when, through science fairs and other educative processes, today's students and their parents learn the true values, rewards, and needs of scientifically educated citizens.

Everybody's Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Dalles (Oreg.) Chronicle:

EVERYBODY'S IDEAS

The drastic measures Congress is soon going to take to remove farmland from production in order to eliminate food surpluses should focus attention on the enormously expensive upper Colorado River project which the President has endorsed. Why, no one seems to know, except that Coloradoans sold him on it when he was there vacationing.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California, will present to the House of Representatives the result of a study showing at least 20,937,153 acres of good cropland now idle. This on top of 40 million acres the administration wants removed from production through its soil-bank plan.

This land, according to HOSMER, is productive, much of it close to markets. It could be put into full-scale production to meet a national emergency for from $15 to $150 an acre, the Congressman claims.

In contrast, the Colorado project is said to require $5,000 an acre to bring into production arid lands in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. The cost may run $4 billion. It is the most costly development project ever proposed, and in a period of heavy overproduction of foodstuffs.

The time may come when this project and some other high-cost jobs, like the Mountain Home in southwest Idaho, estimated at from $1,500 to $2,500 an acre may have to be built to relieve a food shortage. But it most certainly is not in order now. Nor in the next two decades, assuming the steady population increase the experts forecast.

If Congress has even elementary intelligence it will douse all such projects for the duration of the food surpluses at least. (Capital Journal, Salem.)

Reds Act To Join Civil Rights Push

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following excerpt from an article in the New York Times of Wednesday, February 22, 1956:

REDS ACT TO JOIN CIVIL RIGHTS PUSH—SEEK FULL ROLE IN STRUGGLE OF NEGROES IN THE SOUTH—NAACP WARNS UNITS

The Communist Party, which had been laying low dodging congressional process-servers for several years, plans to inject itself into the civil rights struggles in the South.

This was disclosed by Claude Lightfoot, Negro Communist leader, who heads the party in Illinois. Interviewed by the Worker, Communist newspaper, last Sunday, about civil rights cases, Lightfoot said:

"I am certain that in these days and in many other struggles our party will resume its full role, justifying new levels of good will and confidence among the broadest sections of the Negro people."

The Worker said, "Lightfoot spoke of the role of Communists and of Left Progressives in dramatizing the plight of the Negro people before worldwide public opinion."

Lightfoot has been sentenced to serve 5 years in prison and pay a fine of $5,000 under the Smith Act. That act makes membership in the Communist Party, while knowing its aim is the violent overthow of the Govern-

ment, a crime. His conviction is being appealed.

Communist support or participation in the civil-rights movement of non-Communist Negro groups will lend credence to the propaganda of the White Citizens' Councils in the South, Negro leaders believe. The councils picture the civil-rights movement as being Communist-inspired.

Upper Colorado Project: Supreme Court Decision First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from southern California, I deem it my duty to oppose the upper Colorado River project, not in a spirit of antagonism to my colleagues from that area, but in view of the threat which this project would constitute against more than a half-billon-dollar investment of the 27 cities in the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

We believe that a suit for clarification of the meaning of the Colorado River compact, which is now before the Supreme Court of the United States, should be settled before further diversion of water is authorized by Congress.

Once that clarification is made I am sure that no southern California Congressman would object to feasible projects in either the southern or northern compact States. Of course all such projects should be justified on an economic basis.

The project would critically impair operations at Hoover Dam and lose $187 million in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

During the 25-year period of filling the dams contemplated by the bill, firm power output at Hoover Dam would be reduced by 25 percent. Secondary energy would be wiped out entirely. This shortage would cost the lower basin about 200 additional millions of dollars for replacement power and cost the Federal Treasury about $187 million in lost revenues.

To say the least, this is a strange power policy for the Federal Government to follow. First it builds Hoover Dam on the lower reaches of the Colorado River. The power can be produced very cheaply so the Secretary of the Interior enters into contracts to sell certain quantities of power at rates of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour and less. Then the Federal Government builds additional dams upstream. Here power cannot be produced so cheaply. But in order to generate power at these upstream dams to be sold at 6 mills, it cuts back the production of 2-mill power at Hoover Dam, which is already constructed and operating efficiently. This is Government waste with a vengeance.

Essentially, the Colorado River storage project implies the destruction or impairment of 25 percent of the value of the Boulder Canyon project to help make possible the construction of a new project upstream, to furnish power at over twice the cost and water at several times the cost of that which would be taken away from the lower basin, in violation of the covenant of the Government in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and in the power and water contracts made under that act.

Moreover, the Federal Government will be in breach of solemn contractual obligations if it curtails energy output at Hoover by intercepting water for creating powerheads at the upstream dams. The project may not legally impound water for power purposes if needed to generate electrical energy at the lower basin dams. If the Federal Government breaches its contracts with power contractees in the lower basin by cutting back power deliveries at Hoover Dam, it will be subject to suit for hundreds of millions of dollars in damages.

Moscow Turns on Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and that of my other colleagues, to an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Monday, February 20, 1956:

MOSCOW TURNS ON STALIN

Even the most calloused observer of the Soviet scene must be astounded by the speed and extent to which the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party has been turned into an anti-Stalinist demonstration. Khrushchev, Malenkov, Mikoyan, and Suslov once vied with each other to praise Stalin, whom Khrushchev once called the "father, wise teacher and directing genius of the party, the Soviet people and the workers of the whole world." Now these same men compete to find the most bitter phrases to apply to Stalin's regime. "Twenty years of dictatorship and lies" sums up their characterization of the Stalinist era.

Mikoyan has gone furthest of all. He has explicitly opened the Pandora's box of official Soviet history and exposed a few of the lies and falsehoods contained therein. So far Mikoyan has only rehabilitated two of Stalin's many victims, Kossior and Antonov-Ovseyenko, but the process can hardly stop there. Virtually all of Lenin's closest associates in the Bolshevik Revolution and the first few years of Soviet power—Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov, and many others—were put to death at Stalin's order and put into Soviet history as traitors and "enemies of the people." In the land of falsehood, even a small gleam of truth is a dangerous thing. Can the new revision of Soviet history about to begin be contained within the limits the present leadership deems desirable, or will the whole edifice of Stalinist lies, frame-ups, and murders be exposed?

Why has this startling reversal taken place? Most likely Khrushchev and his fellows are responding to the great revulsion against Stalin and Stalinism among the people. The Khrushchev gang, Stalin's creatures and accomplices, hope to retain their power by harnessing this torrent of popular sentiment themselves. Abroad, they presumably hope to impress democratic Socialists, anti-Communist Russians, and others that the Soviet dictatorship has been reformed and is now different from the monstrous evil that was Stalinism.

But we should not be tricked. The men who denounce Stalin now were trained by him and their hands are as bloody as were Stalin's with the blood of innocent millions. They have no claim to power other than that they were, as they once phrased it, the "closest comrades-at-arms of the great Stalin." It is good that they have begun to confess some of Stalin's crimes against the Soviet people. Stalin is dead and cannot be punished. When will the Russian people call his living accomplices to account for their share in those crimes?

The Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a prize-winning essay written by Miss Karen Holt, a senior in the Carbon Hill High School, Carbon Hill, Ala. Miss Holt's essay is entitled "The Bill of Rights."

The essay follows:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS
(By Karen Holt)

In America today, we take many of our liberties and privileges and even our freedom for granted. We don't stop to think how many people in both colonial and modern times have sacrificed their lives and fortunes in order to secure happiness and freedom for the future generations.

When our forefathers, the makers of the Constitution, considered it unnecessary to forbid some of the invasions of personal liberty and property rights in the Constitution, the people were not so sure they wanted this kind of government. They remembered their long struggle in England while securing their rights and how difficult it was when they settled in America to keep them. Virginia and other States made it plain that they expected a bill of rights to be added when they ratified the Constitution. Madison, called the father of the Constitution, led the necessary movement in Congress.

On November 3, 1791, the first 10 amendments went into effect. They form the so-called Bill of Rights. They underline the basic principle of the Declaration of Independence, that the purpose of the Government is to protect individual rights.

The Bill of Rights is the foundation upon which our American democracy rests. Americans will be free as long as its provisions are respected.

We Americans are always talking of freedom. What is freedom? Freedom may be defined as the constant struggle and fight for human longings. It is not only necessary to fight to gain liberty; we must continually struggle to keep it even after we obtain it. President Franklin D. Roosevelt in May 1941 said that we must preserve our four freedoms.

First and most important is that freedom of speech and expression. There can-

not be democracy unless men can say and write what they wish. This freedom cannot exist where there is tyranny. Even the seemingly most insignificant person may speak what he thinks.

Second of the four freedoms is the right of each man and woman to worship in his or her own way. No one tells us what church we must attend and we are not ruled by a government which tells us what to believe and what to do. Americans are not slaves of the Nation as many men in other parts of the world are. Our Founding Fathers, such as the Pilgrims, sacrificed everything for the right to worship as they pleased. Years ago a Russian once said, "Religion is like a nail—the harder you hit it, the deeper it sinks into the wood." This has been proven true countless numbers of times.

Freedom from want is the third of the four freedoms. Other freedoms could be very unimportant if we were starving to death. Many people believe that the world can produce enough goods and food for everybody. Both men and nations are likely to become desperate when facing starvation. We are more certain of our own freedom if all men and all nations have freedom from want.

The last of our four freedoms is freedom from fear. Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." We are all afraid of the things we can't see, as fear of the dark when we were very young. It is easy to imagine that someone wants to harm us. Our minds are free if we can feel unafraid and secure. We cannot enjoy other freedoms if we are overcome with fear. People of all nations are tied together by a common love of human freedom.

Now let us think for a moment about other freedoms stated in the Bill of Rights.

In 1734 John Peter Zenger was charged with printing seditious libels and was acquitted by a jury. This decision established liberty of the press for the colonists. One important cause of the Revolution and American independence was Thomas Paine. He was not afraid to write his beliefs and opinions. Having freedom of the press means that we get first-hand information on important local and world events. We learn different opinions of informed people on interesting subjects.

The Bill of Rights promises to the people the right to peaceably assemble. We are not denied the privilege of discussing matters of interest together. The people have the right to keep and bear arms for protection. According to the fourth amendment troops will not be quartered in our homes without our consent.

The fifth amendment protects against anyone entering to search your home. A person must have a warrant stating the place to be searched and the persons or things that are expected to be found in a search.

The right to trial by jury is enjoyed by all Americans. A person is not compelled to be a witness against himself and must first be indicted by a grand jury for the crime he is said to have committed. He will not be tried for the same offense twice. After a verdict of guilty he may take his case to a higher court. According to the Bill of Rights, the accused may enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial with an impartial jury and he is informed of the nature and cause of the accusation. An individual has the right to his life, liberty, and property.

Excessive bail is not required nor excessive fines imposed. The States and people have powers reserved to them that are not delegated in the Constitution.

Another freedom not mentioned in the Bill of Rights is the chance of obtaining a free education which means that the children of the rich and poor have a more nearly equal start in life. In America any person, rich or poor, has a chance to gain wealth and position. Lincoln is one of the best examples of a person who rose to fame through a struggle of poverty. Inventors, such as Morse and Ford, overcame poverty to achieve world importance. These achievements were possible only in a land where freedom of opportunity exists for all people.

All of our accomplishments would be of little value to us if we were not free. The greatest of all our debts to the past is for our freedom.

A great price was paid for the freedom we possess today. A huge number of men in Washington's army froze to death in the winter camp at Valley Forge during the Revolutionary War. Nathan Hale gave his life for our beloved country. His last words were, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country." Patrick Henry, a great statesman, declared, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death." Freedom to these people was above any price tag.

But what does all this talk of freedom mean to me as a future voter and responsible citizen? It means that each Sabbath Day I may visit and worship at the church of my choice. It means that I do not have to be worried about suddenly being aroused in the night by a loud rapping at my door. I will know my neighbors are my friends and not my enemies. I can think what I please and speak my thoughts. I have a future to look forward to through the many opportunitites offered me. It is not enough to talk of freedom; we must preserve it. It is up to the younger generations to blaze freedom's trail of the future and to let freedom ring.

California Witnesses Prove That Colorado River Project Will Not Threaten California's Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, It is the duty of those of us who represent California in the Congress to satisfy ourselves that not one drop of water to which California is legally entitled is taken from it by the Colorado River project legislation. That this is at the heart of California's particular concern in this matter is clearly set forth in the following excerpt from the comments of the California State engineer, Mr. A. D. Edmonston, on the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project:

The primary interest of the State of California in the specific projects set forth in the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation as approved by the Secretary of the Interior on January 26, 1951, is that in the construction and operation of any of these projects, California will receive its due apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River system as provided for in the Colorado River compact and related laws, instruments, and documents.[10]

Should authorization of the project prejudice California's legal rights to the waters of the Colorado River, my duty as well as the duty of every other person charged with the responsibility of representing California in or before Congress would be to oppose the legislation with all possible vigor. Conversely, such opposition is out of order if it can be established that authorization would pose no threat whatsoever to California's legal share of waters of the Colorado River, providing the project is otherwise in accord with the general policy of the Federal Government governing water resources development.

I have come to the conclusion that it is possible for the upper basin to develop and use some of the water to which it is entitled under the terms of the Colorado River Compact without impairing its ability to deliver to California and the other lower basin States the water to which they are entiled. That conclusion is based on statements by Northcutt Ely and Raymond Matthew, attorney and engineer, respectively, for the California-Colorado River Board, and on official comments and statements by California State Engineer Edmonston, and by the Colorado River Board of California to the effect that all of the consumptive uses in the upper basin contemplated in current legislation can be made without interfering with the quantity of water which must be delivered to the lower basin. Later [11] in this article evidence will be presented from the official record which establishes that California officials have, first, admitted that water available for use in the upper basin is more than adequate to supply all the requirements of the projects included in the Colorado River storage project without injury to California; second, maintained that large holdover storage in the upper basin is an essential prerequisite to development there in order to assure that California and the other lower basin States will continue to receive the water to which they are entitled under the compact; third, urged prompt construction of the largest feature of the Colorado River storage project, namely, the Glen Canyon reservoir; and fourth, endorsed the generation of electric energy as a necessary and desirable adjunct of upper basin development.

BACKGROUND OF PROPOSALS FOR UPPER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Basic to any understanding of the rights of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin to the use of the waters of the Colorado River is the Colorado River Compact of 1922.[12] That compact divides the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the upper basin comprising parts of the upper basin comprising parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, and the lower basin comprising parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, with Lee Ferry, a point in Arizona, as the dividing point between the two basins. Each basin is defined to include, in addition to the specified States, such other States located outside the drainage area of the Colorado River system as are or will be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colo-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

rado River system above or below Lee Ferry, as the case may be.

Article III (a) of the compact apportions to each basin in perpetuity:

The exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

Article III (d) provides that—

States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years.

The Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act,[13]—which authorized the Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal as its major features—became effective in 1929 after ratification of the compact by 6 of the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin, the enactment of the California Limitation Act[14] and the proclamation by the President. Development in the lower basin proceeded at a fast pace with the construction of Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, the Colorado River Acqueduct, and other works. Development in the upper basin, on the other hand, proceeded more slowly, due to various factors including the lack of a comprehensive plan for the use of their waters and of an apportionment of the waters among the States themselves, and to various economic, technical, and other problems that confronted it.

The first effective step toward eventual upper basin development came with the enactment of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.[15] Section 2 (d) of that act provided for a payment of $500,000 annually from the Colorado River dam fund, which was established by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, to a special fund in the Treasury designated the "Colorado River development fund." The first receipts of the fund up to $1,500,000 were directed to be used "for the continuation and extension, under the direction of the Secretary of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system for irrigation, electric power, and other purposes" in the upper and lower divisions of the Colorado River Basin. Receipts of the fund through the year 1955 were directed to be used for investigation and construction of projects in the four States of the upper division.

Pursuant to that authorization, the Department of the Interior undertook an exhaustive investigation of potential water resources developments in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the results of which were contained in an interim report of the Secretary of the Interior published in 1947 and entitled "The Colorado River—A Natural Menace Becomes a National Resource."[16] Before publication the report was submitted to the seven affected States and to the Secretary of war, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture, and their replies were included in it. The report contained a comprehensive inventory of potential water resources developments in the Colorado River Basin. In his letter transmitting it to the President, the Secretary of the Interior stated:

Although I cannot recommend authorization of any projects at this time, I am sending the accompanying inventory report forward in order that you and the Congress may be apprized of this comprehensive inventory of potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin, and of the present situation regarding water rights in the Colorado River Basin.[17]

The report took cognizance of the fact that while the Colorado River compact divides the water between the upper and lower basins, it made no division among the States within each basin. It further noted that an Upper Basin Compact Commission had been created to apportion upper basin water. The commission reached agreement and the compact became effective upon the concurrence of Congress in 1948.[18]

Following the apportionment of the waters among the upper basin States, various bills were introduced to authorize developments there. Meanwhile the Department continued its studies, and under date of December 1950, the Bureau of Reclamation presented Project Planning Report No. 4–8a–81–1 which recommended approval of an overall plan of development of the upper Colorado River Basin and initial authorization and construction of 5 storage projects and 10 participating or consumptive-use projects. Under date of June 14, 1951, California submitted its views and recommendations on the report, saying, among other things, the following:

The State of California favors congressional authorization of the specific projects set forth in the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior or as may be modified, and their construction with Federal funds consistent with national welfare if (a) such projects qualify under criteria, policies, and procedures of the Congress, and (b) the diversion and utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system by and through these projects will not impair the rights of the State of California or any of its agencies to the waters of that system as defined and set forth in the Colorado River compact and related laws and documents.[19]

The project was the subject of continuing study by the Bureau of Reclamation on the basis of which a supplemental report dated December 10, 1953, was prepared. It recommended the construction of the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage and power units and of some 11 reclamation projects. The total cost of the units recommended for authorization was $923,056,000. The report was transmitted to the Speaker of the House.[20] President Eisenhower referred to the report in a press release dated March 20, 1954, which read, in part, as follows:

I have today approved recommendations for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The general plan upon which these recommendations are based has been prepared by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's recommendations have been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. Legislation embodying the administration's recommendations is being prepared for introduction in the Congress.

This is a comprehensive, well-planned development of a river basin. The close Federal-State cooperation upon which the Secretary's plan is based also carries out this administration's approach to water-resource development.

The development will conserve water, enabling the region to increase supplies for municipal uses, industrial development, and irrigation. It will develop much-needed electric power.

The development calls for sound financing. The legislation now being drafted will set up a fund for the entire project so that it will be constructed and paid for as a basin program.

I hope the Congress will give early consideration to enactment of the administration's legislative proposal. I firmly believe development of the upper Colorado River Basin, in accordance with its provisions, is in the national interest.[21]

The President has repeatedly urged the Congress to approve his proposed upper Colorado River development. In his State of the Union message to the Congress in January 1955, President Eisenhower stated with reference to the project:

The Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.[22]

In his budget message for the same year the President said:

I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments.[23]

In his State of the Union message for 1956, delivered only last month, President Eisenhower again urgently recommended action authorizing the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project during the current session of Congress.[24]

THE PROJECT BEFORE CONGRESS

The Senate's bill to authorize the project, S. 500, passed that body during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. It would authorize 6 storage reservoirs with hydroelectric features and incidental works and 12 participating or consumptive-use irrigation projects plus some 21 additional projects conditioned on later congressional approval of feasibility re-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ports on each. The total construction cost of all features in the Senate bill is $1,658,460,100.

H. R. 3383, to authorize the project, was favorably reported.[25] by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 8, 1955, and shortly thereafter cleared for floor consideration by the House Committee on Rules.[26] Congress adjourned before the matter was taken up in the House. It is assumed that the backers will press for House action early in the current session of the 84th Congress. As reported by the committee, H. R. 3383 would authorize as an initial phase of the comprehensive plan of upper basin development 4 holdover storage reservoirs and 11 participating projects. The 4 holdover storage units and their locations are as follows:

Glen Canyon, Ariz. and Utah. Flaming Gorge, Utah and Wyo.; Navajo, N. Mex.; Curecantil, Colo.[27]

The 11 consumptive-use projects would bring irrigation to some 132,000 acres of new land and provide a supplemental water supply for an additional 234,000 acres.

The controversial Echo Park Dam, which has been opposed by individuals and organizations on grounds that it would invade the Dinosaur National Monument, was eliminated from H. R. 3383 in our committee, as was the Juniper Dam. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $760 million which is $190 million less than the $950 million recommended for the project by the Eisenhower administration.

Recently an agreement was reached between the governors, Senators, and Representatives of the upper basin to eliminate Echo Park Dam from the project in deference to those who opposed that particular feature because of its location. Based on the elimination of Echo Park, the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, which is typical of the national conservation societies which opposed the project solely because of Echo Park, advised Congressman Dawson of Utah by letter dated February 1, 1956, that its opposition has been withdrawn.[28] That withdrawal leaves the California opposition as the only objector to legislation to authorize the Colorado storage project.

Although, as has already been pointed out, California's primary concern with legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project relates to any adverse effect the project may have on its legal shares to the waters of the Colorado River, much criticism has been forthcoming from the California opposition based on the financial aspects of the project. Following is the allocation of costs of the project which would be authorized in the pending H. R. 3383:

Item and allocation	
Nonreimbursable: Flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation	$8,205,000
Reimbursable:	
Power	422,743,500
Municipal water	40,950,000
Irrigation	[29] 282,800,000

Of the total cost of the project less than 1 percent is nonreimbursable and that is for features which have specifically been recognized as Federal expenses such as flood control,[30] fish and wildlife,[31] and recreation.[32] The remaining 99 percent plus of the cost is reimbursable. The entire allocation for municipal and industrial water and power of approximately $463.7 million is returnable to the United States with interest on the investment plus interest accruing during construction. The irrigation allocation of $282.8 million would be repaid in equal installments over a 50-year period plus any development period authorized, but does not bear interest in accordance with a principle that has been a part of reclamation law for over 50 years.

Referring to the application of revenues contemplated from the project included in H. R. 3383, the following is set forth in the committee report:

In a 50-year period following the last power installation, net power revenues from the power facilities herein authorized are estimated at $1,075 million. Irrigation revenues in 50 years from the irrigation projects herein authorized are estimated at $36.6 million. The $1,075 million from power revenues would be sufficient to pay the power investment of $422.7 million, interest on the power investment of about $320 million to the Federal Treasury, the necessary financial assistance to irrigation of $246.2 million ($282.8 million minus $36.6 million) and leave a surplus at the end of the period of about $86 million. Municipal water revenues would be sufficient to repay the municipal water allocation with interest including interest during construction.

After the project has been completely repaid, the net power revenues amounting to from $15 million to $20 million annually for the units herein authorized will continue to flow into the Treasury. Over the long run, these additional revenues will more than offset the cost to the Federal Government resulting from interest-free financing for the irrigation investment. Thus, it is evident that the repayment plan is sound and that repayment is in accordance with the normal procedure for reclamation projects.[33]

In his testimony on S. 500.[34] Mr. Northcutt Ely decried the fact that the power revenues, in addition to repaying the cost of the power facilities with interest, will be used to pay out the cost of the reclamation facilities included in the project. Yet the use of power revenues for such purposes has been a common feature of Federal reclamation projects financing.[35] It received the endorsement of President Eisenhower's Presidential Committee on Water Resources Policy in a report [36] sent to the Congress on January 17, 1956. The Committee was comprised of the three following Cabinet officers: Secretary of Interior McKay, Chairman; Secretary of Agriculture Benson; and Secretary of Defense Wilson. In their report the members said in part as follows:

Use of excess revenues: Reclamation law has for many years permitted the application of excess revenue from the sale of power and municipal and industrial water (i. e., revenues received in excess of the amount necessary to amortize the capital cost with interest and cost of maintenance and operation of such purposes) to help repay part of irrigation costs. Such application has been made on numerous projects over many years. It should be recognized, however, that any charge for power above that necessary to repay power costs constitutes in effect an assessment upon the power users, who include practically all of the residents in the region. Thus, it is one method of collecting a share of costs from secondary local beneficiaries.

The Committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived.[37]

The Californians who object to the project on grounds of subsidy do so in the fact of the fact that the major subsidy to the reclamation projects comes not from the Federal Treasury, but from the power users in accordance with regular principles. The Federal subsidy amounts to only $8.2 million and that for features which are recognized as Federal expenses.[38] Contrast that subsidy with the estimated nonreimbursable Federal cost of $348 million [39] for only one flood control project in Southern California, namely the Los Angeles County drainage area—excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir—and you can get some idea of the reaction of Upper Basin spokesmen to challenges to the Colorado River storage project based on economics by the California opposition. Thus a single flood-control project which benefits 1 area in California carries a nonreimbursable Federal grant which is over 43 times the subsidy to the Colorado storage project in which 4 States benefit. If it is considered appropriate to take into account the cost to the Federal Government based on the non-interest-bearing irrigation investment, those features of the Colorado River storage projects would cost the United States some $285 million in interest over the 60-year amortization term. At the end of that period, all Federal costs will have been repaid. The nonreimbursable Federal grant for the Los Angeles County drainage area, on the other hand, will over the same length of time cost the United States $570 million in interest alone and this interest cost will continue to mount indefinitely. After 100 years, it will amount to $870 million.

Furthermore, it is difficult for Californians to oppose the upper basin development on economic grounds when the State of California is going to build the Feather River project out of its own funds with no reference to historical standards of feasibility.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S POSITION

At the outset I stated that my refusal to join the alinement against the upper basin development which Northcutt Ely and Raymond Matthew—attorney and engineer, respectively, for the California-Colorado River Board—have spearheaded is based on a conviction that it is possible for the upper basin to develop some of its legal share of the waters of the Colorado River Basin without impairing California's rights to its share of the same waters. It is my purpose to now set forth the evidence on which that conclusion is based—evidence assembled from the public record which I believe does not support the stand of those who

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

have fought upper basin development as a "threat to California's vital water and power supplies." [40]

WATER AVAILABLE FOR USE IN UPPER BASIN

It has already been shown that article III (a) of the Colorado River compact apportions to the upper basin the beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum from the waters of the Colorado River Basin. The State engineer of California has stated that the long-term average quantity available for use in the upper basin may be somewhat less than 7,500,000 acre-feet a year due to article III (d) of the compact which provides that the upper basin States will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any 10 consecutive years. He stated that studies have indicated that the upper basin during a critical period such as 1931–40 would not have more than 6,077,000 acre-feet available to it, which, together with estimated reservoir losses of 831,000 acre-feet, would result in a total consumptive use of 6,908,000 acre-feet. He then concluded that the long-term average quantity available for consumptive use in the upper basin is between 6,900,000 and 7,500,000 acre-feet per year.[41]

There has been unanimous agreement among Californians that the consumptive uses of projects included in S. 500 or H. R. 3383 would not require near the amount of water allotted to the upper basin by the compact. Mr. Ely testified, in part, as follows:

The aggregate consumptive use of these projects is said to range from about a half million to about 1½ million acre-feet. These quantities when added to about 2,500,000 acre-feet, said to be required by projects already constructed or authorized would represent a total use of say 3 million or 4 million acre-feet in the upper basin. The larger of these figures is still within the quantity of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, the use of which is apportioned to the upper basin by article 3 (a) of the Colorado River Compact. Moreover, the engineering studies indicate that this total could be permanently put to use without the construction of any new hold-over storage whatever.[42]

Not only did Mr. Ely and Mr. Matthew concede that the consumptive uses of all projects included in the Colorado River storage project legislation is well within the upper basin's entitlement, but they testified such uses were so small that they could be made without the construction of any hold-over storage facilities whatsoever.

Mr. Matthew testified before the House committee, in part, as follows:

Under present conditions of development of the upper basin, the measured flow at Lee Ferry during all periods of 10 consecutive years has always materially exceeded 75 million acre-feet throughout the period of record to date. Studies by the Bureau in the project planning report indicate that in the dryest 10-year period of record, 1930–40, the upper basin could have theoretically used, without holdover storage, about 4,300,000 acre-feet of water, or about 2,300,000 acre-feet more than the present use as estimated by the Bureau.[43]

Mr. Ely referred to the fact that all authorized and contemplated uses in the upper basin would represent a total of from 3,500,000 to 4,500,000 acre-feet in the upper basin and added:

Moreover, the engineering studies indicate that this total could be permanently put to use without the construction of any new holdover storage whatever, and that no holdover storage would be required for nearly half a century even if other projects were added.[44]

Even the pendency of the case of Arizona against California does not affect the amount of water required for consumptive use by the Colorado River storage project, plus that required for all presently authorized and existing projects. The future determination by the Supreme Court in that case on such important questions as whether beneficial consumptive use as used in article III (a) of the Colorado River compact and the Mexican Water Treaty means the quantity in fact used, measured at the place of use, or the effect of that use measured in terms of stream depletion at Lee Ferry, as well as its decision on other disputed interpretations of provisions of pertinent compacts, laws, and treaties does not warrant a delay in authorization of the Colorado River storage project, since, as Mr. Ely has testified, the amount involved in that litigation vis-a-vis the upper and lower basins amounts to 2 million acre-feet.[45] Thus if all disputed issues in that case are resolved in favor of the stand California has taken in Arizona against California now before the Supreme Court, there will remain 5,500,000 acre-feet per year available for use in the upper basin. This amount is still well over 1 million acre-feet in excess of the 3,500,000 to 4,500,000 acre-feet which Mr. Ely testified could be put to use in the upper basin without any danger to the lower basin.

THE STORAGE DAMS

By far the biggest assault from southern California on the Colorado River storage project has been directed at the storage dams. This is understandable since those dams, which include hydroelectric features, are the "cash registers" of the enitre development. This is so because the revenues derived from the sale of power will, in accordance with standard practice, be used to pay off part of the cost of the participating, or irrigation, projects. Without them the irrigation projects canot be built except at prohibitive cost and the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the compact must remain undeveloped.

The desire of southern Californians to forever preclude or at least delay development in the upper basin is understandable when the effect of such development on lower basin power revenues is taken into account. Manifestly, water which is used in the upper basin will not pass through Hoover and other lower basin dams to generate low-cost power. The power generated from water to which the upper basin is entitled is sold as secondary—undependable—energy at a low rate as contrasted with firm—dependable—energy which is sold at a higher rate. That upper basin Senators are not insensitive to this basis of the southern California opposition is shown in the following colloquy between Senators Anderson, of New Mexico, Watkins, of Utah, and Mr. Raymond Matthew, of the Colorado River Board of California, in the course of the Senate hearings:

Senator ANDERSON. May I stop you there to ask: Since this has been dealing with Hoover Dam, is it or is it not a fact that the Hoover Dam contracts are all set up on a basis of gradual reduction of power quantities dependent upon the development of the upper basin?

Mr. MATTHEW. That is correct.

Senator ANDERSON. Then why should you suddenly complain about it now, if what you anticipated takes places?

Mr. MATTHEW. Well, this is far more than was anticipated. The firm power is defined in the contracts starting with 4,330 million kilowatt-hours a year, reduced by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours a year, due to depletions in the upper basin.

Senator ANDERSON. Would the projects involved in this bill reduce it more than that?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes, these storage projects would——

Senator ANDERSON. But, surely, you would not contend that it was anticipated that the flow at Lee Ferry should be above 7½ million acre-feet, and keep Hoover Dam going to capacity?

Mr. MATTHEW. Not just necessarily for that. I am merely pointing out that under the contracts as set up, in order to deliver that firm power at Hoover, it would require the larger quantity. And if there was only 7,500,000 acre-feet at Lee Ferry, then the firm power output would be reduced 26 percent, and they would not get any secondary.

Senator ANDERSON. I am trying to get down to bedrock, but you insist on these interpretations of the contracts requiring the delivery of 7½ million acre-feet at Lee Ferry. Now, if we live up to that part of the compact, and that results in any cutting down at Hoover Dam, do you think that is wrong?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes, we do.

Senator ANDERSON. You do. Therefore the Hoover Dam situation is more important than that section of the compact? [46]

* * * * * *

Senator WATKINS. I am just wondering how they can lose when, as a matter of fact, they have been getting the benefit of a gift, in effect, from the upper basin States all these years in the way of secondary power, and, of course, firm power, much more of it than you could ordinarily guarantee unless you counted on having the water from the upper basin States run there personally (sic).

Senator ANDERSON. That is the loss, Senator. The loss he is talking about is a loss that they would obtain if somebody stopped all the water in the Colorado River Basin from flowing down there.

Senator WATKINS. If we stop giving our water to them.

Senator ANDERSON. Yes. That is the loss.

Senator WATKINS. I have had people make gifts to me once in a while, and if they stop giving me those gifts I have lost (sic).

Mr. MATTHEW. As was testified to yesterday by Mr. Tillamn, of course, that secondary power and firm power was not guaranteed.

Senator WATKINS. It was not. That is true.[47]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

It is clear, as brought out in the foregoing colloquy, that the reduction of energy available to allottees of Hoover Dam power which will result from the use by the upper basin of its share of the Colorado Basin waters has been anticipated since consummation of the compact. The Hoover Dam energy contracts with California public agencies and companies such as the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank, the Metropolitan Water District, and the Southern California Edison Co., and the California Electric Power Co. each contain the following express condition and covenant:

Delivery of water for generation of electric energy:

10. (a) Subject to—

* * * * *

(ii) the further statutory requirement that this contract is made upon the express condition and with the express covenant that the rights of the * * *, as a contractor for electrical energy, to the use of the waters of the Colorado River, or its tributaries, shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact.

The United States will deliver the State energy in the manner required in this contract.[48]

Although Mr. Ely's position is that all the participating projects in the upper basin can be built "without the necessity for any storage whatever," [49] and Mr. Matthew has stated that "storage units should not be built in the upper basin in advance of their need in connection with consumptive-use projects," [50] the California State engineer and the Colorado River Board of California included the following recommendations in their comments on the Secretary of the Interior's report on potential upper basin developments:

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The following comments and conclusions are submitted with respect to the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior entitled "The Colorado River," approved June 7, 1946.

* * * * *

6. Large holdover storage as indicated in the report is required in meeting the requirements of the Colorado River compact and in conserving and utilizing as far as it is ultimately possible the waters of the Colorado River system.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

C. That prior to determination of the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River system among the States of the upper basin, new consumptive-use projects in that basin be authorized under the following conditions:

(a) That the consumptive use of each project be assuredly within each water allocation as is considered the minimum for the State for which the project is to be constructed, after due allowance for all existing and authorized projects.

(b) That, concurrently with the construction of any new projects in the upper basin which involve large additional use of water, holdover storage capacity be provided in that basin, to such an extent as may be necessary to assure that the flow of the river at Lee Ferry will not be depleted below that required by article III (d) of the compact.[51]

The largest in physical dimensions and cost of the storage dams, which is included in both the House and Senate bills, is Glen Canyon with a total cost allocation of $421,270,000. It represents 55 percent of all the recommended appropriation for units authorized in H. R. 3383. The reservoir storage capacity of Glen Canyon would be 26 million acre-feet and the total installed power capacity, 800,000 kilowatts. This dam would be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 15 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, which divides the upper and lower basins.

This dominant financial and physical feature of the entire Colorado River storage project was endorsed as late as February 15, 1954, by the State engineer of California in his official comments on the administration's report on the project, which comments were approved by Fred W. Simpson, chairman, the Colorado River Board of California. They were, in part, as follows:

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

* * * * *

10. The early construction of Glen Canyon Reservoir would be justified from the standpoint of other immediate advantages. Based upon the cost analyses in the report, the Glen Canyon Reservoir and power development could be constructed and operated on a sound financial basis and therefore merits authorization at this time.[52]

Testifying on H. R. 3383, Raymond Matthew endorsed Glen Canyon thusly:

Of all the proposed units of the storage project, the Bureau's cost estimates indicate that the Glen Canyon Reservoir and power development is the only one that can clearly stand on its own feet as a financially sound project unit.[53]

It might be expected that after a clear endorsement of Glen Canyon by the State engineer, the chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, and by Mr. Raymond Matthew, the chief engineer of the board, as an economically feasible and even desirable development, that Mr. Northcutt Ely would follow the official State position. Instead of doing so, he opposed the Glen Canyon development as unsound.[54]

Much criticism on the project is based on an allegation that the storage dams may be operated in such a manner as to be detrimental to the rights of California, particularly during the period when the reservoirs are being filled. The Department of the Interior has repeatedly emphasized that the filling of the reservoirs will be accomplished in a manner to minimize any adverse effect on Hoover Dam power. Commissioner of Reclamation Dexheimer testified that during many years they have had to release flood waters from Hoover Dam to make space. He continued:

That water is wasted. Every year we are wasting water into the gulf because we do not have adequate storage now to take care of it.

If we could have stored water a few years back from excess, it would have been available now and would certainly be beneficial not only in the upper basin but in the lower basin.[55]

Dead storage can be built up during the long construction period by impounding what would otherwise be run-off or waste waters from Hoover Dam. In that manner the heads for initial power generation would be accumulated over a long period of time without affecting the production of power at Hoover. The time required to fill the reservoirs would, of course, depend on the amount of run-off in the river. Under unfavorable conditions, filling could be achieved in 5 years, but it could be much longer in the event of drought. In short, the Department of the Interior has given every assurance that it will adapt initial filling to the amount of run-off and the downstream demands for water and firm electrical energy. By the way of further protection for the lower basin, section 15 of H. R. 3383 directs the Secretary of the Interior to operate the facilities authorized in the bill in compliance with the compacts and acts which comprise the so-called law of the river and permits any State of the Colorado River Basin, in the event the Secretary fails to so comply, to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States and gives the consent to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit.

One further consideration relative to the upper-basin storage is that the benefits will not accrue only to that basin. California and the other lower-basin States will likewise share in the benefit, since it will be assured of a regular supply in accordance with the terms of the compact. Thus, in years of low flow in the river caused by drought, water will be released from the reservoirs to satisfy California's rights.

GENERATION OF ELECTRIC POWER IN THE UPPER BASIN

The importance of the installed electrical energy generating capacity at the storage dams as a means of financing part of the cost of the irrigation works has already been discussed. There will be no problem whatsoever in marketing the energy to be generated by the Colorado River storage project in the power-hungry area it will serve. Ten private power companies have offered to purchase any available power above that required by project or other Government contracts.[56] Referring to the private power companies' proposals, our committee stated in its report:

The committee finds that this project is unique in that there is no public versus private power controversy involved. Representatives of the 10 private power companies operating in the area presented testimony before the committee indicating their desire to cooperate with the Federal Government in the transmission and marketing of electric power and energy from the Colorado River storage project. Their proposal provides essentially that the Secretary construct the backbone transmission lines connecting major powerplants of the project and that use be made of the existing systems of the companies and additions thereto to market the power.

* * * * *

The proposal by the power companies seemed entirely reasonable to the committee.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private power companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power-preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected.[57]

Not only the private power companies, but the REA cooperatives,[58] and the State of California are anxious to secure the power. The State engineer of California, Mr. Edmonston, and Mr. Matthew and Mr. Edmonston, the chief engineer and chairman, respectively, of the Colorado River Board of California stated as late as February 15, 1954, in their official report on the project as follows:

11. Glen Canyon power could be readily disposed of in the lower basin where there is a great need for additional power. The question of policy regarding its disposal merits the special consideration of the Executive and the Congress.[59]

California's official position has always been favorable to the development of the power potential of the upper basin. In its official comments on the Secretary's interim report on the Colorado River appears the following with respect to the development of electric power in the Colorado River Basin:

ELECTRIC POWER

Full development of the water resources of the Colorado River necessarily include the production and transmission of hydroelectric power made possible by the construction of storage works for the regulation and utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

An initial construction program could and should include hydroelectric power developments when found needed and justifield. Such projects are nonconsumptive in effect.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That an immediate and intensive investigation and study be made and reported upon by the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with interested agencies, concerning possible hydro-electric projects upstream from Lake Mead on the Colorado River with a view to authorization and construction at the earliest practicable date; provided, it be found that such projects are of nonconsumptive-use character, are feasible from engineering and economic standpoints, are consistent with the primary purpose of furnishing water supplies for domestic and irrigation uses in accordance with the Colorado River Compact, and will not be inconsistent with a comprehensive plan for progressive development of the Colorado River system.[60]

Disregarding this fair and reasonable recommendation of the State of California, California opposition has stood steadfast against the storage dams and appurtenant power facilities proposed for initial authorization in pending legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project. As already indicated, if they succeed, they will foreclose upper basin development since the power dams are the cash register that make that development possible.

CONCLUSION

It would appear to be an inescapable conclusion from the evidence assembled from such official California sources as the California State engineer and the chairman and chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California that authorization of the Colorado River storage project will not deprive California and the other lower basin States of the waters of the Colorado River Basin to which they are entitled. Not only have those officials approved the devlopment generally, but they have specifically endorsed the construction of storage reservoirs in the upper basin as a necessary protection for lower basin water supply. The major storage facility of the project, the Glen Canyon Reservoir, has been twice officially endosed by two successive California State engineers, Mr. Edward Hyatt and Mr. A. D. Edmonston, by the last two chairmen of the Colorado River Board, Mr. Evan T. Hewes and Mr. Fred W. Simpson, as well as by Mr. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California. In view of the stand taken by these responsible State officials, I fail to see the basis for opposition on the part of California to the Colorado River storage project.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[10] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess., 297 (1954).
[11] Infra, at p. 17 et seq.
[12] H. Doc. No. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at A17 (1948).
[13] 45 Stat. 1057 (1928).
[14] Calif. Stats. 1929, ch. 16, p. 38.
[15] 54 Stat. 774.
[16] H. Doc. No. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).
[17] Id. at 2.
[18] 63 Stat. 31 (1949).
[19] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess. at 297 (1954).
[20] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954).
[21] Id at 1.
[22] H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 8.
[23] H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at M. 65.
[24] H. Doc. No. 241, 84th Cong., 2d sess., at 10.
[25] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., (1955).
[26] H. Rept. No. 1332, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955).
[27] Authorization of this feature was made subject to a finding of feasibility and report to the Congress.
[28] 102 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A1079 (Feb. 2, 1956).
[29] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 11 and 12.
[30] 49 Stat. 1570 (1936), 33 U. S. C. 701a (1952).
[31] 60 Stat. 1080 (1934), 16 U. S. C. 662 (1952).
[32] The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. Vol. 3, Water Resources Law (1950) at 331.
[33] H. Rept. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., at 12 and 13.
[34] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 572.
[35] The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., supra, at 296.
[36] H. Doc. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess. (1955).
[37] Id. at 33.
[38] Supra, notes 30, 31, and 32.
[39] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate on H. R. 6766, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955), at 1886.
[40] 30 Los Angeles B. A. Bull. 227.
[41] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947), at 33 and 34.
[42] Hearings on H. R. 3383, supra, at 825 and 826.
[43] January 26, 1954, Raymond Matthew's statement before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H .R. 4449 and others, 83d Cong., 2d sess., at 692.
[44] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 571.
[45] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al., at 991, 992, and 993.
[46] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 517 and 518.
[47] Id., at 519.
[48] See, e. g., power contract, city of Los Angeles, dated May 29, 1941, H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at A361. See also the agreements with other contractors in the same volume.
[49] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al., supra, at 982.
[50] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 526.
[51] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., at 51, 52 and 53.
[52] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess., at 19.
[53] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al. at 912 et seq.
[54] Id. at 987.
[55] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 28.
[56] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 30.
[57] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., stet at 16 and 17.
[58] Charles J. Fain, hearings on S. 500, supra, at 329 et seq.
[59] H. Doc. No. 684, 83d Cong., 2d. sess., at 19.
[60] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., at 47, 48 and 53.

Our Mental-Health Problem—Mental Illness Can Be Cured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith the last in a series of articles on our mental-health problem. These articles were prepared for the Amarillo Globe-Times by two of the newspapers' top writers, Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco. While this series has been concerned with the problem as it affects Texas, what has been said in them can be applied to all the other States because the problem of proper care and treatment of the mentally ill is a nationwide problem. I hope the Members have had an opportunity to follow this series and that it may be the inspiration for added effort to do something for the mentally ill. Mental illness can be cured if we determine to tackle the problem with proper energy and resources:

THE MENTALLY ILL CAN BE CURED—WHAT TEXAS CAN DO

(By Louise Evans and Mary Tom Rasco)

There's a good job a-begging in the Texas State Hospital system.

Last spring the legislature approved a deputy administrator, which can be paid as high as $17,000.

The money was available on September 1, 1955. In this first month of 1956, the job has not been filled. Nor had any concrete efforts been made to canvass possibilities among highly skilled men.

A man qualified in hospital administration should have the job. If he were a psychiatrist-administrator, as is Dr. George W. Jackson who heads the Kansas institutions, it would be pure gravy since Dr. James A. Bethea, capable executive director of the Board of Texas State Hospitals and Special Schools, is near retirement age.

But remember—in the mental health field in the United States today, one begs, borrows, or steals personnel.

It takes more than money to buy them. You can't even train your own unless you have a drawing card—a training hospital * * * a chance for research * * * good working conditions * * * some vital, creative program in which the worker feels he has a part.

Texas can develop such attractions. But it will take some vision on the part of the board, of the legislators, and the general run of Texans.

* * * * *

BIG CITIES SKIPPED

There is something to be said for tossing the whole Texas Hospital and Special School plant into the gulf and beginning over. Take a look at the map (at right). Note location of the facilities. With the exception of the State capital and its nearby neighbor, San Antonio, not a big city is served by a State hospital. The gulf-coast area with such cities as Houston, Beaumont, Galveston, Port Arthur—the most heavily populated area in the State—does not contain a State mental hospital other than the small training facility (233 beds) administered by the University of Texas Medical Branch, at Galveston.

The urban centers produce the patients. In these urban areas of Texas, too, are concentrated the men and women who have training in medical, psychiatric, and the auxiliary services needed in a good treatment program.

Try to persuade an American housewife to carry on her 1955 duties in an 1855 kitchen—yet we are asking that new techniques in mental care be carried on in buildings as unsuited, some 100 years old.

But since the plant has an estimated worth of $150 million and since what is carried on inside the buildings is more important than even their location and structure, we can take a page from Kansas' book:

1. Reevaluate the patients; get the mentally retarded into training schools; the aged senile into nursing and boarding homes; the nonpsychotic alcoholics into clinics; the criminally insane into prisons; the children into special treatment centers. (There are more than 60 Texas children in our hospitals for the insane. They have no separate quarters * * * just more statistics, mixed in with hopeless adult cases.)

2. Place the emphasis on the care and treatment of the mental patients already in the hospitals with the hope of obtaining beds through dismissal of long-term patients.

3. Inaugurate a realistic program of charges so that individuals and relatives can participate in the cost of care.

4. Set up a training program to build a skilled staff.

5. With this staff, keep up with the current load. Don't let the mentally ill stack up on waiting lists or in hospitals without diagnosis and immediate treatment.

6. Start research programs, especially into the treatment of mentally disturbed children.

Whether this fact points the way or not, Kansas achieved part of its success because it reorganized the entire mental health program under a board of social welfare. It recognized that the social problems of neglected children, aged needing public assistance, broken homes, failures in community organization—the whole complex of factors—formed the swamp in which mental illness breeds.

Durwood Manford, of Smiley, former speaker of the house and now chairman of the Texas board, believes an equally integrated program can be worked out in Texas under the interagency agreements which the legislature has approved. Under these agreements, Texas agencies can perform the functions of another if necessary—as, for instance, the department of public welfare—social workers can assist the board in carrying out needed social work at the county level. But as a generality it's mighty hard to get several agency directors to see eye to eye on an integrated program. Some one individual is always resistant.

(The Texas Research League did not recommended such a complete reorganization in its 1955 report. Asked why, staff members explained that its study had been invited only by the Board of Texas State Hospitals and Special Schools. However, the league has been invited to make a similar study of the Texas Department of Public Welfare within the next 2 years. By that time, it may become apparent more integration is needed for a strong Texas program for mental health.)

This is a problem of administration, however. Hospital population undoubtedly will drop through application of good administration. But the meat of the problem still is: How are we going to treat and rehabilitate our mentally ill?

The answer lies in staff members—dedicated people—some of them highly skilled, and some of them merely sympathetic and knowledge of the needs of patients under their care.

If one of the Texas hospitals were made into a teaching and training institution such as Topeka State Hospital has become, slowly the prestige of its accomplishments would attract trainees.

Or let 1 of the 3 fine medical schools in Texas—the university's medical school at Galveston or its southwestern branch at Dallas or Baylor in Houston—adopt a hospital as a training unit. If the Topeka hospital can be used for training of staffs for the other 2 Kansas hospitals, there is no reason why Terrell, Austin, and Rusk cannot be used as training grounds for the other 3 Texas hospitals—and for the skilled help needed in training schools for the mentally retarded, in nursing homes for the aged senile, and even in industrial schools for the juvenile delinquents.

RESEARCH VITAL

A research program into mental illness is an economic necessity. Suicides, a common end to mental illness, account for more deaths in the United States than the five most common communicable diseases. If 1,000 Texan children are allowed to reach our custodial type of mental institution and live only to the age of 60, it will cost Texas $36 million to support them, in cost of operations alone. And remember, it is in the minds of the children where the factors for mental disease can be dissected most successfully.

A State resident center for disturbed children, as recommended by the Texas Research League, therefore, would serve as a research field which may someday give us the answer to this problem of overloaded mental hospitals.

COSTS GOING UP

Last August there were 16,445 persons in Texas State hospitals. (Don't think the State is carrying the whole load of mental care. There are about 4,000 private hospital beds in Texas that bear mentally ill patients.) In 1975 there will be 28,000 in State institutions if a mental-care program is not started.

Given no further inflated costs, disregarding the multi-million-dollar construction program to house that number, consider that it will cost Texas $24,600 more each day to support the increased number. It already costs us $20 million annually for 16,445.

Don't think this increase won't happen. In February 1953, when the Texas Research League started its survey of Texas institutions, the patient load stood at 24,000 (of which two-thirds were in the mental hospitals), and there was a waiting list of 200. By the time the study was completed in late November 1954, the patient load had increased by 1,200 and the waiting list stood at 800.

VOTERS AT FAULT

It would be satisfying to our separate consciences if the blame for the piecemeal program since 1949 could be pushed off on the Board of Texas Hospitals and Special Schools. But Texans went to the polls in 1949 and voted down a constitutional amendment which was the cornerstone to a modern program for caring for the mentally ill, the aged, and the mentally retarded.

Do you remember how many Texans bothered to vote on that important constitutional amendment which would free the "jury trial" commitments? Exactly 282,982. Such a minority report from the voters ought to have broken the spirit of the board and legislators.

The defeating vote was narrow—10,176. But it was a mandate from the people. Until that constitutional requirement comes off the books, no modern program for treatment of the mentally ill can be built.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS

In 1949 the board tried to meet an emergency situation of overcrowding in the hospitals. It made a quick survey and recommended a $41 million building program to put beds under all patients and literally to build roofs over their heads.

The building program, unfortunately, did not allow for future growth. (In 1949 Kansas decided to cut down on future growth by treating the ill then in institutions and staffing up to treat new admissions. It chose to build its mental-health program with brains, not bricks.)

Since the legislature, called in special session in 1950, voted only $35 million for the program, it probably wouldn't have done the board much good to plan for the future. (However, legislators presented with realistic estimates of growth, and a blueprinted program for future creative care of the mentally ill, might have listened.)

The 51st legislature voted a new cigarette tax of 1 cent and allocated $5 million from the fund for each of 7 years to accumulate the $35 million for building. The 54th legislature, sitting last spring, continued the cigarette tax but did not continue the $5 million allotment. After 1957 the board will have to ask its building requirements from each upcoming legislature. Presently it is spending $1½ million of each $5 million annual allotment for repair and renovation of existing buildings.

WORSE TO COME?

Hindsight is always brilliant thinking. Now we can ask: Why didn't the board, the legislature, and Texas recognize the shortsightedness of such a policy? Why didn't someone, somewhere, pick up the 14-point program and put it into effect? Wise personnel policies, intensive in-training programs, emphasis on medical and psychiatric

care of the patients and a realistic policy of admissions could have been bought with some of a $35 million allotment.

Instead, what happened? The board floundered in administrative detail. Five directors came and went in 5 years. In 15 hospitals, 43 superintendents have served in the past 5 years.

Instead of starting a mental health facility, in either Dallas or Houston, where both concentration of population and therefore mentally ill folk and where medical talent and auxiliary services of psychologists, therapists, and nurses are found, the board approved additions to facilities which for many reasons should either have been closed or changed to other types of institutions.

The Texas Research League by 1954 found that some of the buildings erected since 1950 are flawed in construction and ill-fitted for the function they should perform.

But the most uncomfortable fact that emerges is that at the end of the 7-year building program, the degree of overcrowding in most facilities will be greater than it was in 1949.

LOOK AT NEW YORK

Texans cannot build themselves out of this predicament of overcrowded institutions for the mentally ill, mentally retarded and aged. We have to think our way out.

The Board of Texas State Hospitals and Special Schools can spearhead a modern program of mental health. But don't blame the board if Texans, speaking through their legislature, refuse to adopt such a program.

We can go to the polls next fall and join the rest of the western world in discarding a law for the insane we inherited from the Middle Ages.

We can insist upon a teaching and training hospital as a pilot program.

We can demand that the board put skilled hospital administrators and top medical men in charge of the mental health institutions.

We can demand that it formulate policies that will make dedicated folk of the personnel—right down to the ward aides and shoe-repair men—needed to run the complex system.

We can insist upon research into the cause and cure of mental illness.

Suppose we don't. Suppose we elect to reject such a program.

We have been talking a lot about Kansas. Let's have a quick look at New York, one of our older States. It has billions of dollars invested in schools, in a gigantic highway system, mammoth bridges, public works, and State services. And it has to have a State income tax to support this structure.

Yet the figures show that one-third of its entire State revenues goes to the care of the mentally ill. Having just completed a half-billion dollar building program, it has had to vote another $375 million bond issue for buildings. New York didn't start soon enough.

Texas now has a young population. It doesn't have the burden of an aging population that New York has, but it will. Also it will be facing the attritions of an urbanized State. In the last census, 62 percent of Texans lived in urban centers. The trend has been accelerated since.

When we reach New York's stage of urbanization, when our percentage of older people starts rising, we will have the same costs—unless we plan now.

Texas can afford to adopt a modern program.

In fact, we can't afford not to. The stakes are too high.

Public and private facilities for care of mental patients in Texas (excluding State hospitals)

Ownership, name, and location	Bed capacity	Patient-days, 1953	Patients admitted, 1953
Private or church owned:			
Oak Ridge Sanatorium, Austin	25	7,588	227
Baptist Hospital,[1] Beaumont	5	(2)	(2)
Beaumont Infirmary, Beaumont	18	(2)	1,000
Beverly Hills Clinic and Sanatorium, Dallas	120	40,885	937
Timberlawn Sanatorium, Dallas	100	29,659	564
Wheatland Retreat, Dallas	55	(2)	(2)
Westbrook Sanatorium, Dallas	[3] 35	(2)	(2)
Harris Hospital, Fort Worth	[3] 35	(2)	(2)
Howard Sanatorium, Fort Worth	22	5,870	227
St. Mary's Infirmary,[1] Galveston	50	(2)	(2)
Sunland Clinic Hospital, Harlingen	(2)	(2)	(2)
Allen's Private Sanatorium, Houston	8	(2)	(2)
Herman Hospital Houston	30	(2)	(2)
Keightly Hospital, Houston	42	6,404	112
Memorial Hospital,[1] Houston	18	5,090	221
Methodist Hospital, Houston	28	(2)	521
Montrose Hospital, Houston	35	5,871	350
Oak Place Hospital, Houston	50	7,856	749
Counts Sanatorium, Houston	26	(2)	(2)
Benner Sanatorium, Houston	[3] 30	(2)	(2)
Plainview Sanatorium and clinic, Plainview	26	(2)	(2)
Dr. A. J. Bankhead, Tyler	20	(2)	250
Dr. George C. Constant, Victoria	25	(2)	1,000
Total	846		
City-county:			
Memorial Hospital,[1] Corpus Christi	22	4,373	548
Parkland Hospital,[1] Dallas	32	7,160	383
El Paso General Hospital,[1] El Paso	30	(2)	(2)
Jefferson-Davis Hospital,[1] Houston	24	(2)	(2)
Wichita Falls General Hospital,[1] Wichita Falls	12	(2)	(2)
Total	120		
Federal:			
William Beaumont Army Hospital, El Paso	(2)	(2)	(2)
U. S. Public Health Service Hospital,[4] Fort Worth	764	998	(2)
Veterans' Administration Hospital, Houston	248	588	(2)
Veterans' Administration Hospital, Marlin	24	(2)	(2)
Brooke Army Hospital, San Antonio	(2)	(2)	(2)
Veterans' Administration Hospital, Waco	2,040	1,200	(2)
Total	3,076		
State (not under State board):			
Galveston State Psychopathic Hospital, University of Texas	[3] 233	(2)	[3] 2,400

[1] General hospital with facilities for mental patients.
[2] Not available.
[3] Estimated.
[4] For narcotic patients.

Conservation of Marine Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded meetings of the Inter-American Council of Jurists in Mexico there occurred an action which has been interpreted as a severe setback for United States diplomacy. There was passed a resolution dealing with the breadth of the territorial sea and the principle of freedom of the seas. If carried to its logical conclusion the resolution would split the oceans surrounding the Americas into segments of soverign territory stretching to sea as far as the coastal country thought was necessary to protect its interests. The implications of such a radical change in practice upon the defense, merchant marine, and air commerce of the hemisphere are so far reaching that they defy immediate assessment.

Hardly less shocking to United States diplomacy than the substance of the resolution was the way in which its passage was accomplished. The Department of State has worked with some degree of urgency and energy in recent months to explain and rationalize the position of the United States on the doctrine of the freedom of the seas to our southern neighbors 1 by 1 and in groups. But in the last analysis nations who have already laid claims to 200 miles and more or high seas prepared a resolution without asking the United States to participate in its drafting, and ramrodded it through the meeting without analysis, discussion, or study. The vote was 15 to 1 against the United States. Four other countries tempered the defeat lightly by abstaining from voting.

This is not the first time that this subject has been brought to the attention of the Congress nor do I suppose it will be the last. The topic has been fermenting in Latin America for 10 years. The last time it bubbled over was at the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas in the spring of 1954. In reaction to that the Congress enacted Public Law 680, 84th Congress, 2d session, which among other things provided for the United States Treasury standing good for any fine when a vessel of the United States was seized pursuant to rights and claims not recognized by the United States.

This is a complicated subject and there are undoubtedly some aspects of it of which I have no clear understanding. I say this advisedly, because I am certain that no rational person knowing what little I do about the subject would have voted for such a resolution, and I am sure

that the delegates there assembled were rational persons and represented rational governments. A large component of the problem, however, is concerned with the conservtion of fishery resources lying in the high seas and this is a subject about which I do have some knowledge and understanding.

The development of fishery conservation theory and the application of it to the practical problems of conserving marine resources has been advanced substantially in my State during the past 30 years. Such eminent scientists in the field as M. F. Thompson, F. Harvard Bell, H. A. Dunlop, Richard VanCleve, W. C. Herrington, Lloyd A. Royal, J. L. Kask, and M. B. Schaefer have come from the school of fisheries of our University of Washington to contribute mightily to theory and practice in the field. Such eminent public-spirited laymen as Edward W. Allen, the late Miller Freeman, Harold Lokkon, and others are known nationally and internationally, with their Canadian counterparts across the border, for the skill with which they have translated these scientific activities into practical diplomatic, economic, social, and political accomplishments.

I hope that it is with pardonable pride that I relate the achievements which the United States has made in the conservation of fishery conservation in the past 30 years, which are unequaled by any other country, and the part that citizens of my State have played in that achievement. I do this not for the glorification of our State or Nation but to illustrate to our neighbors to the south that the objectives they seek in this complex matter can be accomplished quite adequately, practically, economically, and quickly by peaceful international collaboration and cooperation, which strongly promotes international good will among the participants instead of generating chaos in international relations as would the resolution adopted at Mexico City if it were put into practice.

During the First World War there was much the same shortage of protein food in the world as we remember from so short a time ago in the Second World War. Fishermen and farmers were exhorted to produce more and more food. Under this impetus the halibut fishermen of the State of Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska expanded their fishing effort as rapidly as possible until it spread all over the Northeast Pacific and out along the Alaskan Peninsula. During the entirety of the 1920's, the intensity of the fishery continually increased, but just as steadily the total catch of halibut by Canada and the United States declined.

By 1924, the direction of decline was so apparent to the industry leaders on both sides of the border that they knew something had to be done about it, but they knew not what. Now, of course, we know that the resource had been overfished during the intensive harvesting of World War I, but a short 30 years ago this thought was not widely harbored. Most people still considered that the fish of the sea, like the sands of the beach, and the stars in the skies, were unlimited in number and inexhaustible in supply. There was no science of applied fishery biology as such, and oceanography was a fancy name some Navy people used to refer to the study of wind, wave, and weather at sea.

However, something was required to be done or the whole industry would go broke. The leaders of the industry finally prevailed upon their governments to negotiate a treaty under which a joint commission could be appointed to study the matter. The treaty was signed and put into effect in 1924.

The newly appointed Commissioners had no better knowledge about what had happened to the halibut than did the fishermen. To get started they hired a bright young man who did seem to have some ideas on the subject. He is now the world-renowned Dr. W. F. Thompson, director of applied fishery research, University of Washington. He hired a group of young graduate students, none of whom had had fishery training, and put them to sea with the fishermen to study, observe, and report upon the ocean, the fish, the fishery, the fishermen, and the observable relations between them. This was the International Fishery Commission, and it was the first venture of the sort that nations had embarked upon.

Results did not come quickly or easily, but after 6 years of the most rigid examinations of the facts available to them, Dr. Thompson and his young men had put together a theory to account for the diminished catches of halibut despite the intensified fishery effort. It ran, in essence, like this:

Fish are continually entering the fishery from the newly born crop that comes along each year, and the weight of the fish in the stock was increasing as the individual fish in it grew. On the other hand fish were leaving the stock steadily by death. In a state of nature these forces were in equilibrium and the ocean was supporting the maximum population of halibut it was capable of doing.

When a fishery was started on such a virgin stock of fish three things happened: First, the total abundance of fish in the stock began to decrease; second, the average size of fish in the stock began to decrease; and, third, the productivity of the stock in terms of pounds of fish it would yield to the fishery began to increase. All three of these things continued to happen until a maximum point of productivity was reached. This corresponded precisely with a certain, determinable level of fishing effort. If the fishery was increased in intensity beyond that level the catches would actually decrease, and the more you fished beyond that point the less you caught.

Essentially there was a point of fishing effort at which the stock of fish would produce the maximum sustainable yield. If you held the fishery at that level the production could be had year after year indefinitely. If you let the fishery go beyond that point you were wasteful of the resource, because less fishing would catch more fish. On the other hand it was just as true that if you did not fish that hard you were just as wasteful of the resource, because part of it was being lost by natural deaths to no man's use.

If all of this theory was correct then all that had to be done to restore productivity and prosperity in the halibut fishery was to cut back the fishing effort to below that point which in any season it would produce a little less halibut from the stock—when taken together with natural deaths—than natural growth had added to it.

While all of this sounds logical, coherent, and sensible in 1956 it was nothing but radical theory, unsubstantiated by experience, in 1930. The International Fisheries Commission had no authority to establish the regulations anyway. The Canadian Government could not regulate American boats. The State of Washington could not regulate Canadian boats. Catches were steadily falling off. Fishermen had to fish steadily the year around throughout the bitter winter to scratch together a meager living. The whole industry was going broke and the outlook was bleak.

So after a year or so of wrestling with the problem the industry on both sides of the border decided to take the gamble. Things could not be much worse anyway. So, accordingly, their leaders went once more to Washington, D. C., and to Ottawa and asked their Governments to renegotiate the treaty establishing the International Fisheries Commission so as to give the Commission regulatory authority over the halibut fishermen of both countries. This was done, and in 1933 the regulation of the fishery was begun on the basis of the scientific information gathered by Dr. Thompson and his young men.

The thing was a success almost from the start. Within 2 years fish were enough more plentiful on the banks that even the fishermen could tell the difference. Fishing was easier, catches were had more quickly; it was soon possible even to increase the permissible quota of catch for the season and still keep the stock increasing. In 1937 the treaty was renegotiated again to give the Commission more regulatory authority over the fishery. This still worked good and catches were increased steadily. This has kept right on year after year until last year the catch was more than twice as great as it had been in 1933, it was greater than it had been at the height of the unrestricted fishery of World War I, and the catch was taken in 2 months of fishing instead of 12 months. The stock was producing pretty close to the maximum quantity of halibut each year that the North Pacific was capable of doing. Friction between the Governments and the fishermen of the country was almost nonexistent. The industry in both countries was stable and profitable.

While this great experiment was going on the salmon fishermen of Puget Sound and nearby British Columbia, who depend on the production of salmon from the Fraser River, began to suffer the same troubles that the halibut fishermen had gone through during the twenties. The harder they fished the less they caught. The example of what was going on in halibut was under their eyes. They asked the two Government to do the same for them that they were doing for

the halibut fishermen. As a result a treaty establishing the International Salmon Fisheries Commission was signed by Canada and the United States in 1937. After a period of several years of scientific research, as provided for in that treaty, that Commission began the regulation of the fieshemen of both countries. The results over the past 10 years have been, if anything, more spectacularly successful than was the case with halibut.

World War II brought the same aftermath of hunger as did World War I and similar increase sin fishing intensity. But now theory was available, experience and practice had been gained with such problems, and trained scientists—mostly from Dr. Thompson's brood—were available. The tuna fishermen of California had watched the halibut and salmon fisheries go through periods of great growth, overfishing, short resulting catch, scientific research, economic distress while the resources war rebuilding, and then again stable catches and prosperity. They determined to avoid this cycle by getting their research done before overfishing came, to get the facts in hand with which to build adequate regulations against the date they were needed. So they came to Washington and asked their Government to do for them what it had done for the salmon and halibut men. From this grew the highly successful Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission established under treaty among the United States, Costa Rica, and Panama.

Next the New England fishermen came asking the same thing. Haddock and cod were getting hard to catch and small in size. This was a much more complicated problem than had been tackled yet. Several different kinds of fisheries were being fished in the area by several types of gear. The cizitens of 10 countries—Canada, Iceland, Norway, England, Denmark, Italy, France, Spain, Portgual, and the United States—fished together in the area. This was just about as complicated a set of economic, social, legal, political, and diplomatic problems as can be conceived in a fishery problem. Yet the 10 nations—working on the example of the now old halibut commission—did sign a conservation treaty, establish the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, conduct their researches jointly under it, and finally began to jointly regulate their fishermen. My friends from New England tell me that progress under this multilateral commission has been most satisfactory. International friction over the fisheries has quite died away, and the haddock and cod are getting larger and easier to catch again.

Now a similar treaty has been signed between the United States and Canada to cover the fisheries of the Great Lakes. Another signed a few years ago between Canada and the United States and Japan to cover all their joint fisheries in the North Pacific has materially reduced friction over fisheries in the area and Russia has even asked for permission to attend the next Commission meeting. For some years 19 nations have been engaged under similar treaty to study and regulate the whale fishery of the whole world under the International Whaling Commission. Although the United States has not had a whale fishery for a generation it took the initiative and leadership in establishing the International Whaling Commission and nas actively participated in its work and deliberations. Negotiations are now underway among Japan, Russia, Canada, and the United States to draft a conservation treaty covering the fur seals of the North Pacific. A similar treaty has been proposed by the United States to Mexico to cover the shrimp fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this mixture of industry, scientists, and Government officials in international fisheries conservation commissions works. In all cases where it has been tried, and these are now too many to be regarded as accidental, the resource has been conserved, the industry has been made economically sound, and international friction has diminished or quite disappeared.

What was novel 30 years ago when the citizens of my State first got into such problems has now been recognized as sound practice by the majority of nations. In April of 1955 the fishery experts of 50 countries gathered together in Rome under the auspices of the United Nations in the "International Technical Conference on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea." After 3 weeks of meeting, during which some of the sessions were quite stormy, the conference adopted a report which contained these general conclusions:

The conference notes with satisfaction conservation measures already carried out in certain regions and for certain species at the national and international level. International cooperation in research (including statistical investigation) and regulation in the conservation of living resources of the high seas is essential. The conference considers that wherever necessary further conventions for these purposes should be negotiated.

The present system of international fishery regulation (conservation measures) is generally based on the geographical and biological distribution of the marine populations with which individual agreements are concerned. From the scientific and technical point of view, this seems, in general, to be the best way to handle those problems. This system is based upon conventions signed by the nations concerned.

From the desire expressed during this conference by all participating nations to cooperate in research and from the guidance given by existing conventions, it appears that there are good prospects of establishing further conservation measures where and when necessary.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, there is a system of international cooperation adequate to provide for the full conservation of fish resources lying in the high seas. It has been tried successfully time after time on a great variety of such problems to the satisfaction of the nations involved and their fishermen. It has the stamp of approval of most of the mafitime nations. It is to be hoped that our Latin American neighbors, who are not fishing people, and who have no more trained fisheries scientists than we had 30 years ago, will give this method thorough study and evaluation. It is certain that the United States would give the utmost cooperation in following such a method in their area. It is equally certain that the destruction of the doctrines of the freedom of the seas which they propose to accomplish this end will not prevail.

Ike's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who are concerned with the preservation of States rights, the veto of the gas bill was most disturbing. Typical of the reception of the veto in my State of Texas is the following editorial which appeared in the Pampa Daily News, at Pampa, Tex.:

IKE'S VETO

That self-professed antagonist of creeping socialism, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, seems to be laboring under the delusion that the way to resist said creeping socialism is to run headlong into its arms; at least that is the only conclusion a rational individual can come to with the advent of his veto of the bill which would have freed natural-gas producers from Federal bureaucratic control.

One advantageous factor which should result from Ike's ignorance of the basic principles involved or his hypocrisy (take your pick) will be the awakening which should come to many of his bewitched worshipers who looked upon him as the knight-errant of free enterprise and, sad as it is to relate, Texas has had its share in this category. Indeed, Ike has now earned his place as the No. 3 man in the holy Socialist triumvirate of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

The obvious has been so glaring so long that we wonder why many of the Ike cult needed this veto action to awaken them. After opposing the Bricker amendment, appointing a confirmed Socialist as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and expanding the grandiose fraud of "social security," to name a few examples, the opening of the wedge of a system of Federal price controls shouldn't be too much of a shocker.

In his veto statement, Ike implied resentment because a campaign contribution was offered Senator CASE of South Dakota on the alleged basis that he favored passage of the bill. To an individual grounded in basics, the measure would have been considered in principle and that principle would be to the end of protecting the source of all freedom, the right of ownership in property.

We trust the President is pleased with the results of his action. The leftwingers are howling approval from coast to coast and the most obtuse Marxian doctrinaires can smile with glee at the opportunities now before them for, as Ike knew, there is virtually no chance the bill can be passed over his veto. In light of this, Ike's statement about being "in accord with its basic objectives" proves to be damning by faint praise.

Then, too, there is that patently synthetic concern about the gas lobby when the goons of organized labor and the NEA operate a couple of the most blatant pressure groups to daily kick, push, and bludgeon our national legislators one could imagine. Since these two outfits have been doing it for years, we assume it has become a royal prerogative

in their case. Such, however, is the degradation of democracy.

We surmise that Ike and his retinue have already calculated how many votes will be forthcoming from the eastern metropolitan minority groups because of his action, but then you don't have to be a wizard to realize they have more votes than the gas producers. And the vote is the politician's sole judge of virtue.

The late William Graham Sumner, a political science professor at Yale, a renowned sociologist, and ordained clergyman, made the observation in 1910 that he didn't think the American Republic would live much after 1950 because of the grasping for power on the part of Central Government. Sumner, of course, didn't mean that the Republic would not exist in form, but rather that it would be so enervated by Government intervention that the chance for its continued life as a defender of freedom would be nil. Sad to relate, Sumner's pessimism was partially confirmed Friday with the Eisenhower veto.

The price for ignoring principle is high and posterity will be able to count January 17, 1956, as a stellar day in the forging of their shackles of servitude.

What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which recently appeared in the International Peasant Union. The article was written by Dr. Milan Gavrilovic, and it is entitled "What Now?" Dr. Gavrilovic ably presents his point that America must spring awake before it is too late. The long arm of Moscow is already upon the horizon, and the clenched fist will surely descend. Will we, like the five foolish virgins, be found sleeping at the midnight hour with no oil in our lamps? Or will we snap to our senses before the blow has fallen? Dr. Gavrilovic's words make one wonder.

The article follows:

The second Geneva Conference, held last November, was convened to follow through on proposals made at the first conference in July. Objectives included the unification of Germany through free elections and the establishment of a system of collective European security to guarantee the independence and frontiers of all present European states, including those dominated by the Communists and the Soviet Union. Another objective was to limit armament—especially to forbid atomic arms. To unify Germany meant to release Eastern Germany from Communist enslavement, to unite her with West Germany and to bring the united Germany into NATO. To limit armament meant to recognize once more, this time collectively by the Western Big Three, the Communist status quo in Europe and to forbid the powerful atomic weapons which the United States still possesses more strongly than any other country. The West was most concerned with Germany's unification; the Soviets with the armament question. A Western proposal read: "France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are not prepared to enter into a system of European security which, as in the Soviet proposal put forward at Geneva, does not end the division of Germany." The Soviet proposal asked for "collective security in Europe instead of the formation of groupings of some European states directed against other European states" and for "principles of respect for the independence of states and non-interference in their internal affairs." Into that European system both Germanies would enter as equal, sovereign states, recognized by all. This system, according to the Soviet proposal, "would facilitate the earliest possible settlement of the German problem through the unification of Germany on a peaceful and democratic basis." Naturally, there was no hint of free elections, they being "obsolete," and if not a bourgeois prejudice, definitely a bourgeois fraud. But, of course, the Soviets mentioned reduction of armaments, interdiction of atomic weapons and withdrawal of foreign armies from the European countries. And finally, as if incidentally, the Soviets said in Article 14 that "the Warsaw Treaty of May 14, 1955, the Paris agreements of October 23, 1954, and the North Atlantic Treaty of April 4, 1949 shall become ineffective."

This Soviet proposal meant for the Soviets to gain everything, for the Allies to lose everything. The Allies would not only have to recognize the Communist status quo in Europe, collectively this time, not only to guarantee the existence of all these Communist states, but also to recognize the new Communist member, East Germany. The Allies would have to accept the unification of Germany without free elections, leaving unification to be achieved by the only manner according to the well-established pattern; coalition with the Communists first, then the ousting of non-Communists from the government. The Allies would have to renounce all anti-Communist activities such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, as required by the principle of noninterference of foreigners in the internal affairs of other countries, but the Soviet Union could continue its propaganda in other countries, for this is not accomplished by the Soviet citizens but by citizens under Communist influence in those countries who are free to make any propaganda whatsoever on the grounds that it is constitutional freedom of opinion. Allied armies, especially the American, would have to withdraw from territories of the European states because they would be "foreign," but all Communist armies would remain in all those Communist countries as simple parts of the Soviet Army, because they would not be "foreign" but domestic. NATO would dissolve and nothing would be left of it, because after the dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty there would remain the individual treaties concluded between all these Communist countries and the Soviet Union at the end of the war, and there would remain the Communist solidarity which units all of them unto life and death without any treaty obligation. Lastly, the Allies would respect the obligation of interdiction of atomic weapons once the proposal was accepted, while the Soviet Union would do so only so far as she considered it useful to herself, just as the Soviet Union has done with all treaties concluded with her. The Soviets consider the free West as an enemy, and their word given to an enemy is not binding.

Obviously the Soviets could not achieve their plan. But they have achieved something else. Since the Geneva Conferences, the Soviets have had the feeling of full certitude that the free peoples and their governments sincerely do not want war. Sheltered so safely from war and feeling secure in the term "Geneva spirit," the Soviets promptly transformed Geneva into a great platform for their propaganda, and the "Geneva spirit" term into a shield against any attack against them. Even following the first Geneva Conference in July, Khrushchev's true thinking showed itself to those in the West who began to believe the Soviets were heeding this spirit by a certain ideological slackening, and a certain abandonment of Marxism. "That will happen," Khrushchev said, "when the shrimp starts to whistle, the fish to speak." Khrushchev spoke the simple truth: Soviets stand and fall with Marxism. On the eve of the anniversary of the Soviet Revolution, at one of Moscow's most solemn meetings, and just before Molotov left for Geneva after the second conference's recess, Lazar Kaganovic spoke to the peoples of the free world over the heads of their governments. He said: "We can say today that the forces of peace have increased and that the force of the people is a decisive force. And the people, including those of the imperialistic countries, do not wish to perish or suffer in the interest of militarism." If free people do not wish to perish or suffer, he indicated they have to exercise pressure on their governments to accept Soviet demands, and if a government refuses, they have to elect another. They can do it for they are free to do it. In this respect they will have all the help of the Soviet Union. That promise is absolute. Kaganovic said: "No one will ever be able to break the close bonds linking the Soviet people with the broad people's masses, with the working class of all countries of the world." To kill the morale of the enemies of communism and to raise the morale of its adherents represents the thinking of Kaganovic, who boasted of the increasing Soviet power, and concluded: "If the 19th century were a century of capitalism, the 20th century is a century of the triumph of socialism and communism." Translated into clear language, that means: "If the 19th century were a century of freedom, the 20th century is a century of triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat, enemy of any freedom." Translated into practical language, it reads: "Who has ears to hear, may hear. Let him hurry up to take a place on our bandwagon for otherwise he might fatally be late."

Kaganovich's speech showed clearly the briefing Mototov received before he left Moscow for the second time in November, not even considering the praise bestowed on him by Kaganovich. Molotov strictly followed these instructions. The new Soviet offensive hinted at by Khrushchev when he said Marxism would be abandoned "when shrimps start to whistle," and which was developed strongly by Kaganovich in Moscow, was continued by Molotov in Geneva. In refusing the demand for free elections in East Germany, he said straightforwardly: "Much has been said here with regard to the election system of the Western states, in regard to the fight among the parties for parliamentary seats. But in the elections of which Messrs. Dulles, Pinay and Macmillan have told us, the question after all is: Whether the government will be replaced or not. * * * The question of all-German elections is not merely a question of a change of government. * * * Naturally, there can be no consent to taking back from the working masses of the German Democratic Republic the plants and factories, land and natural resources." And quite in the spirit of Kaganovich's speech 2 days earlier in Moscow, he added: "The German Democratic Republic, being a state of German workers and peasants, has a great future, since it follows the main road of the development of the whole of humanity and has strong and true friends." He could not have stressed more clearly the solemn speech of Kaganovich about the world aims and world politics of the Soviet Union.

The representatives of the free West could not accept this purely communistic thesis. And in refusing it they have emphasized the unbridgeable difference between the two op-

posite ideologies. At the concluding meeting on November 17, Dulles said: "The Soviet refusal even to contemplate free elections in East Germany has a significance which goes far beyond the confines of Germany. It highlights, as no words could, the situation throughout Eastern Europe. If the so-called German Democratic Republic cannot stand the test of the people's choice, no more can the regimes imposed on the other peoples of Eastern Europe. This topic was not on our agenda because the Soviet Government had refused to accept it there. * * * Conditions in Eastern Europe may be such that the Soviet Union feels that it cannot now agree to free elections in any area it controls, because that would have a contagious effect." And Dulles once more repeated the beliefs of democracies. "The free democracies believe that human beings were given minds with which to think and consciences with which to judge right and wrong, and that human dignity requires freedom of thought and freedom of conscience. We also believe that the peoples of the world are essentially a single family, the members of which are naturally sympathetic to each other." These words could not fall on fertile ground. Mutual love has its place in religion and in the ideology of freedom, but it cannot exist in an ideology that rejects the religion and is based on a doctrine of hatred. Macmillan underlined the difference in these words: "The real problem is our radically different approach to German reunification. We believe that individuals and nations should be free, free to choose their own form of government and free to choose their own future. We also believe they should be free to choose their own way of living. The Soviet Government, however, continues to believe in its rights, nay its duty, to impose when it can, political and economic system on other nations and to withhold from them the right to choose their own future. Once more it is clear that we are back in that strange nightmare where men use the same words to mean different things—peace-loving, democratic freedom, all these splendid words, which we have inherited through the long history of civilized Europe, have clear and inspiring meanings to us with deep undertones. They appear to have a wholly different significance to the Soviet Government.

Not only different but quite the opposite. It is important that the basic differences have been stressed by Dulles and Macmillan. Their declarations, let us hope, will convince even the greatest unbelieving Thomas and the naive victims of the Communist propaganda, that it is no fault of their governments if there is no true peace; these people would certainly have made their own statesmen responsible if they had refused to go to Geneva once the proposal had been made. These declarations have done something more. They have stopped the spiritual demobilization of the West, not only stopped it but started new spiritual mobilization before rising danger. The declarations have also stopped the dangerous spiritual demobilization of the enslaved peoples who, rightly or wrongly, have begun to consider the pourparlers in Geneva as bargaining of the great at the expense of the small. But the declaration did not dispel the clear conviction of the Soviets that the West does not want to go to war in any case except if it is itself attacked by the Soviets. For the Soviets the great shelter from the war remained. Shielded behind it, the new offensive they started in Moscow with the speech of Kaganovich, continued in Geneva with the declarations of Molotov; and without even waiting for the outcome of Geneva, they went on with it throughout the vast India with the numerous speeches of Khrushchev and Bulganin. Their Communist hatred of the West grafted very well on the hatred of the natives against their former colonial masters. The success was tremendous. These two most important Soviet leaders began to behave there as if large India were their home, so that in the end one could neither know who was there at home and who was not, who was the guest and who the host—Khrushchev and Bulganin or Nehru—nor who was introducing whom to the masses of India. Finally, Khrushchev said that they were the guests, but now no longer the guests of Nehru and his government, but the guests of Indian peasants. Said Khrushchev: "Now our peasants have in their own hands the political power to develop themselves spiritually, mentally, and physically. Our peasants and farmers have chosen the path of collectivized agriculture and this is the way they enrich themselves spiritually and culturally. So allow me on behalf of the collective farmers of the Soviet Union to wish you prosperity materially as well as spiritually." He was "more than sure that you will find your own road to this end if you will look for this road hard enough, just as your government is looking for it." In point of fact, the peasants in Russia have no political power whatsoever—like no one else has, except the Communist Party. When the day comes that they gain that power there will be no Khrushchev to speak on their behalf. The peasants in Russia did not choose the road of collectivization, but have fallen by the millions in the bitter fight against it, for their own land and their own freedom. Nor were the peasants in the Soviet Union enriching themselves spiritually, mentally, and physically, and as for enriching themselves materially, not even Khrushchev had the courage to say that. But who of those 50,000 peasants who listened to him at one meeting knew the sufferings of the Russian peasants? And when he recommended to them the road of collectivization which brought such happiness to the Russian peasants, there was no doubt that many among his peasant listeners "will look for this road hard enough." And the Communist Party of India will surely know how to help them.

At the departure of Bulganin and Khrushchev at the aerodrome, Nehru spoke to the mass, in front of the loudspeaker: "Our friendship with the Soviet Union is not directed against anybody. Our getting closer to the Soviet Union does not mean that we are drawing away from others." The fakirs of India are famous for their incredible miracles and tricks. But the trick of getting closer to the Soviet Union today without drawing away from the West, that is a miracle that only the greatest fakir of India could accomplish. We dont' believe in that miracle. And we do not believe at all that Nehru is the greatest fakir of India. Between him and even the smallest true fakir exists a big difference. Ordinary fakirs try to make their spectators believe in their optical illusion and not themselves; Nehru is trying to make himself believe without making anyone believe in the West. In bidding the Soviet leaders farewell Nehru declared with a note of emotion in his voice: "An entire generation will remember your visit. Please come back again. We will expectantly await you." This good man was not aware that they did come to stay, that they are already there, in his own country, within his own people, and that there was no need to specially ask them to come again.

On their return to Moscow on December 21 both Khrushchev and Bulganin told a crowd of 20,000 at Moscow Central Airport that they would continue their war on Western colonial policies. Khrushchev asserted that Western colonialism was disintegrating everywhere. He branded colonialism as a "disgrace to modern man." And he promised his listeners and Asia and Africa; "We shall keep repeating this point as long as colonialism exists." No better wish for the New Year and no one closer to the heart of Asia and Africa could he hand out. Yes, we know, there is no worse colonialism today than the Soviet and Communist colonialism. It is not only that the Soviets reduced so many modern European countries to the status of their colonies, but the Communist regimes everywhere reduced their own peoples to a status very, very far below that produced by any colonialism that ever existed or that could possibly be imagined. But in Asia and Africa, who cares what is happening to European peoples? Do even the free European people care?

Bulganin and Khrushchev returned to Moscow with 3 agreements in their pockets, concluded with 3 Asian countries—India, Burma, and Afghanistan. These agreements were "welcomed by the peoples of South Asia." Said Bulganin: "However, not everyone likes it. Our journey and statements, particularly the statements of Comrade Khrushchev, not only aroused the stormy approval of our friends, but also caused stormy indignation of the reactionary press and certain respectable Western statesmen, particularly in Britain." It does not matter to them at all if Western powers do not like their friendship with the Asiatic peoples. "But we," said Bulganin, "we like this friendship very much and it suits us very well." Of course, it suits them very well. In the opinion of both men, "the Soviet Union could now count on the support of India, Burma, and Afganistan in international affairs."

They are right. But this journey was not a mere diplomatic success. Before they left India, Khrushchev and Bulganin gave a tea party for about a thousand of their Indian friends. There Nehru declared: "If any lack of understanding or misunderstanding existed between our people and the people of the Soviet Union, it has faded away because of my visit to the Soviet Union and much more by your visit to this country." Obviously. And they will end in full agreement as soon as that "road of collectivization" is found, the road Nehru is seeking with the candle in his hand. The day India finds that road and begins to tread it, all misunderstanding will indeed disappear, and with it Nehru himself. But something has already disappeared. The Asiatic continent has disappeared for the free peoples of Europe and America. At the confines of Asia and Africa, the Arab world has disappeared, and the entire Arab and the entire Negro world is disappearing on the African continent. The American flag has been torn down in Jordan. In fact all the flags of free peoples have been torn down with it. The arm of Moscow is long.

And what now?

There facing each other, stand two, not only opposite, but also enemy ideologies. They are in full clash. It is no longer, and never was, a purely academic conflict. Behind both of them there stand two enormous armed forces in permanent growth. The situation is now more serious than before Geneva. The danger from the Soviets is much greater. Yet America, Great Britain, and France still declare that nothing could force them to take arms except a direct attack on them. It seems that they do not consider that the loss of Asia today or the loss of Africa tomorrow (just as they did not consider the loss of half of Europe yesterday), is a direct attack on them. It seems that the Soviets can freely continue their business of encircling the free world by inciting everywhere the hatred against the still free Europe and America, playing everywhere the generous Santa Claus that brings freedom and independence. It seems not only that individual countries are falling, but entire continents with all the countries and peoples living on them. It seems that for America, Great Britain, and France all this does not mean direct attack on them. It seems to be forgotten that today every people is a neighbor to every other people, let alone one continent

to another. Every people in Asia and America is neighbor to every other people in Europe and America, the same as are their continents. If the Soviets have reached their frontiers, they in fact have, reached the frontiers of all peoples, frontiers of all free peoples.

Some need to see the enemy soldier at the threshold of his home or to hear the burst of atomic bombs above his head to be aware that direct attack has begun. Some see that same enemy soldier going toward his home before he has reached the threshold of it, and he hears the burst of the atomic bombs before they are launched, without waiting to hear them exploded above his head. For these, the attack has already begun. In their hands is the destiny of their own peoples and of all free peoples. Theirs is the responsibility, too. If they are dead sure that this enemy soldier, though he has started for their homes, will never reach it, and if they are dead sure that the atom bombs will be stifled before they can cross their frontier, they can wait calmy. But they must be aware that during this waiting period the enemy circle around them might tighten to such an extent that there will no longer be any need for this enemy soldier to reach the threshold of their homes nor for the atomic bomb to be sent on its flight. They must be aware that situations arise that eliminate the question, "What now?" and leave only a flat declaration: "Now? Now it is too late."

Farm Problems in Calhoun County, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from 10 farmers of Calhoun County:

LYTTON, IOWA, *February 18, 1956.*

Mr. JAMES DOLLIVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: The opinions presented in this letter represent the thinking of 10 farmers in Calhoun County who have met together and analyzed the farm problems as pertaining to our county and the Corn Belt. We have considered all factors affecting our farm operations. We have endeavored to make an honest, comprehensive study of our farm problems and are presenting for your information and digest our analysis of this situation and solution to said problems.

We believe that our problems in Calhoun County tie in and are quite similar to the problems of farmers in the other 98 counties of Iowa and, no doubt, reflect the problems of the entire Corn Belt. We also concluded that our problem is definitely related to and affected by certain trends taking place in States outside the Corn Belt.

At the end of our analysis we agreed that the same answer to our problems is comparatively simple, that Congress should recognize this fact and not be forced into the complicated and unhealthy approach that many insist on.

In analyzing the problems of overproduction and Government subsidization as affecting farmers of Calhoun County and Iowa we considered first our major sources of income and have outlined them as follows.

Farm income in Calhoun County is derived mainly from two sources—sale of livestock and associated products, and, sale of grain.

1. Livestock income includes that from sale of beef, swine, dairy—milk, cream, and veal—poultry and eggs, sheep, turkeys.

2. Income from grain:

Corn; outlets: To eastern, western, and local markets as livestock feed and for processing. Also includes that part sealed under Government program.

Oats; outlets: Generally same as for corn.

Wheat: Very little grown in Calhoun County. In rest of the State most wheat goes to processors, with some for local feeding.

Soybeans, outlets: To processors.

Hay, outlet: Largely to local beef and dairy operators.

We call your atention to Babson's report on Iowa income in 1954 by percentage. Swine lead with 40 percent, cattle 26 percent, corn 12 percent, dairy 6 percent. Evidently the greater part of our corn and oats not shipped out of the State or sealed has been marketed in the form of livestock and dairy products. Sale of these two products represent 72 percent of our total income.

What has happened to our farm income of recent years?

Instead of maintaining a rival upward pace with that of our national economy, farm income has declined. Particularly so in the case of beef and swine, which have always been our largest source of income.

This decrease in livestock income due to depressed prices has invloved us in much talked of "price squeeze" situation.

We now arrive at the question of cause for this livestock price drop.

After giving under-consumption due consideration we agreed that the primary reason for this drop in livestock prices was definitely that we have overproduced in beef and hogs. We find that the old law of supply and demand has still been functioning and to the extent that our markets simply would not absorb our excessive supplies of beef and pork at a profit to us.

Our next step was to determine why we have this overproduction of livestock.

We are listing the two major reasons for this development:

1. Our extremely large supply of corn on the farms and in storage.

2. Our extremely large supply of livestock feed crops, consisting primarily of oats, barley, soybeans, hay, grass, and sorghums.

We now had to determine what agency was responsible for our large supplies of corn and livestock feed crops.

It was agreed that even though our individual efforts produced these excessive supplies, that primarily a major part of said responsibility must be placed squarely on our unhealthly farm programs of the past 20 years.

The next step naturally was to prove or point our various defects in our present and preceding Government programs, and, by the process of deduction, arrive at the proper course of action to take in correcting these abuses. We have listed under A, B, and C, the most important reasons why our past Government programs have failed to get the contemplated job done.

A. Despite the fact that approximately 51 percent of the farmers in Calhoun County participated in the Government corn-acreage program, more than normal supplies of corn have been built up. This happened because many of the nonparticipating farmers went all out on corn production. The increased production of these farmers more than offset the decrease obtained from the cooperating farmers.

The fact that a large amount of free corn has existed each year and at a price considerably lower than the sealing price definitely encouraged the expansion of hog and cattle feeding. Following the pattern established in the early thirties our livestock farmers in 1954 and 1955, in order to maintain their volume of dollar sales, and also wishing to make use of their large supplies of livestock feed crops, increased their livestock production. This course was followed even though our market requirements did not warrant such action. Consequently, depressed hog and cattle markets developed.

We can only deduct that cheap corn plus unlimited supplies of livestock feed crops invited this overproduction of livestock.

B. Failure of the Department of Agriculture to make sufficient allowance for the impact of hybrid seed corn, fertilizers, and improved farming methods.

C. Fact that cross compliance was not enforced.

Acreage taken out of corn by those complying with their base was diverted to other grain and feed crops. Each farm, whether in the program or not, was allowed to produce a full capacity, resulting in exceedingly large supplies of livestock feed crops. Statistics show our 1955 supply of livestock feeds to be the largest on record. Also vitally affecting the interests of the Corn Belt farmer was the fact that practically all of the acreage taken out of wheat and cotton was diverted to livestock feed crops, thereby stimulating additional expansion of livestock feeding in these areas.

The following situation also exists: Those farmers who have been cooperating by accepting bases now possess more fertile farms than a majority of the noncompliers. Actually the latter are the ones who are in the most need of conservation practices and good soil management. This is an opportune time to point out the biggest gripe of those farmers at our meeting who have been participating in the Government program regularly. They feel that they have carried the load for the nonparticipators, that they have created a healthier market for these people, who operated as they pleased and sacrificed nothing. They also know that if a voluntary corn acreage cut is asked in 1956 that they will be asked to carry still more of the load.

At this point we wish to present other conclusions on which we have agreed and other facts pertinently related to our farm problem.

A. We recognize the fact that our farm units in the United States are producing more products than our American and foreign markets will absorb at a profit to us. It is our belief, that generally speaking, our actual production, plus our potential production, has been 20 to 30 years ahead of our population increase, and will no doubt remain thus for some period of time.

B. We recognize that our basic problem in Calhoun County and in Iowa is one of overproduction of corn and livestock products. We must decrease our output of these products.

C. We recognize the fact that Government farm programs the past 20 years despite corn acreage controls and incentive payments, have resulted in excess supplies of free corn, burdensome supplies of sealed corn, and abnormal supplies of livestock feed crops.

D. We recognize that you are well aware that our overall national economy ties in very closely with our farm economy. That in order to preserve a prolonged sound national economy we must have a sound prosperous agriculture. We well remember the period from 1930 to 1934 when depressed farm prices due almost entitrely to overproduction, dragged our entire national economy to catastrophic depths. History has a habit of repeating itself and the farm trend the past 2 years has certainly been in the direction of the trend followed after 1929. It is a fact that we farmers in Calhoun County and the Nation, as a whole, are at present insufficiently organized to adequately secure and maintain our place in the national economy. Therefore, it appears

that in order to avoid a disastrous repetition of the early thirties, it is definitely up to Congress to help us develop and maintain a sound agricultural economy until the time arrives that we are able to assume this responsibility ourselves.

E. We recognize that the present management of our soil will determine how well our future generations will eat. We realize that it is economically unsound to mine our soil by recklessly producing quantities of food far in excess of our yearly normal demand. We point out that practical soil and water conservation practices are two of the most important issues facing our Nation today. We believe that our nonfarm population is now sufficiently conscious of this problem to financially support Congress on any sensible action that may be forthcoming.

In our discussion of the farm problem as hitherto presented to you, we determined that the "price squeeze" as such has developed largely because our supplies of corn and livestock feeds encouraged overproduction of livestock to the point that they have been a drag on the market.

Our analysis conclusively points out that Congress can take 1 or 2 courses. Either enact into legislation a farm program that will get the job done or come up with some silly substitute that may well bring about a repetition of the troubles that we faced in the early thirties.

Bluntly speaking, our two recommendations are drastic. We are sure that either one will get the job done.

1. Compulsory corn acreage control with accompanying strict cross-compliance, on a national basis, complete enough to reduce our supplies of livestock feed crops by 10 percent or more.

2. Compulsory soil bank plan, placing 10 percent of the total crop acres of each farm in a soil bank, to be seeded down to soil-conserving grasses and left completely idle.

By utilization of either one of the two programs mentioned we have in mind a long-range program that would eventually lead to the establishment of a complete soil-conservation program on every individual farm unit, with established crop rotations based on the capability of the soil.

We are committed to making the above two recommendations only on the condition that a referendum be taken in the fall of 1956 or January of 1957 to determine whether a compulsory program shall continue in use.

COMMENTS

Make substantial payments on retired acreage as soon as possible in order to get cash into the hands of needy farmers.

Allow diverted acreage that has been seeded down to be changed to a different piece of ground as needed to fit the original rotation program of that particluar form. This is a must.

Distribute surplus corn in Government bins at no more than original sealing price to those farmers wishing to be paid with corn or who wish to buy some outright.

In case the soil-bank plan is used, make certain that land placed in the soil bank is reasonably productive and not marginal land. Allow more than 10 percent of each unit to be placed in the soil bank if desired and if approved by the Department of Agriculture. Maintain existing ASC setup to regulate the program.

Maintain crop loans at 100 percent of parity or sufficiently high to discourage cheap feed which in turn stimulates livestock overproduction.

The possibility exists that with proper acreage control and adequate diversion of cropland to soil-conserving grasses, that price supports would eventually not be needed.

In closing we feel that the methods which we have suggested to use in solving the farm problem are aimed directly at the forces which have instigated our price squeeze. We believe that our thinking is sound and realistic. We hope that Congress in their approach will be likewise.

We realize that our thoughts should have been presented to you at an earlier date. However, we still wish to be on record in your file, as of this date, with the findings that we have made.

Sincerely yours,

T. E. Denise; R. J. Ringgenberg, Lester Peters, Lytton, Iowa; Charles O. Doty, Walter Fischer, Lake City, Iowa; Grant Kneller, Lytton, Iowa; Bob Roske, Rockwell City, Iowa; Melvin R. Haden, Frank C. Richardson, Gail Berkler, Lytton, Iowa, was not present to sign.

The Price of Freedom Is High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include a recent speech made by my distinguished colleague, Hon. KENNETH ROBERTS, who represents the fourth Alabama district.

This address was delivered by Congressman ROBERTS at the midwinter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on February 11, 1956, in Anniston, Ala. I am sure that all who read Representative ROBERTS' timely statement will find it of real interest:

The price of freedom is high. All of us in this room are aware that the price of freedom is high because we have already made a substantial payment. Some of the payment has been made in the currency of time from our own lives; some has been made in the currency of dollars and cents; and some of us have had members in our families make their final payment with their life.

When the United States entered World War I, it was with the hope that this was the "war to end all wars." Unfortunately time has cruelly shown us that this was a pious hope. Following the Treaty of Versailles, the United States, searching for the road to peace, participated in a disarmament race. An immature United States danced and drank its way through the roaring twenties, oblivious to world problems; seeking only the gratification of momentary pleasures.

The "crash" which obliterated our dream world of the twenties was a harsh, terrifying experience for America. The long, hard depression had a sobering and maturing effect on our country. During these years of the thirties there was a hard core which felt that the United States Government should devote its foreign policy to staying free from any entangling alliances. Our efforts should be directed toward strengthening our own domestic policy. We had remained out of the League of Nations and we should not now indulge in politics abroad. It was during these years, while we refused to look beyond the gentle rolling surf of our coastlines, that Hitler and Mussolini rose to power. The results of our hope to remain free from world strife by not participating and assuming our role of responsibility took its toll when World War II broke out and invaded the lives of all of us.

I am proud of the mature, responsible role the United States has played since this time. Through the combined efforts of all our citizens the United States did reach total mobilization. The United States contributed her men, her industrial strength, and her philosophy rooted deep in constitutional liberty and respect for the individual. The United States contributed these elements so that the world could live in peace again and be a haven for all freemen everywhere.

Unfortunately once again time did not bring our wish true, at least not immediately. In contrast to previous behavior, however, we have not drawn about us the cloak of isolationism in the false hope that this would provide protection. We have taken a strong stand to see that what we fought for and what many men died for will not be lost. We still must make payments upon the altar of military preparedness if we want to keep peace. And this we are willing to do.

This time the United States took a strong stand to keep faith with those who died so that they may sleep in peace in Flanders Field. You might ask, what has our program for peace been? First, let me say it has been a strong, positive program based on a realistic appraisal of the world—the world's many governments, its peoples, and the intricate struggle being made by some for world control. When I think of what might be called our militant program for peace, which to some may seem a contradiction in terms, I am reminded of a statement made by that wonderful warm, human philosopher, Will Rogers. Will Rogers commenting on the reality with which the Pilgrims faced life said: "When the Pilgrims prayed, they usually had a musket in their hands so they'd be sure to get what they asked for."

Of our immediate postwar action, I think that history will prove that the Marshall plan was one of the greatest and most humanitarian concepts ever conceived and implemented by any conqueror. It would have been quite possible for a nation geared to win an all-out war, while still in the white heat of battle, to have accepted the infamous Morgenthau plan—a plan to completely carve up the carcass of Germany and serve it upon a platter for all the victors to relish. Our philosphy transcended this petty bitterness and embraced a program to benefit free men wherever we could. We had not lost our vision. We had come to the sad realization that though the last shot had been fired in the hot war, the struggle still continued.

It took both courage and vision for our Government to act to aid Greece and Turkey. Time has proved that this decision was right.

Our Government was not flustered by the Russians prohibiting land travel into Berlin. We countered this maneuver with the Berlin airlift.

As the true character and designs of the Russian Bear continued to unfold bit by bit, the United States and our allies adopted a counterdefensive policy. The Western Allies formed the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. This has been followed more recently by the Southeast Asian Alliance.

The United Nations, with our full support, took the difficult strong stand to meet force with force to halt overt aggression in Korea.

In this tense international chess game being waged between the East and West it is difficult to anticipate where the next move will be made. It is not difficult, however, to know what the aims of our opponent are, and our best defensive is to be prepared and to remain alert.

Congress has been very much concerned about both remaining prepared and alert. Although the present administration in 1953 recommended a New Look for the Air Force, which, translated into simple language, meant a cutback in the number of air wings, Congress opposed this action and appropriated funds to provide us with 137 air wings.

In the 1st session of this 84th Congress the administration moved to cut down the manpower of the United States Marine Corps. Congress opposed this reduction. Congress voted additional funds to increase manpower personnel and to maintain it at combat readiness.

This year I think that either the present administration decided that the people

wanted and knew a strong military defense program was essential or the administration feared congressional criticism and opposition, for in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 the defense budget requests are up over last year's and are higher than what everyone was predicting would be requested. I am not advocating that military appropriations be allowed to break the financial back of the Nation. However, when our national income is higher than it has ever been, and when it appears probably that the budget may be balanced this year for the first time since the Truman administration accomplished this in 1948, it seems only sensible that we make an intelligent investment in those programs which are essential to maintaining world peace. If we do not, it may very well be that there is no peace, no prosperity, no freedom, and very little hope.

It was of very grave concern to me when I read the first of Gen. Matthew Ridgway's story, and I quote: "I felt I was being called upon to destroy, rather than to build, a fighting force on which rested the world's best hope for peace. * * * As Chief of Staff, I quickly learned that though my own recommendations were made on a purely military basis, the decisions of the Defense Department were based on considerations other than clear-cut military needs. They were based on budgetary considerations, on political consideration, on the advantage to be gained in the field of domestic politics by a drastic reduction in military expenditures."

If any of General Ridgway's statement is true, it is a shocking situation. The defense of our country should not become political football considerations. The people of our country who are called up to arms whenever there has been an error in judgment, do not want partisan politics to determine our policy. We cannot afford to be partisan in terms of either money, men, or time. As a Member of Congress, regardless of whatever party-line propaganda may be distributed, I can assure you I intend to support those programs which I sincerely feel will carry us toward peace. This is a matter of world security.

One of the deadly races now being run between Russia and the United States is to develop the ballistic missile. Since the end of World War II, the Kremlin has been striving to narrow the technological gap between the Russian economy and our own. Each year they have challenged us more formidably in our one area of superior strength—our ability to design and put into production superior weapons. The Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb in 1949. In 1953, less than 9 months after the United States first full-scale hydrogen tests, the Russians detonated a hydrogen bomb. The Soviets have developed the Bison x long-range jet comparable to our B–52's. Today our monopoly for delivering atomic bombs no longer exists. There are facts we cannot ignore.

In the hands of a treacherous aggressor, the intercontinental ballistic missile can bring hydrogen warfare's threat of extinction to Main Street, United States of America. And it can arrive in less than 30 minutes, direct from Moscow. To date, there is no known defense against this monster.

During the past few years, Congress has been appropriating increasing amounts of money for the guided-missile program. I feel that this program will have to be seriously stepped-up if we want to win this race. If we do not win, it is possible that Russia will blackmail our allies into inactivity by threat of extinction. It is possible that this program could be quickened, if Senator JACKSON'S proposal to remove this program from interservice rivalry were followed and it was established in an independent setup, such as the Manhattan District was created to develop the atomic bomb. I hope that the Senate and House Armed Services Committees will give this deadly matter their immediate attention.

In this race for technical superiority, we cannot overlook the need for brains. Are we winning the race developing and training one of our greatest natural resources, the minds of our young people. In the 26 years between 1928 and 1954 Russia graduated 682,000 engineers as against 480,000 in the United States. Last year Russia graduated twice as many engineers as we did.

At this time I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the stand which the VFW had taken in supporting legislation which would continue GI educational training benefits so long as young men are being drafted. Such legislation seems only equitable to me. I should also like to point out that this program pays for itself in dollars and cents as well as in intangibles. When the trainees of World War II completed their training, their income was below that of nonveterans in the same age group. In 1954, 10 years after the act had been in effect, the veteran's average earning power had gone past the nonveterans, and these men were contributing in income taxes alone approximately $1 billion a year more than the nonveterans. The total cost of the World War II educational program was $14½ billion. This means that the program paid for itself within 14½ years and that the taxes after that are all profit. And it cannot be overlooked that this program trained 180,000 needed doctors, 113,000 research scientists, 450,000 civil engineers and many, many others. I can assure you that I expect to support legislation to continue this very fine program when it comes before the House of Representatives for a vote.

I have spoken of military preparedness this afternoon. But it is in the hearts and minds of men that we shall win our final victory. The success of our great humanitarian concepts—the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, to share the world's abundance—is obvious, if one is to judge by the fact that Russia is now trying to emulate us. World War II cost us $350 billion. Our foreign aid programs have cost less than $65 billion. This is a small investment to make for peace, and the return is incalculable in terms of life, liberty and happiness.

I am sorry if I seemed to have painted you a picture of gloom here this afternoon. I do not feel that way about it. I do feel that it is a realistic appraisal and that a strong portion of our defense depends upon facing reality. I would like to say that I have faith. I have faith in this great Nation of ours. In the heritage bestowed upon us by our ancestors who came to this wilderness to found a nation dedicated to "liberty, justice, and freedom for all."

The West believes in the dignity of man; in human worth; in freedom for the development and expression of man's soul. For these reasons I do not doubt that we shall win ultimate victory in the hearts and minds of men. In Zechariah it reads: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

Upper Colorado Project; Like an Iceberg, Hides Much From View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, save for the extraordinary provision apportioning power revenues among the four States in which the projects will be built, the so-called new upper Colorado bill remains substantially the same as the old one and continues all its vices. The only change in projects enumerated has been in section 2. Here Woody Creek has been eliminated and San Miguel and Yellow Jacket substituted, all in Colorado.

Since we are dealing with the same hulk, all of the objections already voiced on this bill hold good. These objections have been set forth in detail beginning at page 25 in House Report No. 1087, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The $1½ billion project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing. Like an iceberg, the House bill displays only a part of its mass to view, but the remaining bulk nevertheless exists and must be reckoned with.

This includes such things as billions in added burdens on United States taxpayers, an increase in the national debt, invasion of national parks, more surplus crops and a host of other undesirable consequences.

The upper Colorado storage project as presently proposed should be roundly defeated. That will clear the way for a revised plan which will produce results, not merely consequences.

Address Delivered at the 20th Annual Dinner of the Chicago Decalogue Society of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished bar associations of the city of Chicago is the Decalogue Society of Lawyers. With its membership of approximately 1,200 lawyers, it is the third largest association in the city and the 14th largest in the Nation.

Each year the Decalogue Society presents an award of merit to a person whom it considers to have made a most significant contribution to the community or to the Nation. Among those who have received this award are Rabbi Stephen M. Wise, Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, Bartley Crum, Leo A. Lerner, Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, and former President Harry S. Truman. Its award for the year 1955 was bestowed on Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN at the annual patriotic dinner of the Decalogue Society, held on February 18, 1956, at the Palmer House, in Chicago.

Senator LEHMAN, who is senior United States Senator from the State of New York, richly deserves this honor, for his has been a long and distinguished career of public service, marked by high idealism, the greatest integrity, and superb ability.

The president of the Decalogue Society who presided so ably at the ceremony, Mr. Bernard H. Sokol, is an outstanding member of the bar of the city of Chicago. Mr. Sokol introduced Judge

Ulysses S. Schwartz, of the Appellate Court of Illinois, who presented the award of merit to Senator LEHMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching to my remarks the speeches of Mr. Sokol and Judge Schwartz. Senator LEHMAN'S speech already appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1956, page A1523:

ADDRESS BY BERNARD H. SOKOL

The same committee which selected the recipient of our merit award, selected the man to bestow it. The implication is obvious. Our discernment did not abate.

To bestow our award we chose a man who has had a distinguished career as special city prosecutor, leader of the city council, and one of the acknowledged leaders of the Chicago bar. Because of his great ability, his transition from great lawyer to great judge was a logical one.

He has been chief justice of the superior court and is today a presiding justice of the appellate court of Illinois.

Apart from these distinctions, there was a singular appropriateness about our choice. As early as 1914, in a speech delivered to the Iroquois Club, he criticized the Dillingham-Burnett Immigration and Naturalization Act, which contained many of the same onerous provisions present in the McCarran-Walter Act today.

Our annual merit award is the greatest treasure which the Decalogue Society has to give. We believe that it is made the greater by the man who delivers it tonight.

I present to you Judge Ulysses S. Schwartz.

ADDRESS BY JUDGE ULYSSES S. SCHWARTZ

This is the month of February. It is an election year. And all over the land the air is ringing with eloquent speeches in which comparisons are made between men of today and the great men of the past. Those who have been likened to Lincoln would fill a metropolitan directory. Right at this moment, somewhere some candidate for alderman or mayor, Democrat or Republican, is being told by an ardent supporter (and perhaps office seeker) that he is another Lincoln. I hesitate to participate in this practice and yet the occasion tonight affords a happy opportunity to do so.

Benjamin Franklin has been neglected in this political pastime, not for lack of honor to his memory, but because he was unique and not easily the subject of comparison. He was a businessman and a very successful one. He acquired financial independence hardly midway in life and thereafter devoted his talents to the service of his country and humanity.

Our honored guest, like Franklin, commenced his career as a businessman. He is familiar with the balance sheet, with the practices of the counting house, but while his eyes may have rested there for a time, like Franklin he soon turned to the greater balance sheet—counted not in dollars, but in service to human beings. Herbert Lehman has devoted his life to that high vocation with a rugged constancy and ardor that is also remindful of Franklin, giving and working quietly and earnestly in numberless good causes.

More than 40 years ago he took a leading part in directing the collection of a large sum for the relief of Jewish war sufferers in Europe. Since then there has hardly been a moment when he has not been engaged in some enterprise for the public good, culminating in the greatest of all humane enterprises, the organization he headed for foreign relief following the Second World War, which performed the tremendous task of feeding, clothing, and finding shelter for the millions whose lives had been disrupted.

Under his leadership as Lieutenant Governor and then Governor of New York, legislation to prevent social and religious discrimination, to provide for the care of the aged, to mitigate the hard life of those who toil—all were effectively enacted. And then, when he had reached what has been considered the end of man's allotted span, he entered the United States Senate.

Now, his vital enthusiasm unabated, his keen, alert mind unimpaired, he still stands at Armageddon and battles for the Lord. At this very time he is in the midst of the hardest and one of the noblest battles of his life—the amendment of those provisions of our immigration law which for more than a generation have been an offense to great groups of our citizens. That is the subject of his talk tonight. I recall the arguments for the first of such proposed measures. Those arguments were sometimes glossed over with vague implications and sometimes they contained outspoken pronouncements that the disfavored of that law were simply inferior in blood to those favored. Such a law is a grinning, sardonic gargoyle, making a mockery of our professions of love of freedom and equality. It is this modern demon that our embattled champion of 78 has undertaken to slaughter. And even with this undertaking he has not forgotten the other problems of oppressed peoples, particularly those from whom he sprang, who, through great sacrifice and struggle having established the little land of Israel, now find themselves threatened and beset on all sides. He still has time for them.

But for all his ardor in a cause he deems to be right, he is a man of moderation. Like Franklin, who stood his ground for the colonies in England with unflinching firmness while the tempest whirled about him, yet avoided bitterness and preserved his friendships, so has it been with Senator LEHMAN. Moderation is a fighting word today, but what do we mean by moderation as applied to political conduct? Learned Hand has as always given us the true answer, and I quote his words: "It is a temper which does not press a partisan advantage to its bitter end, which can understand and will respect the other side, which feels a unity between all citizens * * * which recognizes their common fate, their common aspirations—in a word, which has faith in the sacredness of the individual."

The people of the Senator's State came to know this spirit of moderation in him and they showed their appreciation of it by giving him the greatest plurality ever given any candidate for Governor in that State. It is this spirit which underlies the many instances of generosity to his opponents, of their cooperation with him, and of his reappointment to public office of political adversaries. That same moderation may account, too, for the fact that Look magazine in a recent survey of the Jews of our country found there was one whom all would unreservedly approve, HERBERT LEHMAN. But there is nothing of milk and water in that moderation. In my own mind there persists the picture of him in debate with one of the younger men of the Senate, too well known for his vituperation and abuse in public utterances. That younger man, purporting to read from a paper, made a statement which Senator LEHMAN challenged. The Senator then vigorously strode up to the younger man and, to his obvious discomfiture, demanded to be shown the statement he had pretended to read. Courage as well as moderation are here in abundance.

It may seem presumptuous that a local organization of lawyers should bestow an Award of Merit on a man who has earned worldwide renown, who has time and again been honored by his own State, whom great nations have honored, a man who has walked with the meek and the humble, the mighty and the noble of the earth. But the Award of this Society has come to have a significance among those who value service to humanity and to country. For this Society has fulfilled the purpose of the Award and has discharged its responsibility with such complete integrity that the Award itself has a value far beyond the worth of those of us who undertake to bestow it. Success has not been its yardstick, nor ability, nor talent, nor genius. Combined with these must be an abiding compassion for fellow men, a love of country, a seasoned and rugged zeal in the propagation of that faith.

Our Committee has selected wisely and well and never better than in this instance. It is my honor to bestow our award of merit upon you, Senator LEHMAN.

Answering the Bellyache of Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herewith an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, appearing under date of February 17, 1956. The editorial was written by Maj. Frederick Sullens in answer to a below-the-belt assault made on him and his colleagues of the southern press by Time magazine. The editorial speaks for itself:

ANSWERING THE BELLYACHE OF TIME

Time, a weekly magazine, self-constituted mouthpeice of the NAACP, and blatant advocate of complete social equality, takes a whack at the editor of the Daily News in its current issue.

The article, as per usual when Time attempts to discuss any southerner or anything Southern, is a grotesque distortion of facts. Under the caption "Dilemma in Dixie," Time says that "southern newspapers with scattered exceptions, are doing a patchy, pussyfooting job of covering the region's best running story since the end of slavery," meaning, of course, the effort of the NAACP to force hireling Negresses into the student body at the University of Alabama.

That, of course, is a wilful and deliberate lie. Southern newspapers have given the Authurine Lucy story all the covering its worth-whileness as a news story justified. It was far from being the "region's best running story since the end of slavery." Maudlin and wishy-wash and namby-pamby, indeed, must be the low gravity mind of the editor who concocted that sentence.

The Authurine Lucy story is merely a passing incident, nothing more. There will be more like it, and perhaps much more so, whenever efforts are made to force Negroes into white institutions of learning.

Another deliberate lie perpetrated by the Time writer is:

"Privately, many southern journalists are far more enlightened than their fellow citizens on the segregation issue but are professionally hamstrung by front office pressure and fear of community wrath."

The editor of Time, to save himself from the hot hole in hell where he rightfully belongs, cannot name a single instance where a southern journalist has been "hamstrung by front office pressure." Moreover, he well knew that statement was a lie when he wrote it—a lie just as outrageous as that when Time and Life tried to make a hero out of Emmett Till by claiming that the boy's father died in action on a World War II battlefield. He died in action, all right, but it was action at the end of a rope when he was hanged for the double crime of rape and murder. No other magazine in the history of this Nation ever printed a piece of sickly, sloppy sentimentality that was so glaringly false.

An overwhelming majority of the editors in the South are fully awake and alive to the many dangers involved in the attempt to enforce the integration decision of the Supreme Court and they are crying out against it, instead of peacefully accepting the situation as Time tries to make it appear.

Personally, the 78-year-old editor of the Daily News—it isn't a disgrace to be 78 years of age—does not care one tinker's damn or a slight whoop-in-hell what the editor of Time may think or say about him. It has been our pleasure on several occasions to point out the utter falsity of articles appearing in that publication, and naturally there is no kind feeling for the editor of the Daily News in the sanctum where its riffraff writers congregate.

Therefore, it is with pleasure that the Daily News reprints what the quidnunc commentator on the Times staff has to say about this editor. Here it is.

"At its worst, notably in Mississippi, the southern press is full of slanting, suppression, and rabble rousing against integration. The most violent is the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News (circulation 38,813), whose ripsnorting old (78) editor, Fred Sullens, incites readers against mongrelization under such front-page scare lines as 'You Are for Us or Against Us.'"

The best NAACP-loving Time could say of the Daily News is that "the best Editor Sullens could say of the Negro was in a sentimental story on the funeral of an 83-year-old onetime janitor at the University of Mississippi; the paper started a scholarship fund in his name, and sang his praises as a good Negro who knew his place."

Charges Time, which pretends distaste for such notoriously leftwing Yankee tabloids as the New York Post but sometime sounds strikingly similar notes, especially in its back-of-the-book summaries of the arts and sciences:

"Such papers as Sullens' Daily News now run more Negro crime news under bigger headlines than ever before—even when it means going as far afield as Chicago. They spike occasional wire stories that show integration working, e. g., a recent AP dispatch about the acceptance of three Negroes at the University of North Carolina. They print and reprint testimonials by Negroes who say that they prefer segregation and ignore Negro leaders on the other side, except to quote them out of context to make them sound like wild radicals."

Time prints on the following page a picture of the editor of the Daily News and quotes him as using these words: "A dead Negro was a good Negro." No such words ever appeared in this paper. They were created in the mind of a writer who has probably never been south of Battery Park and knows no more about the Negro problem and integration than he knows about the Einstein theory of illimitable spae, or how to build a spaceship and journey to the moon.

It is not a pleasant task for the Daily News to bandy words with the editor of Time. The job is akin to wasting lather in shaving an ass or skinning a polecat—nasty and profitless work, for there isn't a ghost of a chance that Time will ever say anything nice about the South and southern people if it can possibly be avoided.

Incidentally, that soft sobbing and low moaning you hear in the distance comes from the circulation department of Time. It is caused by its steady loss of circulation in the South ever since its dirty handling of the Till case, and its continuous bellyaching in behalf of social equality.

Surpluses for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, unprecedented storm conditions in Europe this winter have created an opportunity for us to further evidence the humanity of the American people. Suffering among human beings and livestock can be alleviated out of our huge surpluses of foodstuffs.

Actually no physical transfer of foodstuff is believed necessary to relieve outright starvation conditions since the Government already has on hand in Europe millions of pounds of foodstuffs that can be made available immediately. These, in turn, could be replaced by shipments from the United States at a later date.

I suggest that we move immediately to authorize the various American volunteer organizations—some 20 of them with units in Europe—to make distribution of food packages and other essentials to take care of the immediate problem of starvation. This I understand is more real than would seem possible in these times.

However, in addition, it seems to me the problem is much larger than just seeing to it that people don't starve. Our great surpluses of food creates on obligation for us under these conditions—an obligation to help these people in every way we can.

It is already apparent that farmers in many European nations will have to start from what we call scratch in order to bring back their acres to fertility. We can aid them in many ways.

I suggest that we proceed with the utmost dispatch to make our surpluses available to these winter-stricken nations which are still in the grip of an unrelenting winter, the worst in a century.

In addition, I suggest that we consider making available to those nations supplies from such other surpluses as we may have available.

From our tremendous surpluses, generous, unstinting, and immediate gifts would demonstrate once again most clearly to the entire world that we are not the selfish, grasping people we have been pictured in the Communist propaganda mills.

No one under these circumstances could be persuaded that we were dumping surpluses on the world market, for if stories from Europe are true, and I am sure they are, the average European farmer will be lucky if he can just restore his land to normal conditions by the end of the coming growing season.

I believe this is a splendid opportunity to aid a stricken people, create good will for our country, and in a way relieve come of the distress that has occurred economically here and abroad from the storing of such tremendous quantities of surpluses, particularly in foodstuffs.

Of course, President Eisenhower already has ordered some shipments for relief in Europe, but it is my hope that every effort be made to see that these European nations are abundantly supplied in the quickest possible manner with as many of our surplus supplies, as may be necessary to carry them through the 1956 growing season.

Cotton Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the southeastern part of the country voluntarily reduced its cotton acreage for many years. We have gotten no credit for this voluntary reduction in the recent cotton allotments. On the contrary, we are being forced to reduce our acreage this year by a larger percentage than some other sections of the Nation. We are being forced out of the cotton-planting business. Those in charge of administering the farm program here in Washington seem to be more concerned with acres, allotments, and surpluses than they are with human beings.

In a free country like ours, I maintain that any program should permit a man to plant enough to pay his taxes, earn an honest living and be a good citizen. Many of my farmers have been reduced and reduced in acreage until they can no longer maintain themselves upon the farm. These farmers are past the age when they can learn a new occupation. Some will have to wait 15 or 20 years before they can draw social security. Mr. Speaker, what are they going to do in the meantime? Any farm program should take into consideration a farmer's right to respect as a human being, with the opportunity by his own efforts to support his family.

Greenwood County planted 79,000 acres of cotton in 1910; 70,000 in 1920; approximately 39,000 in 1930 and this year we have dropped to the astounding low acreage, under the allotment program, of approximately 4,000 acres. The percentage of acreage reduction might not be as high in some of my other counties but it has been fantastic.

These farmers in the twenties and early thirties were encouraged by the Agriculture Department to diversify and cut down on cotton acreage. This they voluntarily did. Having gone along with this program, we now find ourselves reduced to the point where we can no longer stay on the land.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this Congress will read the following letter from an outstanding farmer in my district which very ably points out what is going on:

ANDERSON, S. C., *February 3, 1956.*

Mr. BEN BOATWRIGHT,
Chairman ASC State Committee,
Columbia, S. C.

DEAR MR. BOATWRIGHT: On January 9, 1956, I had a meeting with the Anderson County ASC committee in reference 1956 cotton allotment for my farm, possibly you have a report in your office of this meeting.

I am now requesting the State Committee review this matter at your earliest convenience.

I own and operate 492 acres of land, 316.9 acres in cultivation—wheat allotment 1956—26 acres—cotton allotment 1956—57.5 acres. You can see that I have been cut below cost of operating this farm.

History of this farm since 1948, these records are true and correct, before 1948 the acreages were larger.

	Acres
Cotton:	
1948	124
1949	122
1950	100
1951	102
1952	104
1953	109
1954 (allotment)	68
1955 (allotment)	66
1956 (allotment)	57.5
Wheat:	
1948	65
1949	60
1950	55
1951	60
1952	60
1953 (allotment)	50
1954 (allotment)	29
1955 (allotment)	27
1956	26

The above acreages were planted and harvested through 1955.

My farms have been reduced in cotton acreage approximately 50 percent and wheat acreage slightly more than 50 percent, and I am asking for relief from this condition, not as a handout from you or the Government, but I am asking for enough cotton and wheat acreage to keep this farm in operation and not have to face bankruptcy.

My taxes, as other farms in Anderson County, have doubled since 1949, other costs have increased as your committee well knows.

At the present time we have 30 people on these farms including my family. How can we 30 people (4 families) receive enough from 57.5 acres of cotton to live?

If your committee needs further information on my farm, I will be glad to appear before your committee with any and all information that you desire. This is a life and death case with me now, and I am asking for more cotton and wheat acreage so that I may earn my livelihood and not be a ward of the Government.

Under average conditions this farm should not be cut below 75 acres cotton and 40 acres wheat, then some years this operation would not be profitable.

Please place this letter before your State Committee and let me have your answer as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

ELIAS T. MCGEE.

Add Loss of Priceless Uranium Reserves to Other Fantastic Upper Colorado Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, to the already fantastic cash costs of the upper Colorado River storage scheme in the form of construction outlays and interest at 2½ percent per year for up to a hundred years or more on the money borrowered to make them, that is, 250 percent interest, yet another expense to the American people, must be added.

This amounts to the priceless reserve of uranium ore that would, like the lost continent Atlantis, be inundated by the waters of the project's reservoirs.

The following letter comes from a geologist. He does not live and work in New York, California, or any other place remote from the proposed project. He lives and works in Moab, Utah, in the heart of the proposal. Not only that, he has completed a comprehensive geological examination on the Glen Canyon area requiring approximately 4 months of detailed field study. This is the same area in which Wilbur A. Dexheimer admitted the geologists of the Bureau of Reclamation had only done surface geology. Dexheimer's admission was made during the Interior Committee hearings on the bill and will be found on page 246 of the committee hearings.

Read why geological consultant George R. Grandbouche concludes that loss of these deposits "will be of considerable detriment to our national defense and economy":

MOAB, UTAH, *February 1, 1956.*

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
United States Representative, California,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading your protest of the construction of the dam under the proposed Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, in the Salt Lake Tribune dated January 31, I would like to commend you on your stand.

However, as a geological consultant with over 3 years experience in uranium, and associated minerals, of the Colorado Plateau in general and with the Glen Canyon area in particular, perhaps you have overlooked a most vital reason for objecting to the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project.

No mention was made of the uranium deposits, now so vital to our national defense and national economy, which would be buried under millions of tons of water and which could never be recovered if the Glen Canyon area was flooded by the Colorado River storage project.

I have recently completed a comprehensive geological examination and report on the Glen Canyon area for several large uranium companies. This examination required approximately 4 months of detailed field study of the area in question, and consisted of both aerial reconnaissance and exhaustive field investigations. During this time I flew Glen Canyon and the canyons of the San Juan in a chartered super cub for the purpose of mapping detailed structural and sedimentary geology. I flew in and along the canyons for a distance of approximately 100 miles. Outcrops of considerable importance were noted on the map and were subsequently revisited by use of a jeep and by foot. During this period I flew for 3 days giving adequate time for this examination.

Several trips into the area required camping and long stays as it is quite far from the nearest settlements. During these trips I examined numerous Chinle-Shinarump sandstone lenses and paleo-stream channels which are one of the most important guides to the discovery of uranium deposits on the Colorado Plateau. Enclosed you will find several pictures taken during the examination, containing notes on the reverse side, regarding their importance and location. If the Colorado River storage project is completed and a dam constructed, it is probable that all of the pictured area, in addition to a great proportion of the area examined, will be inundated and rendered useless to the Nation.

For example, the Whirlwind mine located in sec. 2, T. 41 S. R. 13 E., has produced over 1,000 tons of uranium ores. It is probable the waters backed up by the dam will flood the Whirlwind property and parts of Copper Canyon, Nokai Canyon, and most important Oljetoh Wash, wherein is located some of the best uranium mines on the Colorado Plauteau. Also, Industrial Uranium Corp. has just recently blocked out an estimated 125,000 tons of uranium ore. Other major deposits situated in Oljetoh, Wash., are the Mitten-Skyline Koley-Black and several other interests too numerous to mention.

The Chinle formation in the area which probably would be covered by water possesses a great potential of uranium reserves, and that any destruction will be of considerable detriment to our national defense and economy; therefore, in the best intrests of the Nation I would like to voice my support in your stand.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. GRANDBOUCHE,
Geological Consultant.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

The REA—Yesterday and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas, addressed the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in its national meeting at St. Louis on January 25. What he had to say is worthy of the attention of all of us who have watched the great contribution REA has made to America's free enterprise system in the last two decades.

Mr. POAGE, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, has had a large part in promoting this very important program that turned on the lights in millions of rural homes in America, and that has brought to these homes the freedom from drudgery, the conveniences and the comforts that hitherto were shared and enjoyed only by the people of our towns and cities.

I want to commend Mr. POAGE for the great contribution he has made to REA, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentleman, it has been a number of years since I have had the opportunity to meet with the men and women from all over America who have done so much to improve rural life—the men and women who have built the great rural electric service systems of the United States. Probably nowhere in the history of the world can we find a parallel to the electrification of the American farm. And to you, the leaders of the local rural electric cooperatives from Puget Sound to the Straits of Florida, I unhesitatingly give the credit. Others have indeed come into the picture since you showed that it was a practicable and profitable undertaking, but they stood aside when the whole field was theirs for the taking. You led the way; others followed.

It is with real pleasure that I return to one of your great conventions. It is a real inspiration to work with this group. In it are some of my finest and closest friends. I am proud of every one of you. Had I not been, I am sure I would never have agreed to leave the great agricultural price fight in Congress and to come here and speak on the subject assigned to me this afternoon.

On the other hand, had you been any other than the sincerely dedicated group of public-spirited citizens which you are, you would have never asked anyone to speak on the rural-telephone program. You could have smugly passed it by. You could have talked only of your great and praiseworthy achievements in the field of electrification. That is your especial responsibility. You need not bother with the problems of getting telephone service for farmers; that is, you would not need to do so were it not for the same spirit which makes you co-op managers sit up nights trying to figure out ways whereby you can take lights 2 long miles up the creek to a lonely cabin which will never pay more than a minimum bill, the same spirit which has made hundreds of you board members give the co-op more of your time than you are able to give to your own business, this same spirit forces you, and I believe it forces me, to do what we can to lend a hand to the rural-telephone program.

That program needs a hand. The act of Congress authorizing the REA to make telephone loans has helped. It has helped the situation even more than most of you know, but to be a success, the telephone program needs enthusiasm and cooperation even more than the electric program ever needed it. We started the rural-electric program just as farm income began to move upward from the depth of the depression. The telephone program had hardly gotten off the ground, as it were, when the terrible and relentless price squeeze began to paralyze the farmer. We started the electric work with a program for which we can expect at least 95 percent acceptance when economic conditions are favorable. The telephone program can never expect connections to reach more than possibly three-fourths of our rural homes, even in the most prosperous times. Most people look upon electricity as a necessity to be retained and paid for even after they have lost the family automobile. Many people look upon a telephone as a luxury to be taken out when the going gets hard.

We would, therefore, be unrealistic as well as unfair if we were to expect too much of the rural-telephone program. But let us see just what has been done and what needs most to be done that we may the better appraise the needs of the future:

In order to see what the rural telephone program has done, we must in all fairness, go back to the time when we began talking about REA financing of telephone lines. We must do this because we recognize then, as we recognize now, that one of the greatest contributions of the REA telephone program would be the momentum which it would give to nonborrowers to improve and extend their own rural systems. I recall that during the fight to pass the rural telephone bill, I repeatedly made the statement that I expected such legislation to be of far more help from the standpoint of inducing the private telephone systems that theretofore had refused to give any appreciable rural service, to extend and improve that service. Of course, it worked out exactly that way. For 20 years prior to the discussion of an REA financed rural telephone system, the number of rural phones in America had dropped steadily from 2,498,493 in 1920 to 1,526,954 in 1940. Very few of the independent telephone companies were putting in any new rural lines and, of course, the farflung Bell System was concentrating on the higher returns to be found in the great cities and in the long line service, but once the REA telephone system was proposed and a bill introduced in Congress, even the Bell System undertook to forestall the passage of legislation by constructing lines which it had just a few months earlier declared unfeasible.

During the fall and winter of 1948–49, this legislation was pending in the House of Representatives. The Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., which operates the exchange in my hometown of Waco, was refusing to accept new city subscribers on the theory that the switchboard facilities at Waco were inadequate to care for any more connections. Of course, this was but the predicate for one of their periodic drives for higher rates. Strangely enough, each time the big telephone companies increase the efficiency of their plant, they increase the charges to the public. Be that as it may, the Southwestern Bell picked this peculiar time to vastly expand its rural service in the country surrounding Waco. Hundreds of telephones were connected in the rural areas of the county. They all went on the overloaded switchboard of Waco. I think it is but fair to attribute this and similar activity throughout the country to the pendency of the REA legislation.

Since this legislation was passed, this same Bell affiliate has been extremely anxious to extend its rural lines in another one of my counties where there are two privately owned REA-financed independent companies trying to provide rural coverage, but in still a third county of my district where there has been very little possibility of any well-financed new telephone development, the Bell people have been completely unwilling to give any appreciable new rural service. I have asked them why. Their answer has simply been that they weren't ready to develop the territory. Somehow or another they never seem to get ready to develop any territory until somebody else offers to develop it.

Let us, therefore, start with 1945 when there were about the same number of rural phones as in 1940—roughly a million and a half. By the time REA actually was making telephone loans in 1950, there were probably 2 million rural telephones in the United States. Today, there are about 2½ million rural telephones which means that almost exactly 50 percent of the farms of America today have telephone service, and, of course, the service is available to a good many more who simply feel they can't afford to pay the necessary rates. Probably more than half of these rural homes that have telephone service have modern service, so we can say that while the picture is not all bad, neither have we begun to approach a solution of the problem.

At the same time, we are reminded that in February 1949, speaking on behalf of the Independent Telephone Association, Col. William C. Henry stated:

"There is now available, without construction charges to the subscriber, rural telephone service to between 80 and 85 percent of the occupied farms of the United States. Adequate rural telephone service is not a national problem."

At the same congressional hearing, Mr. E. M. Widen, of the Southwestern Bell Co., of this city, said:

"If let alone, there is no question in my mind but that this problem will be met by my company and other telephone companies."

Most of the older delegates here today will recognize a striking similarity between these statements and those of Mr. Neff who, in speaking for the private power companies in 1935 said that the job of rural electrification was then practically complete.

As a matter of interest, I think we should observe that the loan part of the telephone program has moved rather more rapidly

than some of us had supposed. At the end of the first 5 years of electric loans, REA had committed $369 million. At the end of 5 years of telephone loans, it had approved $275 million. Of course, these figures are somewhat like comparing bales of cotton with bushels of corn, but it does indicate that the privately owned telephone companies cannot sit complacently by and assume that their stranglehold on territory which they do not serve will never be challenged. And that, to my mind, is one of the most important features of the whole program.

It is very true that I would feel that the situation were much better if more of these loan funds had actually been advanced to the borrower. Only about one-half of this money has, as of this date, been actually turned over to the borrowers for construction. Likewise, I would feel better if a somewhat larger percentage of these loans were going to farmer-owned cooperatives. As of December 31, 1955, loan allocations had been made to 226 commercial companies and to 189 cooperatives. Just over half of the money was advanced for new construction, most of the remainder for improvements. Again, of the 606,000 subscribers to be served by these outstanding loans, just over one-half, 310,000, will be new subscribers while 296,000 will be customers who had some kind of telephone service but who are now to get improved, modern service.

While the record of repayments of telephone loans is not as good as that of the electric systems, it is certainly not a record of which we need be ashamed. As of November 30, 1955, there were 24 delinquent borrowers. They owed $527,398, but against this, we must note that other borrowers had paid $112,300 in advance of the due date. Most of these delinquencies seem to be due to the fact that the original telephone loans were, in most cases, made before it was possible to secure equipment and before it was possible to establish an earning base on the funds borrowed. I believe that REA has largely corrected this situation and that we can reasonably hope that the record of the next 5 years will be much more favorable.

And what of the needs of the future? Can we by legislation? Can we by administration? Can we, in any other way, increase the efficiency and the progress of the rural telephone program? I have no magic formula. In 1944, the Agriculture Committee of the House was able to so revise the basic REA legislation that the electric co-ops were given a longer amortization period, a guaranteed low-interest rate, and the assurance of effective help in solving their engineering and operating problems. There is no such opportunity to come to the aid of the telephone borrowers at this time. I have inquired both of borrowers and of the REA as to what, if any, legislation Congress should pass in order to be helpful. I stand ready—and I know the majority of the Agriculture Committee of the House stands ready—to sponsor any sound and reasonable legislation that may be needed. Frankly, there have been very few suggestions made for legislative changes. Possibly this convention may want to offer suggestions. If it does, I can assure you that they will be well received.

What, then, of the administration of the act? Certainly some of our ablest telephone people have contributed to the administration of the program. Certainly both Claude Wickard who launched this program, and Ancher Nelsen who now directs it, have been anxious and determined to bring telephones to our farm folks just as far as they could. I am not here to criticize or condemn anyone, but since it is much easier to sit on the outside and tell someone else how his business should be run, then it is to actually accept the responsibility for running it, and since I am prone to take the easy course, I think that we should at least consider the possibility that we might be able to improve this program by applying some of the techniques that were successful in the case of rural electrification.

Fundamentally, it seems to me that our present telephone program does not have the crusading spirit that was associated with the early days of the electric program. I have tried to determine why this is lacking. I believe that basically it is lacking because the farmers simply have not felt that this telephone program was their program as they did in the case of the electric program.

Now, I am not here to say that I think that REA should make all its loans to cooperatives or even that it should undertake to see that cooperatives handle the bulk of the business. I look upon farmer cooperatives simply as a means of getting something done that someone else won't do at a reasonable price and with reasonable efficiency. There can never be much public demand for an REA financed rural telephone cooperative in an area where a commercial company is providing adequate coverage and satisfactory service at reasonable prices. There would never have been a single rural electric cooperative had the power companies of America met the reasonable needs of the rural areas for electricity. It would not be necessary to organize another rural telephone cooperative in the United States if the existing telephone companies would overnight provide the needed service at reasonable prices, but they haven't done it, and I have no reason to believe they will do it without the nudge that these farmed-owned cooperatives give them. On the other hand, I realize the farmer-owned cooperatives need the competition of the privately owned commercial companies. When you and I were working to get the electric cooperatives established, REA was giving us every kind of help that it could in connection with organization and management of the cooperatives. I think we need that kind of aggressive assistance right now. I fear that REA is not giving it.

The telephone problem is more difficult than the electric problem and the telephone companies are even more obstinate and, in many cases, more reactionary and less inclined to give service than were the electric companies 20 years ago. This is understandable because of the even greater monopoly that exists in the telephone field than is found in the highly monopolized electric field. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is the largest corporation in the world. It controls about 80 percent of all of our telephones in the United States and it controls an even larger percentage of the long-distance lines.

The so-called independents who carried on a long, bitter—and almost successful—fight against the establishment of an REA financing system for rural lines have in many cases been even less cooperative with the needs of the people than the Bell System. I am delighted that some of their members have recently seen fit to avail themselves of REA financing. I welcome them into the fold of REA borrowers, but I would say to them as I would say to the farmer-owned cooperatives: I don't want to see any one segment of the industry obtain a monopoly. I believe the whole great work of the REA rests on the fact that it has been able over the years to prevent the development of monopoly in the electric field. I want to see the same thing prevented in the telephone field. One of the ways to do this is to keep a substantial balance between commercial companies and farmer-owned cooperatives. To keep this balance, it seems to me that the REA should give the same kind of cooperation and help to the telephone cooperatives which was accorded to the electric cooperatives in years past.

Along much the same lines, it seems to me that there may be room for substantially more research and development of telephone equipment and facilities than there has been by REA. Again referring to the early days of the electric system, REA carried on the research needed to materially lower the cost of rural systems. That research was just as helpful to the private power companies as it was to the cooperatives, although in the beginning most of the private power companies opposed it. I have a feeling that today the private telephone equipment companies don't want REA to conduct this kind of research. I think it is one of the great obligations of that lending agency.

Two highly controversial fields for a possible speeding up of the telephone work present themselves: Both involve a compromise of the ideal with the practical question of costs to the farmers. One lies in the reduction of the so-called equity requirements. Frankly, I don't know how far we should go. I realize that telephone connections are not as stable as electric connections. I realize we must have some local investment before we can expect the Government to advance the money for entire new plants. This problem of equity investment is possibly more serious with the farmer-owned cooperatives than with the commercial companies. Commercial companies ordinarily have some substantial equity either in money or in kind, but in the case of the cooperatives, the present regulation usually simply means that they must collect $50 per prospective subscriber in cash. This is a far greater sum than I as a householder have to put up as a deposit with any utility company—either in Waco or in Washington. I have at least wondered if it might not be feasible to require each subscriber to furnish his own instrument—of course, buying the instrument from the local cooperative—and to provide that should the subscriber discontinue the service, that the instrument would be reconveyed to the cooperative with appropriate and rather substantial depreciation deducted.

The second closely related field of possible acceleration of the program seems to me to involve the question of the quality of service. We all want good service. We want the best we can pay for, but may it not be that a great many of our people who cannot pay for the kind of telephone service that is given here in St. Louis might be able and glad to pay for something, possibly a little better than the fenceline service that we used to have when I was a boy, but still something less than the best? I know that I would like to have a Cadillac automobile. I am sure it is a good car and doubtless worth the money—if you have the money, but I have never owned a Cadillac. I do own a Chevrolet and I do get a great deal of pleasure out of it. Maybe we are trying to force all of the rural people of America to buy Cadillac phone service when their income won't afford it. If we are really interested in wide coverage, we better give some thought to the statistics on the limited number of Cadillacs as contrasted with the number of Chevrolets and Fords in the United States.

Again, I confess that I am not expressing any matured or well-thought-out conclusions. I am simply offering a suggestion for consideration.

I think, however, that I can, without fear of contradiction, put my finger on the one single factor which more than any other has retarded—and still retards—the development of rural telephone. That is the tragic inadequacy of farm income. If every American farmer were making $10,000 a year or up, we would need no Government lending program; rural telephone service would be so profitable that even the most conservative commercial companies would seek to furnish it. The latest figures indicate that the average farm income is only about $913 per year. This means that vast numbers of farmers who should be consumers of their own local telephone systems simply can't afford the

convenience of a telephone, regardless of the fact that they may even now have telephone wires across their front yard.

Farm income, or the lack of it, is unquestionably the most pressing economic problem at this time confronting America. It limits your business—electric as well as telephone. It adversely affects the REA's collection records. It is beginning to throw men out of work in the implement and equipment factories of St. Louis, and sooner or later, it is certain, if not corrected, to lead our high-flying economy over the same kind of brink which so nearly ruined us in 1929. No one knows how long we can "free wheel" down the road. We did it for 7 or 8 years in the twenties. We have done it for 3 years during the fifties. Maybe we can do it for several years to come, maybe we are already on the brink as we were in the spring and summer of 1929—I do not know, but this I do know—that unless we improve farmer income the rest of our great economic edifice is sure to fall.

Nor has the Department of Agriculture or the administration offered us any clear or effective program for an immediate increase in the price of the things farmers grow.

But I resolved that I would not talk any politics at this convention.

The only way I know of to keep that resolution is to stop—so thank you one and all.

Why Farm Programs Are Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the Wall Street Journal, dated February 10, 1956, on the subject of the farm problem, written by Mr. C. W. Croes, a distinguished citizen of Aberdeen, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

The WALL STREET JOURNAL,
Chicago, Ill.

Our attention has been called to the article entitled "And Heaven Too," under your Review and Outlook of February 7, 1956.

In this you generally criticize the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Congress for its efforts to do something for agriculture.

Apparently the basis for your criticism is the assumption in the fourth paragraph of your article which you express as follows:

"But the purpose of rigid 90-percent supports, which the same bill would reestablish, is to encourage maximum production; they were decreed early in World War II to meet swollen wartime demands."

In this opinion which we think is completely out of line with the facts, we believe rests most of the misunderstanding and opposition to the farm-support program.

We think a correct interpretation of the purpose of any support for agriculture is to give agriculture some of the benefits of our protective policy.

In other words, it is to compensate agriculture in whole or in part for the burden of overhead that is hung on agriculture's shoulders by our protective policy, our minimum wage law, our restricted immigration behind which labor can organize and force its wage scale higher, our time and a half for overtime, our tariffs that protect industry from foreign competition when industry pays that wage scale and extracts from the consuming public its 10, 15, or 20 percent return on the investment.

Frankly, we do not feel too critical of the author of this article or of others, even Mr. Fischer, the author of the now famous, Country Slickers Take Us Again, in Harper's magazine of December, for having expressed what we think is a dangerously unfortunate and unwarranted picture of the farm issue.

We are not too positive as to who should bear the responsibility of giving to the public the true facts as to the cost that our much lauded protective policy hangs on the shoulders of agriculture.

We are inclined to feel that this should be the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture; although it is an element of such vital interest to the Nation that every influential agency in the Nation's economy should have those facts clearly at hand.

For the past several years, we have tried to find some agency that could give us some authentic information as to how much the farmer's overhead is increased by our protective policy. We had hoped that the National Industrial Conference Board might have made such a study, but they advise us they have not and they know of no place where such information is available.

Just after the present administration came into power, we wrote the Department of Agriculture asking for this information. We are convinced that it was a vital bit of information that the Department must have in order to deal intelligently with the economic welfare of the great agriculture industry.

In reply, we got a sheaf of statistics showing all the details of the cost of the support program to date, but not one word in answer to our inquiry.

What costs does our protective policy add to agriculture's operation?

We note you say that the purpose of the support price was to encourage maximum production. We believe on scanning the records you will agree that this could not be true. The first support program went into effect some time before we entered World War II.

It went into effect at a time when there was no shortage of supplies. On the contrary, a surplus already showing up and acreage limitation went into effect very shortly after the first support price program went into effect.

Later when the needs of World War II began to develop, the acreage limitation was lifted and the support was left at 90 percent of parity. War needs pushed the market price to a maximum of 113 percent of parity consumed the accumulated surplus stocks of agricultural products and even threatened a shortage and some limited rationing.

We think the record will show that at no time except in the case of flax when vegetable oils were short, and possibly 1 or 2 other minor items, was support prices used to encourage production.

One hundred percent of parity is a level calculated as accurately as could be done that would give agriculture approximately the benefit of our protective policy that is enjoyed by labor, particularly organized labor and by industry. Since agriculture has, since colonial days produced an exportable surplus of most farm products tariffs give very little protection without a support program. All commodities of which there is an exportable surplus would naturally float to the world market level. Liverpool less freight was the market price of wheat and most other farm commodities until a support price went into effect in the middle thirties. It will be the level again anytime that a support program is denied agriculture.

Another very erroneous thought that seems current in most of the eastern press, is that agriculture has become unimportant: It represents only 13 percent or less of the Nation's population.

We lose sight of this fact that every man that has left the farm since our grandfathers represented 60 percent of the population has been replaced by machinery; machinery and supplies that comes from the shelves of industry.

The 13 percent who still remain on the farm, consume and pay from 10 to 20 times the volume of goods coming off the shelves of industry and labor that their grandfathers consumed. Fifty years ago, a few hundred dollars would adequately equip the average farm. Twenty-five to fifty thousand dollars is required now to equip the average farm.

Agriculture's gross income has shrunk an estimated 30 to 40 percent in the last 5 years. That 30 to 40 percent shrinkage in agriculture's income will be only a year or two late in making its effect felt in the market outlet from the shelves of industry and labor.

Furthermore it is not only the farmer's buying power that we lose, but the business of the small towns and the cities whose primary source of new wealth is serving the agricultural community of the Nation are affected as this loss of buying power pyramids as it moves toward industrial centers.

Peculiarly labor's periodicals indicate that they are conscious of that, but generally speaking, industry's spokesman, such as your good paper seems to be almost completely unconcerned or is it completely unaware of this disastrous loss in marketing outlet for the goods of industries.

Can anyone seriously doubt that this 30 to 40 percent reduction in gross income for the Nation's agriculture has not contributed liberally to the cause of unsold cars in the automobile industry, has not contributed liberally to the ever increasing volume of long term credit, installment payment, mortgages on the income of the next 2, 3, or 4 years.

Back in the early twenties we were constantly told that it was economically unsound to do anything for agriculture. Agriculture's buying power became exhausted early in the twenties. In the middle twenties, industry busied itself rebuilding its own house, ignoring the lack of agriculture's buying power that normally should come from its annual production of new wealth from the soil, but by 1929 the house of cards collapsed.

Following World War II, we had a reasonably effective support program for agriculture, one that kept the economic bloodstream of buying power reasonably well distributed and circulating from the grassroots to the industrial heart of the Nation.

* * * * * * *

* * * Supports, of course, call for effective control of production. Our present agriculture surpluses are not the result of intelligent price supports that would give the farmer the benefit of our protective policy. They are the result of lack of effective control.

Controls have their objectionable features. Those objectionable features are not as bad as bankrupcty of the industry with bankruptcy of the Nation inevitably following as it did in 1929. We start artificial blocking of the law of supply and demand when we start with tariff, combinations of industry, organized labor, restricted immigration, minimum-wage law, time and a half for overtime. If we drop all of those, the farmer will face the world and hold his own. He cannot carry the overhead of all of those and sell his products in competition with the low standards of foreign countries.

C. W. CROES.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK.

United States Policy Toward the Satellite States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the January 23d issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appeared a very interesting letter by Mr. Stefan Osusky, on the subject of our policy toward the satellite states. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERATING THE SATELLITES

Mr. James P. Warburg's letter of January 12, Liberating the Satellites, calls for several observations. He maintains that President Eisenhower's Christmas message to the captive European nations, assuring them that their peaceful liberation "is a major goal of the United States policy," was not a wise act.

One of Mr. Warburg's arguments is that the President's message was motivated more by partisan electoral politics than by any serious considerations of foreign policy. While I have no desire to meddle with American party politics, I feel perfectly qualified to give information to your readers on the foreign policy aspect of the President's message from a European point of view.

I was, last July, at Strasburg at the session of the Assembly of the Council of Europe, when the parliamentary delegations of 15 free European nations debated the policy of the Council in view of the impending Geneva "summit" conference of the Big Four. After an exhaustive debate the Assembly unanimously approved a report which provided that Europe's security and peace depended on its unity, the enslaved nations included.

The report said: "The West can never accept as final any settlement which would perpetuate the loss of their national independence and their political liberties by a large number of the peoples of central and eastern Europe. Every country must be entitled, in full independence, to choose its political regime and its social structure. This choice implies that its elections shall be free, its government independent, and that there shall be no interventions by foreign countries in internal affairs.

And at its autumn session, on the eve of the Big Four Foreign Ministers Geneva Conference, on October 26, 1955, the Assembly reiterated its stand for the national independence and political freedom of the subjugated nations of central and eastern Europe.

Moreover, the 15 Foreign Ministers of the free nations of Europe, in a meeting in Paris, on December 13, 1955, approved the stand taken by the Assembly of the Council of Europe and resolved "that security for all cannot be achieved on the basis of the present division of Europe," and "that the creation of a united Europe remains indispensable." I hope that this makes it clear that in his Christmas message President Eisenhower voiced not a sectional or partisan view but a major political goal common to the United States and the 15 free European nations.

Furthermore, Mr. Warburg places Radio Free Europe's activity, with regard to the countries behind the Iron Curtain, on a par with the activities of the Communist parties in the free countries. Radio Free Europe is engaged in the task of diffusing information denied the enslaved nations by their taskmasters, and dedicated to the cause of right and liberty.

There is no common term of comparison between the activities of the free American people in its diffusing truth with the work of the Soviet wrecking crews, the Communist parties, in the free countries. There is, after all, a difference between working for liberation and working for enslavement.

STEFAN OSUSKY,
WASHINGTON.

A Blank Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement based on information contained in a minority report on the Colorado River storage project bill. The bill is scheduled for the floor during the week beginning February 27.

Total costs of this Colorado River boondoggle are unknown. Therefore the bill in its proposed form amounts to a blank check to a Government construction agency which has been treated overgenerously already in the past.

Interest charges alone for the full period allowed for repayment are estimated at between $320 million and $1,153 million, or from 30 percent to more than 100 percent of the original estimated construction cost. This, of course, will be subject to revision upward should more participating projects be added, and there are many being talked of. They are of dubious value, to say the least.

Extension of the repayment period to the year 2032 is a departure from precedent and means that it is entirely probable that the year will be beyond the economic life of some of the units.

Almost complete dependence for repayment of the costs of the project upon a system of high-cost hydro projects amounts, in my mind along with the minds of the minority members of the committee, to fiscal necromancy.

There is much doubt that a ready market can be found for this high-cost power—at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Sufficient evidence to justify dependence upon this source of revenue for repayment costs has not been presented. It is indeed doubtful that consumers will pay the high rates that will be needed for the liquidation of the cost of this project. These rates would necessarily be far above established rates at other reclamation projects.

It is strange, too, to have such dependence placed on hydropower near the center of the largest coal reserves in the Nation. These reserves need only to be mined to produce steam-generated power to the full extent of any foreseeable demand. The oil-shale deposits of the Colorado Plateau are another potential source of energy to compete with this high-cost hydropower.

I submit that this blank check project amounts to no more than the wildest of wild dreams to spend Government money for a wholly unnecessary source of power. This proposed project not only is financially unsound, but also is not reconcilable with the interests of common sense.

Most Needed Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in light of the pending interest in juvenile delinquency, I have had called to my attention by a constituent of mine a column entitled "Most Needed Man," written by H. I. Phillips, which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Newark News. As this article contains some homely and interesting observations about how delinquencies used to be taken care of, and some of the limitations of today, I ask unanimous consent that this brief article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONCE OVER
(By H. I. Phillips)
MOST NEEDED MAN

The greatest blow to juvenile delinquency and crime in general would be the restoration of that vanished American, the cop on the beat. What a law-enforcement factor he was in the days when a policeman knew nothing about engines, passed nobody in a cloud of dust and depended on his feet, a nightstick, a resolute sense of duty, and a familiarity with the neighborhood. Teenage crime never got to first base until cops began covering their beats sitting down. The kids terrorized nobody longer than it took for Officer Callahan to come flatfootedly around the corner with fire in his eyes. No schoolboy gangs started anything he couldn't stop fast.

The cop on the beat was an institution guaranteeing protection, an instrument for good behavior, and a force for law and order. He was a personality, not a vague figure in a squad car, a well-known law-enforcement agent, not a shadow flitting by in an auto; a definite name, not a license-plate number. He knew mom, pop, and all the kids.

He was John Law, not car 367 or one end of a two-way radio circuit. His word was law. When he spoke the word it had nothing to do with psychiatry. (A psychiatrist was generally though to be a vaudeville acrobat who also imitated birds.) The probation officer was a kid's old man. And he accepted no reports by letter or telephone.

A juvenile crime wave occurred only if some kids stole a gate off the same fence two Halloweens in succession. Or when junior tore up his report card. The nearest thing to school vandalism took place when some moppet wrote Susie Loves Gussie on the fence.

The cop on the beat carried a billy or persuader and had a way of innocently twirling it that induced respect and discipline. He

never used it on the moppets and only applied it to teen-agers who had height, weight and reach on him. But, dangling idly, the nightstick was a greater influence for good behavior than the pistol is today.

The cop on the beat had a way of taking a baddie by the collar and getting an immediate surrender by the force of his ultimatum. There was no neighborhood protest, no parent demanding his transfer and no arrogant teen-ager hoodlum carrying his case to the United Nations.

The cop on the beat left the station house with one plain assignment: "Cover your beat and take no nonsense." This has been superseded by "Check every traffic meter," "Keep traffic moving" or "Remember this is the day you escort the Brazilian Ambassador."

(This is no knock on the cops of today; they are doing what modern civilization, growing populations and inadequate staffs compel them to do. But they are obliged to do too many things over too much territory too swiftly, mostly by automobile, motorcycle, and whistle.)

More cops on the beat are a must. Get them back and there will be a complete collapse in the switch-blade knife business, neighborhood gang activities and juvenile nose-thumbings at law and order. What America needs is a return to the effectiveness of "Cheese it, the cop."

Surplus Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry C. Parke, chairman, merchant marine committee of the national security commission of the American Legion, presented a very fine statement before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on February 16, 1956. I am inserting it in the RECORD for the the information of the Members.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Henry C. Parke. I am chairman of the merchant marine committee of the national security commission of the American Legion. We Legionnaires have minutely examined our whole merchant marine policy and our support of it is based upon proven facts as well as upon congressional findings.

Two world wars and the Korean conflict have dramatically demonstrated that a strong American merchant marine is not only vital to our general economic welfare but also to our very security as a Nation. Both as General of the Armies and as the Nation's Chief Executive, President Eisenhower has repeatedly and emphatically called the Nation's attention to these facts. It is now an historic truism, but it will bear repeating here, that because of the American merchant marine we were able to fight and win two world wars and the Korean conflict on the enemy's territory rather than on our own. In all three conflicts it was our merchant ships that carried millions of men and their tremendous armaments and supplies over all the seven seas to final victory.

Therefore, because our merchant marine has become the indispensable factor in our whole defense system, we of the American Legion regard with real alarm, any threat, from any source, that would weaken this fourth arm of our national defense. In a troubled world of sinister portent, the Nation intelligently and rightfly approves the expenditure of billions to strengthen the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We must keep our fourth arm equally strong because of its vital importance to the other three.

The American Legion is acutely aware of the danger of altering or emasculating our present national policy on the merchant marine. Under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, this committee has displayed courage and foresight in originating legislation designed to sustain that natonal policy. In doing so, you and your colleagues have won the praise of every thinking American.

The American Legion, always deeply concerned with problems of national defense, supports you 100 percent in your unremitting efforts to foster and improve the merchant marine, and we are glad that you have called these hearings on the important question of the 50–50 policy which guarantees to American ships the right to carry half of those cargoes paid for by American taxpayers and shipped abroad for the aid of countries outside of the Iron Curtain. This guaranty has been enacted by Congress on nine occasions in the past. It partly expresses the characteristically American philosophy of the even break. It seems incredible that attacks on such an honest and cooperative policy should originate in nations we are doing so much to help. Thousands of Americans gave their lives to liberate these countries from brutal oppression. Our citizens are not only being severely taxed to pay the expenses of that war but are continuing to pay heavy imports to help rehabilitate and defend those nations. To deny to American ships the right to carry half of our agricultural shipments to these countries is simply unthinkable. But the attacks on our 50–50 policy, inspired by foreign shipping interests, continue, and constitute a real threat.

Mr. Chairman, the American Legion at its annual conventions has emphatically and unanimously expressed its views on the importance of maintaining the 50–50 principle so that we may maintain a strong merchant marine as a vital corollary of national defense. We reaffirmed ths policy pointedly at our 1955 national convention, and more recently on January 18, 1956, at the national security commission meeting in Washington in the following language:

"This legislation (the Cargo Preference Act) is literally a matter of life or death to a significant part of the merchant marine, and of health or sickness to the whole industry. The fact that more than 50 percent of American postwar exports have been foreign aid and similar Government cargoes were the basic principles which produced the 50–50 principle in 1948. Without it foreign shipping would probably have carried all but a negligible portion of these Government-aid cargoes. Therefore Congress has repeatedly enacted 50–50 clauses as the most practical and economical means of attaining its maritime objectives.

"We come back in the end to the real problem, which is that shipping interests in some foreign maritime countries have induced their governments to object to our 50–50 principle either as a bargaining lever or as an outright threat. This politically astute move kills 2 birds with 1 stone. It helps their government bargain for lower prices and it plays upon the fears of the most influential partner in our whole economy—the American farmer. Foreign shipping interests are thus trying to drive an artificial wedge between two great segments of this Nation, agriculture and shipping, which traditionally and in reality are partners.

Mr. Chairman, the American Legion must formally and firmly oppose any attempts to change this law that Congress has so wisely enacted. We believe, until evidence indicates otherwise, it should remain on the statute books unaltered as one of the most practical and effective supports we could give our merchant marine. Certainly its elimination or modification must wait until the case of those opposed to it becomes based on realism and fact, essential elements lacking to date. For anything harmful to our merchant marine in an economic sense weakens its potentiality as a vital defense factor also.

State of California Officially Opposes Upper Colorado Boondoggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in order to remove any doubt about the official position of the State of California on the upper Colorado River storage project, I am inserting below the text of the resolution adopted in the Assembly of the State of California on May 9, 1955, and adopted in the Senate of the State of California on May 27, 1955. The resolution, of course, opposes the project and urges that Congress suspend any further consideration of it.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 37

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to pending legislation affecting the waters of the Colorado River

Whereas more than 6 million people of this State depend upon the Colorado River as an important source of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial needs; and

Whereas the metropolitan areas of southern California, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and some 60 other cities depend on the Colorado River for water and hydroelectric power; and

Whereas the Colorado River is the sole source of water to irrigate over 1 million acres of land in this State; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of two major power and irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River at an estimated total cost approximating $1,750,000,000; and

Whereas one of these projects as contemplated by S. 500, H. R. 270 and companion bills, known as the Colorado River storage project, includes (1) the construction of six large dams creating reservoirs with an aggregate storage capacity of 44 million acre-feet, and (2) the construction of 14 or more irrigation projects known as participating projects; and

Whereas these storage dams are not required to serve the proposed irrigation projects but would store water for power purposes under interpretations of the Colorado River compact now being defended against by California in the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.*; and

Whereas the major irrigation participating projects are very costly transmountain diversion projects to take large amounts of the highest quality water out of the Colorado River Basin to other river basins; and

Whereas the other project, as contemplated by S. 300 and H. R. 412, and known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, is also a very costly transmountain diversion project to take the best quality water out of the Colorado River basin to the Arkansas River Basin, and is the initial phase of a project to divert 900,000 acre-feet of water

per annum out of the Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas both of these projects are based upon interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are now at issue before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Arizona* v. *California et al.*; and

Whereas these projects, if constructed under those interpretations, would be detrimental to both the quality and quantity of water to which California has rights long established by prior appropriation as well as by contracts with the Federal Government for projects now constructed; and

Whereas both proposed projects are based upon questionable standards of financial feasibility and if constructed would cost the taxpayers of our Nation several billion dollars in the form of a subsidy to the lands which would be irrigated; and

Whereas California is the second largest taxpaying State in the Nation, and would therefore be doubly injured if these projects were authorized both by the impairment of the quality and quantity of water to which existing California projects have established rights, and by the burden of a tremendous tax load: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of legislation authorizing the Colorado storage project and participating projects, and legislation authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project until the Supreme Court decides the case now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

A Timely Article by David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Washington's Principles Called Applicable Today," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, Wednesday, February 22, 1956:

WASHINGTON'S PRINCIPLES CALLED APPLICABLE TODAY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Not long ago, Chief Justice Warren made a speech in which he said that, if the Bill of Rights were up for adoption today, he was sure it would be ratified but not until after an extensive debate in which doubts about it would be widely expressed.

This suggests that the same thing might be said about George Washington's policies. It is often assumed that, if he were alive today and proposed the doctrines outlined in his Farewell Address, he would be denounced as an isolationist or a rightist. It is generally believed he would be accused at least of neutralism and as having failed to see that the world is all one nowadays and that there can be no such thing as isolation.

THE FAREWELL ADDRESS

Unfortunately, most of the critics who would be saying these things have never taken the time to examine carefully the text of Washington's Farewell Address. Somehow, they don't give it as much attention throughout American schools in connection with Washington's Birthday as they used to do. For there is nothing in the Farewell Address that opposes the pinciple behind an American membership in the League of Nations or in the United Nations. The first President of the United States, after 8 years in office, gave his countrymen the following advice:

"It is our true policy to stay clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it. * * *

"Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

NO PERMANENT ALLIANCE

Certainly the United States has not entered into a permanent alliance with any country. The United Nations Organization is not an alliance. Each government retains freedom of action on specific issues, including the use of military power.

Certainly also World War I and World War II, so far as the United States was concerned, were temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies. The cold war and the aftermath of World War II also may assuredly be considered extraordinary emergencies.

What George Washington wanted future administrations to avoid was entangling commitments. He said: "Why, by interweaving our destiny with any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

This was a plain warning against becoming enmeshed in the internal affairs of European countries, and the advice holds good today. George Washington deplored foreign influences in our own affairs and declared: "How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. * * * Foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

These words might have been written today. For unquestionably foreign influence, whether benevolent or malicious, is far reaching in the domestic councils of the Nation. The whole anti-Communist crusade in Congress is rightly based on the belief that foreign governments finance a political party and its apparatus here in America. Throughout America there are many groups, some of them with millions to spend, who are misguidedly arguing with conscientious zeal that the Communist Party is just another political party and hence Congress should cease investigating its beliefs. These people do the work of a hostile government whether they realize it or not.

So far as the expenditure by Congress of sums for foreign aid is concerned, there are two main points of view. One is that America should spend money in the role of a world philanthropist on the strange theory that mere spending will create friends abroad. The other is that America should spend money for temporary alliances of a military nature to help the defense of the United States and of the overseas bases it needs to intercept airplane attack in an atomic age.

There are those Americans who go about bemoaning the policies of their own country, arguing that America is losing throughout the world. On the one hand, those persons want money given abroad without strings and, on the other hand, they want America to buy a pig in a poke and get nothing except vague "thank yous" in return for the dollars of the taxpayers of the United States.

American capital is already invested abroad by the billions and expects a return on its investment.

AID IN DISASTERS

Aid where there is human distress and famines and other disasters is well understood by the American people as involving grants of sums for those emergencies.

But to pour out American billions abroad year after year, as some returning American travelers urge, merely to create an atmosphere of friendship is an adventure in extravagance which will never get past Congress no matter how much the hearts of the advocates of unlimited spending may bleed for the Nehrus and the neutralists who play one side against the other. The neutralists pontifically declare that, as between totalitarian tyranny and human freedom, they must observe neutrality, and that justice and morality are obsolete words in the face of expediency.

What the first President of our country prophesied has come true—that "at no distant period" a great nation would emerge "to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

All that America seeks today in connection with her benevolence is that it shall not be wasted among those countries which do not exalt justice or defend a moral cause. For they would ignore our crusade against those governments which have committed—and threaten again to commit—aggression and thus disturb the peace of the world.

The National Guard: An American Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an address delivered by me before the annual convention conference of the Louisiana National Guard held in the city of Shreveport, La., Saturday, February 18, 1956. I am told that the National Guard is causing this to be printed but in the meantime I am extending this in the RECORD:

Gentlemen, I am extremely pleased that you have given me the opportunity to come here and talk to you about the National Guard. It is not only a privilege for me to participate with you at this convention—it is an honor. I say this because it is an honor for any American to be associated with an organization that is so close to the heart of the people of our Nation. I feel a close kinship to the National Guard, inasmuch as I am the senior Democratic member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives—and as such, I am in almost daily contact with officers and members of the National Guard Association, and I am continually working upon National Guard problems and legislation.

Our country would not be so great, its people would not be free, if it were not for the guard's proud record of service for over 300 years. And the Louisiana National Guard has played its full and valiant part in that record. The Louisiana Guard's participation has been earned the hard way—not only on the battlefronts around the world but in its service to our State.

In all the wars that have been fought by this country, the struggles have been won because they were backed up by the fighting sinews of the American people. The military muscles that packed the invincible wallop was in large part made up of National Guard troops. And, an important part of these troops have been the officers and men of the Louisiana National Guard. I know of no other organization in the country that hews closer to the line of American beliefs, that is dedicated more completely to American principles, than our own National Guard.

Today, with all our military forces taking new or expanded roles, both at home and around the world, it is important to understand the background and aims of America's oldest military organization. This is especially true since, more than any other military component, the guard is vested with the deep personal pride of our communities. It is supported by local effort, encouraged by the tradition of our home states, and staffed with officers and men who are friends and neighbors.

In front of the Archives Building in Washington there is a stone statue and at the base of this statue is an inscription which reads, "What is past is prologue." It is true that the Washington taxicab driver has interpreted this to mean, "You ain't seen nothing yet." I have never read this inscription, "What is past is prologue," without pondering the wisdom of its full meaning. It is simply that we must look to the past to get an indication of what the future has in store for us. It is, therefore, important that we remember the history of the guard, for by remembering its history we can gain an impression of its future.

Actually, the National Guard is older than the Nation. It antedates the Revolutionary War and the Constitution. The oldest regiment in the United States is the 182d Infantry of the Massachusetts National Guard, which was organized as a Middlesex County Militia in 1636. Such early patriots as Paul Revere were active members of the Massachusetts Militia, a forerunner of our own National Guard. I think that we should continually reacquaint ourselves with the long evolution through 175 years of our history which has slowly resulted in the general acceptance of the philosophy first expounded by George Washington, that we need on a continuing basis, a relatively small, able, standing regular establishment backed by a militant and trained organization of civilian volunteers.

George Washington recognized the need for the militia. He planned an organization composed of the younger men of the community, who should be properly officered and periodically trained under uniform supervision.

The debates during the Constitutional Convention reflect the widespread fears of large standing armies. The Constitution finally adopted was therefore a compromise in this field. A standing army was provided, but so was a militia. It was to be organized, armed and disciplined (that is to say, trained) by Congress, but, except when in Federal service was to be governed by the States. The President was made Commander in Chief of the Army, and of the militia—but only after it was in the Federal service.

Furthermore, when the Bill of Rights was made a part of the Constitution, the militia was protected by the second amendment, which reads:

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The first militia law was enacted in 1792. It was the only permanent legislation for the militia existing for over a century. Under that law, every ablebodied man between 18 and 45 was enrolled in the militia and required to arm and equip himself at his own expense. In that year, also, the Congress provided by statute for the calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions. It was under this law that the Whiskey Insurrection was quelled by the militia. It was the only campaign in American history to be led by the President in person.

In 1903, the Congress enacted the Dick Act, which organized the militia to be known as the National Guard; and in 1916 the National Defense Act provided the backbone of Federal legislation pertaining to the National Guard.

And so the efforts and faith placed in the National Guard, and our own Louisiana Guard, proved to be invaluable when the end product was tested by fire. The record of the guard in all of the wars of our history—in both world wars, and more recently in the Korean emergency, fills many pages in our Nation's history.

Now speaking of the guard as a whole, I want to remind you that in 1917 the guard furnished 18 divisions to the country, composed of some 380,000 guardsmen who served in that war. They won honors and distinction in every battle. As a matter of fact, the German General Staff recorded for posterity its opinion of allied forces. It rated 8 American divisions superior or excellent, and mark you, 6 of those 8 were guard divisions.

We hardly have to turn back the clock to show the contribution of the National Guard to our victory in World War II. At this time, the guard gave 19 divisions to the country. Ten were in action in the Pacific, 9 were in Europe. Other nondivisional guard units were in service in every major theater of the war.

At the end of World War II, the most important step in the history of the National Guard was taken. The guard was completely demobilized. All enlistments had expired during the war and all equipment had been diverted to Federal use. In fact, there was no National Guard. But this was far from the end of the citizen army. Rather, it was only the beginning. Immediate plans were begun for the formation of the new National Guard—a guard that would carry on the traditions of the service—would be geared to play a more vital role in our national defense. The new guard was given a vital M-day mission of immediate action in case of aggression and was made a first-line integral part of our defense team.

Starting with a personnel list that totaled zero, in a little over 4 years the new National Guard built an organization of more than 400,000 officers and men, in over 5,000 units strategically located in the 48 States, Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

You all know what happened when Korea broke. The President knew where to turn when he needed trained and ready manpower. He called forth the guard and the guard responded as it always has done when the Nation needed help—in war or peace. More than 2,000 units and 150,000 guardsmen were ordered into service and performed a magnificent task.

Thus far, I have only touched on the guard's record of service in war and I would be remiss if I failed to mention its peacetime State service. This 100 percent organization is always ready to give help to fellow citizens when help is most needed. And again, using the past as a basis for an impression of the future—a future which may bring atomic war to our homeland—it is well that we remember the functions of the National Guard at home.

Wherever disaster strikes—wherever life and property are threatened, you will find the National Guard an immediately available force in all of the States—trained, equipped, and ready. Yesterday it may have been an explosion at Texas City—a hurricane in Florida—starving cattle in the Midwest. It may be a flood along the Mississippi, a tornado, a forest fire, or an epidemic. Whatever it is, wherever it occurs, the National Guard is there to help reenforce a levee, to set up emergency communications, to evacuate and care for refugees, to patrol and guard stricken areas.

It is not only for this devastation, caused by man or nature, but because of the possibility of sudden, dreadful atomic warfare brought to our own communities that we must look to the guard in the future. For the guard has the organized manpower, equipment, and facilities for such emergencies. It has the communications, the blankets, tools, medical supplies. It has the aircraft, trucks, boats; it has the tents and all that is necessary to save lives and relieve suffering. The National Guard is always ready to serve.

There have been many attempts to destroy the guard as we know it today. Nearly all of these attempts have been made by attempting to reorganize this citizen volunteer army, and, for all intents and purposes, to make of it the National Guard of the United States, under Federal control. All of these attempts have met with failure, and if this monster rears it ugly head in the future, the Congress must see that any plan which advocates the federalization of the National Guard is defeated.

I will remind you that, among other arguments, there is a moral issue involved here. The framers of the Constitution deliberately subordinated the military to civilian control. The military must serve the people, not be served by the people, and for a very good reason. History is filled with the dangers inherent in building a military monster at the expense of the civilian population. You have but to look to Germany and Japan for the most recent examples of the disasters that befall a nation when military power replaces civilian authority.

And would the creation of a federalized National Guard violate the principle of States rights? I say that it certainly would. The framers of the Constitution contemplated a standing army as the only Federal force. Complete federalization would violate the principle upon which the States bargained when deciding upon the provisions of the Constitution, by giving to the Federal Government, in addition to its standing army, a militia over which the States would have no power or control whatever. Nowhere in the Constitution is there any power given to the Federal Government to do other than raid and support armies—and only standing armies were contemplated. There is no authority to raise and support a Federal militia.

The Governors of each State have the right to commission the officers of the National Guard. They have control over the guard. I recall very definitely during the course of the Congress last year that I stood on the floor of the House and battled the vicious and insidious efforts to completely federalize the guard in time of peace by those more interested in politics than in our national defense. The guard constitutes a citadel of States' rights. It is one of the checks and balances provided by our Constitution to maintain States' rights. It is the one military organization in our country which in time of crisis will be available to prevent military usurpation or military dictatorship, which pray God may never come to this land.

To federalize the guard would place all military power in the Central Government—a mistake made by our friends and neighbors in Central and South America and often resulting in the overthrow of civilian government in those countries.

Last year we met with an early defeat in the Congress when we were battling efforts of selfish interest to expand Federal controls

so as to take over completely our State-controlled National Guard. Later I presented another bill to Congress to provide for our military reserves and our National Guard, and, after terrific efforts, we were victorious, and the National Guard remains today, as it has remained during its 300 years of history, still under State control.

Today America faces an emergency unique in our history. This is not the first time that a potential danger threatens our land; but it is the first time that war could come to our country swiftly and devastatingly by guided missiles and by atomic weapons delivered by jet aircraft.

I want to make myself clearly understood. I do not say that war is imminent; but we cannot overlook the fact that danger exists. This is true because of Russia and of a coalition of armed totalitarian states which continue to create tenseness that maintains the world in a state of uneasy peace. This is true despite the meetings at the summit and Russian smiles and handshakes. It is true despite the release of prisoners by Russia and Red China, the offer of a propaganda peace treaty, the return of a Finnish naval base wrongfully seized and other seemingly peaceful overtures.

Our country has a long history of being misled by such apparently kind actions. In my opinion, we must again look to the past and realize that our natural desire for peace has often closed our eyes to the facts of the present. So long as Russia, Red China, and their satellites continue to trouble the world by propaganda and infiltration—so long as these nations remain armed to the teeth—then free nations have no choice but to look to their own security.

Of course, I don't want to leave the impression that we are without adequate defenses at the present time. Our active forces are the largest we have ever had in times short of actual war. They are in a high state of readiness and are equipped with the latest weapons, but, because we cannot ever know the detailed plans of the Communist dictators, we cannot precisely gage their intentions. It would be folly, therefore, if we overlooked a single area of our defenses which should be strengthened in planning against the possibility of a surprise attack.

During the last 17 years, I have sponsored practically every bit of legislation which has passed our Congress having for its purpose the building up of our military Reserves and our National Guard. I am proud of the fact that almost every one of these bills were introduced by me. The latest measure, of course, was the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which passed the Congress last year after the bitterest battle in the Congress. This bill seeks to provide for far better training and for higher standards for our National Guard and our military Reserves. Enemies of national defense and misguided reformers fought us from all sides. Hardly had the bill been signed by the President before these same forces which had made an all-out effort in the Congress to wreck this legislation, began to proclaim its failure. Within 20 days after the law had gone into effect, I read speeches reported in the press and received letters from people condemning the act because of its inadequacy and saying that it would not work. Recently, I heard a radio address by our own Chief of Staff of the Army, in which he stated the draft would be necessary because of the failure of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 to produce the number desired.

We have heard witnesses before my committee—the Armed Services Committee—in the Congress, testify about our military Reserves and our National Guard as to how this program is working. I placed figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to show how the program is working under the new act—I tell you today that the act is working and that the results thus far have been most encouraging. If the entire act were implemented as of today, I am satisfied the National Guard and the active portion of our Army Reserve would in a short time exceed 700,000 men, and these men, outside of some of the guard members, would have the benefit of active training in the regular establishment followed by an active period of training in the Reserves.

This Nation must have an adequate force of trained civilian manpower. Without it, we will have no organized Reserve strength. Find me a military expert who will seriously argue against the concept of the properly balanced defense forces—land, sea, and air, all with strong citizen volunteer Reserve units, together with a strong supporting economy. You will look in vain.

What we need is a flexible and dynamic program, taking full advantage of our native genius for mechanics, and based on a healthy, expanding economy. This country will never subject its citizens to a subhuman living standard in order to maintain a vast military structure which devours the productive wealth of an entire nation. This is a practice in which the present rulers of Russia and Red China excel. We can answer the threat to our security implied in their enormous military machines by continuing to make our active forces the finest anywhere, and by backing them up with a strong and potent Reserve and National Guard—one that is able to move into action swiftly.

Our Reserve installation program is moving forward nicely at the present time. Several years ago we provided $250 million for the purpose of building armories and air installations for our guard and our Reserves. This money has been expended; and only recently we provided an additional $250 million to continue this program. I am pleased to report to you that the program is now approaching the point that we can soon say it is one-half completed. To provide the matching funds for the States for guard armories and the money needed for the Reserve armories, we will require a total of $1 billion. While we have had some trouble in obtaining the release of some of this money by the executive department after it has been appropriated, I can say that the Congress is enthusiastically behind this program of providing installations for guard and Reserve training.

The Farrington bill to allow certain employees of the National Guard to enter State-operated retirement systems is a good bill and should pass the Congress. It will give retirement advantages to some 24,000 employees of the National Guard throughout the country.

Another measure pending in the Congress is a bill to provide readjustment pay to guard and Reserve officers who have served a time on active duty and who are returned to inactive duty through no fault of their own and without their request. This measure should, in my judgment, be extended to cover enlisted men in the same status. In this event it will provide the needed financial assistance to enable them to readjust themselves in civilian life when their active-duty period is terminated.

And now, let me speak briefly of the history of Louisiana's Militia, now the Louisiana National Guard. This history dates back more than 200 years.

When the first colony of New Orleans in the Province of Louisiana was established by France in 1717, Governor Bienville found it necessary to call upon a local militia to assist the inadequate garrison of French troops required to preserve the peace and security of the colony.

When Napoleon Bonaparte reclaimed Louisiana from Spain in 1803 and then almost immediately sold the vast territory to the United States, it was the militia, called the volunteer battalion and consisting of well over 300 American and French citizen soldiers, which was called upon to take over at New Orleans until the arrival of United States troops. At the Place d'Armes in New Orleans marking the official transfer of Louisiana from France to America, this volunteer battalion stood at attention as the Fleur de Lis of France was replaced by the Stars and Stripes of the United States.

On October 6, 1814, the Governor of Louisiana received from the President of the United States orders to hold in readiness for immediate service a corps of 1,000 militia infantry.

This regiment of 1,000 was divided into 2 battalions which were organized and equipped without delay, and 9 days later Gen. Andrew Jackson asked Governor Claiborne for this entire force.

In the memorable Battle of New Orleans in 1815 the forces of Jean Lafitte and his pirates joined with the Regulars and the militia in routing the British.

A regiment of Louisiana Militia Infantry was among those units participating with General Taylor's forces in Texas in 1846, which action finally drove all the Mexican forces out of the Lone Star State.

At the beginning of the War Between the States, newly organized units of the Louisiana Militia were soon on the field of battle. The units of the Louisiana Militia have gone down in history. Do you remember these? The Washington Artillery, Louisiana Grays, Louisiana Cadets, Sarsfield Rifles, Orleans Cadets, Crescent Rifles, and the Zouaves to name only a few.

Many of these famed companies such as the Washington Artillery fought with honor and distinction from Bull Run in 1861 to Appomatox in 1865.

Upon the declaration of war with Spain in 1898, Louisiana Militia units were among the first to respond to President McKinley's call for volunteers.

Following the war with Spain, the Louisiana Militia was reorganized and largely as a result of excellent training and equipment received thereafter the Louisiana Guard was among the first called upon when President Wilson called General Pershing to command a punitive expedition on the Mexican border against Pancho Villa.

Even before the declaration of hostilities in World War I, the Louisiana National Guard went into action. The Washington Artillery was called out a week before the declaration of war to patrol both facilities and the levees at New Orleans.

Troops of the Louisiana National Guard thereafter served in eight major campaigns in France from Luneville to the Meuse-Argonne.

Again in World War II, the Louisiana National Guard responded to a call to duty and its units served with distinction in both Europe and the Pacific.

What was once considered to be our favorable geographic location now has become meaningless. Today, distance between potential enemies has literally been annihilated. Ocean barriers and distance vanished as protective factors with the arrival of the intercontinental jet bomber. Today war could come to us unannounced, traveling on the wings of supersonic speed. If such a war ever does come upon us, we will be courting disaster if we cannot mobilize effectively and relatively smoothly. In the shock of such a conflict, we would not have time for picking and choosing our way to readiness. We must be as close to 100 percent ready as we can get—without being on a full wartime footage.

In terms of today, we require a clear understanding, once and for all, that we shall never again have an opportunity to take our time in mobilizing. Time may well become the key to this Nation's survival. Both our manpower and our industrial power must be geared to this fact. As the first line

of national defense, the National Guard must be supported by all of our efforts. We must make sufficient appropriations available so it will not lack in equipment or facilities. And as I have said, we must continue with our education of the American youth so that volunteers for the Guard will not be wanting.

When I come back to my home State and meet with the members of the Louisiana Nation Guard, when I travel to other parts of the country and visit with other National Guard members and, above all, when I recall the glorious history of the National Guard, I have no fear for the future of America. What is past is prologue.

California's Opposition to Upper Colorado Boondoggle Based on Protection of Her Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water. Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the upper Colorado Basin storage project is built as now planned.

Imagine a canal wide enough and deep enough to float the world's biggest ship, the Navy's new aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Imagine that canal stretching from New York City to Los Angeles. During just 1 year, enough of the Colorado River's water to fill it could be stopped from flowing downstream at the project's gigantic Glen Canyon Dam.

That is water that could not be used by southern California, Arizona, and Nevada because it would be withheld upstream and never reach them.

All this is true because the multibillion-dollar project is designed to put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet of water would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage. The bill before this Congress seeks to authorize a substantial portion of the overall project. Authorization of additional phases would be sought later.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that most of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these seven States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the storage project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these existing rights, California carefully invested between one-half and three-quarter billion dollars of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to another part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

That is why Californians in Congress are fighting so hard to prevent spending billions from the United States Treasury to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

The reason they have failed so far to do it is clear. To find a common ground for agreement amongst themselves, each of the upper basin States had to accept every project, good, bad, or indifferent, any of the others asked for. They ended up with a monstrosity that did not fit the interpretations and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Rather than recede, they adopted a technique of twisting, straining, and distorting the compact in an attempt to stretch it over the monstrosity.

The reason they have adopted this technique is not so clear. To understand it requires some knowledge of the Colorado River compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California already had begun its miraculous expansion in population, agriculture, and industry. A water shortage was faced, and Los Angeles began reaching up into the Owens Valley for water to be transported through an aqueduct over 100 miles long. Even then, men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the Owens Valley and began talk of more ambitious plans. Plans which one day would result in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the Metropolitan Water District's vast Colorado River aqueduct with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

Meanwhile the upper-basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States foresaw burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves.

In this circumstance, according to the language of Delph Carpenter, Colorado's negotiator of the compact:

> The upper States had but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower States until the uses within the upper States have reached their maximum.

And that exactly is what they did. The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizing Hoover Dam was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper-basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact, which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by them; and

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

The net effect was to place on California a limit of slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water per year that she could use. Thus limited, the State had to jettison many desirable projects. Nevertheless, California went to work and tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of the great dreamed-of projects built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificance to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

Red Antarctic Claims Feared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent news item appearing in the Washington (D. C.) News points up the need for the United States to protect its interests in the Antarctic. Other nations have claimed portions of it although we have done more exploratory work there

than all of those countries put together. The news item follows:

RED ANTARCTIC CLAIMS FEARED

LONDON, February 7.—Radio Moscow announcements today of new Soviet advances in Antarctica stirred added concern in some circles here over British claims in the South Polar region.

Dr. C. H. M. Waldock, professor of public international law at Oxford University, yesterday urged Britain to emphatically stake out her claims in the Antarctic before Russia takes over. Prof. Waldock voiced his warning in a letter to the Times in which he disagreed with a Soviet claim that Russian explorers discovered Antarctica and with a Times editorial that hinted the Soviet has undoubtedly strong claims there.

Moscow, meantime, announced members of the Soviet expedition have visited one of the largest oasis of the eastern Antarctic. It said the oasis covered an area of "about 500 square kilometers on Queen Mary Land and was first discovered in 1948 by an aviator of the United States expedition led by Rear Adm. Richard Byrd."

Professor Waldock's warning followed a dispatch written for the United Press by Mikhail M. Somov, leader of the Soviet expedition, in which he said "all interested countries should be invited to discuss the territorial regime of any area of international significance." Professor Waldock said Britain should maintain its claims with absolute distinctness.

Reserve Building Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present herewith an editorial taken from the Air Force Times of February 25, 1956, entitled "Reserve Building Lag." I commend this to my colleagues for reading.

RESERVE BUILDING LAG

Contrary to earlier Defense Department predictions, the Air Force Reserve construction program is going to be hurting when this fiscal year ends. Of $31.5 million appropriated by Congress for Reserve facilities, only about $6 million will have been apportioned by June 30—80 percent of the planned construction sidetracked.

This means that 25 nonflying training centers are out altogether and that improvements can be made at only 11 flying installations where originally planned at 18. This is possible because Air Force Reserve construction people channeled all of the $6 million into flying units, but it's still far short of the $25 million originally earmarked for flying centers.

Blame for the snarl—if it can be called blame—falls at the feet of the Air Force's first things first policy. In striving to meet its 137-wing goal, headquarters weighs spending a given amount for, say, a runway extension at Thule or a Reserve training center at Waukegan. Invariably the nod goes to Thule. And every high Reserve official agrees it has to be this way.

Pity is that the squeeze is damaging the Reserve just when the Defense Department wants the Air Force to swallow unpalatable provisions of the Reserve Forces Act. Air Force Reserve unit commanders find it easier, according to Pentagon spokesmen, to fill their recruiting quotas when they have a presentable place to let a recruit hang his hat. As long as they can man their units, USAF can get along without Air Force Reserve, but this may be difficult without good facilities.

This whole business is possible because the Reserve, unlike the Air National Guard, draws its money from a lump sum USAF budget.

Congress alone has the tools to get Reserve construction back on the track. It could do this by giving the Air Force enough money to meet its regular obligations while at the same time sustaining its Reserve program. In view of the mounting defense load carried by the Reserve and the awesome job that would fall to it in an emergency, it seems at least to warrant the necessary facilities.

Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles will soon visit south Asia. During his visit, Mr. Dulles will no doubt be placed under great pressure by Prime Minister Nehru, of India, to agree to a conference with the Chinese Communists. Nothing could be more tragic to the cause of the free world than such a meeting. The conference at the summit last year was a mistake, as far as the United States and the West were concerned. I am confident that, having learned from this mistake, the United States will not repeat its error by succumbing to the platitudes of Nehru and Menon. A meeting with the Chinese Communists could only lend respectability to their illegitimate regime, and the United States must assume the leadership in defeating the efforts of these international brigands to gain such respectability. It is time that we faced the fact that we are already up to our ears in a war for men's minds and men's hearts. It is a war to the death, and there will be no end until one side is the victor and the other side is the vanquished. Once having realized this, we should yield not one single inch politically, geographically, normally, or otherwise, and there is no better time and no better way to convince the world that we mean business than by telling Nehru and Menon now that we intend never to sit down with the Chinese Communists. Mr. Dulles should do this on his trip to Asia, and when he uses the word "never" he should underline it and follow it with an exclamation point.

Under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the February 23 edition of the Washington Evening Star. This article speaks of the difficulties which will confront our Secretary of State on his visit to India, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. I hope that Mr. Dulles will go to India with his eyes open and that he will remember that this is the same Nehru who, in bidding Khrushchev and Bulganin farewell after their recent visit to his country, declared with a note of emotion in his voice:

An entire generation will remember your visit. Please come back again. We will expectantly await you.

The article follows:

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles will be leaving again shortly for what may well be a crucial visit to the hot spots of southeast Asia. In connection with the formal SEATO Conference, Dulles will stop off to call on the political leaders of the nations in the critical area of Communist imperialism's immediate target. But the Secretary's most important call, by far, will be in New Delhi, where he expects to have extended conversations with Prime Minister Nehru and the No. 2 man in the Indian Government, V. K. Krishna Menon.

Indications are that the wily Nehru will let his chief deputy and favorite counselor do most of the hard talking in the course of the visit. Nehru knows that India occupies the key position in the cockpit of southeast Asia, and he knows further that Krishna Menon is the man to exploit that fact to the hilt in any bargaining with Dulles, who will, of course, be in New Delhi with a mission of prime importance to the United States and to the entire free world.

Krishna Menon, of course, has made no secret of his attitudes in the course of the cold war. He is a neutralist of a decided pink tint. He follows the broad outlines of Nehru's policy of keeping India out of the warring camps on either side, refusing to become identified in any way with the national groupings behind the Iron Curtain or with the nations allied with the West in the fight for the survival of freedom. But, as is the case with so many of these so-called "neutralists," Krishna Menon's pronouncements on important matters of world politics sound consistently sweet to the Kremlin's ears and increasingly discouraging to the West.

In the New Delhi talks, Krishna Menon will have as his chief objective the convincing of Dulles that face-to-face talks with Chinese Red Premier Chou En-lai are of the utmost importance. This will be no easy task, and the Indian diplomat knows it full well. But he is not to be easily discouraged, because he is fully aware of the critical importance of southeast Asia in the growing world struggle. He will put the matter suavely but no less bluntly to the American Secretary of State: Do you want the chance, at least, to secure the friendship and the friendly neutrality of the Asian peoples, or do you prefer to throw it away because Chiang Kai-shek and the American politicians friendly to Nationalist China insist on nonrecognition and hostility to Communist China?

On a basis of pure principle, of course, Mr. Dulles will not even contemplate yielding any major concession to Red China in the form of American recognition, or American acquiescence in the admitting of Red China to the United Nations. But unwilling as he most certainly is at the present time to sit down across the table from the leader of aggression from Peiping, the possibility certainly exists that he may be constrained to some such agreement if the stakes are high enough.

And whether any possible talks with Chou En-lai could produce any concrete results, the fact remains that the mere holding of the talks would represent a major victory for Red diplomacy in the eyes of the world. That much victory alone would probably be sufficient for Communist China's plans to attack Formosa. For if Peiping can point to the actual holding of talks between Chou and Dulles, and the failure of the talks to produce any worthwhile results, then the stage would be set for aggression on the Na-

tionalist strongholds while the blame for the adoption of forceful methods would be laid squarely at the doorstep of the United States. No matter how false and hollow sounding such communist propaganda will be to the West, it will sound reasonable to the peoples of southeast Asia, who are suspicious still of Western motives because the West has been the defender of colonialism.

Dulles will have need for all his powers of resistance and all his devotion to principle rather than expediency when he talks with Krishna Menon. The pressure for a talk with Chou will undoubtedly be overwhelmingly strong, in America as well as abroad. But the talks would be a grave mistake for the West, a great triumph for the Reds, and an almost certain guaranty of disaster for Formosa if not for all of southeast Asia in time.

A Strong Army Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a very excellent address delivered by a great soldier, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, before a National Defense Week luncheon at the Skirvin Hotel, Oklahoma City, Okla., on Thursday, February 16, 1956. The general's talk was carried by press and radio to every corner of America, but I think we would all like to have a full opportunity to read his remarks:

NATIONAL NECESSITY: A STRONG ARMY RESERVE

Gentlemen, I was very happy to accept the invitation to come to Oklahoma City and address the Reserve Officers' Association on the occasion of National Defense Week. Oklahoma and Oklahoma City have a rather special place in my affection, first, because my parents are longtime residents of the city, and, second, because Oklahoma is the home of the 45th Infantry Division, which it was my honor to command in Korea. It just happens that the officer whom I have chosen to head the Reserve activities of the Army General Staff in Washington, Maj. Gen. Philip D. Ginder, is a former commander of the 45th Division. Ginder was famous for the way he decorated the hillsides of Korea with the famous Thunderbird symbol of the 45th. He even had the cookies served at his division mess cut in the outline of a Thunderbird. The qualities of enthusiasm, initiative, and leadership which I saw him display at the head of this division led me to select him to lead this most important Reserve program.

I always remember one device of the 45th Division which characterizes the ingenuity of American soldiers. In the mountainous sector occupied by the division the Chinese Communists in many places had burrowed their way into the hillsides within a few yards of our own trenches. They did so to obtain some protection from the powerful artillery fire which we could mass upon them. Close as they were to our own positions on the very sharp slopes of the hillsides, they were a very difficult target for our usual weapons. So the 45th looked for the unusual.

Under General Ginder's guidance, a depth-charge launcher was borrowed from the Navy, and hoisted painfully and laboriously up to the division's front positions. Then the men assembled a large quantity of pot-bellied stoves of the kind used to heat their tents behind the lines. They filled these with napalm and inserted in each of them a simple firing device. Then they placed the pot-bellied stoves with their napalm contents in the depth-charge launchers, and proceeded to lob these cans down the hillside into the Chinese positions. On impact they exploded and poured out napalm like flaming lava in an operation known as Ginderizing the enemy. I sincerely hope that we will be equally successful in "Ginderizing" all obstacles to the progress of our Army Reserve program.

I am often asked as I go about the country why the Army needs Reserves. And it is a thoroughly legitimate question. Before undertaking to answer it, however, we must really answer a more fundamental question, namely, how does the Army contribute to national defense?

I would say that in national defense the role of the Army is, like that of the other services, to deter war—to prevent war from happening—both large war, general war, or the smaller so-called brush-fire type. However, if deterrence fails and the country is forced into war, then the Army must make its contribution, as part of the great defense team, to winning that war.

It may be asked, What can the Army do to contribute to the deterrence of war? How does one go about deterring war?

I would reply that the Army contributes to the deterrence of war by visible evidence of its readiness to fight any kind of war, large ones or small ones, with or without atomic weapons. The enemy must see clearly that if he engages in new aggression, he will be met quickly and decisively by Army men on the ground, standing between him and the objective of his aggression. This readiness must be the real thing; it cannot be a sham or a facade of strength. It must embrace not only the active Army—the so-called Regular Army—but the National Guard and the Reserves as well. It is the strength of the Reserves which will determine our ability to react quickly and to wage war over the long pull.

I said that if our efforts to deter war are in vain, then the Army must be ready to play its part in winning the war. In case of future hostilities the Army will immediately be involved in defending vital areas—the task of our units presently deployed overseas. As you know, we have an Army of five divisions deployed along the Iron Curtain in Europe. We have a corps of two divisions—the American part of the great Eighth Army—similarly deployed along the Bamboo Curtain in Korea, separated by only 4,000 yards from a formidable Communist army. These forces must be, and are, instantly ready to resist any aggressive act on the part of the Communists in the important areas where they stand guard .

If these forces are attacked, obviously we must come to their aid promptly and quickly. We must have behind them ready forces of the active Army, trained Reserve units, and trained individual reservists, whom we can send rapidly overseas to reinforce our deployed units and to replace the losses which they suffer in combat. In this operation, time is of the essence. We are no longer in an era when the United States can deliberately develop its Reserve Forces during wartime. You will recall that World War I broke out in 1914, and although we had the warning of imminent hostilities long before our declaration of war on April 6, 1917, we had only 200,000 men in our Regular Army in 1917 to support a conflict which ultimately required 4 million men. It took more than a year thereafter to get a force of five divisions to Europe, ready to fight. Specifically, it took us 13 months to get to Europe a force equivalent in numerical strength to the one which we now have deployed in that area.

In that World War I period, we were slow not only in developing our military units, but in producing the equipment necessary to support them in action. I would remind you that throughout most of that war our divisions had to be supported by French Army artillery, and, indeed, we never used in Europe a single artillery piece produced in the United States.

Similarly, in World War II, we had ample warning of involvement, yet we were equally improvident. In 1939, there were only 190,000 Army regulars in uniform for a war eventually requiring 10,400,000 men and women.

Yet in spite of our unpreparedness, circumstances twice permitted the United States the luxury of arming deliberately behind the protection of allied forces. That pattern of reaction is no longer possible in the world in which we live today. Our reaction must be far faster, if we are to avoid losing the next contest, during the early decisive phase. It is for this reason that we stress so much the need for more and better Reserve forces. Let me remind you of the fundamental time factors in developing Army strength.

It takes 4 months of basic training to equip an individual soldier with the bare essential knowledge to warrant his commitment to combat. Such a soldier is basically trained only in the fundamentals of his profession. If he is to be a technician or engaged in more advanced forms of military activity, he will require considerably more individual training before he can be of service. Thereafter, the individual trained soldier must be amalgamated into the team in which he works. In the case of the combat man, this team is the squad, the platoon, the company, or battery. In order to make that team work together and perform all the functions necessary to survive on the modern battlefield, a minimum of 2 months of additional training is required. But beyond this small unit training the company must eventually learn its part in the battalion, the battalion in the regiment, and the regiment in the division. All of these teams of increasing size must have time to practice, so to speak, before they can be safely committeed to action. About 3 months is the minimum additional time necessary for this kind of large-unit training. When we add up the 4 months for the individual, the 2 months for the small unit and 3 months for the large unit, we find we need a total of 9 continuous months to train these large tactical elements of a modern Army.

The role of the Reserves is to make possible the telescoping of some or all of these training phases. At a minimum we want individual soldiers in the Reserves who have had their basic training, so that the initial 4 months can be saved in time of mobilization. We would like, in addition, to have a large number of trained smaller units—company-size units—for which most of the 2 months training has been accomplished. These small units will be most important in filling the chinks in the troop structure of the Active Army and in providing logistical and combat-type support to National Guard units which may be deployed early in an emergency. Ultimately we would like Reserve divisions which have completed all or part of their training so that with a few months of refresher training it would be possible to deploy them faster than would be possible for divisions mobilized after D-day.

In summary, we need trained individuals, trained small units, and trained large units. All have an important part to play in compressing the time in which America can react to aggression. We have a long way to go in developing this ability to react quickly. Never in our history have we been able to

maintain Reserve forces which gave more than a slight time advantage over the creation of completely new units. Recently, however, our Congress took very significant action in the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of August 1955. I will not go over all the provisions of this act, which is somewhat involved and requires close study to understand all of its provisions. Furthermore I would not say that it is the ideal law. Indeed, it varies rather widely from the one proposed by the Department of Defense. However, it is a definite step forward, and we are very grateful to the Congress for having given us this act in its present form.

The purpose of the act is to increase eventually the size of the Army Ready Reserve to 1,600,000 men, mainly organized into trained units. As a part of this strengthening process, the Army is striving to obtain a hundred thousand predraft age young men into active training within the first year following its implementation.

Although only a brief period has elapsed since the act became law, the Army has taken positive and aggressive action down to the lowest echelon of command to insure that every benefit will be realized from this legislation. Within 10 days after the passage of the act, personnel were being enlisted in the Army. In less than 2 months, training was being conducted. Within a few days after the issuance of the Executive order, a nationwide publicity program was set in motion by the Army. Although, frankly, we are not obtaining volunteers at the rate at which we require them, I am much encouraged by a recent upswing in volunteering, 1,000 a week for 3 weeks.

I mentioned the speed with which the Army initiated training under this act. We now have a 6 months' training plan which is in effect. The Army insisted on the highest standards of training, housing, and welfare for the young men reporting for training under this act. The enthusiasm of the Army trainer personnel and the high morale of the trainees attest to the success of this phase of the program.

This new Reserve Act also provides the Army with a means for utilizing the full capacity of the Reserve Officer Training Corps. The class of 1955 produced some 4,100 lieutenants in excess of the needs for the Active Army. The new Reserve program provides ready employment for the lieutenants who are now assigned directly to the Ready Reserve for 6 months' active-duty training. We are now in a position to accept unlimited numbers of Reserve officers, hoping that we will eventually reach our full mobilization requirement for this very valuable individual, the ROTC graduate.

The Army has a strong sense of responsibility toward the Army Reserve units which will receive individuals trained under the new Reserve Act. I recognize that many of these units are in dire need of better training facilities within their hometown areas. We are trying to secure new facilities and we are making some progress. For example, we have authorized construction so far this fiscal year of over 50 training centers. We are planning over 200 projects for the next fiscal year. The actual construction of these installations is subject to the availability of funds and suitable sites.

There are essentially two aspects to this problem of strengthening the Reserve. First, the recruitment of an adequate number of individuals into units, and second, the conduct of effective unit training. These individuals, from our 6-month training period as well as those veterans returning from the active service with an obligation to participate in Reserve training, will be excellent potential for incorporation into our Reserve units. But they must receive effective training in these units. They will know their business, and they will insist upon realistic and profitable training. All of us who have a share in the responsibility for the Reserve program must, starting today, intensify the emphasis upon effective training. If we do not maintain a high standard of training in our Reserve units, the individual enthusiasm brought to the unit by the trained individual will be lost, and the success of the entire program will be jeopardized. I know the problem of the Reserve officer commanders of these units and the difficulty of reconciling the obligations of their civilian professions with the requirements of their military unit. I have the highest admiration for those individuals who succeed in reconciling these requirements which oft-times are conflicting. I want the Active Army to render all forms of assistance possible to assure that our Reserve units are improving not only in numbers, but in the quality of training and in overall combat-readiness.

In my talk today I have not mentioned the National Guard, primarily because of the nature of my audience. Although their legal status is different, the National Guard and the Reserves together form an indispensable team in providing the Reserve strength so necessary for our military posture. I view them both with an impartial eye, considering that the needs of both must be met if we are to develop our necessary Reserve strength. I find that the guard is in the best condition that I have ever known it. It is presently at its highest strength in our peacetime history, and is contributing directly to the Army mission in providing antiaircraft units to man sites near some of the Nation's most critical industrial and population areas. In so doing, the guard serves to economize on our requirements for military strength by relieving Active Army battalions for use elsewhere.

In closing, let me thank the Reserve Officers Association for sponsoring National Defense Week, a project which is both significant and timely. It should be an occasion for all of our citizens to take a good look at the Army, both Active and Reserve, to verify that it is ready to discharge its important role in national defense. I have often said that the Army will be no better than the Nation insists that it be. It reflects the interest and understanding with which our citizens view the Military Establishment. I only hope that you will recognize the indispensable contribution which the Army makes to your security today, and then insist that it receive all the means necessary to do its job well. There is no place for a second-class army in the world of tension in which we now live. The interest of the citizens of Oklahoma will be the surest guaranty that the Army performs up to the high level of the national interest and the requirements of our security.

Thank you.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

National Defense Strengthened by Research and Development at Great Air Center in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center located in Coffee and Franklin Counties, in the district which I have the honor to represent, is daily contributing major achievements in the technical field of aviation directed toward the defense of our Nation.

This great air engineering and testing center is of major importance in the atomic age in which we live. Because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of an article by Mr. Roy Calvin, appearing in magazine Business Week, issue of February 18, last, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

IT'S HOMETOWN FOR COSMOPOLITES

The people who appear in the pictures on these pages are behaving normally in one of the least normal small towns in all of the United States today, Tullahoma, Tenn.

It is not that the town, physically, is so different; apart from the massive wind tunnels that are its distinguishing landmark, much of it is carbon-copied from the thousands of small cities and towns that dot the southern landscape. But its people are unusual, startlingly so.

Consider two of them. Ronald Smelt and Edmund Stollenwerk, who now play chess together, were enemies little more than 10 years ago. Stollenwerk, a German, had designed a supersonic wind tunnel that sped the perfection of the Nazis' V–2 rocket. Smelt, a British intelligence officer, had the job of ferreting out the V–2 center. Ultimately, intelligence pinpointed it, at Peenemunde on the Baltic, and British bombers blasted it. Among the Germans who escaped was Stollenwerk.

Today Stollenwerk and Smelt, both of whom rank among the world's foremost wind tunnel experts, who side by side in Tullahoma. They and many like them, a cosmopolitan group of scientists, engineers, and technicians, have settled fondly into a new way of small-town living in the highlands of middle Tennessee. And in the process, they have changed both Tullahoma and themselves.

When the Air Force in 1949 finally settled on Tullahoma as the site for its new supersonic wind tunnel laboratories, it still had decided qualms about the place. Success of the project was, and is, vital in the race for air supremacy, and that success depends in large measure on the well-being and happiness of the project's people.

The 1949 question was: Can they be happy in a small town, away from the centers of learning and far distant from big city lights? The 1956 answer is: They can be—and are.

For its part, Tullahoma is happy, too. It is experiencing a steady growth and a healthy prosperity that must rank as a boom, although it is nothing like a grim World War II boom that gave the town, justly or not, a black eye. That was when Tullahoma, with a resident population of about 4,000, was often host to as many as 170,000 Army troops spread over the adjacent countryside.

First, there was Camp Forrest, an infantry training center. Then the Second Army made Tullahoma the railhead for extensive maneuvers in the mid-Tennessee highlands.

A decade later, the facts about Camp Forrest days are in controversy. Indisputably, they were lush ones for business of almost any kind, but old Tullahomans want to fight at any suggestion that there was wholesale gouging of troops.

Be that as it may, Tullahoma's new boom is different in every respect—not the least important of which is that the people who are causing it and the people benefiting from it have formed a solid society of mutual admiration.

I. THE NEW TULLAHOMANS

Americans largely outnumber the Britons, Germans, and other foreigners attached to the Tullahoma project, known formerly as the Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), in honor of the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold.

But Smelt and Stollenwerk, because of their foreign backgrounds, have seen perhaps as clearly as anyone the problems of transition undergone by the "new Tullahomans." In the aggregate, it has amounted to transplanting a bunch of big city people into a small country town. In many cases, family roots were planted reluctantly in Tullahoma. But once down, they have flourished.

Take Stollenwerk's story. He came to the United States in 1946 to work in Washington at the hush-hush Naval Ordnance Laboratory. It was there, in 1948, that he first met Smelt, his wartime adversary, newly arrived to join the NOL staff.

Domestic protest: Eventually both moved to St. Louis, where the engineering firm of Sverdrup & Parcel was designing technical facilities for what was to become the AEDC. One of the units, known as the gas dynamics facility, is an improved version of the Peenemunde wind tunnel. Smelt is the chief of this facility, which simulates conditions of flight at five times the speed of sound; Stollenwerk is his right-hand man. But at first the German had trouble getting to Tullahoma.

"Naturally, I wanted to get into this project," he says. "But my wife—well, she didn't like the idea. She told me pointblank one day that if I ever moved to Tullahoma it would break up our marirage."

Then President Harry S. Truman dedicated the Tullahoma project on a blistering summer's day in 1951. Not long afterward Stollenwerk moved his still-protesting wife and daughter to Tennessee.

"There's something about this place that gets you; it got my wife. Within 2 years she was insisting that we build a house."

Digging in: The Stollenwerks, by now naturalized United States citizens, are well settled in their new home, a handsome rambler on a big wooded lot in Oak Park, a new subdivision of $18,000 to $30,000 homes.

The Smelts, too, are new citizens of the United States—and Tullahoma lovers. Smelt, a tall, sandy-haired man, whose British accent is still strong, has a theory about what has happened.

"The impact is greatest on the women. After all, this is an international business that Ed and I are in. The problems are the same here, in London, or Washington. My wife and I have lived in London, Washington, and St. Louis. And I must say that this is the first place my wife has been really happy in.

"It's fairly simple—she sees friends, instead of merely thousands of blank faces on the streets."

Stollenwerk leans forward intently and interposes, "In Tullahoma, we know them all—including their dogs."

Smelt bought and remodeled an old farm house. There, he tinkers hour after hour with a barnful of electronic gadgets. At the moment, he's working on an electric organ "which, I hope, will successfully embody some new concepts."

Smelt's wife, Marie, has organized a woman's choral group of 16 fine voices—in which old and new Tullahomans alike are members. It is in frequent demand for concert and radio shows, and recently appeared on a Tennessee television program.

The bait ignored: Like a lot of their fellows, either Smelt or Stollenwerk could go to other important jobs elsewhere. Since New Year's, Smelt has turned down an offer to head a missile project in Detroit at $30,000 a year.

A Midwesterner who has lived "all over," Harvy M. Cook has settled in Tullahoma as supervisor of operations in another AEDC unit, the "engine test facility." Within the past month, he turned down three job offers—all at higher pay. In one, he could have been project engineer on a $40 million test facility. In all of them, he would have had to move to a big city.

Cook, an Annapolis graduate who bears numerous scars from Pacific combat in World War II, chooses the quiet Tennessee town because "you can live for living."

Relaxed living in Tullahoma means just about anything but a gay evening of nightclubbing. It can mean television at home, a quiet game of penny ante poker with friends, or mere visiting for the sake of talking. Or, as with Smelt, it can mean an occasional "gramophone concert" in which a few friends are invited in to drink tea and listen to music.

It means no traffic jams going to or from work; no parking problems in town, even on Saturdays. Haircuts cost 75 cents; 1 penny buys 12 minutes of parking time, and if you get a ticket it costs only 25 cents.

For $100 initiation and $40 annual dues, it means privileges of a new golf and country club with a small, but swank, clubhouse. And the countryside abounds with State-administered hunting preserves and lakes where the fishing is almost always good.

And, for almost any of the women who want such service, living in Tullahoma means at least a part-time maid.

II. A CHANGING TOWN

Tullahoma's population was 7,500 when the 1950 census was taken, and that figure was swollen by many newcomers who had arrived to work on the wind-tunnel project. Mayor Jack Farrar, a doctor by profession, figures it now at 15,000, give or take a few. It's still growing.

Statistics help a little to explain what's happened. They show, for example, that 1,214 new home building permits have been issued since 1949, that 20 miles of new water mains have been added, that 2 new public-school buildings have been finished—1 elementary, 1 junior high—with a new high school yet to come.

But they don't show that a prime reason for this permanent growth is an experiment in operating procedure. AEDC is an Air Force installation, but it has only a nominal Air Force staff. The project is operated by a private contractor, ARO, Inc., which employs civilians and pays wages competitive with those offered by the aeronautical industry.

Development: This has meant big city salaries in a small town. It has also meant that ARO's employees have been permanent type residents—stable and well-educated people wanting good homes and schools and willing to take a hand in community life.

The statistics also will show that John W. Harton, Sr., has developed or is developing six new subdivisions. But they don't show that the land isn't much good for anything else, that Harton was "land poor" for many years while holding on, confident that something would happen. When that something—the project—did happen, Harton had a big hand in causing it; he was once a Democratic power in middle Tennessee and a close friend of ex-Senator K. D. McKellar, who spun the necessary wheels in Washington. Now, Harton, is "Mr. Tullahoma" and is finally "land rich" as he nears age 73.

Local industry: The town sits high on flat terrain of the Cumberland Mountin rim, about midway between Nashville (75 miles to the northwest) and Chattanooga (80 miles to the southeast).

The land is poor for farming, and Tullahoma's prosperity—aside from the fantastic war years—had depended on small industry producing such diverse items as baseballs, golf clubs, overalls, bedspreads, cheese, leather jackets, gloves, and shoes.

In 1955, local industry paid about $5.6 million to 2,700 employees; at the same time, the wind-tunnel project paid about $16 million to its 3,500. (An estimated 60 percent, or about $10 million, of that payroll went to families living in Tullahoma; the remaining 40 percent of the project's employees live elsewhere within a 35-mile radius, a large number of them in two small towns—Manchester and Winchester.)

The obvious disparity in wage scales could have caused trouble, but it has not. AEDC and the local industries are not competitive in the labor market, except for clerical and stenographic help. There, the project wins hands down. It offers girl beginners about $3,000, against an average of less than $2,000 in the town.

III. THE OLD TULLAHOMANS

There was shouting in the streets of Tullahoma on November 9, 1949, when word came from Washington that the wind-tunnel project site had been chosen. Citizens rolled out the town's two firetrucks with sirens at full blast to join a motorcade of honking automobiles that rolled through the streets.

But not everybody shouted. One who didn't was Lee Soesbe, operator of a tannery and leather jacket manufacturing plant.

"Some of us stopped and asked, 'What's all the shouting about?' We thought this might hurt us, especially for labor," Soesbe remembers. It hasn't, and now Soesbe preaches that AEDC is a good thing for the town of Tullahoma.

An accounting: Ben H. Wilkins, a veteran of both wars and a native Tullahoman who manufactures Bulls Eye overalls in what he calls my britches factory, sat down recently to contemplate the changes.

One of the new people is on the town's board of aldermen, another is on the school board. The new Tullahomans have sparked—always sharing membership with the townspeople—diverse groups, including a community playhouse that has staged four productions in little more than a year. They have, through a lively junior chamber of commerce, pressured the aldermen into building Tullahoma's first public swimming pool. They have swelled church memberships and touched off expansion plans: indeed, the Catholic community—now about 150 families where there were only 5 before—has built a new $135,000 church and school.

Better schools: What does Wilkins think of this? It's good—and "the best thing is the big expansion and improvement of our school system."

This becomes a remarkable statement only when you understand that Wilkins, in middle age, has no children; he is one of the town's wealthiest citizens and owns extensive properties that must be taxed to pay for such improvement; and his overall business does not benefit directly from the project's presence.

"And most of us think it's a good thing to have different people, solid people like these, taking part in our community life," Wilkins says. "My daddy was chamber of commerce president for years and years; later on, I was president. It seems like before it was always the same people just changing chairs in civil affairs."

Humid Land Reclamation Will Be Greatly More Expensive Than Upper Colorado Reclamation Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that lands in the South, East, and Midwest may be reclaimed for a fraction of the cost of those in the West. The estimated total potential acreage of these lands is 21 million acres.

These lands would be cleared and leveled at costs up to $150 per acre. Most of the areas would have to be drained after major flood-control works had been built. On many of these areas the soils are shallow and infertile from centuries of leaching by heavy rains. To secure and maintain production from these lands heavy applications of fertilizer must be applied annually. These costs may be from $40 to $60 per acre.

Assuming a $200 per acre cost for reclaiming and a $50 per year cost of fertilizer, the equivalent cost per acre obtained by capitalizing the cost of fertilizer at 4 percent would be $1,250 plus $200 equals $1,450 per acre. In other words $700 per acre to reclaim Western lands with an annual water charge of $5 per acre would equal an equivalent cost of $825 as compared to $1,450 per acre that would have to be invested to secure production from the timber and wet lands of the East, South, and Midwest.

Furthermore, except for special areas the cropping pattern would be limited to a few crops which are now in surplus, while an acreage under the Colorado project would not be devoted to basic crops under surpluses.

If the reclamation of these unused and humid lands is profitable, one wonders why they have not been brought under cultivation long before this time.

Rundown on Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following editorial from the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal of February 20, 1956, entitled "Rundown on Roads":

RUNDOWN ON ROADS

Despite differences on details of financing, estimates of revenues, and the like, the administration and the Democratic leadership of Congress agree on the need to complete a 40,000-mile interstate highway system. While the House Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings on the (Boggs) highway revenue bill of 1956, designed to pay for the roads, the past, present, and future of the program shape up like this:

The President's (Clay) Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program on January 11, 1955, advocated a 10-year program to satisfy the traffic needs of the next 20 to 30 years. The overall program would cost $101 billion. The Federal Government would boost its road spending by $25 billion, to $31¼ billion.

Of the 40,000 miles of interstate system, 37,600 miles already had been designated for construction or improvement. The Federal Government's share was to be financed by bond issues of a Federal Highway Corporation.

The President on February 22 sent a special message to Congress embodying the general recommendations of the Clay report, including the bond-issue financing. This plan, with its provision that the new securities were not to be part of the regular public debt, had already drawn the fire of the Democrats.

The Senate turned down the administration bill, 60 to 31, on May 25. It then approved a highway bill providing for $12.6 billion in road spending, to come from general tax revenues.

The House in July successively voted down (1) a highway building program with no provision for meeting the cost, (2) the administration plan, and (3) a Democratic pay as you go plan for financing through taxes.

This year the Democratic program embraces two road bills. One calls for outlays of $25 billion over a period of 13 years for the interstate highway program, plus $9 billion in regular Federal aid for normal building. This is in line with the Clay report and administration recommendations. And the bill enhances the chance of passage of the superhighway program by combining it with the regular road appropriation, which would have to be renewed this year in any event.

The superhighway building would be paid for by a second bill, the Boggs bill, which calls for a 1 cent increase in the present 2 cents a gallon, Federal tax on gasoline and diesel oil, increases the excise tax on tires 5 cents to 8 cents a pound, causes the excise

tax on trucks, trailers, and buses to rise from 8 to 10 percent, imposes a new tax on camelback (heavy retread rubber). These rates would be frozen for 15 years.

The American Automobile Association, is attacking the revenue bill because the new taxes would be more burdensome on the automobile driver—and less burdensome for truckers—than those contemplated in the Democratic pay as you go program of 1955. Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey disputes the revenue estimates of its supporters. However, it seems to be satisfactory to truckers, whose lobbies allegedly killed the 1955 bill.

What would the 13- 15-year program mean to the Nation's economy, aside from adequate highways? Experience on superhighways now in use indicates a drop in the highway death rate of up to 40 percent. And the program, the largest single construction undertaking ever attempted in the United States, would pour $51 billion into the construction, equipment, and allied lines, at the same time creating as many as half a million new jobs.

The Indian Picture in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert the following item from the Timber Lake (S. Dak.) Topic under date of February 16, 1956, with regard to the Indian picture in South Dakota.

The article is as follows:

Speaking before approximately 200 people gathered in the Timber Lake High School auditorium, Sunday evening, February 12, Dr. Ben Reifel, director of Aberdeen area office of the Department of Indian Affairs, neatly summed up the basic difference between the Indian and his white neighbors.

"The American Indian is a victim of circumstances * * * something before us, even before Columbus discovered America, has prepared our life in which we find ourselves," Dr. Reifel stated.

There are three things which are central to American life, he continued: (1) concern with time schedule; (2) hard work; and (3) saving. For the Indians, nature provided most of their needs. The buffalo provided food, shelter, clothing and a certain religious element. Because the buffalo was so abundant, the Indians didn't have to work, didn't have to schedule their time; nor did they have to save.

Thus, Dr. Reifel enumerated the basic difference between the nature of the white man and the Indians. "Some of us will have to extend a helping hand to show brotherhood to the Indians * * * it will take patience on the part of both. * * * To have brotherhood is to live it," Dr. Reifel concluded.

Dr. Reifel's talk concluded a union service sponsored by the Timber Lake Ministerial Association in observance of Brotherhood Sunday. Before pronouncing benediction, the Reverend C. A. Carlson commented the white people must remember that we pushed the Indians to remote places, away from their lush hunting grounds, put them on the poorest kind of land, put them on a dole system, and thus further deprived them of the incentive to work and to save.

Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, February 16 was the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made in observance of this important day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Throughout the world freedom-loving men pause on February 16 to observe the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. In America and other free nations there will be large gatherings to mark this occasion. But, the people of Lithuania can at best only gather in small groups in their homes to observe their Independence Day. The Communist overloards do not permit them to openly celebrate this day in their native land. Yet, while the right of open assembly can be denied to them, no power on earth can wipe the glorious past of this brave nation from the pages of history nor tear from the hearts of the people of Lithuania the ardor and devotion for freedom and independence.

For centuries the Lithuanian people have been in the forefront of man's continuing struggle against oppression. Over 600 years ago the first independent Lithuanian state was organized and through the centuries this small but noble country developed into a leader among the peace-loving peoples of Europe.

However, a strong and vicious neighbor, even then hungry for conquest, forcibly annexed Lithuania in the 18th century and she disappeared from the maps of Europe as an independent state. At the end of World War I Lithuania regained her independence and became a model republic, only to be engulfed in the Red tide of expansionism at the start of the global conflict in 1939.

Yet, the people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged by these stark realities. The fever of liberty and freedom is heightened, not dispelled, by this adversity. Their courage and indomitable will to resist grows stronger with every outrage committed against them by those who seek to become masters of their spirits as well as their bodies. We in America and her countless friends throughout the free world will remain true in our struggle to free Lithuania from the Communist yoke. We shall take courage from the valor of the Lithuanian people. We shall be sustained by their devotion to our common cause. We shall continue the struggle with every resource at our command to overcome the scourge—that godless conspiracy—which would enslave the entire world, and which now has gallant Lithuania within its grasp. We will be steadfast in the position that all peoples can live in peace and harmony and that man's right to be free is not only inalienable, but unconquerable. With the strength of these convictions we have on our side the truly ultimate weapon of the atomic era, free man's faith in God and his own destiny.

People of Lithuania, we salute you on your Independence Day. You have our undying faith and respect, and we reverently pray that God will continue to give you the strength to carry on.

Reclamation Products Do Not Increase Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me to have a group of distinguished California newspapers recognize the fact that considerable opposition is being raised to reclamation projects largely on phony grounds.

This recognition is given in an editorial which appeared in the February 21, 1956, editions of the McClatchy newspapers of California—the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee.

Undoubtedly out of consideration for their erring neighbors to the south, these great central California newspapers did not recognize the fact that most of the opposition generated to the reclamation program on a variety of phony issues has come from, of all places, an area which owes its amazing growth in the last quarter of a century largely to Federal reclamation, namely, southern California.

Perhaps the reason why the southern part of California is busily engaged in undermining a program still highly important to the Central Valley of California is that the southern California area has received such tremendous benefits from Federal reclamation, navigation, and flood-control works—undoubtedly more than any other given area in the country—and that the people living there feel there is no need or possibility for any further large-scale Federal assistance.

This relative regional security, obtained by getting the lion's share of reclamation and civil-works appropriations for years, also appears to be reflected in southern California's activities in delaying and thwarting water-resource developments in its own State.

The McClatchy newspapers themselves recently called attention to this fact in a newspaper feature article which charged that southern California interests were seeking to purchase the site for the proposed San Luis Reservoir in order to dominate that project, vitally needed by a Central Valley area where the underground water table is dropping at a rate of 25 feet a year.

I am sorry the McClatchy newspapers did not pursue the subject of this February 21 editorial a little further, and tell their readers in central California what southern California is doing to discredit the entire reclamation program through its vicious and absolutely unjustified attacks upon the Colorado River storage project. This attack has been made by southern California in spite of the fact that California water authorities have publicly stated that the State has available within its own borders sufficient water to supply the greatly expanded needs of the State for many, many years to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I refer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION PROJECTS DO NOT INCREASE SURPLUSES

One of the cries raised by opponents of western reclamation projects is the question: Why construct these projects to bring more farmlands into production when the Nation already is burdened by staggering agricultural surpluses?

The question becomes apocryphal in the light of a survey recently made by the Federal Reclamation Bureau at the request of Senator ARTHUR W. WATKINS, of Utah.

The answer is that crops grown on lands irrigated by the Federal projects have a negligible effect upon the farm surpluses and the Government's price support program.

As of September 30, 1955, nearly nine-tenths of the Government's investment in price supported commodities was in wheat, upland cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice.

The reclamation projects produce none of the tobacco, less than 2 percent of the national yield of wheat, one-third of 1 percent of the corn, less than 1 percent of the rice and about 6½ percent of the upland cotton. And, of this, only from 5 to 50 percent of the production has been under price support.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer points out the great bulk of the agricultural yield on reclamation lands consists of fruits, nuts, vegetables, and seed crops, which are not in surplus, and forage which gives a stable spring feed supply for livestock on the West's 700 million acres of range land.

The opposition to reclamation projects obviously is phony and is raised either out of ignorance of the facts or as a coverup for antagonism to the low cost public power features of the developments.

As a matter of fact, agricultural land is being retired from production by urban and industrial expansion 10 times as fast as irrigation dams are making new lands available for tillage.

Agricultural experts estimate the increase in population will eliminate the Nation's food surplus within 3 to 5 years, or as soon as any irrigation project begun today could be completed.

Beyond that time, these experts figure, the Nation will face a food deficit unless steps are taken at once to bring the potentially irrigable land of the West into production. But this threat is not apt to faze those special interests which profess to see the great reclamation projects only as creeping socialism.

Washington's Birthday Address by Charles H. Silver, President, Board of Education of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very acle and informative address delivered by Hon. Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education of the city of New York, at the annual luncheon of the Jewish Teachers Association in New York City on February 22, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE JEWISH TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the board, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it seemed to me, as the date of this annual luncheon approached, that the Jewish Teachers Association had chosen a day and time altogether blessed by good aspects on which to gather. I am not only honored to bear the greetings of the entire board of education—I also feel a thrill of pride that you have always chosen the birthday of our Nation's founder and foremost defender and that it falls within the week devoted to brotherhood.

The pleasure I feel in appearing before you is heightened by the wholehearted recognition you have earned by your efforts as an organization. The biggest system of public education in the world deserves nothing less than the best teachers. And that is exactly what I confidently believe we have in your association and other groups such as yours.

All of us on the board are constantly inspired by the caliber of our teachers and the vastness of the job you are doing. We know how vital that job has become. We realize, and every man and woman who reads a newspaper or hears a news broadcast realizes, that education has become a kind of fortress that must be kept strong to safeguard our land and our freedom.

I want you to know that every member of the board is behind you every step of the way in your fine work and in the fight to obtain sufficient reward for every teacher in our city's schools.

Let me take a moment to tell you about the people who constitute your board of education. This is not a tribute, but just a kind of inventory, to have you know more intimately the sort of men and women who are working with you and working for you to win the things you want.

You know the names of the nine members who sit on this supreme court of our city's huge educational enterprise. But do you know that among these selfless public servants who perform their tasks without monetary gain are three highly successful attorneys taking time from their very busy practice? One of our members is a dentist. I don't know when he gets to see his patients. Another is a minister of the gospel * * * who feels that he is doing God's own work in serving our city's children. Still another, a prominent accountant whose clients are among the top Wall Street firms, is almost always present at our council table. This is true, as well, of one of the leading insurance men of the city, who is practically never absent from our meetings. I don't know how he finds time for his business, but he is helping every minute to insure the future years of our children.

We have one woman on our board. She is active in every community project, plus the personal project of running her own household. Let me just say now that her sincerity and devotion are an example to us all. I will have more to say of her later.

There isn't a member of the board—and I will certainly include Dr. Jansen, Mr. Gilman, and Mr. Warschauer—who has not been active in the battle for better salaries for everyone in the public schools. And by active I don't just mean now and then with word and voice; I mean day and night with heart and soul. It is a battle we mean to win.

Off the record, I might add that though victory will come in our campaign for adequate teacher compensation, it is not going to come easy. In my time, I've sold millions and millions of dollars worth of merchandise with nothing like the problems and worries that have plagued us from here to Albany. Rest assured of one thing, though: I am sold on higher pay and so is every man and woman on the board. The newspapers are with us; the public is with us—and I do honestly believe that, if help is not forthcoming from the sources to which we have applied, the mayor will find the way. I may be wrong. This is just my opinion, but I give it to you for what it's worth—my money—or perhaps I should say your money—is on our mayor. I don't know how he is going to do it, but I'm pretty sure he will.

The President of the United States recognizes the importance of providing the schools with a well-paid teaching staff. Only a few days ago, our Governor, in acknowledging resolutions adopted by your board of education, stated, and I quote: "I am in complete accord with the determination of the board that the salary schedules for the supervisory and teaching staff should be adequate to attract and retain competent personnel." The mayor of the city of New York has expressed himself again and again as favoring increased pay.

The leaders of the Nation, of the State, and of our city stand together on the importance of our teachers to the survival of our way of life. They are of one purpose in the firm conviction that no one entrusted with so delicate an undertaking as the molding of young minds should approach that task with a faltering of spirit produced by the problem of making both ends meet. We must dignify the profession of teaching. * * * And the best way to do it is to grant it the dollars-and-cents dignity it deserves.

That is why we appealed for an increase in the budget. That is why we made our personal plea to the mayor and to Budget Director Beame. That is the cause that took us to the State capital to speak before the senate and the assembly. I want you to know, too, that I talked personally, privately, and at length with Governor Harriman * * * and a transcript of my own statement before the joint finance committees at Albany has been mailed to each and every legislator. You should know these facts because this is the way your board is keeping faith with the teachers.

Until now, my friends, I've been talking mainly about dollars. Now I'd like to talk about sense. Actually, I am going to talk about the lack of sense in some of the recent actions of our State Department regarding Israel. The headlines have been startling enough; but I have a few facts to give you that carry a shock of their own, not just for us as followers of the Jewish faith, but for all who love the American standards of justice and fair play and do not want to see them dishonored.

Since I am to speak for a few brief minutes about Israel, I might mention in passing that we have had an invitation from the Israeli school system to send a group of our New York high-school students to that country as part of a permanent exchange program. The first few of our students will leave for Israel at the end of March. Accompanying them, as representative of the board, will be our valued member, Mrs. Cecile Ruth Sands, with her graciousness and concern for the peace and progress of the world our children will inherit. I think you will agree with me that, in sending forth this wonderful woman and these selected young people from our schools, we are exporting far better merchandise to Israel than our State Department is shipping to Arabia.

You don't need me to tell you what a sorry mess is being made of our whole mixed-up Near Eastern foreign policy. Arms and money have been forbidden to the little state

of Israel, imperiled by the overwhelming power of its Arab neighbors, who are fortified by jet planes, tanks, guns, and submarines of Communist origin. That was bad enough. But now we can no longer say that all of the deadly weapons aimed at Israel's heart are of Communist origin. The tanks that were loaded at a Brooklyn pier may one day shed Jewish blood. That's what we're shipping to Arabia—packaged death, wrapped in lies, to destroy the State of Israel.

And let me tell you something I have learned about Arabia.

My dear friend, Dr. Israel Goldstein, has furnished me with the exact wording of a letter sent to American firms by their Arabian customers, and I quote:

"We very much regret to inform you that our government has duly published a notice announcing that any importers in Arabia must not be permitted to import any kind of goods from any Jewish firm in the world.

"Further, they have listed you as being Jewish and your firm as a Jewish firm. As these steps are taken suddenly against you, we are obliged to cable you to stop the shipment of our orders.

"We ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm belongs to, Jewish or Christian. Until we have full particulars, we are obliged to stop our business with you."

The same letter was received by an exporter of wheat, flour, and textiles whose business with Arabia ran about $2 million a year. Under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, the United States Government pays 70 cents for each bushel of wheat shipped, as a subsidy to American exporters. The effect of this Arab boycott, therefore, in realistic terms, was that our own Government made grants to Christian firms while Jewish firms were excluded from the benefit of these grants.

The Arab boycott has been extended not only to firms that have Jewish ownership, but to those which employ Jews or have Jewish stockholders or branches in Israel. More than that, airlines have been compelled to dismiss Jewish personnel if their routes cross Arab countries. Neither Iraq nor Arabia permit Jewish passengers, not even if they are Government officials or members of our Armed Forces, to land on their territory. As a matter of fact, our Government has submitted, without protest, to the arrogant Arab demand that there should be no Jews in the military or civil personnel which are sent to that country.

Here is a situation sickeningly reminiscent of Nazi techniques. Reminiscent? It is a malodorous fish from the same rotten barrel.

Consider this. The Jewish taxpayer in the United States contributes to the arming of these countries. They mark us as second-class citizens. They stamp us as enemies. They don't want us in their territory and they won't do business with us or anyone who does do business with us. But our money goes into the subsidies that our State Department uses to send them shiploads of tanks.

This is a matter of tremendous impact upon the fate of humanity and the preservation of freedom. There is more than the future of Israel at stake. It is not a question of who sells planes to Egypt or tanks to Arabia. It is a question of how long civilized people will remain silent while these merchants of death barter today for the means to destroy Israel's tomorrow.

It does not matter whether you are a Zionist or not; this much is true:

If there is one country in all the world which, in 7 short years of precarious existence, without fixed boundaries, with few friends around her and not a day of peace, has shown a matchless zeal for creative effort and constructive accomplishment, that land is Israel. Can we afford to let her down? Can the world afford to let her down?

Huddled into a narrow, sandy strip, Israel has earned its integrity among the nations. Hounded and beaten about the globe for centuries, extended little compassion and less protection by law, these pioneers have survived their trials as a sword survives the flame in which it is tempered. Here, on a desert they have made to bloom, some of our brothers have emerged at last from their endless wanderings, resolved to preserve their own nation and ready to die in its defense.

They deserve the armed assistance of every other freedom-loving people in protecting their borders against attack.

We cannot forsake them now. Civilization cannot forsake them. If Israel goes down, then you and I go down, and down go the honor and decency of all mankind.

The things of which I have spoken, I felt that I should share with you because we share the same faith. You teach the principles of humanity, so I felt we could discuss the threat to those principles.

I have been glad of this privilege of expressing the thoughts of my heart to you who have given so much thought and so much heart to the instruction of the children entrusted to your care. I am proud and deeply grateful that you have shared this precious time with me.

The public schools of our city are the richer for your presence and I hope you will give me the pleasure of appearing before you many times in the years to come. God bless you for your good work—and thank you for your kind attention.

Freedom's Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as we know, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, writes a column entitled "Spires of the Spirit," which is published in the Washington Sunday Star. The column published on yesterday under the title "Freedom's Foundation" is so timely and outstanding that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 26, 1956]

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION

Our America is in mortal peril. The threatening danger is not simply in a foul conspiracy from the outside to snuff out freedom's glorious light. The graver peril is a disease which, if not checked, will fasten itself fatally upon the body politic. Its chief symptom is to make the victim look in the other direction from that in which a deadly enemy plots to strike. Another symptom is the deluded insistence on business and pleasure as usual. Avowed enemies have sworn by their false gods to rip to shreds the very fabric of our boasted liberties. Yet, oblivious to a growing preponderance of might by those who respect nothing but physical strength, our Republic of the free, the one bastion in all the earth which has the resources to make tyranny tremble and tumble, debates how much defense it can "afford." In the encroaching shadow of the Red menace, the marriage of freedom to adequate defense is denied and refused unless the fair Columbia can go on living in the lavish style to which she has been accustomed.

One of the dire signs of this disease, "complacency," which Toynbee tells us has killed more than a score of civilizations, is blindness to the fact that when a fully prepared bully system is in a position to say "do our bidding or else," a hothouse-nurtured economy will be smashed in the doomsday its foes are plotting. It was purposely and rightly a colossal understatement when, at Valley Forge, on Washington's birthday, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, solemnly and with apparent conviction, declared, "Americans are not doing enough to protect their freedom." He knows full well that those responsible for the actual striking power of each branch of our armed services are crying "More! More! For safety's sake, more!" If the stark truth of the present situation, threatening the very survival of America, were known it would be enough to blanch every patriotic cheek and to raise a deafening demand from ocean to ocean, "Arm to the teeth." It is imperative now that we harness our total strength which, once mobilized, would be invincible. There is yet time—but not much. The sands of that opportunity for impregnability are running out. If America is not thus alerted, one does not have to be a congenital prophet of gloom to discern the handwriting on the wall, "the refusal of denials and the insistence on indulgences today will be the rope by which Freedom will be strangled tomorrow."

At Valley Forge, where Freedom's Foundation, with thrilling ceremony, made its annual awards to those who are defending the American way of life, the contemporary danger was faced, not only of determined foes without, but also of the deterioration of the democratic tradition within. It ought to be added that the eyes of the head of America's Armed Forces were not just on the gathering might of our enemies under the hammer and sickle. For this, too, he said, "American opposition to Communist aims must be more than military strength to resist aggression." On the very day these words were uttered at Valley Forge by this voice from the Pentagon, new defenders of the cause for which Washington and his troops braved peril and pain had been summoned from all parts of the Nation to be awarded the Freedom Medal with the inspiring imprint of the Father of His Country, sword aside, kneeling in agonizing prayer on the frozen ground of that testing winter, a spot hallowed forever.

These new soldiers of freedom, thus recognized by the Foundation, are fighting with tongue and pen and brush and deed. The humblest citizen of this dear land of liberty may be designated by impartial judges, as well as those whose names are in Who's Who, for some effective blow struck for liberty. What a setting for such a recognition, as Freedom's Foundation sounds the trumpets to the imperiled Nation. For there at Valley Forge one gazes almost incredulously at that flimsy tent in which Washington himself risked his very life as 3,000 of his men died around him that awful winter. This tent, exposed to the fury of the elements in the dead of winter, he chose as his habitation instead of the stately Mount Vernon he loved, where, in warmth and comfort, he might have been the pampered lackey of the oppressors. Here, Freedom's Foundation asks of Americans, not what they want from freedom, but what they are willing to give to it that it may not perish from the earth; not what they are against, but what they are for. This inspiring channel of patriotism reminds all under the Stars and Stripes that the question of questions in this grim day is not "Do you live in a democracy," but "Does democracy live in you."

Freedom's Foundation, nonpartisan and nonsectarian, is saying to very American, "The foundation of all we have is God"; and upon its banner is the great affirmation of Archbishop Temple, "The great and profound difference between Christian civilization and the kind of civilization which the Communists are aiming at lies in our affirmation that the primary fact of the world is God—that each individual is the child of God, that at the root of his being he is the child of God, and that he is a child of God before he is a citizen of any national community."

And so the bugles are blowing for the greatest battle of the ages—for the bodies, the minds, the souls of men. The moral, spiritual, and material arsenal of this global struggle is America. The fight is on, the issues are momentous, the odds against us are terrific. Henry IV of France, in the 16th century, wrote a letter to Crillon, his friend, who had failed to show up for a crucial battle. This is what Henry said to him with biting scorn: "Go hang yourself, brave Crillon. We fought at Aques and you were not there." Of any American who, in this day of desperate battle, is bent on personal success or pleasure—the most damning thing that could be said to him or of him would be, "We fought in America for the survival of freedom and you were not there."

America's Debt to France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "Debt to France," written by Charles Parmer, of Alexandria, Va., and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT TO FRANCE

"George Washington's News Scoop," a story appearing in the February 19 American Weekly, inadvertently gives the false impression that the French were our deadly enemies as this Nation was approaching birth.

The feature is based on the Journal of George Washington, which we are told "has just been put on display in reconstructed Williamsburg."

The contents of that journal have been known to historians for decades. It merely highlights one youthful episode in a great life: When 21-year-old George Washington was sent by Colonial Virginia's Governor Dinwiddie to warn off the French from disputed Ohio lands which the latter claimed by right of prior exploration.

The story gives not one pleasant thought about the French: A poor disservice to history, especially during the Washington birthday season. For it was the French Army—sent by Louis XVI to aid Washington in his fight against England for independence—which held the first Washington birthday celebration on American soil. That was in 1781 at Newport, R. I. The French General Rochambeau wrote to the Commander in Chief of the Allied Forces in North America:

"Your Excellency's birthday * * * we will celebrate it with the sole regret that Your Excellency is not a witness to the gladness in our hearts."

After the allied success at Yorktown the French wintered at that same Williamsburg, and in February 1782, Rochambeau wrote to Washington, "Tomorrow is Your Excellency's birthday anniversary. I propose to celebrate it with a great ball which I give on that account."

If one must pick an isolated episode and blow it to full-page dimensions, fairness calls for a line summing up the overall truth; which in this instance is that it was the French who, 20 years later, answered Washington's plea and came to his side in the American Revolution when he wrote to Col. John Laurens in Paris, "we are at the end of our tether."

The public might also be told of Jules Jusserand's declaration that France joined in our fight against England because of "enthusiasm for the Americans, not hatred of their enemies," a statement borne out by diary notes by Gen. Matthieu-Dumas and others.

In fairness to England, it might be recalled that not all scowled at us with Sam Johnson's venom. Quite a few leaders in Parliament favored the Colonies against the Crown's taxation demands. There was William Pitt (later Earl of Chatham) joined with Shelburne, Barre, Camden and others, who in a forceful speech stated: "The Americans cannot be bound to pay taxes without their consent * * * I rejoice that America has resisted."

As for Washington's view of the French, one need only recall his thanks to God at Valley Forge when he learned of the French-American alliance being signed—Lafayette was as a son—Chevalier de Chastellux a warm friend—and in one of the letters Washington wrote to Rochambeau following peace, you find this one, dated February 1, 1784: "We have been contemporaries and fellow laborers in the cause of liberty, and we have lived together as brothers should do in harmonious friendship."

We may be fair to France, while still acclaiming our English heritage.

CHARLES PARMER.

ALEXANDRIA.

Electoral College Outmoded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Electoral College Method of Electing the President Is Outmoded," which appeared in the Baytown Sun, of Baytown, Tex., of February 15, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL COLLEGE METHOD OF ELECTING THE PRESIDENT IS OUTMODED

On the United States Senate calendar for early consideration is Senate Joint Resolution 31 proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would abolish the electoral college method of electing the President.

It appears now that this resolution has solid backing in both Houses of Congress, thus indicating a favorable vote when it is called up, probably sometime this month.

The resolution calls for abolition of the electoral college and the unit rule system of counting electoral votes. These would be abandoned in favor of a method whereby the President and Vice President are elected by distributing the popular vote cast for a given candidate according to the proportion which that vote bears to the total vote cast and the number of electoral votes available to a given State.

It is evident that the framers of the Constitution, for the most part, were definitely opposed to electing the President by direct popular vote.

During the Constitutional Convention, George Mason, of Virginia, observed that "It were as unnatural to refer the choice of a proper character for Chief Magistrate to the people, as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man."

It can be seen that the convention delegates distrusted the ability of the average citizen of that day to decide questions of such great gravity. Moreover, the discussions of the convention reveal that the delegates did not believe it was possible for a voter in one State to know anything about the ability or character of public men in the other States scattered along our 1,500-mile shoreline.

In addition, those representing the smaller States believed that popular election would somehow increase the power and prestige of the more heavily populated States.

These considerations, after probably the most prolonged debate of the Convention, led to adoption of the indirect method of electing the President. Under this plan the States were to select well-informed public men who were to look the field over and elect a President and Vice President.

In selecting these electors, each State was left free to use any procedure it might see fit to adopt—direct popular election of the electors on a general blanket ticket (the procedure used in all States today); or by single member districts; or by the vote of the legislature itself (a procedure which all the States had abandoned by 1860).

The electors so selected by each State should meet, it was decided, on a given date at a designated place within the State and vote by ballot for two persons. They were required to send a list of all persons voted for and the number of votes for each, to the President of the Senate, where, on a date fixed by law, they were to be opened in the presence of the two houses and the vote counted.

The person having the largest number of votes was to be declared President if such number were a majority of all votes cast. The runner-up should be declared Vice President whether he had a majority or not (later modified by the 12th amendment).

This, then, is the system, which, modified by the 12th amendment, has continued in effect up to the present time. It has retained the original form, even though all reason for this form has long since disappeared.

Sinec the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 31 has as one of its objectives the correction of certain evils in our present method of electing the President, the need for reform is highlighted by a discussion of both the obvious and latent defects inherent in the electoral college—unit rule system of choosing our President.

The indictment that can be drawn up against the present procedure is an impressive one. In general, there are three principal counts in this indictment:

1. The evils arising from the retention of the office of presidential elector;

2. The method of selecting a President when no candidate commands a majority of electoral votes;

3. The defects and dangers which derive from the so-called unit rule method of crediting all of a State's electoral votes to the plurality candidate.

A Few Flyspecks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 19, 1956, entitled "A Few Flyspecks."

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEW FLYSPECKS

Former President Truman writes in his memoirs that Adlai E. Stevenson made a major mistake as the 1952 Democratic presidential nominee. It lay, he says, in seeming to back away from the Truman administration and in appearing to accept even the Republican charge that there was "a mess in Washington." The Republican corruption charge, says the ex-President, involved only "a few flyspecks on our Washington windows."

What the former Illinois Governor did in the 1952 campaign was all he could in reason do. He supported the sound foreign policy and major domestic policies of the Truman administration to the full. But, as the reform executive in Illinois who cleaned up after the Dwight H. Green scandals, he obviously could not endorse the Truman administration scandals. And they were scandals, whatever Mr. Truman may now say.

If the former President thinks these were only flyspecks let him remember that beginning in March 1951 the Post-Dispatch disclosed that Federal income tax cases involving fraud were fixed by influence wielders who worked with faithless officials in the Internal Revenue offices.

That these scandals involved many cities among them St. Louis, New York, Boston, and San Francisco in addition to Washington.

That in 1 year 63 percent of the income tax fraud cases approved for prosecution by heads of intelligence units throughout the Nation were killed by the Bureau's regional counsel or by the Justice Department.

That a whitewash report was made after a secret investigation of the office of the then collector at St. Louis, James P. Finnegan.

That the coverup in process was so revolting that Chief Judge George H. Moore, of the Federal district court, a Democratic administration appointee, called for surgery "to the bone."

That 8 district revenue collectors resigned under fire or were dismissed and that 1 of them, Finnegan, was indicted, tried, convicted of misconduct in office, fined $10,000 and sentenced to 2 years in prison.

That close to 400 Internal Revenue officials or employees were either fired or forced to resign by the Truman administration itself.

That among those who resigned were Charles A. Oliphant, chief counsel in charge of regional attorneys who passed on prosecution of tax frauds; George J. Schoeneman, head of the bureau, and Daniel A. Bolich, first assistant, who was convicted of a $160,000 tax-fix conspiracy.

Outrageous as was this record of corruption of the Federal tax gathering forces, the above recital is hardly more than a start on scandals of the second Truman administration. For if the former President looks it over he will also find:

That William M. Boyle, Jr., then chairman of the Democratic National Committee, resigned under fire for being on the payroll of the American Lithofold Corp. whose business dealings were largely with the Federal Government.

That the then Attorney General J. Howard McGrath was dismissed under fire as was Theron Lamar Caudle, assistant attorney general in charge of tax prosecutions.

That the Department of Justice under Tom C. Clark so limited the FBI that the latter's investigation of the 1946 vote stealing in Kansas City became a waste of time and money.

That after the Jackson County grand jury proved itself more alert to ballot corruption in Kansas City than the Federal authorities, the vault was opened and the evidence stolen.

That from that night to this day no one has ever found what became of the evidence.

Harry S. Truman can take pride in foreign policy decisions that he made in the White House. He can also take pride in many of his domestic policies. But he fools no one when he dismisses as mere "flyspecks" the scandals which he himself was forced to move against.

The Truman scandals were many, ugly, and a disservice to democracy. Nothing whatever will alter the facts.

Use of Food Supplies for Emergency Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an interesting and imaginative proposal sponsored by the Federal Civil Defense Administration entitled "Back to Grandma's Pantry." This proposal was brought to my attention through an article published in the February 5, 1956, issue of the Denton, Tex., Record-Chronicle. This particular project was put into operation on a statewide basis in Arkansas by Mr. Bill Rosch, Regional Public Affairs Officer of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUS FOR EMERGENCY—GRANDMA PANTRY IDEA DEVELOPED

While Congress and farm leaders are looking for ideas and methods for disposing of surplus food, a practical approach was developed and put into operation on a statewide basis in Arkansas by Bill Rosch, regional public affairs officer of the Federal Civil Defense Administration in Denton. The theme of Grandma's Emergency Pantry, a project sponsored by the FCDA, calling for a 7-day supply of food to be kept on pantry shelves for emergency purposes. Rosch suggests the emergency stock be made up of plentiful foods which are produced in the State.

PLENTIFUL FOODS

Beginning in October several conferences were held by Rosch with State officials, civil defense leaders, and food producers in the State of Arkansas and particularly with the people who raised rice and fruits, since those items were in surplus in the State. As a result of these conferences, the plentiful foods idea was incorporated into the Grandma Pantry Idea. Arkansas was the first State and Little Rock was the first city in the United States to sponsor this joint program.

The program was officially launched by Arkansas Governor, Orval Faubus.

"I strongly urge all persons and families in both urban and rural areas to maintain at all times for current use an average, normal 7-day food supply for emergency situations, whether the result of natural or man-made disasters which cause widespread disruption of normal living," the governor said.

PRESS COOPERATES

One of the highlights of the week was developed by Mrs. Christine Unger, director of women's activities from the Denton office, who arranged, with the cooperation of Mrs. Faubus and Mrs. Mann, wife of the mayor of Little Rock, a viewing by press, radio, and television media of the civil defense emergency food pantries. Arkansas' plentiful foods were featured in the homes of the governor and the mayor of Little Rock.

Food stores in Little Rock cooperated with the Arkansas State office of civil defense and FCDA in promoting this program by setting up the Grandma Emergency Food Pantry displays and suggested food items that should be put in the 7-day pantry.

MORE FOOD SOLD

One Little Rock food store executive, commenting on Rosch's plan, said, while it was too early to determine the full impact of the program, a survey of his food stores during the first 3 days of Grandma's Emergency Food Week, showed an increase in sales in rice and dried foods, two of the items in plentiful supply in the State. When the program leaves Little Rock, it will move throughout the other areas in the State. Owen Payne, Jr., State director of civil defense, will continue to handle the plan in cooperation with State and civil defense officials.

Mrs. Faubus and Mrs. Unger will appear on a national radio hookup later this month describing the Arkansas plentiful food theme.

After seeing the plan in operation Rosch said, "the success of this program has resulted from the cooperation we received from the State civil defense office and the Governor's office and food producers and store executives in Arkansas."

"It is hoped that his plan can be further developed and made available to other States desiring similar operations," he said.

Bipartisanship in Foreign Affairs, a Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by a former Member of the House, the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, which appeared in Human Events for February 18. Mr. Pettengill calls the turn on an overworked phrase "bipartisanship" in foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I shall at a future date have more to say on this subject of bipartisanship.

The article follows:

BIPARTISANSHIP IS SUBVERTING THE CONSTITUTION

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

"The consent of the governed" is the bedrock of our form of government. It is being dynamited and crumbled by this new and alien fetish called "bipartisanship."

All governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." That is the one great affirmation in the Declaration of Independence with respect to government itself. And the Declaration is the spirit and the soul of which the Constitution is the letter and the page, as the Supreme Court has said.

The consent of the governed requires a choice between alternatives. Consent is based on access to the facts, followed by free speech, free press and a vote. The "governed" can consent or not consent. They can make the minority today, the majority tomorrow. They can be free and stay free as long as "the consent of the governed" is daily fought for and preserved.

No one will say that the laws which govern the Russian people are based on their consent. They have but one party and therefore no choice. Their one party is hard to distinguish from the prevailing "bipartisanship" so far as foreign policy is concerned.

In the face of the threat of world domination by the bosses of the Kremlin, the foreign policy of Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower—whatever it is at any time—has been protected by the hush-hush of "bipartisanship." Whatever the Executive does in foreign policy, whether right or wrong, it is not to be disagreed with. We can "be lied into World War II" and our sons must go. We can be hurled overnight into the Korean war by one man, without any say-so by Congress, and our sons must die without debate. Neither they, their parents, nor their Representatives in the National Legislature had any voice in the decision.

Such is our "bipartisan foreign policy," the huge dimensions, cost and appetite of which are engulfing domestic policy as a python swallows a rabbit. Indeed, as a part of its propaganda, the State Department, in an official bulletin, with a foreword by President Truman, said, "There is no longer any real distinction between 'domestic' and 'foreign' affairs." Bipartisanship in foreign affairs, therefore, leads inevitably to bipartisanship in domestic affairs and the one-party state, even if the party has two labels.

The present "brink of war" hassle gives the appearance of a real division on foreign policy. But it concerns details only—full of sound and fury, signifying nothing more than who holds office. It reaches no fundamentals. The leaders of both parties are for global busybodyism. They will not debate a total overhaul of how we got into the mess we are in, or how to get out. The patriotic groups all over the country who are demanding such an examination have no spokesmen except themselves. Let them speak up.

How this degradation of the consent of the governed came about, and how our constitutional Republic is being subverted into a major province of a world government by President, Pentagon, and foreign politicians is well but briefly told in a small book by the late Garet Garrett, entitled "Rise of Empire." But all the secret manipulations and conditioning of the public mind calls for another Gibbon to some day write a history of the rise and fall of the American Republic unless a stop is called—soon.

Such a history cannot be written now. For much of the sordid story is still marked "classified," and kept from historians who have the honesty to be critical. We can only guess at the pressures put on editors, publishers, Congressmen, Senators, manufacturers, bankers, exporters, professors, writers, teachers, clergymen, and others to swallow this notion that bipartisanship in foreign policy is patriotic, and shut their mouths.

However it was done, it is plain that behind the scenes, powerful hands pulled the strings that moved the puppets of public opinion. Without knowing how we got there, we now find ourselves committed by dozens of treaties and executive agreements to again go to war, when ordered to do so by one man.

A wrangle over some dim boundary line separating the goat pastures of rival tribesmen is now an international incident of very grave importance. These incidents, constantly recurring, become the daily bread of headline writers and radio commentators. Thus the public mind is kept in a constant turmoil which precludes a calm discussion of where we are and how we got there.

We do know that patriotic leaders of both parties, such as Lindbergh, Wheeler and Nye, who remained true to the historic policy of free debate and honest opposition, were smeared and driven from public life.

Although Dr. Samuel Johnson wrote caustically that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," and George Washington, the purest patriot we ever had, warned "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence," we need not pass a moral judgment on all the authors of bipartisanship. Many of them were good men who became ensnared in the propaganda net which they helped to weave for others.

We need only, here and now, to see how bipartisanship is subverting the Constitution.

It made sense to say, as we did before we got into this series of world wars that "politics stops at the water's edge." That was when policies also stopped there. That was when American foreign policy was to defend our shores and preserve our independence from foreign conquest. But now, when this bipartisan cabal has involved us in every jawing match between diplomats all over the globe, this old saying has become a shibboleth used by cunning men to shut off debate on whatever they are planning to do.

To the shout of this slogan, the United Nations Charter was jammed through the Senate—with little discussion and no reservations while the war fever was on—before we used the atom bomb on Japan. Its promoters took no chances on free debate in a calmer time.

Today, our foreign policy affects domestic policy, in our most vital concerns. It embraces taxes, debt, inflation, high prices, wage, rent, price, and agricultural controls; import and export trade; the peacetime conscription of our sons; the right to travel and do business abroad; the allocation of the materials, money, and credit with which domesic business is done. It is so draining the taxable wealth of State, county, city, town, and village that they feel they cannot build the needed roads, bridges, hospitals, or schools, or pay thier teachers without Federal aid from the Government that impoverishes them. Hence, the leviathan on the Potomac is consuming State and local self-government and breaking down every substantial barrier our fathers so painfully erected to keep government limited and people free.

Yet, whenever the exercise of any of these ancient domestic rights is claimed to impinge on the undisclosed plans of the architects of foreign policy and world empire, the cry goes up, "Don't tie the hands of the President. Don't let the President down before foreign politicians by the Senate rejecting any agreement he negotiates with them. The honor of the Nation is at stake!

"Take from Congress its constitutional power and duty to declare war, or to refuse to declare war. That's obsolete. Under the NATO and other treaties, Congress has already abdicated its power to declare war. Don't let any Congressman question the State Department or the Pentagon on how much money they say they need. They're experts, aren't they? What do Congressmen, or the people know about such matters."

Such are the words we hear from the bipartisan bloc, many of whom plan to get rich from the tens of billions of dollars of Government loans, gifts, and bribes which pour across the seven seas from the Pentagon and other executive agencies.

The need to spend billions for national defense now, is of course due to the fact that the Bolsheviks, and "good old Joe," became a world menace largely because a previous administration demanded secrecy, and no criticism of its colossal blunders that lifted Stalin into Hitler's saddle. Despite the secrecy, many patriots like ex-President Hoover attempted to warn against cuddling up to "good old Joe." But they were denied access to the public mind by the bipartisan clique in Government, publishing houses, editorial offices, radio and television.

There is surely something very odd about a bipartisan foreign policy which now feverishly seeks to rearm Germany and Japan as our trusted allies against the freedom loving country which Roosevelt told us Russia was only 2 years after he had told us that it was a dictatorship as absolute as the world has known (when it attacked Finland). Yet the present administration has sought to maintain the historical blackout against any real investigation of Teheran, Cairo, Yalta, Potsdam, or Pearl Harbor.

The reputations for almighty wisdom of even dead politicians must not be called in question. And so we march our dreary and bloody way through the Chinese maze of universal meddlesomeness that is the thing of which the bipartisan clique is most proud. This clique is determined to reduce Congress to the impotence of a Nazi Reichstag, or a Russian Supreme Soviet.

As a republic is transformed into a world empire, the following steps occur:

The executive power of government becomes dominant; domestic policy is subordinated to foreign policy; the military mind gains such ascendancy as to intimidate the civilian mind; a system of satellite nations is set up; and finally, we are told that it is "our turn" to save civilization and take over "the white man's burden" from the palsied hands of previous empires which failed on the job.

All this we see. It is promoted by a flood of taxpaid pamphlets, radio discs, TV jingles, and canned speeches from the State Department and the United Nations into every school, church, kindergarten, and civic organization. As a task force of the Hoover Commission has said, "Free institutions cannot long survive when the vast powers of government may be marshaled against the people to perpetuate a given policy."

When the difference between Democratic and Republican bipartisans becomes little more than that between Tweedledee and Tweedledum, the voters twiddle their thumbs and stay home on election day. In the 1954 elections, out of 100 million eligible voters, 58 million stayed at home. Bipartisanship and general apathy are close relatives.

Every world empire from Rome to today has suppressed divergence of opinion at home in order to show abroad that it could engage in its external ventures unhampered. Empire requires a "united front."

If the Executive says the immigration gates should be opened to admit whatever number or group he supports, Congress is blackjacked into silence by the bipartisan cabal. If he says so many billions of dollars must be given to Panhandlia, or Upper Wemilkyou, any Congressman who questions either the wisdom or amount is charged with a lack of patriotism or of human sympathy.

He lacks neither. He knows that if any country will establish a stable government that respects property rights, private American capital will pour into it, as it has always

done, for example, into Canada and Venezuela. He objects, however, to taking our money by force—by taxes—and giving it to selected foreign politicians, many if not most of whom are Socialists or even Communists, such as Tito of Yugoslavia.

He doesn't think much of sending billions abroad to buy friends. He doubts if many of the recipients will stay bought when the heat is on. He recalls the billions we gave to "good old Joe." He knows that the proposed Covenant of Human Rights implies that governments have the "right" to confiscate our property "loaned" to foreigners.

But a Congressman who says these things is in for a rough time from the bipartisan cabal. There are too few such Congressmen left. And so "the control of the purse," the final bastion of a free people, passes from the hands of their chosen representatives whom they can hire or fire, and into the hands of a vast executive bureaucracy, in Washington and the United Nations, not chosen by them nor dischargeable by them.

With the people denied by the White House from any opportunity to pass on the merits of the Bricker amendment, the President—any President—together with foreign politicians, who have their own axes to grind, becomes the superlegislature of the American people with the power to make executive agreements that become "the supreme law of the land," without reference to a single Senator or Member of Congress.

When Congress surrenders its right and duty to debate, uphold or reject foreign policy, it betrays its trust and abdicates government "by the consent of the governed."

There is a small handful of men of both parties still left on Capitol Hill who see how bipartisanship is subverting the Constitution, and have the courage to say so. May their tribe increase as a result of the coming elections. It will, if the American people wake up to what is at stake. What they stand to lose is all they have.

Americanization Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, whenever and wherever American history is written about the decades of our development following 1930 down to date, the story of the infamous activities of Alger Hiss and the intrepid disclosures of Whittaker Chambers is certain to be recorded. Any interpretation of American history of this era which overlooked comment and reports on these epochal activities would, indeed, be omitting some of the strangest and most significant events of recent history.

Whittaker Chambers now farms, peacefully and I hope profitably, a small cluster of placid acres in the neighboring State of Maryland. He has paid the price of his earlier days of perfidy and his courageous willingness to disclose the procedures and personalities of the espionage ring the Russian Communist agents were operating in our Government during the 1930's and the 1940's has done much to tighten our internal security and to give greater hope for permanent peace to all Americans. He has followed and supplemented his testimony before the FBI, before the grand jury, before the courts of law, and before congressional committees by significant magazine articles and by one of the great books of our times—Witness.

I feel confident, however, that when all is said and done that both Mr. and Mrs. Chambers must derive maximum pleasure and reward from the fact that their children are growing up to be fine, patriotic, typical young Americans. The following article from the American Weekly points up the encouraging fact that Ellen Chambers—the daughter of the Chambers—was awarded a certificate of honor for a most persuasive article on the blessings of Americanism. For the reference of history, I now call attention to these current pumpkin papers from the gardens of Whittaker Chambers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article published in the American Weekly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW PUMPKIN PAPERS

(By William Engle)

Bright zinnias and asters nod this fall in a hilltop flower garden that used to be a pumpkin patch known around the world. It was Whittaker Chambers' pumpkin patch. Now it is Ellen Chambers' garden. She is his 17-year-old daughter. There in this pastoral corner of western Maryland she has tended the flowers and crops and cattle. She has tended them as diligently as ever her father tended the pumpkin shell where he hid his microfilm—the pumpkin papers, which helped to send Alger Hiss, former State Department official, to prison for committing perjury by denying under oath that he had given Chambers Government documents for the use of a Communist spy ring.

She's done more. While she's been busy helping with the farm work, some stirring thoughts have been crowding each other in her mind and a while ago she put them all in order in an essay.

It's an avowal of loyalties and ideals, hopefully symptomatic perhaps of youth's deepest reflections in a troubled time, and it won first prize, a certificate, in a contest conducted by the Moleville Farm Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in the Westminster, (Md.) High School.

Here, then, are the new pumpkin papers, by the thoughtful daughter of an American who made a grave mistake—and atoned for it by aiding his country at a time when his act must have required that quality of courage which, in the words of Ellen Chambers, helps to make her country unconquerable.

"What does my country mean to me?" she wrote, to start the essay. "What chords do those two words strike in my heart—my country?" she asked in the composition which she called What America Means to Me.

Her country, she declared, meant to her a place free, beauteous, unconquerable, wealthy, and peaceful.

This was the idea she developed slowly, often laying the writing aside to do the tasks she's used to in the neat farmhouse, in the fields among the Guernsey cattle and Shropshire sheep, in the hayfields, and in that sunny flower garden.

She explained a little about this—a forthright, serious girl, friendly and gracious.

"I don't have to go in for athletics at school," she said. "I get the exercise here.

"See that yearling over in the barn looking at us right now? That's Pipe Creek's Jasmine, named after Pipe Creek, our farm. She's my favorite, but it takes time to look after her. It's one thing and another."

She knows farm animals and she has won many 4-H honors. She's been president of the Carroll County Dairy Club, too, and president of her high school's honor society. This fall she expected to enter Smith College at Northampton, Mass. Her essay says: "My country is a symbol of freedom for all downtrodden peoples. Freedom for which great men gave their lives to become even greater for their sacrifice. Freedom of living, thinking, and expressing. Freedom to rise by merit, not on blood alone. Freedom of morals and ideals. Freedom of worship; freedom of self-government.

"My land is a beauteous one. Natural beauty abounds. * * * We have beauty for the heart of the workman in the whirr of the wheels, for the musician in melody, for the scientist in new discovery, for the farmer in self-owned and cultivated acres.

"When men fight with great courage because they know that they are really fighting for themselves, for the preservation of their livelihood * * * for freedom, is that country conquerable? If that country is backed by a foundation of brave, loyal men, full of spirit, can that country die? When the women of that country are in the fight, too, giving their all for freedom, can that country lose out and perish? No. Then my country is unconquerable because the spirit of its people is unconquerable.

"Wealth my country has, too—her people have the highest living standard in the world. She has a wealth of inventions, wisdom, science, culture, and knowledge. Wealth in good men, in new ideas, in richness of life, in fame, in strength, in power, in resources, in morality, in reputation, in personal liberties. * * *

"Our Nation is a crucible in which the ores of all nations are melted and stirred until they are completely merged into one. A nation where past histories, culture, theories combine to make a stronger nation. We have grown from the experiences of others. We caught the torch and held it high where it burns with the renewed vigor of youth.

"Here there is a composite of different personalities, likes and dislikes, opposites, and strangers working as brothers. * * * We are intermingled. * * * We are the melting pot of the world, a fatherland for all people. * * *"

That's the voice this fall from the pumpkin patch—Ellen Chambers speaking, it seems, for the youth of America.

Hardships in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of the leading farm women in my State dealing with the farm problem.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAHPETON, N. DAK., *February 11, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: My home is on a farm a short distance from Christine, N. Dak. My parents have lived on this farm for 29 years. When they first moved on this farm it was extremely run down. My parents took this farm over with a mortgage on it in 1928. They lived through the horrible de-

pression and by hard work, perseverance, and decent prices they were able to build up the farm until today it is one of the outstanding farms in North Dakota. (You may confirm this fact by contacting the Lums, who have the newspaper in Wahpeton.)

Then came Mr. Benson with his new farm ideas. As a result, my parents, who should be able to retire and live on the farm in their old age are planning to move the buildings to Fargo for resale, and dispose of the land for what they can get.

Are you people in Washington going to let Mr. Benson run the farmers off their land, or are you and smart people like you going to run Mr. Benson out of Washington.

Sincerely yours,

MARCIA BERSETH.

Promotion of Farmer-Labor Conflict by Secretary of Agriculture Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, labor has been shocked, as many of us in the Senate have been, by the attempts of Secretary of Agriculture Benson to sow strife between the farmer and organized labor.

Many of us believe that this campaign of misrepresentation is one of the most dangerous that the free trade unions have had to face in recent years.

A farmer-labor conflict, of which Secretary Benson is so desirous, can, in the long run, help only the enemies of our country.

At the moment, organized labor is angry and worried. Unions have answered the Secretary's attacks at every opportunity. They have especially referred to his San Francisco speech of February 16, 1956, in which he lambasted the food-processing unions.

An excellent reply was made by the two top officers of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, President Earl W. Jimerson and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EARL W. JIMERSON AND PATRICK E. GORMAN, PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY-TREASURER, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE 315,000-MEMBER AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN, AFL-CIO

In a speech in San Francisco today, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson launched a violent attack on labor unions—especially meat-industry unions. As has become his fashion, the Secretary used gimmicked statistics and distorted economic reasoning to whitewash the tragic results of his own ill-advised farm policy. We can see the Secretary's speech as only another crude attempt to make labor the scapegoat for his own monumental failures.

His attempt to set one group against another is a part of this unethical and irresponsible policy. Thus, in the attempt to end 90-percent parity, he tried to pit different groups of farmers against each other. To gain the same end, he attempted to arouse city consumers against farmers. Now, to alibi his own failures, he is trying to incite a farm-labor struggle.

Farmers and the public will not be taken in by Secretary Benson's poison propaganda. In order to defeat his ruthless and base attempt to divide the Nation, we offer the following to refute Secretary Benson's charges.

1. Secretary Benson's claim that most of the 1955 wage increase for packinghouse workers was paid by ranchers and farmers, through lower prices for meat animals, is absolutely false. Livestock prices increased one-half of 1 percent in August and September 1955—immediately after the wage increase in the meat-packing industry. They dropped again in October.

2. The packinghouse worker himself paid for his 1955 wage increase with a sharply increased productivity. Wage cost per hundred pounds of beef actually dropped after the wage increase—from $3.54 in May, June, and July, to $3.47 in September, October, and November. In other words, increased productivity not only covered the 14-cent-per-hour wage increase granted last August plus any overtime worked, but also cut labor cost per pound of meat beyond that. This further disproves Secretary Benson's charge that the farmer and the rancher are suffering because of labor's wage increases in the meat industry.

3. Actually, the prices paid by the meatpacker to the farmer depend upon the supply and demand of livestock. It does not depend upon the wages. Nowhere in economic history is there any evidence that prices paid for livestock go down when wages paid labor go up.

4. Secretary Benson demolishes his own charges by admitting that it is the oversupply of livestock which has caused the decline in the livestock prices. "Market gluts, such as recently were experienced with hogs, always mean a sharp break in prices," he says. He also states, "In recent years our farm production has been distorted and thrown out of balance with what our domestic and overseas markets will take."

5. Secretary Benson speaks of "soft wage settlements" in the meatpacking industry. Actually, the wage increases were won after tough collective bargaining. It is true there have been no strikes in recent years. Perhaps Secretary Benson thinks any increase without a strike is a soft settlement.

In short, Secretary Benson's speech is shot through with distorted statistics, false premises and perverted conclusions. He has reached a new low in a desperate effort to evade responsibility for his own mistakes.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Upshur County Republican Executive Committee, at Buckhannon, W. Va., on February 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE UPSHUR COUNTY REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT BUCKHANNON, W. VA., FEBRUARY 11, 1956

I am highly honored by your invitation to address this meeting of patriotic Americans.

I sincerely appreciate the privilege of joining with you in tribute to the memory of one of the greatest of all Americans, Abraham Lincoln.

And let me assure you, with equal sincerity, that it is always a pleasure to come to the great mountain State of West Virginia.

Through the years I have enjoyed the most agreeable association with many of your fine citizens in business, politics, military affairs, and in the activities of government. There are so many whose friendships I treasure, but I cannot come into West Virginia without making special mention of my long-time friend, your Republican national committeeman, Walter S. Hallanan.

He is a real American, an unselfish leader of the Republican Party, and a tower of strength in support of good government. Without expecting anything for himself he gives generously of his time, his means, and his energy to advance the welfare of his State and the Nation.

In honoring the immortal fame of Abraham Lincoln we recall with gratitude his greatest achievement, the preservation of the Union. We recall with pride that West Virginia, in those days of national crisis, gave the world an example of loyalty and faith in the American Republic.

In Lincoln's time the Nation was torn asunder by a great internal upheaval. Out of the turmoil and struggle of that day patriotic Americans rallied to defend the Union and the cause of human freedom.

They formed a new party—the Republican Party—dedicated to the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

As one of the founders of the Republican Party and first Republican President of the United States Lincoln grows in stature year after year. He lived by high ideals and had the courage to stand by them in the face of discouragment and disappointment.

We must have the same courage today to do our full duty as Americans. The future of our Nation depends upon the course of action we take and the outcome of our fight for the principles in which we believe.

As Republicans we believe in freedom of the individual, freedom of enterprise and freedom of opportunity. These are American principles which have come down to us as a priceless heritage. They were the principles of Abraham Lincoln. They are the principles of the Eisenhower administration.

Three years of clean, decent Government have proven that the Republican Party is the party of peace, progress, and sound prosperity. There has never been an administration with such a brilliant record of achievement in so short a time.

We can be proud that we have a Republican administration at Washintgon without favoritism, without corruption, without extravagance and without socialistic regimentation.

We have a Republican administration that is sound, trustworthy, and economical, serving no special interests, but working to advance the welfare of all the people.

We have an administration that believes in the Constitution of the United States and respects its limitations on the power of the Central Government.

We have an administration that supports the American system of free enterprise which means unlimited opportunity, progress, and prosperity.

But we must remember that this year of 1956 is one of tremendous importance. It is a year in which we face a challenge that

calls for all our courage, determination, and loyalty.

This year the American people will decide whether we will go forward to greater achievement under sound, constructive Republican leadership or whether we will return to the disastrous, crazy-quilt pattern of corruption, confusion, and Korea of the previous Democratic administrations.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Republican Party has gained the confidence of the American people by its magnificent record under the inspired leadership of our great President, Dwight Eisenhower.

I cannot tell you whether he will be a candidate for reelection or not, but I am firmly convinced of one thing. His decision will be made without thought of himself but will be based solely on whether he can fully and completely serve the best interests of the United States and the world.

Whatever President Eisenhower's decision may be, we can go into this year's national campaign with a record of achievement that reflects the basic philosophy of the Republican Party and the principles to which the Republican Party is dedicated.

Every real American, regardless of his politics, rejoices that we have gone through 3 years of the greatest prosperity we have ever known—prosperity based on a sound, expanding economy—without the blood, sweat, and tears of war.

In the heart of every American there is gratitude for the crowning achievement of the Eisenhower administration in bringing to an end the death and destruction of Mr. Truman's so-called police action in Korea.

It took great courage for Eisenhower to go over to Korea in fulfillment of his campaign pledge to do everything within his power to end the fighting. But no one has ever questioned his courage. Less than 6 months after he took office the guns were silenced—the casualty lists were ended and no more brave American boys gave their lives without hope of victory.

If the Republican Party had no other claim for credit, that alone would shine forth as a bright beacon of honor and glory.

It took great courage for the President to stand firm for a balanced budget and the reduction of the national debt before a further cut in taxes. That may not be popular with some people, but it is the right course for the safety and security of our Nation.

Let me review briefly some of the accomplishments in 3 years of Republican leadership:

Taxes have been cut within the margin of safety. The Republican 83d Congress in 1954 reduced taxes by nearly $7½ billion, the largest tax cut ever made in a single year.

Government spending has been brought under control. The cost of government has been reduced by $10 billion below the latest budget proposed by President Truman. We will have a balanced budget this year and next.

In 3 years there has been no significant loss in the purchasing power of the dollar. Inflation has been checked.

The personal income of the American people is at an all-time high.

More than 65 million working men and women are employed at higher wages and salaries than ever before.

Unfair restrictions on business and labor have been eliminated.

The 20-year trend toward centralization of Government in the socialistic pattern has been reversed.

Communists, fellow-travelers, and other disloyal subversives have been weeded out of the Government service.

Social security has been expanded and its benefits increased.

We have built a balanced military defense, the strongest in the history of our Nation.

We now have a firm, strong, dynamic foreign policy that has lessened world tension and has brightened our hope for peace.

These are just a few highlights. There are many more I could enumerate. Not the least of these are the high moral and spiritual values which guide President Eisenhower and which have restored honesty and decency to our National Government.

We believe with President Eisenhower that to serve the cause of world progress we must first protect the liberties of our own citizens. To go forward in leadership for freedom, justice, and peace we must preserve the American system of government.

Therefore, the Republican Party seeks no alliance with those who would socialize our country. The Republican Party rejects the support of those who think the American form of government has outlived its usefulness. We ask no help from those who would distort the meaning of the Constitution to serve their selfish purposes.

In the great crusade which resulted in Republican victory and the election of President Eisenhower, we did not promise an easy way of life. We did not promise security from the cradle to the grave, without effort and without cost.

We did not seek to create disunity. We did not array one class against another or stir up sectional hatreds.

But we did make a solemn pledge to the American people that their liberties would be protected by a finanically sound Government structure, based on sound fiscal policies and rigid economy.

We promised to protect American freedom from the dangers of socialistic experimentation which would concentrate all authority in the Central Government.

We promised that unwarranted peacetime controls that shackled the expansion of productive enterprise would be removed. We pledged the Republican Party to create an atmosphere that would once more provide incentives for free enterprise to function for the maximum benefit of every man and woman who works for a living.

Those pledges have been fulfilled. The Republican Party has been faithful to its campaign promises.

The memorable words of Abraham Lincoln have come down to us for inspiration and guidance.

When the Republican Party was being organized 100 years ago he said, and I quote:

"Let us, in building our new party, plant ourselves on the rock of the Declaration of Independence and the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against us."

The political wisdom of Abraham Lincoln grows more impressive wtih the passing years. It calls upon us in our day to reaffirm our allegiance to the heritage passed on to us by the Founding Fathers, preserved for us by the first Republican President and strengthened by the high spiritual concept of government to which our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, is dedicated.

Let us go out from this dinner with renewed determination to face the challenge of 1956.

America must not turn back.

With the honored memory of Abraham Lincoln to inspire us we can go forward to victory—victory for the Republican Party—victory for the United States and the free world.

Tribute to John Baer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago the newspaper Labor Daily published an excellent article on former Representative John Baer, of North Dakota. Mr. Baer is very well known as a great labor cartoonist, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor's Daily of October 21, 1955]

MR. LABOR CARTOONIST—BAER'S POINTED PEN FLAYS LABOR'S FOES

(By Frank B. Powers)

WASHINGTON.—A sharp wit, colorful imagination, and potent pen-and-pencil set have earned for John Baer the title, "Mr. Labor Cartoonist."

Currently flaying labor's enemies as cartoonist for Labor, the newspaper of the railroad brotherhoods, 69-year-old Baer has been at it for some 45 years as labor writer, editorialist, and cartoonist.

A onetime football star at Lawrence University near Appleton, Wis., Baer became a country editor in North Dakota and eventually the youngest member of that State's house of representatives.

He was born in Blackcreek, Wis., in 1886, his ancestors having come to Pennsylvania in 1746. John Baer lived in Beach and Fargo, N. Dak., for a time, and ran for Congress from that area. He came to Washington in 1917, served two terms, and has since lived here, and in nearby Maryland. He now makes his home in Chevy Chase, Md.

SON CONTINUES TRADITION

John talks more about his son, John, Jr., than he does of himself. John Baer, Jr., has won honorable mention for his architectural drawings from the Beaux Arts Institute.

Baer was married to Estelle G. Kennedy, of Waukon, Iowa, in 1910. They have three children, John M., Jr., Alfred Sherman, and Byron.

When John appeared in Congress, as a young newspaperman from North Dakota, his main interest was the farm problem. That was in the days of the farmer-labor movement in Minnesota and North Dakota. But it was not long until AFL President Samuel Gompers and the railroad brotherhoods found in him one of their best friends in Congress. Baer championed the idea that labor should have its own representatives in Congress.

Old Bob La Follette was his idol, and Baer listened to all of his speeches in the Senate.

"I think old Bob holds the record for the length of his speeches. And they were not excerpts from the Bible, just to hold the floor, either," John will tell you. "Everything old Bob had to say was worth listening to. But it did become tiring especially to the predominant conservatives in his own party."

"Presidents I have known," John Baer could say, include Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, Warren Harding, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. He also knew William Jennings Bryan, admired his oratorical ability, and agreed with nearly everything Bryan had to say about solving the problems of the farmer and the worker.

But his memories are mainly concerned with them as cartoon subjects. An impromptu drawing of F. D. R. pleased the fourtime President so much that he requested the original. It was one of Roosevelt's many souvenirs on that famous presidential desk, with its statutes and knickknacks.

DREARY OLD DAYS

When it comes to subjects, John says that Calvin Coolidge presented the easiest to draw. F. D. R. and J. Ham Lewis, the picturesque Senator from Illinois, were others he found easy to put on the drawing pad.

John Baer has known labor leaders from Eugene V. Debs, Sam Gompers, and Frank

Morrison, down to George Meany and Bill Schnitzler. Despite this span of time, John never refers to the "good old days."

"They were the dark, dreary old days of 12 hours' work, 7 days a week," he said. "Labor of today has much to do, but long strides have been made in building up purchasing power and shortening hours."

The story of John Baer can best be told by a glance at his cartoons. One of his early cartoons, which have appeared over the years in Labor and in the railroad monthly publications, appears in this edition. Labor's Daily has printed scores of Baer's cartoons.

Another hobby—and job—is cartoonist and editorialist for the AFL Union Label and Service Trades Department. He lives, eats, and sleeps the union label.

PAINSTAKING WORKER

He does not claim to be one of the quick, chalk-line type of cartoonists. Baer spends from 1 to 3 hours just outlining his work in pencil. Then after a rest, he puts in another 4 or more hours inking in the cartoon.

If John Baer has any pet peeve it is that cartoonists need a labor union. He told us we would be surprised if we knew the small increase in his "wages," as compared to those of General Motors workers, which went, for example, from $28 per week in 1929 to $103 in the first 6 months of 1955. He belongs to the CIO Newspaper Guild, and the AFL Public Relations Federal Labor Union.

Baer probably has donated as much time in free public relations services to the Louisville & Nashville Railroad and Miami Beach hotel strikers, and to the struggle to organize southern textile workers, as any union official involved. And he's been doing just that for years.

Relationship of Soviet Objectives to the Winter Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Mr. Louis Azrael, a veteran newspaperman and able columnist for the Baltimore News-Post and the Baltimore Sunday American, recently traveled to Cortina D'Ampezzo, Italy, to observe the winter Olympics. His comments with respect to the relationship of these games to the continuing struggle to capture the minds of men are most enlightening, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Azrael's excellent column of February 21 in the Baltimore News-Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPOTLIGHT—ATHLETES HAVE ROLE IN COLD WAR

(By Louis Azrael)

The headlines and the story are on the sports pages; not in the general news sections: "Wes Santee, Track Star, Banned as Amateur—America's No. 1 Hope Knocked Out of Next Olympics."

It is on the sports pages presumably on the theory that only sports fans will be greatly interested. Normally, that may be good reasoning. A month ago I might have read the item with scant attention.

During that month, however, I was a woeful witness to the terrific shellacking that American athletes took, chiefly at the hands of Russians, in the winter Olympics at Cortina D'Ampezzo, Italy. And I now know that, whatever the merits or demerits of Wes Santee's case, it raises a subject which goes far beyond sports interest.

STRUGGLE FOR MINDS

The subject reaches into international relationships, into the struggle for the minds of men that is being waged between Soviet Russia and the Western World which America leads.

Wes Santee won't run in the Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia, next summer because officials of the Amateur Athletic Union say he chiseled about $1,500 in his expense accounts at several track meets. That, they say, makes him a professional. And the Olympic games are only for amateurs.

Knowing nothing about the facts, I am willing to assume the athletic officials did exactly what the rules require.

It is a mistaken notion, however, that the Olympic games are merely a great contest between amateur athletes for the glory of good, clean sports, and the promotion of international good will.

That's what they are supposed to be.

The Russians have made them something else.

BRILLIANT JOB

There was no doubt at Cortina that the Russians used the games as an important instrument of propaganda. They did it brilliantly, after long preparation. And they did it by a method which has become routine in much more important fields; by giving their own definition to words. This time, the word was "amateur."

Perhaps the best example was the hockey competition, in which the Russian team was undefeated and the American team surprised itself by doing as well as second.

The American players were amateurs by the American definition of the word. They weer chiefly boys who had recently played on college teams. They play hockey for fun, when other activities permit. They were selected for the Olympic team and have practiced together only since December.

They are not the best hockey players in America. In Detroit, New York, Cleveland, Springfield, Buffalo, and other cities are professional teams, any one of which could probably play havoc with them.

The men on these teams, however, couldn't play in the Olympics. They are professionals.

NONE IN RUSSIA

But Russia has no professionals—by its definition of the word.

The team which won for Russia has played together, constantly, for at least 4 years. Openly or by stratagem, the government subsidizes the team and the players.

Why? Because it wants to present, in this way and others, a symbol of Russian physical prowess, of Russian supremacy.

The same principle governs in almost all other sports.

One may argue, of course, that these are merely games. One may ask, "What difference does it make to the world that some Russians skate faster, ski faster, handle a puck better than our boys?"

The difference is that physical prowess has been admired always and everywhere. Such victories, therefore, evoke admiration for the nation which achieves them; evokes it among millions of persons throughout the world whose admiration and cooperation we need.

There is no easy answer to this challenge. Should the United States take charge of, or even subsidize, Olympic athletes? It might be argued that such action would mean we are copying Russia's tactics though we disapprove of them.

One way or another, however, the challenge in this field of Red propaganda, as in all others, should be met.

Financing Program of Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, and in particular of the select committee charged with investigating lobbies and revising the statutes relating to the Federal corrupt practices law, an editorial which was published in the Northland Times of Bemidji, Minn. The editorial discusses the financing program of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bemidji (Minn.) Northern Times of February 10, 1956]

THE DFL SUSTAINING FUND IS NECESSARY

The method of obtaining funds for Minnesota's Democratic Farmer Labor Party is unique. It is being studied by many States with an idea of inaugurating a similar system for their own use. The fact that it is to the benefit to have such a method of financial suport for a political party has never been brought home with more force than by the Senate fight last week over passage of the natural gas bill.

In asking for passage of the bill, the oil companies claimed that open competition would result in a decrease of price-cost for teh consumer; that rates would actually be less. Most of the cynical consumers—and that includes the majority—doubt the big companies' concern for the small individual would entice them to spend money for passage of a bill which would reduce their profits. And the constant activity of the Justice Department against monoplies seems to bear them out.

In the debate, three things were outstanding:

A Senator was offered á $2,500 campaign contribution; offered in his estimation, because he was in favor of the bill or with the hope of inducing him to vote for the bill.

Companies had employees solicit signatures for telegrams which were then sent to Senators at the companies' expense asking for passage of the bill.

Senators from States having huge oil—and gas—interests or resources, fought for passage of this bill regardless of party policy or platform.

The three things above indicate that our Congressmen need money—lots of it—to conduct a campaign. And, when elected, they are under obligation to those who provide the funds. Regardless of pledges, regardless of promises, regardless of platforms, such a system can only lead to domination of Government by "big money" unless a way is found to obtain funds from another source.

The Minnesota Democratic Farmer Labor Party has found that methods—thousands of small contributions from thousands of small contributors—through their sustaining fund program.

The method is simple. Anyone who desires to do so may make a pledge to contribute from $1 to $25 per month. Those so pledging receive a monthly statement.

However, they may pay as they can, in advance, quarterly, as they are able. If they pledge $2.50 per month or more, they receive the Democratic Digest and a ticket to the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

What is accomplished? As pointed out before, our Congressmen need campaign funds. One Texas representative said he could not start a campaign without $50,000—in a Saturday Evening Post article—and it usually cost $100,000 before he is finished. Our Congressmen are beholden to their contributors.

If you, and thousands like you, make the contributions, then you, and thousands like you, are the ones to whom he is obligated. He need not worry about being obligated to a few big businesses or to a few big money men. He is already obligated to the biggest business with the greatest capital—you, the people.

Only a skeptic would believe that, if the oil States had had sustaining funds for their Congressmen, the natural-gas bill would have passed.

Raising and Exporting Fighting Gamecocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of Oregon's most interesting, but little-known exports are fighting gamecocks. Raising fighting gamecocks is admirably well suited to the beautiful hill country of western Oregon, and the Nation's only State club, Oregon Game Fowl Breeders Association, was organized 2 years ago by Vern Bridges, of Lebanon.

Gamecocks, whose history dates back to 700 B. C., were a favored sport of the fathers of our country. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and Andrew Jackson were avid owners of participants and Abraham Lincoln refereed many cock fights.

At one time, Oregon exported an average of 2,000 cocks a week, but that has declined somewhat with an upsurge of foreign breeding. Skill and science have united in making Oregon's birds world famous, and the birds' rich diets include staple grain ration, snacks of ground beef, bananas and fruit, lettuce, eggs, and other delicacies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the interesting article written by Katherine Wonn Harris, which was published in the Sunday Oregonian rotogravure magazine, Northwest, on February 19, 1956. This aptly titled article, "Exotic Oregon Export," was written by Mrs. Harris, of Lebanon, who has distinguished herself for many years as news editor of the Lebanon Express.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXOCTIC OREGON EXPORT

(By Katherine Harris)

Thriving in Oregon's hill country is a little-known industry whose existence depends on an export trade to exotic foreign climes—the breeding of fighting gamecocks.

At one time an estimated average of 2000 birds a week were shipped by sea from Portland to ports of call in Guam, Hawaii, the Philippines and elsewhere. Recently an upsurge in foreign breeding has been responsible for some decline in prices and shipments.

Besides distant countries, buyers of Oregon gamecocks include Mexico, Canada and sportsmen in states of the union where cockfighting is not in public disrepute. Oregon breeders, during the peak of their export sales, drew an average of $25 per bird.

Gamecocks, whose pedigree has been established back to 700 B. C., appear to be suited admirably to the climate of western Oregon in the mid-20th century A. D.

Though frowned upon in some sections, cockfighting in many parts of the United States is freely practiced, particularly in the South, where events are widely publicized.

It was a favored sport during the nation's youth, and many early Presidents were avid cockers. George Washington line-bred and fought a strain of Irish Grays, Jefferson both bred and fought cocks, Andrew Jackson bred and fought a black strain called Tormenters, and Lincoln attended and refereed many events.

Clay, Calhoun and other statesmen of the era matched their birds in committee rooms of the national capitol, and Jackson frequently invited friends to contest in the White House.

Benjamin Franklin had such respect for the valiant bird that he worked for its adoption as the national emblem instead of the eagle, which he termed "cowardly in comparison." It lost out by only one vote.

Oregon fanciers developing stock for commercial purposes have formed the Nation's only State club, known as the Oregon Game Fowl Breeders Association. It was organized 2 years ago by Vern Bridges of Lebanon, who now heads the group as president.

Other officers are vice president, Henry Burr, Coquille; secretary, Miss Jackie Matson, Roseburg; and treasurer, Marvin Hill, Roseburg.

The membership of 220 includes breeders in every part of the State, but the majority are in the Eugene-Roseburg section. Meetings are held quarterly to exchange information on breeding practices and marketing.

Widely known in State and National game fowl circles, Vern Bridges dates his interest in the birds back to days of his youth in Oklahoma. There, at the age of 11, he had a flock of bantams and frequently matched his cocks in mild encounters with those of boyhood companions.

When a game fowl breeder moved to the neighborhood, young Bridges secured a job at 50 cents a week feeding and watering the fowls and cleaning their pens. Soon he had a start of his own, and since that time has continued to breed the birds either as a hobby or a business, with the exception of the war years when he was overseas.

The Bridges game fowl farm, 5 miles south of Lebanon in the foothill country, is admirably suited to the enterprise, since it has excellent drainage (a requisite for successful breeding), a wide wooded area, and is isolated from close neighbors. The latter is necessary, Bridges explains, since the fowls must have a wide range during the first 5 months of their lives, but they are given to flight comparable to that of the pheasant and would prove troublesome to close neighbors.

After 5 monts of roaming in the wild state, the flocks are rounded up and culled. The cocks, known as stags for the first year, are put in individual pens where they stay for the rest of their lives.

At least 10 acres of ground is required for a successful operation. Bridges has 25 acres devoted to their needs.

Two hens are allotted each cock for breeding, and eggs are hatched in the natural manner. The game hens are unusually good mothers, with a strong protective instinct. At the appearance of a chicken hawk, a good game mother will rise to the attack. She meets the marauder in the air as he swoops to strike, stuns him with blows and finishes him off when the two plummet to earth.

The strength of these birds is remarkable. Carelessly handled cocks have been known to break bones in the hands of their keepers with a single strike and Bridges cites an instance when a 2-by-4 stick of lumber was shattered by one blow of a steel-spurred cock. Ordinarily the birds are quite tame, with pleasant faces belying their savage instincts, and respond with evident pleasure to handling and stroking.

Table scraps and common food are not for these elite members of the feathered world. Their menus include the staple grain ration, interspersed with snacks of ground beef, bananas and other fruit, lettuce, chopped boiled eggs, and other delicacies.

Prepared for the table, they are a tempting dish with meaty breasts and delicious flavor resembling that of the pheasant. They are too expensive to eat, Bridges points out, since stags bring an average price of $25 and hens $10. Average weight of the game cock is 5 pounds, the hens running to 4.

An operation such as Bridges conducts requires constant care, since the individual pens which house his 100 cocks must be moved frequently and kept in a state of ultracleanliness. Feeding and watering chores occupy many hours each day.

Preparation for shipment involves skill and scientific knowledge. Each fowl must be pullorum tested, vaccinated for Newcastle disease, and then quarantined under daily observation and special feeding for 45 days. If results are satisfactory, they are made ready for shipment in standard individual cases and hauled to Portland.

In addition to keeping a number of registered breeds, Bridges has developed his own strain, Hill-Top Gray, which he has bred exclusively for more than 5 years. Patriarch of his flock is Old Cockey, father of 300 stags which have been shipped abroad and sold nationally. The veteran, now a 5-year-old, is retired and used only as a breeder. Thus sheltered from the hazards of his kind, he may live to be 10 or 12 years old.

Good brood trios consisting of a cock and two hens normally bring $100 and up.

Game fowl breeding on a commercial basis cannot be regarded as a part-time job, Bridges points out.

I Speak for Democracy—Prize Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize-winning essay for the State of South Dakota in the I Speak for Democracy contest. This was written by Jessie Bewley Parker, of Brookings, S. Dak.

Every year I am amazed and gratified at the quality of the orations and essays written for this contest. The sponsors of the program can be more than proud of the inspiration they are giving to the high-school students who participate in these contests. I believe that the patriotic sentiments and the love of country which shine through these orations are sincere and genuine. I believe that it is

good that students give voice to such thoughts.

No more stirring oration has been written, in my opinion, than the one which won the South Dakota State contest this year. I congratulate Jessie Bewley Parker, her parents, and her teachers. I want to call this work to the attention of the Members of Congress and to the public by placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Jessie Bewley Parker)

I speak for democracy. I speak for democracy because I have known her all my life, and I love her. Every moment I feel her presence, but today I felt especially near to her. I distinctly heard her voice three times today, and each time she took a different form. She first appeared as a small child upon his mother's knee.

I saw the child but a moment, and yet I knew that I had seen democracy. As I passed, he earnestly was saying to his mother, "Mommy, I'm going to be the President when I grow up."

In those simple, childish words, I heard democracy speaking. In them I felt freedom—freedom to choose an occupation, freedom to speak, freedom to dream. Yes; I had seen democracy once.

The next time I saw democracy she took the form of a young woman, mother of two children. In the living room of their home was a photograph of a soldier, the father of the children. I listened as the mother told the children about her husband, how he had died for the country he loved; died, so that his children, and men and women all over the world, might enjoy the freedoms he had enjoyed—died, that democracy might live.

As the young woman spoke, I knew democracy was speaking. I knew that I also must speak for those freedoms for which the soldier had given his life—for his democracy. Twice democracy had spoken.

In the light of an old man's eyes, I felt her presence a third time. Eyes that told a story of a young boy who came to America, a boy who came west when his country was unsettled; the story of a young man who had tilled the soil, had worshipped in the church his father had helped to build. The story of a father who had taught a child to print, and had seen his son develop into a man, printing a free newspaper, read by thousands. His eyes told the story of an old man's pride in his family, in his community, in his country, and in his world. His eyes told the story of pride in democracy.

Three times I had heard democracy speak, in the forms of youth, young adulthood, and old age. But it wasn't three times, it was a hundred, a thousand, a million. For every day of my life I have seen her, have spoken to her, and have felt her presence. And, like the young soldier, I, too, know what is worth dying for. Therefore, I speak for democracy.

State by State Cost of Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on the total construction appropriation to date, by States, for active Corps of Engineers civil-works programs, including completed works.

Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, flood control is a direct appropriation to the States and communities. Neither principal nor interest is repaid to the Treasury.

This study of total expenditures for flood control, which amounts to $6,859,553,000, is about 3 times the amount spent on reclamation projects. Reclamation projects pay back the principal, and they bring a new source of wealth and security to the communities of the arid West.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the States that have profited so much from flood-control projects will look with some favor upon reclamation projects. They are both an investment in America.

Total construction appropriations to date, by States, for active Corps of Engineers civil-works program, including completed works

Alabama	$55,404,000
Arkansas	369,412,000
Arizona	1,381,000
California	473,031,000
Colorado	31,713,000
Connecticut	31,966,000
Delaware	22,738,000
Florida	116,783,000
Georgia	148,235,000
Idaho	51,319,000
Illinois	263,260,000
Indiana	60,634,000
Iowa	97,564,000
Kansas	106,514,000
Kentucky	245,489,000
Louisiana	450,936,000
Maine	10,496,000
Maryland	26,423,000
Massachusetts	85,125,000
Michigan	118,076,000
Minnesota	58,774,000
Mississippi	255,858,000
Missouri	324,703,000
Montana	135,817,000
Nebraska	125,822,000
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	15,581,000
New Jersey	56,378,000
New Mexico	18,058,000
New York	238,109,000
North Carolina	62,821,000
North Dakota	233,255,000
Ohio	158,657,000
Oklahoma	154,393,000
Oregon	478,627,000
Pennsylvania	227,073,000
Rhode Island	6,895,000
South Carolina	59,789,000
South Dakota	267,688,000
Tennessee	195,594,000
Texas	292,530,000
Utah	708,000
Vermont	5,259,000
Virginia	100,328,000
Washington	451,282,000
West Virginia	120,851,000
Wisconsin	13,386,000
Wyoming	300,000
District of Columbia	4,518,000
Total	[1] 6,859,553,000

[1] Includes maintenance of the Mississippi River alluvial valley project prior to fiscal year 1942, since both construction and maintenance funds were combined in annual appropriations in the early years of the project and are inseparable.

Multiple Purposes of Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Colorado River storage project, now before Congress, makes a very positive, persuasive case, if people will take a few minutes to consider the multiple purposes of the project and the many reasons justifying it as a sound and economically feasible undertaking for the Federal Government.

It recently was my honor to be chosen to represent the proponents of this project by presenting the positive side in a pro-and-con analysis of the proposed legislation, published by the American Enterprise Association. The two opposing views of this legislative proposal, Raymond Moley having stated the negative side, were published by the American Enterprise Association as a public information service. Copies of this publication can be obtained from the Washington, D. C., office of the association at 1012 14th Street NW.

I ask unanimous consent that my views on this matter, as reflected in the American Enterprise Association publication be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

(By Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Colorado River storage project is necessary to regulate, control, and convey the waters of the upper Colorado River for and to those areas entitled to its use under the terms of the Colorado River compact and upper Colorado River compact.

It is a well-planned, economically sound, completely self-liquidating, long-range project designed to provide for the conservation and development of a vitally needed water supply for a four-State semidesert area larger than New England.

No other comparable river development program has ever been presented to Congress for authorization backed by the detailed engineering and economic studies and interstate cooperation in its planning reflected in this bill. This project has been under detailed study and investigation for more than 20 years, during which time there have been expended, from State funds and power revenues allocated to these investigations from the Hoover Dam, approximately $10 million.

The Colorado River storage project is the culmination of an overall basinwide program for the total consumptive use of the waters of the Colorado River provided for in the Colorado River Compact signed by the seven States in the Colorado River Basin and the Federal Government. The first units of this basinwide plan, beginning with the Hoover Dam, all in the lower basin, have now been completed largely with Federal financial aid.

The Colorado River Compact was agreed to by the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin

and the Federal Government in order to insure an equitable division of the water resources of the Colorado among the several States, regardless of the time of development. It was recognized that the lower basin would develop first because of the greater ease of control and diversion of the water, the need for flood control in the lower basin, the need for an All-American Canal to serve the Imperial Valley, and the proximity of large centers of population in California. During the last 33 years, the lower basin, with the help of Federal funds and the support of the upper basin States, has enjoyed practically full development.

It was also recognized at the time of the signing of the compact that the upper basin, because of its difficult topography, relative inaccessibility, and the necessity for major storage for regulation, would develop much more slowly. The signers of the compact in the lower basin, however, pledged their support to upper basin development when such development was ready for construction. That time is now.

Why, then, has so much misinformation been spread about this program and why has opposition to the upper basin development been generated, largely by southern California, in the lower basin?

The explanation is simple, but first one must get a true picture of the situation.

(a) The Colorado River Basin is an arid region. The total flow of the river is not sufficient to meet the water needs of the area. This fact was recognized early and prompted the Colorado River Compact which divided the waters of the river among the States before it was put to use.

(b) The Colorado River is the last major source of water available to the upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming).

(c) More than 90 percent of the water in the Colorado River system originates in the upper basin States. No water originates in California.

The flow of the river varies widely from year to year and season to season. For example, the flow at Lee Ferry may be as low as 4 million acre-feet in 1 year, and as much as 25 million acre-feet in another year. The flow at Yuma, Ariz., may be as low as 3,000 cubic feet per second during the dry season, and as much as 300,000 acre-feet during the season of flood flows.

To utilize the entire flow of the river, the flow at the points of diversion must be made to coincide with the demand, both with respect to amount and time. To meet this requirement the river has to be regulated, that is, storage must be provided which will make it possible to hold the water during wet seasons and release it during the dry seasons. Long-time hold-over storage for river regulation is necessary on the Colorado River because of the wide fluctuations in its flow. Wherever the term regulation is used in this discussion it means artificial storage to make the flow of the river coincide with the demand for water use.

(d) The Hoover Dam fully regulates the flow of the lower river. A fully regulated, safe supply is available to all water users below the dam.

(e) In the lower basin there are many thousands of acres of land for which there is no water within the allocation made to the lower basin by the compact.

(f) Water runs downhill. The value of this water resource to the upper basin is beyond measurement because it is renewable. Water is liquid gold.

(h) So long as the upper basin States can be prevented from using their water, the lower basin users, who are principally in California and Mexico, will enjoy the benefits from the upper basin's share of the Colorado River.

Therefore, the issue is clear. The Colorado River storage project will make it possible for the upper basin States to use their allocated share of the Colorado River. So long as this project is not built, the lower basin users, principally in California and Mexico, will be the beneficiaries of this great resource in terms of water and hydropower.

Each year that the present unused portion of the Colorado River water allocated the upper-basin States is allowed to flow into the lower basin, it means a windfall of roughly $4 million a year to southern California power users, and it gives southern California and Mexico an opportunity to utilize consumptively the waters belonging to the upper-basin States.

The following is a brief description of the principal features of the project and sound positive reasons why people interested in economy and sound fiscal governmental policies—a group in which I claim membership—can support the Colorado River storage project.

II. PRINCIPAL FEATURES

1. The Colorado River storage project and participating projects is a basinwide proposal which, when carried out, will provide the facilities necessary for the upper-basin States to use their share of the Colorado River water. The proposed basin development is unique and difficult because of topography, distances to be covered, storage to be provided, water exchanges to be made, and power to be developed. It must be planned and built as a basinwide project. This accounts for the large authorization requested, but it must be remembered that it will take 30 to 40 years to complete the works included in this project.

2. The Colorado River storage project and participating projects provides for regulation of the river—storage of seasonal floodwaters to make the river's water available for use year round in the upper-basin States where 90 percent of the river's water originates.

3. The Colorado River storage project provides water for consumptive use by direct diversion or by exchange, both within and outside the Colorado River Basin.

4. The Colorado River storage project provides power as a byproduct, the net revenues from which will be used to help pay the costs of the project.

5. The Colorado River storage project provides regulating and control works and conveyance channels to convey the water to the land, to municipalities, and other points of use.

6. The Colorado River Storage Project Bill, H. R. 3383, provides for the authorization of 4 storage dams, 3 allied hydro-power plants and 11 participating projects to deliver water for use in each of the 4 States. The estimated cost of these units is about $760 million and the construction period approximately 30 years.

7. The Colorado River storage project is self-liquidating. The cost of the power and municipal water features will be repaid with interest. The cost of the irrigation features allocated to the water users will be paid back in 50 years, plus a 10-year development period, without interest. The balance of the cost allocated to irrigation will be paid back from power revenues, all within 50 years. The cost of the interest on the irrigation features during the payout period will be exceeded many times by the new income taxes which will pour into the Treasury from the new wealth created as a result of the construction of the project. After the project costs are repaid, the project power plants will continue to pour into the United States Treasury many millions of dollars per year.

8. Historical summary of the development of the Colorado River, 1870–1954:

1870–1922: Isolated, limited small projects on tributaries, along banks of main stream and in Imperial Valley of California and Mexico—limited by uncontrolled late season flow and subject to frequent floods which would wash away the diversion works. Water rights acquired under doctrine of appropriation—i. e., "First in time is first in right."

1922: The Colorado River compact was drawn to divide the water resource of the river, prior to its being put to use. The compact provided for total ultimate consumptive use of the water resource, and equitable division of such use among upper and lower basin States and Mexico.

Total consumptive use of the water resource depends upon:

(1) Complete regulation of flow, with long-time holdover storage. Necessary to carry water available during wet years over to dry years and provides for:

(2) Storage of water for consumptive use.

(3) Power, the net revenues from which would help pay for the project.

1922–54 (lower basin):

(1) Construction of Hoover, Parker, Imperial Dams, and All-American Canal under reclamation law. Davis Dam under Mexican Treaty.

(2) These provide (a) storage for regulation and power and water for consumptive use; (b) power revenues pay entire cost of storage for regulation and power, and help pay cost of irrigation features.

(1) Investigations to establish plan for development.

(2) Investigation completed in 1950. A feasible project was reported by United States Bureau of Reclamation, and favorably recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President in 1954.

(3) Construction in the upper basin during the 32 years has been limited to the Colorado-Big Thompson project and a few very small, miscellaneous projects.

(4) Authorizing legislation has passed the Senate (S.500) and is now before the House (H. R. 3383). This legislation provides for 4 dams and reservoirs to provide for river regulation, holdover storage and water for consumptive use, and 3 allied hydropower plants for the generation of hydroelectric energy. It also provides for 11 participating projects, to convey water from points of origin to points of use.

And now may I point out some of the reasons why this project should be authorized and built.

III. JUSTIFICATION

1. The project will provide water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural needs.

2. The project will end a deplorable waste of fresh water into the sea.

3. The project will provide for holdover storage.

4. The project is well planned, based on sound engineering design, and the cost estimates and estimates of net power revenues are conservative.

5. The project is a true partnership enterprise.

6. The project is a multiple-purpose development.

7. The project produces power as a by-product.

8. The project will provide water and power for the industrial development of the area.

9. The project is vital to national defense.

10. The project is an investment of recognized Federal interest.

11. The project users pay all operation and maintenaance costs.

12. The project will benefit every section of the Nation.

13. The project will stabilize the river and protect downstream facilities.

14. The project will start the Navaho Tribe on the road to independence and self-sufficiency.

15. The project does not involve the public versus private power controversy.

16. The reimbursable project costs—99 percent of the total—will be repaid by the users of the water and power.

17. The reclamation fund provides ready cash in the Treasury to finance reclamation projects.

18. The project creates a new source of income to the Federal Treasury, not a tax burden on each State.

19. Water rights are established by compact.

20. The project construction period will be at least 25 years.

21. The project costs are reasonable.

22. The project does not add to the agricultural surplus.

23. A discussion of southern California's proposals for alternate reclamation in nonarid areas.

24. The contemplated future firm power production at Hoover Dam would not be adversely affected.

25. The real issue—who gets the water and power?

26. Partnership in reclamation.

IV. THE WATER PROJECT IS JUSTIFIED

1. The project will provide water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural needs.

The climate of the Colorado River basin is semiarid to arid. The river is snow fed. It runs high during the snow-melting period, and low in the late summer and winter. This project will store the water during wet years and wet seasons, and make it available during the dry years and seasons for all consumptive uses. The project will extend and stabilize the water supply and provide water for the maximum agricultural, industrial, and municipal development.

2. The project will end a deplorable waste of precious fresh water into the sea.

The upper-basin States are now using less than 2½ million out of 7½ million acre-feet apportioned to them by the Colorado River compact. From 4 to 5 million acre-feet annually are being wasted into the sea, or are being diverted illegally by lower basin or Mexican water users. This water flows through the turbines at Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams, after which it wastes into the Gulf of Lower California. The Colorado River compact provides for total consumptive use, and after full development there should be no water reach the sea.

3. The Colorado River storage project will provide holdover storage for regulation of a wild and unruly river. Such storage, above Hoover Dam, also will improve the operation characteristics of Lake Mead, and provide increased firm power generation at any dam which may be built between Hoover and Glen Canyon. More important, the Glen Canyon Dam will extend the life of Lake Mead indefinitely, because much of the silt now building up in Lake Mead will be trapped in the Glen Canyon Reservoir. The holdover storage in the upper basin also will guarantee annual delivery to the lower basin and Mexico of the waters to which they are entitled under the compact and the Mexican Water Treaty.

4. The Colorado River storage project is well planned, based on sound engineering design, and the cost estimates and estimates of net power revenues are conservative. More than 20 years time and $10 million have been expended in engineering and economic studies. These studies were made by the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the respective States, and took into consideration the total potential basinwide development.

5. The Colorado River storage project is a true partnership enterprise.

The proposed development will be carried out under the terms of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, an interstate agreement entered into by the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The irrigation water users will repay the irrigation costs up to the limit of the land and water capability, without interest. The municipal water users will repay the full cost of the municipal water features, with interest. The power facilities will be repaid, with interest, from power revenues. The costs allocated to irrigation, above the ability of the irrigators to pay, will be paid back out of power revenues. Thus all water and power users in the area concerned will participate in the repayment of the project costs.

Public benefits of great magnitude will result from this project. Recognition of these public benefits by the Federal Government is reflected in the provision of interest-free money on the unpaid balance of the construction costs allocated to irrigation. Save for contributing less than 1 percent of the total cost for such nonreimbursable benefits as flood control, the Federal Government makes no other direct contribution, even though the States involved are more than 50 percent federally owned.

The States contributed liberally to the costs of planning. The Upper Colorado River Basin Compact Commission has cooperated in the planning of the project and furnished information relating to it. The project has the unanimous support of the four upper basin States, on a bipartisan basis.

6. The Colorado River storage project is a multiple-purpose development.

It provides water for municipal, agricultural, and industrial purposes, and power as a byproduct. It will greatly improve the recreational and wildlife facilities of the area. It will provide for flood control by regulation and use of the water. All water uses developed in this project will be subject to the respective State water laws governing appropriation and use.

Although the initial use of the water may be agricultural, in this area of limited water supplies uses may change, with agriculture yielding to municipal or industrial demands under long-established legal priorities. The economy of the area is so closely tied together that the water and power users are essentially the same people. Therefore, there is no objection from the power users to paying an extra price for their power, when they know it is going to help pay for the cost of water, which in turn, benefits agriculture, municipalities, and industry, and contributes to general economic progress in the area.

7. The Colorado River storage project produces power as a byproduct.

Falling water represents energy. This energy, when converted into useful forms, becomes very valuable to man. Water is one of the few renewable resources. Therefore, power created from the energy of falling water is in great demand, because there is no recurring cost for fuel.

Hydropower is premium power, because of the ease of making the power output coincide with the demand for power. When the load goes off, the turbine gates close, and the water is put in storage. When the load comes on, the urbine gates open, and the water is drawn from storage. Such an operation is impossible with either thermal or nuclear power. Hydropower will never be put out of business by other forms of power, because of its value for peaking purposes.

The project storage dams are ideal sites for hydropower plants. These dams are necessary to the storage of water and the regulation of river flow. It is good business to utilize them also to convert the energy of falling water to power. This power, when sold at competitive rates in the intermountain area, will produce net revenues which will be used to help pay the cost of the irrigation features and thus make the entire project self-liquidating. After all costs have been repaid, these plants will still be producing power, the revenues from which will flow into the public treasury.

8. The Colorado River storage project will provide water and power for industrial development of the area.

The upper Colorado Basin States are storehouses of raw materials. Great quantities of coal, oil, gas, oil shale, strategic minerals, nonferrous and ferrous metals, hydrocarbons, and other minerals and chemicals are found in the area. All the raw materials for chemical and fertilizer industries abound in the area. To develop these materials, water and power are required. Both will be available from this project.

It is estimated that 500,000 acre-feet of water will be required to meet the industrial needs of the area in the next 25 years. It will take at least 25 years to develop this water resource.

9. The Colorado River storage project is vital to national defense.

In this age of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, most of our centralized vital industries are "sitting ducks." Many could be wiped out in a single aerial bombing or missile strike. Such industries should be dispersed.

New defense plants should not be constructed alongside old ones. When new plants to make steel, scientific instruments, machine tools, processing plants for vital materials, heavy equipment and armaments, are built, they should be widely dispersed, and some of them located in the mountains where they would be hard to find and hit. The Rocky Mountains provide such protected sites, but water and power are needed to make the sites useful. Early construction of the Colorado River storage project, to provide water and power for such industries, is amply justified on the grounds of national defense.

10. The project is an investment of recognized Federal interest.

Approximately two-thirds of the total cost of the Colorado River storage project is to be repaid with revenues from power and municipal water features. These costs are fully reimbursable, with interest; hence, for this portion of the project there is no cost to the taxpayers.

The irrigation features of this project will cost approximately one-third of the total. The costs of these features are fully reimbursable, but without interest. The estimated average annual cost of these features of the project is $10 million.

The Reclamation Fund, a revolving fund used to finance reclamation projects, is made up of income from the sale or lease of natural resources on the Federal lands in the public land States, including power revenues and other miscellaneous receipts. By June 30, 1954, this fund totaled $848,149,945, plus an unappropriated balance of $88,033,070. This fund is so large that currently more than half the total appropriations to reclamation, and more than all the appropriations to the irrigation features, come from this fund. In 1955 more than $20 million from the natural resources in the upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming) were added to this fund.

So long as the average annual appropriation to build the irrigation features of the Colorado River storage project does not exceed the annual contribution to the Reclamation Fund from the upper basin States, the construction cost of this project represents an investment of all or a portion of the upper basin's share of the revolving fund which is already in the revolving fund bank. Such construction, therefore, would take no tax money out of the Federal Treasury. As far as the irrigation features are concerned, this project pays its way with direct income from water users and the upper basin States and the contribution to the reclamation fund, which is made up in major part from the sale or lease of natural resources held in trust by the Federal Government in the said States. The other features of the project are built all or in part with borrowed money for which interest is paid.

11. The project water users pay operation and maintenance costs.

Almost all of the river and harbor and flood control projects are not only largely non-

reimbursable, but the Federal Government also assumes most operation and maintenance costs. During the next 10 years, the Federal Government will spend more on operating and maintaining these water resource projects than will be required to finance the capital construction costs of the Colorado River storage project, a completely reimbursable project that will require an estimated 30 years to complete. In the case of this Colorado River project, as with all other reclamation projects, the direct beneficiaries (water and power users) pay the capital costs and also the operation and maintenance costs.

This point is not made in criticism of the flood-control and river-and-harbor programs, as such. I believe that sound projects under these two great programs are just as much an investment in national economic and social progress as the comparable reclamation projects. But in supporting these other programs and appreciating their value, I have been impressed that most water-resource studies have recommended that all other water-resource development programs be placed on the same basis as the 54-year-old reclamation program, insofar as cost sharing by beneficiaries and payment of operation and maintenance are concerned.

In this connection, I also have been impressed that the major economic arguments against the Colorado River project have come from California, which not only has received the lion's share of the reclamation appropriations, but has also received more appropriations under the general flood-control program than any other State.

12. The project will benefit every section of the Nation.

Every State in the Nation will benefit from the Colorado River storage project. These benefits are tangible and can be measured. They come in different ways, but the end result is the same—benefit for every area.

Expansion of trade area: Products produced in a reclamation area create new trade through transportation, processing, manufacturing, wholesaling, financing, retailing, and all other processes between production and the ultimate consumer, whether the products be uranium or apricots.

New markets: New income resulting from reclamation projects is the source of new buying power for goods produced in other areas of the United States. A case study of the Central Valley project in California provides an excellent example of the influence of resource development on retail sales. This project alone resulted in a new market for a million pair of shoes each year, parts of which will be made in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Missouri; for $10 million worth of tobacco products, which will come largely from North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, Florida, and Pennsylvania; for 8,000 vacuum cleaners, 8,000 refrigerators, 8,000 washing machines, 8,000 radios and TV sets which will come from many States but largely from Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

The increased purchasing power of this one project translates into an annual market for 15,000 new cars, some from Detroit, and South Bend and other cities, but many assembled in California from parts manufactured in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin; for hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of textiles from New England and South Atlantic States; and for thousands of tires, accessories, home appliances, office machines, and all the assorted products of the day produced in all corners of the country.

Eighty-one percent of the construction costs of the Colorado River storage project will be spent in markets outside the Upper Colorado Basin, for the labor and materials with which to build the project. This means that practically every State in the Union will benefit from expenditures resulting from such construction.

13. The project will stabilize the river and protect downstream facilities.

The Colorado River carries a heavy silt load which is now being deposited behind Hoover Dam. These silt deposits will ultimately fill up Lake Mead. It is estimated that the life of Hoover Dam, without upstream storage, will be less than 300 years. The construction of Glen Canyon Dam, which provides for 23 million acre-feet of silt storage, above Lee Ferry, will make the life of Hoover Dam indefinitely greater, and will also protect subsequent developments planned between Hoover Dam and Glen Canyon. The storage in Glen Canyon will make feasible, power developments in the canyon between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam. Glen Canyon, therefore, will provide the regulation for future firm power generation, at no expense to the lower basin power users. It will, in fact, be a free contribution worth many millions of dollars.

Extensive headwater holdover storage provided by the Colorado River storage project will add stability to the water supply for the lower basin during extreme drought, because such holdover storage will make it possible for the upper basin States to meet the required delivery at Lee Ferry of 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10 years in spite of recurring dry years, when the flow at Lee Ferry drops below 7.5 million acre-feet per year.

14. The project will start the Navaho Tribe on the road to independence and self-sufficiency.

The Colorado River storage project is the Navaho's major hope for the future—their opportunity to become self-supporting.

The Navahos make good farmers—when they have water. There never has been a food surplus in the Navaho Nation, but always a shortage of food. Hunger and poverty are constant specters among the Navahos. The proposed development will provide food to eat, economic stability and opportunity for progress.

The Navahos do not ask for charity, but by authorizing the project, the people of the United States will be able to keep some of the promises made to the Navahos in the Treaty of 1868.

The average cash income of the Navahos today is about $150 per person per year. The project will raise the Navaho standard of living and provide opportunities for the Navahos to earn their own way.

The project will accelerate the educational program by providing a basis for a more concentrated population.

The project is the least expensive way to provide for long-range rehabilitation of a proud and deserving people.

15. The project does not involve a public versus private power controversy.

Ten private power companies serving the upper basin area appeared before the congressional committees in support of this project. The National Association of REA Cooperatives has endorsed the project. The power from the project powerplants will be sold under the provisions of the Reclamation law, which includes the preference clause. There is no Federal subsidy to power in this project. The entire cost of the power features will be repaid with interest. The power will be sold at competitive rates, expected to be about 6 mills per kilowatt-hour at the load centers. This means that the users of power in the area, who are also the water users, will help pay for the cost of the project.

16. All reimbursable costs will be repaid by the users of water and power.

The Federal Government, throughout its history, has provided financial aid to public works, where such public works would result in public benefits. The earliest aid was given in the improvement of rivers and harbors, ship canals, and roads. Later, such aid was extended to flood control, railroads, highways, shipping, airlines, and critical industries. In most of these uses, the first costs were never repaid and frequently the operation and maintenance costs were also assumed by the Federal Government. Currently the Federal Government is spending billions on water resource projects (rivers and harbors and flood control), little of which will be repaid and upon which no interest is charged.

In spite of the erroneous and misleading propaganda which has been widely disseminated, the construction costs of the Colorado River project will be 99 percent reimbursed by the water- and power-users of the area served. The nonreimbursable 1 percent represents a very modest appraisal of other values, such as flood control and fish and wildlife protection.

Approximately two-thirds of the total cost of the project represent the investment in power and municipal water features. These costs will be repaid with interest. The one-third allocated to irrigation will be repaid, without interest. This is in harmony with national policy which has been in effect for more than 50 years, because the value of the interest is the Federal Government's contribution toward the cost of the public benefits which are many, and recognition of the large percentage of public land in the reclamation States.

With the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, a revolving fund, called the Reclamation Fund, was established to finance reclamation projects. The major source of this revolving fund has been and still is the income from the sale of timber, public lands, and oil, gas and mineral leases and power revenues in the public land States. This fund has been built up to nearly $1 billion, and its annual accruals are now sufficient to finance reclamation investigations and overhead, and to provide more than one-half the construction appropriations for reclamation.

Considering the multipurpose character of reclamation projects, and the fact that the power and municipal features of these projects draw interest on the unpaid balance of the construction costs, it is obvious that the interest-free money outside that in the revolving fund required to finance the irrigation features of the reclamation program is very small. The charges that the Colorado storage project will place a heavy tax burden on other States are therefore completely erroneous.

17. The project creates a new source of income to the Federal Treasury, not a tax burden upon each State.

The widely disseminated charge that the Colorado River storage project will be paid for by States outside the upper Colorado River Basin is pure fiction.

The provision of interest-free money from the Federal Treasury for irrigation features of reclamation projects has been national policy for more than 50 years. This is not a subsidy. It is a form of payment for indirect benefits received by the public from the results of reclamation. These benefits are tangible and can be evaluated. During the payout period of a reclamation project, the value of these benefits greatly exceeds the cost of interest on the cost of the irrigation features.

Put in a more recognizable form, let's look at the income-tax situation alone, because this revenue goes directly into the Federal Treasury.

First of all, the expenditures for construction become income, which is immediately taxable. H. R. 3383 provides for an expenditure of $760 million. Assume for the purposes of illustration, that the construction is completed in 10 years at $76 million per year. This expenditure, in one form or another, becames taxable income. The Treasury Department estimates 20 percent is about

an average income-tax rate. Twenty percent of $76,000,000 equals $15,200,000. Out of the $760 million expended for construction, therefore, $152 million goes back directly into the Treasury as a new source of income to the Treasury, which would not exist if the project were not built.

A part of this new income would offset the interest on the unpaid balance during the construction period. The offset would be current, so only simple interest would be involved. The net new income into the Treasury during the assumed construction period, therefore, would equal $106,752,000.

At the beginning of the development period, the farm income would start to increase. This new farm income, which did not exist before the project was built, is taxable.

The new income taxes resulting from increased farm income, increase from 0 at the beginning of the development period to an estimated $4,947,000 annually at the end of the development period, and are assumed to remain constant during the 50-year repayment period. For a period of 24 years this new income to the Treasury annually will total less than the simple interest on the unpaid balance, but beginning with the 25th year after full development is reached, the total new income to the Treasury would exceed total simple interest, if applied to the unpaid balance of the construction costs. At the end of the payout period for the last unit of the irrigation features, the cumulative new income to the Treasury from increased income on the farm exceeds the total value of interest on the unpaid balance of the construction costs by $131,811,000.

In this analysis, no credit is given for increased State income or ad valorem taxes resulting from project construction, even though they would be considerable.

This claim for new Federal revenue from reclamation projects is not a theoretical assumption. The facts have been borne out in 50 years of reclamation activities. Typical of economic returns, exclusive of direct crop values, from reclamation projects are these from a sampling of long-established reclamation projects:

Salt River Valley, Ariz.: Total cost of project, $24,631,302; cumulative Federal tax revenues attributable to project—$310,700,000 on individual incomes, and $253,100,000 corporation income-tax receipts.

Yakima project, Washington: Total cost of project, $49,593,890; cumulative Federal tax revenues attributed to project on individual incomes, $239,600,000, and corporation income, $101,800,000.

Strawberry project, Utah: Cost, $3,348,684; current annual tax revenues attributed to project, $1,797,960 to State and local governments, and $4,432,800 to the Federal Government.

New income to the United States Treasury, regardless of the source, reduces proportionately the income taxes required or it provides additional revenue for new expenditures.

Providing interest-free Federal money for reclamation is not a subsidy (nor a taxpayer's burden) for the following reasons:

(1) No interest should be charged because the money for the irrigation costs would come out of the Reclamation Fund, which comes from the States involved.

(2) The project creates new wealth from which new income taxes, in excess of the value of interest, are paid.

(3) The value of interest may be considered as payment for public benefits.

18. Water rights as between the upper and lower basins are established by compact. Nothing in the pending legislation will impair these rights.

The upper basin States are required not to deplete the river at Lee Ferry below 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10-year period, and, in addition, the upper basin States must carry one-half the Mexican requirements in case of short water supply. The bill affirms these compacts as the law of the river.

19. The project construction period will be at least 25 years.

If the project were authorized tomorrow, it would take 2 years to produce planned reports and contract documents. It is estimated that to construct Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Currecanti and Navaho Dams, will take more than 10 years, and that at least 15 years will be required to fill the reservoirs.

The participating projects will start to deliver water at about the eighth year after authorization, and their construction will string along for about 17 years, even without the customary delays in appropriations. The flow of appropriations will govern, but it is doubtful that more than $30 million per pear, on an average, will be available for construction, which suggests 25 years as the minimum construction period.

20. The project costs are reasonable.

The Colorado River storage project is expensive, but so is virtually all water development these days. The Colorado project's costs are increased by the rough topography, large holdover storage requirements, long distances to the points of consumptive use, and the scattered arable land areas involved. The costs, however, are not excessive, because this project provides water for present and future municipal and industrial uses, as well as for agricultural uses. In addition, the reservoirs and dams which are necessary for river regulation and holdover storage are also valuable as efficient power sites.

The generation of electric power from the energy of the falling water as a byproduct of the irrigation project provides revenues which can be used to help pay the cost of the irrigation features of the project. This unique situation places the burden of repayment upon both the water and power users of the area, and no portion of the cost is passed on to those outside the area, in spite of the fact that they do receive benefits.

The per-acre costs on the 11 participating projects vary from $210 on the LaBarge project in Wyoming to $794 on the central Utah project in Utah. These costs are spread over a 50-year period, after a 10-year development period, making the annual costs per acre vary from $4.20 to $16, a rather modest annual cost for a long-term water supply.

The costs are reasonable and well within the limits of net increased returns per acre, after water is made available. Fifty years experience on Reclamation Projects show that the cost of supplying water to the land has averaged from 2 to 3 times the market value of the land and water at the beginning of the payout period. At the end of the payout period, however, the market value of the land is 3 to 4 times the cost of supplying the water. Every acre of land proposed to be irrigated under this project will show an increased net production, after water is made available, greater than the annual repayment plus the cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement. The propaganda arguments against the per-acre cost on this project are pure fiction.

Nonagricultural benefits from reclamation projects were cited in the recent Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Water and Power (vol. 1, p. 44) as follows:

"The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crops, and from the industries which grow around these areas. The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation."

21. The authorization of the Colorado River storage project will have no effect on the current agricultural surpluses for the following reasons:

The basic crops which are under mandatory price support or which constitute the bulk of our surpluses are: wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts. None of these crops, except wheat and corn is grown in the upper basin States. Very little wheat is grown on land to be supplied with water and most of this on nonirrigated land, which, when water becomes available, will be diverted into specialty crops or alfalfa and forage, and thus reduce the wheat acreage and production. In Utah—and this is typical of the other upper basin States—less than 7 percent of farm income is derived from the basic crops which are now under mandatory price supports. The principal crops to be grown on this new irrigated land will be fruits, vegetables, alfalfa, and forage. None of these crops is in surplus, or under mandatory price supports.

The total acreage of new land that will come into production as a result of the project will be small (132,360 acres), and the timetable of construction so long, that the surpluses will have vanished before the area comes into production. For example, elapsed time between beginning and end of construction will be at least 30 years.

It is estimated that 10 years will be required to construct the major storage and control works and the conveyance channels to the participating projects. An additional 10 to 15 years or more will be required to fill the storage dams and to build the participating projects. Experience has shown that it takes about 10 years to fully develop the irrigation practices after water is made available to the area. Therefore, although a few acres will be irrigated annually after about the 10th year after authorization, the project cannot possibly be in full production before about 30 years after authorization.

The principal crops grown in the upper basin States are fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops so important to the American diet (75 percent of the present production comes from irrigated lands in the 17 Western States), and alfalfa and forage.

The upper basin States are deficit areas in the production of livestock feeds. Most of the Nation's feeder cattle are produced in the Mountain States. To maintain the supply of feeder cattle needed to fill the feed lots of the Midwest, sufficient alfalfa and forage must be produced to carry the intermountain area livestock through the winter. As of December 7, 1955, 17 counties in Utah and Wyoming were on drought relief. The upper basin States will remain deficit feed areas until water is made available so that more alfalfa and forage can be produced. The United States Department of Agriculture reports that drought assistance and relief through the loan and feed programs amounted to over $20 million in 1953–54 and over $14 million in 1954–55.

Population is growing at a staggering rate. Estimates for 1975 population vary from 200 to 250 million people in the United States. The President's Materials Policy Commission report in June 1952 says that the United States will need 40 percent more agricultural production in 1975 than in 1950. The commodity estimated to be in greatest demand by 1975 is livestock—a 49.4-percent increase in total consumption of meat is forecast, and a 41.6-percent increase in beef. Livestock feed and feeder cattle will control the supply, and the new demand will be built up before the Colorado River project can be put into production. A 6-percent increase in vegetables for processing is forecast, and a

37.2-percent increase in fruits other than citrus. The total demand for cereal crops also will be up—wheat only 23 percent—but not to the same degree.

The demands for food and fiber projected by the USDA and the President's Materials Policy Commission cannot be met in the next 20 years. For example, the USDA says we will need 35 million new acres by 1962 to produce the feed necessary to maintain the current per capita meat consumption of 156 pounds. About 17 million of this can be obtained by shifting acreage from wheat and cotton to livestock feed. A part of the balance can be obtained from increased per-acre production, but such increases are definitely leveling off. Projecting the period to 1975, when the population will be in excess of 200 million, we will need in excess of 100 million acres of new land in production. Actually, the acreage requirement by 1975 will be greater than 100 million, because each year approximately 1 million acres of farmland is taken out of production for highways, airports, urban development, military or public buildings. This will amount to 20 million acres by 1975. Erosion and alkali will take out additional acres.

It is not unreasonable to assume that by 1970, when the bulk of the land in the Colorado River storage project starts to come into production, that this country will need the equivalent of 100 million acres of new land. The USDA estimates probably 20 million could be obtained by draining and clearing land in the humid and subhumid areas; hence 10 million additional acres will have to be found elsewhere. This is about the equivalent of 6 million acres of irrigated land, and that is about all the irrigable land left in the 17 Western States.

The Colorado River storage project, as proposed in H. R. 3383, will bring into production 132,360 acres by 1980. The need by then will be 6 million irrigated acres. Therefore, the land brought into production by the Colorado River storage project can have absolutely no effect on the current agricultural surplus. The total new area to be irrigated would be only 0.027 of 1 percent of the total cropped land in the United States and would be used primarily to grow fruit, vegetables, alfalfa and forage crops, all of which will be in great demand by 1975.

The Colorado River compact apportioned, for beneficial consumptive use, 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per year to the Upper Colorado River Basin. Of this more than 5 million acre-feet per year are now unused in the upper basin and without holdover storage in the upper basin these waters flow downhill to become available to the lower basin and Mexico. In both these lower basin areas the physical facilities are available for the control, diversion and use of the entire flow of the river. Failure to use the 5 million acre-feet in the upper basin makes it available to the lower basin for the production of cotton, which is now in surplus. Cotton acreage in the lower basin and Mexico has increased greatly, because of the availability to these areas of unused upper basin water. Here is what has happened during the past year, 1955. Cotton quotas were reduced in California. Cotton growers moved over into Mexico, and, using upper basin water, produced in 1955 nearly 500,000 bales of cotton.

The acreage in California taken out of cotton was used to grow alfalfa seed, which soon flooded the market and threatens the demestic alfalfa seed industry. Water belonging to the upper basin States and not used now in the upper basin is being utilized to produce crops which increase the crop surpluses.

The Colorado River storage project will make water and power available for industrial and municipal development as well as for agriculture. The Colorado River basin is a storehouse of raw materials. Development of these resources will provide jobs, homes, create new wealth and add new income-tax pipelines to the Treasury. It is not unreasonable to believe that the increased population resulting from this project will consume more agricultural crops than it produces and this will create new markets for such crops from other areas.

The farm surplus is a current and temporary situation. This country will soon outgrow it. It is inevitable with the rapidly growing population. This country must project its food and fiber needs in to the future. It cannot afford to live only in the present with no concern for the future, when it takes so long to develop a dependable food and fiber supply. A few years ago, during the war, there was a shortage of food. Everyone remembers it. The people in the West remember the drought of 1934. Another year like 1934 would wipe out the present food surplus.

The United States has become the greatest Nation on earth because it invested in the future—in the promotion of transportation, communication, agriculture, industry, even to the extent of providing cash grants. It planned for the future. We must continue to look ahead, and 25 years is not too long a forward look. In 25 years we will need all the food the Colorado River storage project can produce, and it will take about that long to bring the land into production. The project must be built beginning now. It cannot possibly add to the current surplus. It is even doubtful that it can meet the increased food demand by the time it is in full production.

22. The reclamation fund: With the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, a revolving fund was established to finance the reclamation projects. This fund is known as the reclamation fund. This fund is supported by proceeds from the sale of public lands and timber, and was later augmented by a percentage of the oil, gas, and mineral leases and revenues from the repayment of construction costs of projects to develop the natural resources of the public-lands States.

The Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the reclamation law in 1938 provided that all revenues from reclamation projects should be deposited in the reclamation fund, an earmarked fund in the Treasury. In fiscal year 1955, more than one-half the total money appropriated for reclamation projects (irrigation and power) came from the reclamation fund.

Up to June 30, 1954, $936,183,015 had been paid into the reclamation fund. Of this total, $848,149,945 had been expended on reclamation projects, leaving a balance in the fund of $88,033,070 on June 30, 1954.

Up to June 30, 1954, the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico had put into the reclamation fund $178,456,067.

During 1954, these same States, out of public land resources, put into the reclamation fund approximately $20 million. This is more than enough to have paid interest on the unpaid balance of the cost of the irrigation features of all reclamation projects in those States, including the Colorado River storage project, if its construction had been initiated during that year.

When all States, except the public land States of the West, were admitted to the Union, they retained all their land and mineral resources. These resources were developed as taxable private enterprises, or as sources of State revenue. In the Western reclamation States, more than half the land and most of the oil and mineral resources on it were kept by the Federal Government. Under these conditions it is no more than right that the proceeds from these Federal resources in the upper basin States should be used to offset the interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government to build the irrigation features of reclamation projects.

23. A discussion of the southern California proposals for alternate land reclamation in nonarid areas:

Wet lands of South, East, and Midwest can be drained and cleared. It is estimated that perhaps as much as 21 million acres might be reclaimed by such action.

The soils for the most part are shallow and infertile from centuries of leaching by heavy rains. Heavy applications of fertilizers will be required annually. These annual costs plus the first cost of reclamation greatly exceed the cost of reclamation by irrigation.

Except for limited areas, the cropping pattern will be limited to a few crops, most of which are in surplus.

If these lands had been attractive for reclamation at the very low costs as claimed by the southern California groups opposing upper Colorado River development, why haven't they been reclaimed before, during the period of agricultural shortages and high prices for agricultural products?

Within 15 years this country will need to have every available acre of productive agricultural land in production including the total irrigable area in the 17 Western States.

Every year the highway, airfield and urban expansion is taking out of production more available land than is being brought into production. It is reported by the Soil Conservation Service that these withdrawals amount to more than 1 million acres per year. In the four upper Colorado River Basin States, 160,000 acres of cropland are diverted to other uses every year.

24. Current power production at Hoover Dam:

The contracts for power were based on a rate sufficient to repay the entire cost of the dam and power facilities in 50 years. Power which was considered to be firm and available at all times, regardless of development in the upper basin, is under contract at the rate of 1.34 mills per kilowatt-hour. Power, which is to be available only so long as upper basin is not using its water, is secondary or dump power, and the rate for this power is .33 mills per kilowatt-hour.

So long as the upper basin is kept from using its water, the secondary power at Hoover is just as good as firm power, and the southern California users get it for the secondary rate and sell it as though it were firm power. The value of this power, being made with water apportioned to the upper basin States, amounts to approximately $4 million per year. This is an outright gift to the southern California power users at the expense of the upper basin States.

From 5 to 10 million acre-feet of water per year is now going into the sea from the Colorado River. This water is being used to generate power for the primary benefit of California.

With the completion of construction of Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams, this water which is now wasting into the sea will be used to fill those reservoirs, and later for consumptive uses in the upper basin.

The loss of this power source is one of the main reasons for California's opposition to the Colorado River storage project, in spite of the fact that California signed the Colorado River compact and agreed to a division of the waters of the Colorado River. Planned reductions of firm power to the lower basin as a result of expected upper basin water diversions are plainly provided for in Hoover Dam power contracts.

25. The real issue—who gets the water and the power.

There is not sufficient water in the Colorado River to supply all the agricultural, industrial and domestic needs of the area.

After all the water of the Colorado River is consumptively used, there will still be thousands of acres of thirsty lands, raw materials undeveloped and living space unoccupied by people because of lack of water.

To provide for an equitable division of this water resource among the States of the basin, a compact, dividing the use of the water among them, was drawn, signed by each State and the United States.

This compact divided the use of the water between the upper and lower basin, the first 15 million acre-feet equally.

The lower basin (California, Arizona, and Nevada) developed first with the support of the other States and the use of money from the Federal Treasury.

Storage reservoirs, powerplants, control structures and conveyance channels have now been built, largely under the reclamation law, sufficient to control, divert and convey all the water of the river.

There are more than 2 million dry acres in the Colorado River Basin of Mexico and 500,000 acres in the Imperial Valley of California waiting for water to make them productive. It would take more water to irrigate these lands than the entire allotment to the upper basin.

An insatiable power market exists in the southern California area sufficient to use all the power that can be generated with all the water in the Colorado River system.

The lower river is completely regulated by the Hoover Dam.

Water runs downhill. If by any means the upper basin States can be kept from using their water, this water will run downhill and southern California and Mexico will get it.

This water resource is literally worth billions of dollars. It is not surprising, therefore, that the southern California opposition is willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the people in the upper basin from utilizing their allocated water.

There is only one issue to this controversy—who gets the water and the power allocated by compact to the upper basin States?

Failure to authorize this project by this Congress will lend the support of this body to the consummation of the "steal of the century," whereby one Commonwealth, which has become prosperous and powerful as a result of water and power made available through Federal aid from a common river source which was divided by compact, now uses that strength and economic wealth to take, by indirection, that portion of the river resource apportioned to the upper basin by a valid contract which that Commonwealth signed.

26. Partnership in reclamation:

The reclamation partnership program joins good land and good water with good people. This combination creates new fertile acres, new wealth which will produce food and fiber in perpetuity. In one sense, a nation is only as strong and enduring as its food supply. In another and more important sense, no nation can be strong unless there exists a deep spirituality among its citizens.

Fulfilling the commandment God gave in the beginning, "to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it," is one of the best ways to develop those spiritual forces every nation must have to endure. The good earth is man's best friend. In Proverbs it is declared, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." The subduing of the earth requires imagination—vision. Let us have that same vision that inspired the Dutch, who reclaim land from the ocean itself, to live their creed that "A nation that lives builds for the future."

American Mayors Urge Enactment of Depressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, probably no group of men is more aware of the need for depressed areas legislation to offset the problems of chronic unemployment than the mayors of those communities with such unemployment. A group of such mayors, including Mayor George D. Johnson, of Duluth, Minn., which is in my congressional district, have indicated their support of such legislation in a jointly signed letter which appears below. I want to call to the attention of all the Members of this body the urgency of the situation and the need for prompt and positive action as called for by the signers of this letter and the American Municipal Association.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1956.

To the Congress of the United States:

On behalf of the municipal officials whose names appear below, the American Municipal Association urges legislation which will speed up the redevelopment of communities that suffer from chronic unemployment.

Persistent and substantial unemployment causes hardships to individuals and to the entire community. Unemployment weakens the economic base of the community and consequently reduces the financial ability of the area to cope with its problems. City officials in these communities find it increasingly difficult to provide an adequate level of education and a host of other municipal services. Unemployment also brings with it increased demands for social services, such as relief and welfare, which the community finds it difficult to supply.

City officials are aware of their responsibilities and are pledged to continue to do all in their power to redevelop their communities. The causes of unemployment, however, are very complex and often national in scope. Changes in national tastes, depletion of local natural resources and technological changes are all factors in the decline of employment in these areas. What is needed is a many-sided attack on the problem. There must be neighborly cooperation between all levels of government and private industry. Each must act without unnecessary interference with the other.

Because of the effects on the national economy of areas of chronic unemployment, the Federal Government has a responsibility to help these communities help themselves. Present Federal technical assistance, loans, and aid to community planning must be increased. Programs to provide aid to private business in these areas must also be expanded.

All levels of Government, as well as the citizens in these areas, have a large stake in a program of redevelopment. We urge the quickest possible action to help solve the problems of chronic unemployment areas.

Mayor Litz McGuire, Logan, W. Va.; Mayor R. T. Hicks, Jellico, Tenn.; Mayor B. W. Krodel, Point Pleasant, W. Va.; City Manager Ralph M. Wood, Hazard, Ky.; Mayor A. Valentin Vizcarrondo, Mayaguez, P. R.; Mayor Roy W. Eyes, Cumberland, Md.; Mayor Francis G. Fedder, Michigan City, Ind.; Mayor Milton DeVault, Kingsport, Tenn.; Mayor Reuben P. Anderson, Iron Mountain, Mich.; Mayor Albert C. Lambert, Biddeford, Maine; Mayor S. Thomas Capparell, Hazleton, Pa.; Mayor William G. Brown, Parkersburg, W. Va., Mayor F. R. Whalin, Middlesboro, Ky.; Mayor Everett A. Koomler, LaPorte, Ind.; Edward G. Nelson, President of the City Council, Superior, Wis.; Mayor George D. Johnson, Duluth, Minn.; Mayor J. W. Sembower, Uniontown, Pa.; Mayor Dave H. Miller, Herrin, Ill.; Mayor T. C. Atkinson, Jr., Marion, S. C.; Burgess R. C. Culp, Berwick, Pa.; Maurice J. Maurice, Chairman, Board of Selectmen, Sanford, Maine; City Manager Harlow R. Richardson, Mount Vernon, Ill.; Mayor Thomas S. Curtin, Bristol, Tenn.; Mayor Abe I. Daniels, Connellsville, Pa.; Mayor G. A. Bridges, Kings Mountain, N. C.; City Manager S. C. MacIntire, Jr., Rocky Mount, N. C.; Fred B. Hughes, President of the Borough Council, Clearfield, Pa.; Mayor John J. Buckley, Lawrence, Mass.; Mayor Guy W. Blackwell, Johnson City, Tenn.; Mayor William G. Meyer, Fairmont, W. Va.; Mayor C. L. Beard, Sheffield, Ala.; Mayor E. J. Evans, Durham N. C.; Bernard L. Manh, Borough Manager, Lewistown, Pa.; Mayor W. R. Young Appalachia, Va.; Mayor B. B. Cruton, Paintsville, Ky; Mayor Alexander Vineburg, Long Branch, N. J.; Burgess Joseph P. Bradley, Mount Carmel, Pa.; C. Martin Lutz, President of Town Council, Bloomsburg, Pa.

Small Business Loses Ground to Giant Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Midland Cooperator, Minneapolis, Minn., February 20, 1956, entitled "Small Business Loses Ground to Giant Firms."

The article is as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS LOSES GROUND TO GIANT FIRMS

Small-business men are in the same boat with farmers, sinking on a rising tide of prosperity, reports Eric Sevareid, CBS news analyst.

Small businesses aren't disappearing as small farms are, Sevareid said.

"But neither are small businesses growing in number as the economy grows, and the number of small business failures has risen to levels that alarm some observers," the radioman reported.

"Net growth in the number of business firms stopped in 1953 after growing by 20,000 new concerns in the previous 4-year period. The profit margin of small business has dropped sharply, while that of big business has continued to grow."

Sevareid used Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Dun & Bradstreet figures.

These show that "the smallest manufacturers suffered a 66 percent drop in profits after taxes, compared with 1952," Sevareid reported.

The Senate Small Business Committee has concluded "that there is simply no evidence the American small-business man will be able to hold his ground, shaky as it is."

"Big business can arrange big, long-term loans. Any workingman can buy a house, car, furniture for 10 percent down and 3 years to pay," the commentator declared.

"What about the modest retailer, jobber, wholesaler, serviceman? His credit situation hasn't changed at all. He still has to pay for his goods in 30 to 60 days."

Small Business Administration isn't much help. SBA has received 11,000 inquiries a month and granted less than 400 direct loans in 2 long years," Sevareid reported.

"So far, hardly a whisper of concern has been voiced by the administration over the profound social fact that the big get bigger, while the small get smaller—a fact, concludes the Senate committee, that will ultimately change the fundamental character of the American economy, perhaps beyond easy recognition by the present generation."

Is This Blackmail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., February 23, 1956. This editorial points out many pertinent facts and, in my opinion, answers contentions made by southern California in their opposition to the upper Colorado bill, H. R. 3383.

The editorial is as follows:

IS THIS BLACKMAIL?

California has received, over the years, more Federal reclamation money than any other State. In other words, California has been the chief beneficiary of the program under which Congress makes appropriations to irrigate dry land, produce hydroelectric power and control streams which are subject to flooding.

Significantly, the only new reclamation project approved by Congress last year was the Trinity River development in California.

One might expect California to be the leading advocate and defender of the reclamation program which has meant so much to its own prosperity. It is something of a shock, therefore, to find California Congressmen attacking the principle of reclamation in an effort to defeat the upper Colorado River storage project.

Congressmen from upper basin States have helped California get her projects. They supported legislation to enable California to use large quantities of Colorado River water.

They had every right to expect that California would help them get reclamation money to develop their part of the river when the time came. But what do we find? Many Californians are not only opposing the upper basin project for selfish reasons but they are so anxious to defeat it that they are attacking reclamation in general.

One of the most telling pieces of propaganda against the upper basin project is a list purporting to show how much the project would cost the taxpayers of each State, so many million of Illinois, so many million for New York, etc.

Actually, the upper basin project would be self-liquidating but the opponents do not mention that. Californians have been active in spreading this propaganda although they must be aware any argument of this kind plays into the hands of antireclamation forces.

This is an argument which is adaptable for use against any reclamation project any place—even a reclamation project in California. Fundamentally, it is the argument that Federal money should not be spent to benefit any particular locality—even though the money is to be paid back and even though no one but the Federal Government could undertake such large public works.

It is the principal argument raised against every reclamation project ever proposed. It ill becomes such an important reclamation State as California to embrace and further such an argument.

In their desire to defeat the upper basin project, Californians have been using another favorite weapon of the antireclamationists. "Why," they have been asking, "should we bring more land into cultivation when we already have crop surpluses?"

This is a phony attack because surplus crops are not raised on irrigated land. Principal irrigated crops are alfalfa, sugar beets, fruits, garden truck—not wheat, corn, and other products which are in excess supply.

Here again the Californians are using against the upper basin project an argument dreamed up by those who oppose all reclamation.

From time to time efforts have been made to call the attention of Californians to the damage they are doing the cause of reclamation (including California reclamation) by using against the upper basin project the arguments borrowed from the bitterest foes of any and all reclamation.

Apparently that is what Senator CHAVEZ (Democrat, of New Mexico) had in mind the other day when he sent out a letter soliciting support for the upper basin project. He pointed out that he for one is sympathetic with necessary river-control projects in all States, including California, and he hopes upper basin needs will receive similar consideration.

Californians are trying to interpret the Chavez letter as "threatening to blackmail against them if they continue to oppose the upper basin bill. Actually, it is high time that sometone told the Californians, straight, that they cannot be antireclamation where other States are concerned and proreclamation when they want Federal money for their own projects.

That is not blackmail—it's commonsense. Californians should realize that in their efforts to stop a project they do not like they are undermining the foundations of the reclamation system.

This Sort of Stuff in a Water Reservoir?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Greenville (N. C.) Reflector of January 30, 1956:

THIS SORT OF STUFF IN A WATER RESERVOIR?

We received an interesting little package from Washington the other day from Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California.

The package contained two little pieces of what looked like purple rock. An accompanying note in the package read:

"Put this Chinle rock in a clean ashtray and pour water on it. This rock came from the walls of Glen Canyon, where the Bureau of Reclamation wants to build Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, the key unit of the proposed gigantic upper Colorado River project. You can see what happens. It disintegrates."

We did.

It did.

Most interesting.

It leads us to the conclusion that Congressmen, following the trend of the times, are trying do-it-yourself methods of getting a point across to the public.

If you want to try this little experiment in your own ashtray, just drop a line to Congressman HOSMER. We're sure he'd be happy to send you a little package just like the one we received.

We're Being Warned About Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have said that in order for this Nation to maintain its position of world leadership toward peace we must offer the peoples of the world positive and constructive leadership. If we do not, as we have not in the past 3 years, a vacuum will be created into which the Soviet Union will surely move, as it is now moving in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. Prompt and positive action is needed to check this Communist threat in these areas. Mr. John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, is writing a series of articles in which he shows a deep insight into and knowledge of the situation in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. His warnings of the threat and the need to do something about it should not go unnoticed. I note that Senator HUMPHREY and THYE, of Minnesota, have already included in previous CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS the first three of Mr. Cowles' articles. These articles are receiving wide attention as evidenced by the following article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Minneapolis Star for February 21, 1956:

WE'RE BEING WARNED ABOUT ASIA—PROMPT ACTION NEEDED TO CHECK THE COMMUNIST THREAT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Two of the most eminent and able Americans in private life—Paul G. Hoffman, former Administrator of the Marshall plan, and John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune—are uttering a sober and solemn warning on the most critical front of the cold war.

It is evident that, based on their wide, first-hand experience, they have reached the same conclusions independently and almost simultaneously.

When you lay alongside of each other the address on Asian aid which Hoffman delivered at the University of Bridgeport last week and the articles which Cowles is writing in his newspapers (Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, February 5, 12, 19) as the result of his latest trip through Burma, Indonesia, India, and the Middle East, their combined report constitutes something very near to a "shock treatment" which shouldn't go unheeded.

Their words are the more impressive because they are neither shrill nor emotional. They are calm, knowledgeable, free of wishful thinking.

Their warnings, carefully and faithfully briefed, are:

That the Communists are making frightening headway in all Asia, that the tide of the cold war in this area of the world is perilously uncertain and that unless we lay hold of the will and the means to reverse it, the free world faces dire consequences.

That through subversion and seduction, pressure and promise, communism is continuing to pull these 10 inexperienced, poverty-plagued, newly independent democracies of Asia into its orbit.

That just as we have usefully taken a new look at our military program, it is imperative that we take a fresh new look at our relations with Asian democracies, to seek better ways of helping them resist communism.

Hoffman urgently counsels a boid, resolute, and untimid program of aid and encouragement to do for the Asian democracies what the Marshall plan did for the war-torn countries of Western Europe.

He urges that we keep ourselves radically disassociated from any taint of colonialism, treat the new democracies "with the respect due sovereign nations" and free ourselves from the fallacy that neutral nations are enemies.

He says we should uphold the "right of the nation which wishes to remain neutral to do so." "Not for a minute," he adds, "should we assume that those nations which are unwilling to join a military alliance with us are necessarily against us."

Cowles' words are no less grave.

"The Communists are clearly gaining throughout much of Asia," he reports. "Unless the United States adopts a much more imaginative and understanding psychological approach toward Asia and enlarges the scope of its economic aid, the probability is that much, if not most of Asia, will gradually slip into the Communist orbit."

Cowles sees the opportunities to prevent this not in our reach indefinitely; action must be prompt as well as adequate.

"Whether the people of the United States," he says, "will come to appreciate quickly enough what is now happening in the underdeveloped areas of the world, or whether we will wait passively until the backward countries begin to accept Moscow's political and economic philosophies as their model, is the overriding political question in the period immediately ahead. Compared to it, most of our other problems shrink into insignificance."

None of the Asian nations want communism. But their leaders and their peoples are convinced that poverty does not have to be their lot. It is clear that if they cannot confidently turn to America for help to help themselves, they will turn in the only direction open to them—Moscow-ward.

The consequence of neglecting the Asian democracies may well be that the Western World would find itself a shrinking island in a Communist sea.

The reward of helping the Asian democracies could be, in Hoffman's view, the "beginnings of the first durable peace men have ever built."

Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the very interesting column by Michael Hudoba, the Washington correspondent of Sports Afield in the March issue of that magazine. Mr. Hudoba, in his Report From Washington, discusses Secretary Douglas McKay's order on leasing the wildlife refuges to oil and gas interests. He. also discusses the all-important question "Can the national wildlife refuge system survive?" In view of the increasing encroachments and whittling away of our wildlife refuges by the Defense Department, private gas, oil and lumber interests, I believe this is a very pertinent and timely question.

Mr. Hudoba's article follows:

NEW ORDER MAKES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE PROVE THE VALUE OF EACH ACRE OF REFUGE LAND

All but 12 of the national wildlife refuges are now open to oil and gas prospecting and leasing. Drilling will be done under the general supervision of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

While Secretary Douglas McKay's oil and gas leasing order provides for Fish and Wildlife Service supervision of the oil and gas leasing, prospecting, drilling and operations, the inescapable fact is that the national wildlife refuges are now vulnerable to exploitation.

The primary purpose of any wildlife refuge is to conserve and restore wildlife species. This purpose now is diverted. Wildlife must now share the refuges with the oil and gas drilling operations.

Secretary McKay's order raises the question whether wildlife preservation can continue even to remain the primary purpose of the refuge. It is the most serious reversal of policy toward wildlife conservation since the refuge system was established and built laboriously over the years.

Regardless of the protection the new order is supposed to give wildlife, the order inevitably encourages exploitation of the refuge lands. Refuge personnel must now divide their time between refuge and wildlife management and protecting wildlife against oil and gas operations due to come.

The national wildlife refuges, with the exception of the 12 exempted from leasing, must now be reproven for their wildlife value. As each application for a 2,560-acre lease, or 640-acre competitive lease on known oil deposits, is made the Fish and Wildlife Service must prove acre by acre the value of such refuge. Your reporter cannot escape the conclusion that the concept of a wildlife refuge has been drastically changed, and not for the better.

Although the Fish and Wildlife Service has supervision of lease applications, a requirement makes it necessary for oil and gas operators to submit operating plans for the refuge lands for Fish and Wildlife Service approval. This is somewhat diluted by the statement in the order that this applies only to those cases where such operations might seriously impair the wildlife values of the refuge lands in question.

We can assume that each applicant will claim that his operations would not seriously impair the wildlife uses, and in such case the veto power of the Fish and Wildlife Service would be questioned by arbitration and appeal.

The appeal would go to the Secretary of Interior who has already indicated his sympathy and interest in oil and gas exploitation by the signing of the order. At the same time, the Fish and Wildlife Service, handicapped by having its top officials changed into political appointees, is vulnerable to the pressures that political patronage can apply.

There is no argument that it was vitally essential for national defense to open the refuges to oil and gas exploration and drilling operations; the new order provides more supervision than the previous regulation in effect before McKay's stop order on leasing in 1953. But, even this stop order was waived to make leases on refuges in the period following 1953.

But if Secretary McKay had stood firm to protect the wildlife refuge system as previous Secretaries of the Interior had done, and not allowed oil and gas leasing on wildlife refuges per se, then the previous order would have been just as effective as the present order.

The issue resolves to the fundamental question of maintaining the integrity of the national wildlife refuge system and its 262 more or less individual units.

It is urgently hoped that Secretary McKay will immediately put the entire refuge system under the exempt classification on which no oil and gas leasing or allied operations may be permitted—the classification which now has only 12 refuges so protected. Then, if the public interest is endangered by periphery operations on some one refuge, the present order would be an effective instrument. Until this is done, we can only decry the descending gloom and pessimism over the fate of the wildlife refuge lands—which in reality are the last resort lands for wildlife conservation in the sportsmen's interest.

REFUGES BATTERED BY TRIPLE ATTACK

Can the national wildlife refuge system survive?

Not in the memory of this reporter has there been such a concentrated series of pressures to disrupt, exploit, and take over the 17½ million acres of wildlife refuge lands. Nor, have these threats and raids been so successful.

Although the refuge system is sadly inadequate, it has been laboriously built over the years to about 50 percent of its needs for wildlife conservation (the waterfowl refuge system is only up to one-fifth of what is needed for the ducks and geese). Yet the past 2 years have seen direct assaults, erosion, and subtle moves encroaching, whittling, and slicing away at the entire system and its individual units.

Whether the refuges can be saved becomes a serious question for even the sportsman who wonders casually about his wildlife resources. It will take the most drastic steps to stem the cancerous gnawing at the refuge concept.

There are three basic types of deterrents to the system. These all have been accentuated in the past 2 years.

The first is the demands by the Army, Air Force, and Navy for refuge lands to be used for bombing, target ranges, and maneuver areas. Where these demands were formerly for temporary permit, requests are now pending for permanent use by the Defense Department.

The second is the whittling away of the refuge system areas under the theory of multiple-purpose-use of resources. The oil and gas leasing order for prospecting and drilling comes under this category.

The last is the failure to expand and develop the refuge system through inadequate budget.

The first two of these threats to the refuge system income from the Federal Government and the Interior Department, which administers the refuge program.

The latter is the result of joint responsibility between the Interior, Budget Bureau and the Congress for failure to seek, recommend, and make adequate appropriations.

Unless prompt steps are taken to inhibit encroachments on the refuge system, in addition to measures designed to strengthen protection of refuge lands and provisions for stepped-up budgets to enable the refuge system to meet the critical wildlife and waterfowl needs, there is more than enough reason for concern over the future of the refuges

as a fundamental game management program.

Representative FRANK KARSTEN, Democrat of Missouri, a member of the Migratory Bird Reservation Commission which approves the acquisition of refuge lands, has become concerned over these problems to the point of introducing House Resolution 350.

House Resolution 350 would set up a special five-member committee of the House of Representatives to conduct a complete investigation of the operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service pertaining to replacement and conservation of wildlife and the maintenance of wildlife refuges.

The special committee, if approved by the House, would also give particular attention to the oil and gas leasing on wildlife refuges. It would study the adequacy of the oil and gas order to protect wildlife on the refuges, and whether the usefulness of the refuges would be impaired by this order.

The committee would have subpena powers for witnesses and records, paper and memoranda, and would hold hearings to investigate, study and report recommendations to the present Congress.

House Resolution 350, referred to the House Rules Committee, offers a prompt and direct method to produce results for strengthening the national wildlife refuge system.

If the oil and gas leasing order protects the refuge system, as the Interior Department so vigorously claims, it should not fear the special congressional study. And Congress should welcome the interest of its members to concentrate a study of the refuge program. It is of particular importance to all those interested in wildlife conservation-restoration.

Atomic Power Will Obsolete Upper Colorado Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the upper Colorado project seek to a large extent to justify the huge expenditure on the assumption that the sale of power will reimburse the Nation for the funds advanced with interest.

When the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, the legislation required that contracts for the sale of power be negotiated before the construction began. No such protection or guarantee is included in the upper Colorado project bill, and it is extremely doubtful that there will be a market for anywhere near a hundred years for power produced by the project.

The power units are proposed to be located in a region which has almost boundless energy potential in the greatest coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits in the country. When it is considered that atomic electric power will be available in the comparatively near future and this, combined with the other natural resources of the area, will make 6-mill power competitively obsolete in a few years, there would be little or no reimbursement to the Federal treasury.

We know that whereas 15 years ago nuclear power was practically unheard of, today commercial nuclear electric energy generating plants are actually being constructed. We are assured that nuclear electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy and the time when this will be a fact is not far distant. Yet the planning figures for this project show that it may take up to a hundred years to pay for them out of the revenues produced by hydroelectric power. In fact, it is expected that these powerplants will pay not only for the cost of the power dams and installations but also 88 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Proponents of the bill in having such expectations completely ignore the cost figures prepared by James A. Lane of Oak Ridge National Laboratory which show that while the cost of producing electricity in conventional steamplants is 7 mills per kilowatt hour, the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills. The actual production of power, therefore, is less costly than by steam and then in addition, plutonium is produced as a by-product of the nuclear electric plant and can now be sold for approixmately $100 a gram. Even if the plutonium price were to drop back to its fuel value of about $20 a gram, the cost of producing power by atomic energy would still be far less than any other method.

Can anyone doubt, in view of these facts, that the Colorado River project is financially unsound? The taxpayers of our Nation should not be forced to bear such a tremendous burden. I hope my colleagues will join with me in defeating this measure.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Redding Chamber of Commerce Favor Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, certain opponents of the upper Colorado River storage project in my State recently have made public a resolution purporting to show that members of the California Municipal Utilities Association are unanimously opposed to this great reclamation project.

These men have made it appear as if all California utility districts deplore the upper Colorado project as both unfeasible and endangering California's use of Colorado River water.

The truth is that the resolution in question was prepared and released without apparently going through the formality of asking the opinion of many members of the association. In this connection, in the Third Congressional District of California, alone, the Sacramento Public Utility District—largest in the area—has been forced to publicly deny that it opposes the project. Additionally, the Redding (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce has felt constrained to take an opposing view to that announced by the California Municipal Utilities Association.

The facts are indicated in a news story appearing in the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of February 25, 1956. This story follows:

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, REDDING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FAVOR COLORADO PROJECT

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District and the Redding Chamber of Commerce have sent telegrams to California Congressmen supporting the proposed Federal upper Colorado River reclamation project.

The stands, taken yesterday, are in direct variance to a position taken by the California Municipal Utilities Association last week in Los Angeles.

LAWMAKERS ALARMED

The telegrams were dispatched after Congressmen CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of Red Bluff, Tehama County; JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of the Third (Sacramento Valley) District; and B. F. SISK, Democrat, of Fresno, expressed alarm at the association's action.

Rex B. Goodcell, chairman of the association's legislative committee, this week sent a letter and copies of the resolution to the California congressional delegation.

Committee hearings on the project are scheduled for next week in Washington, D. C.

In his letter Goodcell contended the association took a unanimous stand against the proposed project and claimed it is unfeasible and would endanger California's use of Colorado River water.

Fearing the effects such statements might have on the support of congressmen from the upper basin States who want the project, ENGLE, MOSS and SISK asked SMUD and the Redding Chamber for a clarification of their positions.

SISK charged the Goodcell statements were factually incorrect.

Goodcell is an official of the Los Angeles Water and Power Department. The agency is a member of the Colorado River board.

This board has strenuously opposed the Colorado project, causing concern of northern California congressmen.

The congressmen fear uncontrolled California opposition would endanger support for Federal appropriations for Federal reclamation projects in their districts.

SMUD OFFICIAL

James E. McCaffrey, SMUD general manager, stated in his telegram to Moss the utility has not officially been asked heretofore for its position on the project.

"We do not concur in the claims of unanimous opposition in the letter from Goodcell," McCaffrey wrote.

He went on to point out SMUD favors an expanded Federal reclamation program to assist local districts and States in urgently needed water and power developments.

In consequence, he added, SMUD favors any projects found feasible by the Federal Department of the Interior for the upper Colorado Basin States in accordance with the terms of the Colorado River Compact, an agreement among Colorado, Arizona, and California for use of the river. The compact terms are being tested in the Supreme Court.

The utilities association's resolution in opposition was adopted by a voice vote. Carl Richey, SMUD assistant general manager, as association president, did not cast a ballot.

REDDING FOLLOWS

The Redding Chamber of Commerce directors at a meeting yesterday followed SMUD's lead. They sent a telegram to Congressman ENGLE similar to the one sent by McCaffrey.

"Some question has been raised regarding Redding's attitude on the upper Colorado project," it reads. "Assure you continued support on your position."

Mayor George Fleharty told the directors the association opposition telegram is a blow to reclamation as a whole and the Trinity River project as a part of the overall reclamation picture.

He singled out three Colorado project proponents for special praise in their backing of the Trinity, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah; Senator CLINTON D. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico; and Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado.

Fleharty, in asking for approval of the telegram to ENGLE, pointed out the three are stanch friends of northern California and fought for the Trinity.

The five-member Trinity River project committee of the Redding Chamber studied the suggestion before approving the telegram.

New Hope for Election Reform Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the sponsors of legislation to reform our outmoded Corrupt Practices Act have been heartened by developments of recent days. These bills—S. 636 and H. R. 3139—would realistically control election spending and require a full disclosure by candidates—and their supporters—of all their expenditures.

Two days ago the two Senate leaders, Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. KNOWLAND, agreed there is need for a change in our wholly inadequate election laws. Indeed, Senator JOHNSON predicted "we are going to have a strong election bill this session," and an agreement has been reached for prompt floor action in the other House on S. 636.

Such bipartisan support takes cognizance of the swelling demand by our citizens for respectable ground rules to govern the election of public officers.

It is my conviction that nothing will do more this year to elevate public life and bring new respect to persons in positions of public trust than the enactment of an honorable election code which will put to rest the suspicions that now becloud American politics.

I hope that our colleagues will take increasing concern in this legislation, and to whet that interest I present an editorial which appeared today in the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Honest Elections Bill":

HONEST ELECTIONS BILL

The drive for enactment of the so-called honest elections bill is a necessary concomitant to the investigation into lobbying and use of money to influence legislators. One effect of the furor over Senator CASE's disclosures and the forthcoming inquiry is likely to be a drying up of contributions for the 1956 campaigns from donors interested in getting bills through Congress. Even regular contributors are likely to think twice before offering any substantial sum to a Senator or Representative while the investigation is underway. It becomes especially important, therefore, to encourage campaign contributions from other sources.

The evil that has come sharply into focus as a result of the natural gas lobby's activities is not the spending of money in political campaigns. The people must be informed about issues and candidates if they are to vote intelligently. Our democratic system is admittedly expensive to operate. The real danger arises when special interests contribute heavily to political campaigns in the expectation that the legislators elected with such help will pass bills the special interests want. The Senate concluded, largely on the basis of the Case incident, that this danger demands thorough investigation.

At the same time the Senate leaders are keenly aware of the fact that campaign contributions do not grow on bushes. While striking a blow at gifts from special interests, they see the need for encouraging more numerous donations from the rank and file of citizens interested in good government. Consequently, the plan that seems to be emerging from conferences by Majority Leader JOHNSON, Minority Leader KNOWLAND, and other Members of the Senate and House emphasizes three important steps:

First, it would permit taxpayers to deduct from their taxable income political contributions up to $100. This would be a substantial incentive to taxpayers to aid the party or candidates of their choice. Contributions on this level would not be large enough to create any sense of obligation on the part of the candidate to the donor. For some legislators, this proposal may well become a declaration of independence.

Second, it would permit radio and television networks to give free time to major candidates without extending similar favors to every fringe or splinter office seeker. This would notably ease the high cost of campaigns.

Third, expenditure limits would be lifted to make the law meaningful, and reporting requirements would be drastically tightened. Means should also be found, in our opinion, of extending the safeguards of the bill to campaigns for nomination, which, in about one-third of the States, are equivalent to elections. Senator MUNDT's proposal that congressional candidates be required to file in Washington duplicates of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures appears to have a good deal of merit in this connection.

The important objectives are to stimulate a flow of contributions from the right sources, to discourage gifts that tend to sway legislative judgment and to expose all transactions bearing upon nomination and election to public office to the fullest public scrutiny.

Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth of February 1, 1956, in opposition to the upper Colorado project:

FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS PER ACRE FARMLAND

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, has picked a sensitive occasion to attack the proposed upper Colorado River project.

Main purpose of this proposed project is to bring irrigation to parched, drought-ridden Western States.

But HOSMER claims that this river development would cost $5,000 for every acre brought under cultivation.

Meanwhile, he declares that 20,937,153 acres of the best American cropland now lie unused in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States—1 of which is Indiana.

And now, of course, we have the proposed soil bank which would remove still more acres of land from production.

It seems fantastic to HOSMER that we would go ahead with a plan to develop dry land in the West at exorbitant cost, when we are taking other land out of production, and have a crop surplus worth more than $8 billion stored away.

What's more, HOSMER claims that rock at the site of a proposed dam and reservoir is of a poor quality which disintegrates quickly under waterflow.

It all depends upon who views this problem, of course. HOSMER, in California, fears this project is going to divert water that now reaches his own State.

Here in Indiana, as Federal taxpayers, we woudd pay a big share of this western project. Whereas HOSMER claims that the four Western States directly benefited would pay only 2 percent of the cost.

People in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico naturally take a much different view.

First of all, they declare that 90 percent of all this Colorado water originates in their States, yet they now use only a small part of it. They say they are only asking Uncle Sam to help them keep what is largely theirs.

They say that the river project also will improve recreation areas patronized by people from all 48 States; would help the Navaho Indians; would improve fishing and hunting territory; and would aid national defense.

We are sympathetic to such needs, but wonder whether the percentage share paid by the States benefited should not be much greater.

And we also wonder whether this is the particular time to do it, when there are such shocking surpluses of food on land already in production.

Old Man on the Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following editorial from the Bedford (Pa.) Gazette:

OLD MAN ON THE MONUMENT—ROCKS IN A BOX

The Old Man has received all types of communications during his career, but never before Saturday did he receive a box of rocks.

We opened it with interest, because we seldom receive a box of any kind from a Congressman, and this came from Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California. In the box, wrapped up in tissue paper, were some chunks of gray-green rock, which seemed to have crumbled in transit.

Was some kind-hearted politician sending us samples of uranium? We hastily unfolded an affidavit of certification, which stated that two geologists of good repute "personally collected a large quantity of samples of the Chinle formation in the area of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers to be covered by the reservoir of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. On said date these samples were flown

by helicopter to Lee Ferry, Ariz., and then and there were delivered to Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California."

By this time our curiosity was thoroughly aroused. We opened a second small slip of paper, and got the answer to our rocks in a box:

"Put this Chinle rock in a clean ash tray and pour water on it. This rock came from the walls of Glen Canyon, where the Bureau of Reclamation wants to build Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, the key unit of the proposed gigantic upper Colorado River project. You can see what happens. It disintegrates."

We did what the man suggested. Sure enough, it crumbled into a mud puddle.

The soft rock—known as Chinle shale—forms immense cliffs in numerous areas that would be covered by water impounded by the proposed 700-foot-high Glen Canyon Dam, according to HOSMER. He predicts that gigantic landslides would promptly devastate the $421 million dam and reservoir, which is the key unit of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

"The size of the landslides which would occur may be pictured by considering the fact that the Chinle itself has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area," geologists reported. "On top of the Chinle are the great cliff-forming sandstones, which would tumble, as big as houses, into the reservoir."

"If this is permitted to happen, the finances of the entire upper Colorado River would collapse. The Nation's taxpayers would be left with a billion-dollar mud puddle."

We are quite a distance from the upper Colorado. Why should we care?

Well, during the next biennium Bedford County will fork over $12,199,000 to help balance the Federal budget. That is roughly four times the amount paid out to industrial employees in the county, and two-thirds of our total assessed valuation of taxable real property.

Twelve million dollars is quite a chunk of change; $400 million is quite a bit more. When we get to talking about billion-dollar mud puddles, perhaps it's time even for us, far from the Colorado, to get interested in the ways bureaucrats spend our money.

Thank you, Congressman HOSMER, for our rocks in a box. It looks a bit to us as if the Bureau of Reclamation has rocks in the head.

Can Free Enterprise Exist Without Small Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold B. Wess, professor of business administration and marketing at American University, recently made a speech entitled "Can Free Enterprise Exist Without Small Business?" Mr. Wess, a former vice president of R. H. Macy & Co., of New York, spoke at the opening session of the university's second institute on profitable management for small business.

It is my belief that this talk outlines the problems of small business quite clearly and it should be brought to the attention of the American public. It contains such desirable material that, under unanimous consent, I make it available through the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

If and when small business disappears from our midst, then our free-enterprise society will be no more. I use "when," because I fear that unless appropriate action is taken, it is possible that small business will no longer be present, keeping our economic system healthy and dynamic.

How many big businesses that began as small businesses would have been able to grow and expand under our present tax structure? If Henry Ford had started his pioneering venture under the current tax system, would the Ford Motor Co. have reached its present size; would it be able to make its present contribution to a prosperous economy and to the economic wellbeing of our Nation?

Our present tax structure makes it difficult, if not impossible, for small and struggling business concerns to accumulate sufficient working capital to expand, purchase up-to-date fixtures and machinery, improve plants and stores, and hire additional labor.

Let us face it squarely. Small business, now as in the past, must depend on plowed-back earnings for working capital. Access to the capital markets and to the savings of investors by issuance of stocks and bonds is not available to small business. Small business must turn to commercial or bank credit and, more important, to previous earnings plowed back in the business, to meet financial requirements. Our taxing system makes it difficult for the small-business man to accumulate adequate profits to plow back into his business, credit is often not available when needed and, when available, the cost is high, and the open market for securities is largely closed to the small-business man. The usual result is under-capitalization. This means that with a slight economic squall, many a small-business man capsizes and then sinks.

There are more than 3 million small businesses in our economy. In discussing the place and problems of small business in our society and in paying tribute to the contribution of small business to our economy, let us not forget that big business is equally essential to our prosperity and high standard of living. We need both for a well-balanced and soundly integrated free economy and free social climate. In this connection I quote Prof. J. D. Glover, of the Harvard School of Business Administration, from his book, The Attack on Big Business:

"Facts, it seems to me, teem about us on every side to attest the great contribution that big business has made to American life. Big business deserves much of the credit—not all by any means—for our unequaled technological advance and standard of living."

As to the claim of certain rabble rousers that big business is running the country, he has this to say:

"It seems to me that no reasonable man, looking objectively at the facts, can believe that big business runs the country, nor that it is pushing us, willy-nilly, into totalitarianism. In fact, it ought to be perfectly obvious that, if there is any real threat of this sort, it comes from those who desire, by authoritarian political action—by the power, and ultimately by the force of the state—to remake the country to correspond to some fixed ideal of their own, or to push us back into some never-never golden age."

Much emphasis has been given to the high mortality rate of small business. Let us remember that bigness itself is no guaranty of survival. A study by the Brookings Institution showed that, of the 100 largest corporations that existed in 1909, only 31 remained on the list in 1948. The rest either slid down the scale or went out of existence entirely. No company, large or small, has a permanent guaranty of survival. That is as it should be in a free society. In the last analysis a business, large or small, must serve the public or go under.

Why is maintaining the health, growth, and survival of small enterprise vital to a better social and economic performance? The answer is implicit in our conception of free enterprise. Free enterprise makes available to individuals the opportunity to try their talents and abilities in new ventures. Private enterprise must provide these opportunities in order to retain its dynamism.

There must be opportunities for the rugged individual to attempt the new and untried. We must have a climate which makes it possible for the newcomer to make a better start and with guidance and education, enable him to prosper and survive and become, perhaps, a medium and important middle sized business. In order to make all this possible, we must provide a flexible business system where such attempts on the part of the individual will have a reasonable chance for success.

With over 3 million centers of business entrepreneurships and initiative we can have, and in fact must have, a dynamic society with millions of opportunities for new ideas, for trial and error, for daring ventures into the future. Newcomers force established businesses into alertness and efficiency. In this way they serve to keep the advantage of a competitive market open to the consumer.

It is to the best interest of big business to foster the success of small business and to the best interest of us all. In recent years an attempt was made by the Federal Government to take over the steel industry. Let up hope that Government ownership zealots do not come into power. Healthy small business makes this difficult. It is reassuring to contemplate that it is not simple for a government to take over several million small enterprises.

I am not suggesting that the Federal Government has no part to play in our private enterprise economy. What makes our society dynamic and vigorous instead of static and inflexible is the decentralization of authority and decision making, in contrast to a society under centralized direction and control. We have many governments and centers of activity and decision making. Labor unions, business associations, fraternal orders, clubs, churches, universities, professional organizations, the family unit, and many groups of farmers, adult study groups, town councils, and so forth, are all participating directly and indirectly in the Government of our Nation.

We may best sum up the case for small business by quoting Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University:

"In an age of bigness there is need to preserve islands for the cultivation of the resources of smallness."

We know that many people by temperament and makeup will be happier and more effective in a business of their own. There are also many who should try their own wings before becoming part of a large organization.

Let us take a look at small business; how many are there, how do they perform, and what happens to them? There are 4,200,000 firms now in operation. Of this number, 75 percent have fewer than 4 paid employees. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent employ 1,000 or more people. More than three-fifths of the 4.2 million firms now active have been in operation by their present owners since the end of World War II. The median age of all operating business is nearly 7 years—that is, half of the businesses are older than 7 years and half younger. Taking the business population as a whole (4.2 million), only 19 percent remained in operation under the same ownership for more than 10½

years, 54 percent survived 1½ years, and 25 percent survived 6 years. The chances are that about 1 out of 5 small businesses will attain the age of 10 years.

Not all businesses are liquidated because they are unprofitable, but a study made in 1946 disclosed that half of all liquidations and about one-fourth of all transfers were made either to avoid or minimize a loss.

Why do we have this high mortality rate among small businesses? Need this always be so? Such high mortality is sheer economic and social waste.

We know there are functions the small business can perform more economically than big business can. There is a need and a market for goods and services which a small enterprise is more flexible and qualified to achieve. The small-business man can give better personal service; he can meet the needs of his customer because he is closer to them; he can move faster than the big business. Small business can compete and capture a market in manufacturing, retailing, wholesaling, and services because of this personalized service—high in convenience, quality, specialization, and accommodation. Yet the small-business man usually gets into trouble because—

1. He tries to make limited capital stretch too far.
2. He handles his credits poorly.
3. He lets his inventories get out of hand, carrying too much slow-moving and dead stock instead of concentrating on fast-moving items.
4. He lacks training and preparation for his job.
5. He has little understanding of his market and the personal and physical equipment needed for success.
6. He lacks financial understanding, does not know how to determine the availability of funds and how to use them to the best advantage.
7. He has little or no record keeping and does not understand the accounting function.
8. He is so involved in the pressure of day-to-day details that he has no time to analyze his situation.
9. He fails to seek help from the outside.
10. He is frustrated by changing competitive conditions because of his inability to evaluate them and does not know how to cope with them.
11. He does not understand nor has he been trained in the art and science of management.

In addition to these handicaps, small businesses characteristically have insufficient working capital and, therefore, cannot afford to tie up this capital for any long time on improvement in plant and equipment.

The small owner must meet the same problems in the management of his business as his large competitor with this difference—he is the buyer, the seller, the financier, controller, recordkeeper, etc., all in one. Yet he must learn to appraise all of these functions himself as though he had delegated them to others. For these reasons he frequently needs outside qualified counsel to help with an objective examination of his operation and suggestions for improvements in areas where he is weak.

It is the duty of big business, of government, and of educational institutions to encourage and help the rugged pioneering individuals who are ready and willing to take the risks of blazing new trails. Today, alas, there are too few young people willing to take the risks of going into a small business of their own. Witness how few are the young people who will go into selling as a career, and note that those who do, generally prefer the security of a straight salary rather than the hazard of a straight commission.

What can schools of business administration do to help small business? They can, in setting up their programs, bear in mind that the small businessman must have versatility. He cannot delegate to specialists jobs of finance, control, personnel, advertising, marketing, production, etc. He must be the specialist in all or many of these functions. Schools of business must therefore develop courses of instruction that will fill his needs for an overall expertness and skill peculiar to the requirements for a small enterprise.

Uppermost in everyone's mind is what will happen to small business under automation. It is encouraging to find Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, reporting to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on November 25, 1955, that—

"Relatively small business may be in a position to turn its disadvantages into an element of strength by capitalizing upon its comparative adaptability and flexibility. While big business fights for mass markets, smaller business may capture the business left behind. While big business concentrates on mass assembly, the manufacture of components and parts—even the mass production of components—becomes the opportunity for small new enterprises. There is no doubt that the smaller plants will need to give especial study to product design and standardization problems in order to achieve longer product runs and secure the maximum benefits from automatic machinery.

"Small business unquestionably has its problems in the contest for survival. These include the terms of competition, the difficulty of securing sufficient capital, adequate management, and the problems of research and development. The trend toward automatic machinery may result in making these difficulties even greater, but it is far from clear that automation itself is going to add a wholly new and overwhelming set of survival problems of its own."

Small business is indispensable in a free enterprise economy. However, wholesale subsidizing of economic inefficiency and wasteful use of resources as a method of promoting the growth of small business will do only more harm to our economy, and, in the long run, will be a disservice to small business itself.

President Eisenhower in his economic message to Congress on January 24, 1956, said: "The lasting prosperity of our Nation depends far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does or can do for them." Let us, therefore, turn our thoughts away from subsidies and artificial props to thoughts of how to help small business help itself.

The Late Edwin Franko Goldman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Edwin Franko Goldman died a few days ago. One of the great bandmasters of history. His name has been identified with free, open air band concerts for nearly 40 years. His great band has been heard by millions all over this Nation. His name has been indelibly inscribed upon the musical history of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I remember Goldman's Band coming to my community some years ago. His music was one of the highlights of the great Industrial and Agricultural Eastern States Exposition at West Springfield, Mass. This exposition is one of the finest in the Nation. Goldman's Band played for better than a dozen years there and his reputation as a bandmaster in our locality was unexcelled.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald be included with my remarks.

EDWIN FRANKO GOLDMAN

Dr. Edwin Franko Goldman, who died in New York the other day, was probably the last of the great band leaders. There were some who even thought him the greatest of all. What is certain is that he belongs in the galaxity of John Philip Sousa, Arthur Pryor, Guiseppe Creatore, and the other idols of the age of innocence, spontaneity and enthusiasm that came to an end in 1914, when the quasi-military band was the most popular form of musical pleasure, and perhaps the only one to which the generality of Americans were really habituated.

Thus the most remarkable thing about Dr. Goldman's band was that most of its success was achieved in an age when musical taste had become more fastidious and less sincere. The proof was in the enormous attendance at all his concerts, though it was in every sense voluntary and afforded no reward in the way of social approval. It is safe enough, though, to say that nobody ever slept through one of them. The great appeal of good band music lies in an irresistible power to stir the pulses.

The difference between a band—as the term is understood in this country—and an orchestra is simply an emphasis on wind instruments, though most of the great bands, including Dr. Goldman's, Sousa's, and the marine band, have also included a section of strings. Where Dr. Goldman, in his time a cornetist and trumpeter of great talent, excelled most of his peers was in the management of massed brasses. He avoided the weakness of many band leaders for arrangements transcribed from symphonic and operatic works, believing that a band does best pieces written primarily for its own instruments. He was himself an indefatigable composer of band music, though perhaps only one of his works, On the Mall, has quite achieved the great popularity of the Sousa and Pryor marches.

But the chief value of the great bandmasters was the stimulus and influence they exerted on younger and lesser musicians, amateur and professional, throughout the country. Musicians like Dr. Goldman made them aware that band music can equal and occasionally surpass orchestral music in artistic quality; and, after all, as Dr. Goldman himself once pointed out, there are still at least 10 wind-instrument bands for every symphony orchestra.

Cost of 6-Year Program of Civil Works, Flood Control and Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a chart showing

the civil works—flood control and navigation—6-year program, as of September 1, 1955. This chart was prepared by the Civil Works Division, United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the estimated Federal cost of this proposed program is $13,818,716,000.

Flood control projects are designed to keep water off the land. They are generally an outright gift to the community. Irrigation projects in the arid West are designed to put water on land. Every penny of money appropriated for reclamation is repaid by water users from power revenues and other means. Great wealth is added to this country by reclamation projects.

Civil works (flood control and navigation) 6-year program, as of Sept. 1, 1955

ESTIMATED COST

	Federal (July 1954)	Non-Federal	Federal appropriation to date
Alabama:			
Flood control	$1,025,000		
Navigation	140,393,000	$143,000	$27,469,000
Multiple purpose	179,500,000	525,000	2,890,000
Total	320,918,000	668,000	30,359,000
Arizona: Flood control	48,310,000		1,142,600
Arkansas:			
Flood control	883,529,000	23,000	609,534,000
Navigation	41,486,000		20,385,000
Multiple purpose	326,329,000		136,945,000
Total	1,254,344,600	23,000	766,864,000
California:			
Flood control	757,086,000	242,996,000	322,912,000
Navigation	92,539,000	36,160,000	18,092,000
Multiple purpose	64,819,000		63,319,000
Other	4,106,000		
Total	918,550,000	279,156,000	404,323,000
Colorado: Flood control	35,070,000		93,000
Connecticut:			
Flood control	14,610,000	189,000	14,384,000
Navigation	6,054,000	435,000	4,689,000
Other	755,000	1,451,000	710,000
Total	21,419,000	2,075,000	19,783,000
Delaware: Navigation	105,794,000	29,000	978,000
District of Columbia:			
Flood control	1,650,000		
Navigation	8,338,000		1,907,000
Total	9,988,000		1,907,000
Florida:			
Flood control	118,000,000	30,233,000	29,324,000
Navigation	49,490,000	109,000	8,660,000
Multiple purpose	46,379,000	156,000	44,683,000
Other	34,000		
Total	213,903,000	30,498,000	82,667,000
Georgia:			
Navigation	8,151,000		3,253,000
Multiple purpose	213,576,000		117,339,000
Total	221,727,000		120,592,000
Idaho:			
Flood control	38,810,000	1,630,000	19,413,000
Multiple purpose	31,100,000		30,506,000
Total	69,910,000	1,630,000	49,919,000
Illinois:			
Flood control	187,675,000	5,475,000	56,024,000
Navigation	553,845,000	56,218,000	382,197,000
Other	1,310,000		
Total	742,830,000	61,693,000	438,221,000
Indiana:			
Flood control	82,459,000	511,000	18,365,000
Navigation	45,985,000		1,659,000
Total	128,444,000	511,000	20,024,000
Iowa:			
Flood control	231,234,000	15,095,000	44,764,000
Navigation	229,987,000	76,000	141,769,000
Total	461,221,000	15,171,000	186,533,000
Kansas:			
Flood control	330,697,000	1,308,000	81,732,000
Navigation	98,020,000		90,000
Total	428,717,000	1,308,000	81,822,000
Kentucky:			
Flood control	187,601,000	4,104,000	65,340,000
Navigation	264,140,000		20,516,000
Multiple purpose	246,278,000		79,478,000
Total	698,019,000	4,104,000	165,334,000
Louisiana:			
Flood control	$234,849,000	$200,000	$154,000,000
Navigation	168,728,000	8,899,000	37,037,000
Total	403,577,000	9,099,000	191,037,000
Maine: Navigation	3,876,000	25,000	3,419,000
Maryland:			
Flood control	25,572,000	7,600,000	13,739,000
Navigation	7,583,000	19,000	5,300,000
Total	33,155,000	7,619,000	19,039,000
Massachusetts:			
Flood control	36,991,000	2,727,000	16,220,000
Navigation	24,004,000	179,000	4,014,000
Other	1,341,000	680,000	210,000
Total	62,336,000	3,586,000	20,444,000
Michigan:			
Flood control	5,163,000	3,007,000	1,013,000
Navigation	96,462,000	737,000	18,162,000
Total	101,625,000	3,744,000	19,175,000
Minnesota:			
Flood control	17,322,000	2,520,000	10,008,000
Navigation	31,739,000	3,106,000	10,615,000
Total	49,061,000	5,626,000	20,623,000
Mississippi:			
Flood control	182,501,000		86,064,000
Navigation	48,000		1,000
Total	182,549,000		86,065,000
Missouri:			
Flood control	206,848,000	1,411,000	16,778,000
Navigation	119,309,000	644,000	99,991,000
Multiple purpose	107,700,000		18,651,000
Total	433,857,000	2,055,000	135,420,000
Montana:			
Flood control	7,222,000	469,000	2,117,000
Multiple purpose	426,300,000		133,565,000
Total	433,522,000	469,000	135,682,000
Nebraska:			
Flood control	60,522,000	678,000	50,781,000
Multiple purpose	53,000,000		45,631,000
Total	113,522,000	678,000	96,412,000
Nevada: Flood control	3,187,000		122,000
New Hampshire:			
Flood control	6,817,000		2,277,000
Navigation	952,000		400,000
Other	140,000	280,000	140,000
Total	7,909,000	280,000	2,817,000
New Jersey:			
Navigation	178,963,000	1,332,000	52,783,000
Other	2,572,000	6,317,000	1,033,000
Total	181,535,000	7,649,000	53,816,000
New Mexico: Flood control	57,784,000	3,147,000	8,305,000
New York:			
Flood control	98,881,000	1,122,000	52,201,000
Navigation	122,762,000	6,564,000	46,062,000
Other	142,000		
Total	221,785,000	7,686,000	98,263,000
North Carolina:			
Flood control	120,000	15,000	120,000
Navigation	5,078,000	22,000	1,371,000
Total	5,198,000	37,000	1,491,000
North Dakota:			
Flood control	6,644,000	501,000	4,627,000
Multiple purpose	279,000,000		251,781,000
Total	285,644,000	501,000	256,408,000

Civil works (flood control and navigation) 6-year program, as of Sept. 1, 1955—Continued

ESTIMATED COST—continued

	Federal (July 1954)	Non-Federal	Federal appropriation to date
Ohio:			
Flood control	$124,504,000		$77,497,000
Navigation	160,028,000	$12,852,000	43,375,000
Other	1,591,000		
Total	286,123,000	12,852,000	120,872,000
Oklahoma:			
Flood control	111,902,000	7,350,000	29,543,000
Multiple purpose	378,650,000	30,000,000	72,045,000
Total	490,552,000	37,350,000	101,588,000
Oregon:			
Flood control	140,911,000	903,000	7,161,000
Navigation	33,998,000	390,000	1,579,000
Multiple purpose	1,268,267,000		589,365,000
Other	23,463,000		12,341,000
Total	1,475,639,000	1,293,000	610,446,000
Pennsylvania:			
Flood control	308,768,000	4,504,000	81,539,000
Navigation	73,374,000	28,000	22,176,000
Other	2,090,000	4,180,000	600,000
Total	384,232,000	8,712,000	104,315,000
Rhode Island:			
Flood control	1,880,000	160,000	125,000
Navigation	727,000		
Other	167,000		
Total	2,774,000	160,000	125,000
South Carolina: Navigation	935,000		700,000
South Dakota:			
Flood control	8,400,000	700,000	3,380,000
Multiple purpose	587,500,000		251,247,000
Total	595,900,000	700,000	254,627,000
Tennessee:			
Flood control	20,718,000	2,000,000	10,494,000
Navigation	21,600,000		11,151,000
Multiple purpose	193,236,000		140,041,000
Total	235,554,000	2,000,000	161,686,000
Texas:			
Flood control	$357,530,000	$46,323,000	$119,679,000
Navigation	46,328,000	6,079,000	10,790,000
Multiple purpose	179,073,000	3,000,000	122,625,000
Total	582,931,000	55,402,000	253,094,000
Utah: Flood control	1,490,000	318,000	63,000
Vermont: Flood control	75,256,000	3,000	4,940,000
Virginia:			
Flood control	3,190,000		
Navigation	17,895,000	224,000	6,496,000
Multiple purpose	114,450,000		86,847,000
Other	609,000	1,100,000	235,000
Total	136,144,000	1,324,000	93,578,000
Washington:			
Flood control	25,536,000	185,000	1,844,000
Navigation	12,025,000	750,000	2,467,000
Multiple purpose	1,060,007,000		129,733,000
Total	1,097,568,000	935,000	134,044,000
West Virginia:			
Flood control	88,400,000		3,705,000
Navigation	33,000,000	6,000	1,157,000
Multiple purpose	28,890,000		28,890,000
Total	150,290,000	6,000	33,752,000
Wisconsin: Navigation	3,290,000	87,000	448,000
Wyoming: Flood control	6,107,000	83,000	445,000
Alaska:			
Flood control	1,158,000	26,000	56,000
Navigation	15,309,000	237,000	3,716,000
Total	16,467,000	263,000	3,772,000
Hawaii:			
Flood control	1,646,000		61,000
Navigation	11,360,000	41,000	550,000
Other	292,000		
Total	13,298,000	41,000	611,000
Puerto Rico: Navigation	1,430,000		176,000
Wake Island: Navigation	3,450,000		
Grand total	13,818,716,000	570,596,000	5,398,381,000

Economic Conditions in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from Bob Fitzgerald, B. S., D. C., Chicago-Lake Chiropractic Clinic, Minneapolis, Minn., regarding his trip to Italy and commenting on the economic conditions as he found them.

Dr. Fitzgerald's letter follows:

CHICAGO-LAKE CHIROPRACTIC CLINIC,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 17, 1956.

Representative ROY WIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIER: Just recently I returned from a trip to Italy. Three things impressed me very much about Italy. The beautiful and historic scenery and only two classes of people, rich and poor. I discovered that the richest man in Italy paid $100 income tax last year. There are enough excise taxes for the little fellow to pay and the income tax laws are on the Italian books—if the Italian Government would inforce them.

Until these inequities are brought about through reform within the Italian Government, perhaps a more tempered attitude on our part toward financial assistance to Italy should be taken.

Perhaps the answer would be investment of private American money in Italy rather than American tax money.

The threat that Italy will go Red if we don't assist her financially will only present itself again and again when our money runs out, if the tax reforms do not come from within the Italian Government. 25 percent of the Italian people control the wealth of their country leaving 75 percent poor.

Sincerely,

BOB FITZGERALD, B. S., D. C.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing tendency on the part of southern California spokesmen to attempt to convince other Members of Congress that without the use of the Colorado River the State will die of thirst. This is simply not true. Southern California does not need to take Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin States in order to meet her own water needs.

Informed California officials are on record to the effect that California has enough water within its borders to meet its own requirements for many years to come.

Excerpt from Preliminary Report on the Major Features of the California Water Plan in the North Coastal Area, dated January 3, 1956:

The data developed in State Water Resources Board Bulletins Nos. 1 and 2 demonstrate the basic geographical water problem of California, and also indicate the solution to that problem. From the abundant water supplies of the north coastal area and the Sacramento River Basin, an average of approximately 23 million acre-feet of water per season will ultimately have to be developed and exported to the remaining inherently water-deficient areas of the State. These exports will be surplus waters, over and above the waters needed in the north coastal area and the Sacramento River Basin for ultimate local use. With the full practicable development of local water resources in all areas of the State for local use, and with the water available under California's rights in and to the waters of the Colorado River, these exports from the north will satisfy the probably ultimate requirements for water in all parts of the State.

Excerpts from an article by J. J. Deuel, director, California Farm Bureau Public Utilities Department and Water Problems Department, entitled "California's Water Program," which appeared in the California Farm Bureau Monthly of January 1956:

It is estimated that the present annual use of water in California is approximately 21 million acre-feet; that 51 million acre-feet will support a population in California of 40 million people, and that the total amount of water available each year is approximately 70 million acre-feet. Based on the above figures, which are supported by extensive studies made by the State engineer, it is apparent that there is sufficient water available to supply the needs of California into the far distant future. The problem is one of stopping the surplus water from wasting into the ocean and making it available where needed for domestic, agricultural, and industrial uses. The Feather River project has an important place in the plan to bring that about.

Quotation, Engineering News-Record, February 9, 1956:

Spokesman for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, C. C. Elder, held that while sewerage reclamation is the district's most important reserve, with its Colorado River aqueduct operating at only 33 percent of capacity the district couldn't see asking taxpayers to pay for waste water reclamation when the aqueduct won't reach full capacity for another 20 years.

California Opposes Upper Colorado Scheme Because It Tramples Her Water Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in the so-called upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

According to Government experts, they would cost about $300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period as required by Reclamation Law and precedent.

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 participating projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

As a consequence the proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent of the price tag within the time limit. They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true cash register nature.

As a starter three power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon, one at Flaming Gorge, and one, conditionally at Curecanti, costing respectively: $421,270,000, $82,942,000, and $88,500,000. Total: $592,712,000. Other power projects would follow later.

The power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The latter could function to supply water entirely without them. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about $600 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the $300 million participating projects' cost.

It is little wonder that alert citizens throughout the Nation, concerned over the Federal debt and high taxes, have voiced opposition to the scheme. Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11 participating projects to the Upper Basin States and forgets the power features completely.

It is with these power features that Californians have also a special concern. They would hold back, for power use, most of the 48,000,000 acre-feet of water to be stored by the project. In the storage process, another 10,000,000 acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation. Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects. It is 150 percent of that amount.

That is mostly water that thirsty southern Californians claim they are entitled to have flow downstream to their State and which cannot legally be withheld from them because of their prior right to it established by contract, appropriation, and the Colorado River compact.

The Colorado River compact was negotiated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover, then winding up his affairs as World War I food administrator for starving Europe, acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First. The upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

Second. The lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Third. That part of the river which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in northernmost Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon the negotiators proceeded to apportion "beneficial consumptive use" of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial, or domestic purposes.

That kind of "use" of water in the amount of 7½ million acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin by the compact's article III (a). This totals 15 million acre-feet; and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, by article III (b) they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of "surplus" water.

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they wrote article III (c), saying Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This again was to come out of "surplus," but, if need be, equally out of each basin's III (a) apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1½ million acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17½ million acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river, so in article III (f) they set up machinery for "a further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river, in fact, averages a critical deficiency of almost 2½ million acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one party "suicide pact" California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt, by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water. Illustrative is the dispute involving article III (d).

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower-basin negotiators insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. This turned up as article III (d) prohibiting the upper basin from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in

excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

They persist in this contention even in the face of an interpretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes.

In the past, California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

New Support for $100 Exemption on Campaign Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last June I introduced a bill—H. R. 7001—which would allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes political contributions up to $100 annually. Senator THOMAS HENNINGS simultaneously introduced an identical proposal—S. 2302—in our sister body.

This measure was designed to enlarge the base of political participation by encouraging modest contributions and to reduce the dependence of candidates and political parties on large contributors.

Interest in this proposal has quickened since the Neff-Keck campaign contribution was disclosed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Only last Saturday the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON] announced his support of this legislation, and there is good reason to hope that other congressional leaders will shortly perceive the commonsense of this proposal.

The origin of this idea—and a discussion of broader aspects of political campaign financing problems—was explained in an article written by Chalmers Roberts which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of last Thursday. Mr. Roberts' article follows:

CAMPAIGN DONATIONS

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

If the coming senatorial investigation of lobbying and election practices is to have any lasting value, it must lead to major changes in the methods of financing political campaigns. Minnesota offers suggestions on what might be done.

Last April Minnesota altered State income tax laws to permit two new sets of tax deductions: For political contributions and for campaign expenses of candidates for office.

Any citizen may deduct up to $100 for his contribution to a political party, candidate, or political cause. County chairmen may deduct up to $150; congressional district committeemen up to $350 and national committeemen and State chairmen up to $1,000 each. (The $100 exemption idea applied to Federal income tax has been proposed by Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, and Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, but nothing has been done about it so far.)

The Minnesota law also provides that candidates may deduct unreimbursed campaign expenditures personally paid by the candidate up to these levels: Candidates for governor or United States Senator, $5,000; for other State office or United States Representative, $3,500; for State senator, State representative, presidential electors at large, $500; for presidential electors chosen by congressional districts, $100; for any other public office, one-fourth of that office's annual salary, a provision covering mayors, councilmen, and so forth.

The Minnesota law is the baby of Byron G. Allen, State commissioner of agriculture and former Democratic national committeeman. Allen has said that "as a working politician, I know the subterfuges that are used" to get around the current campaign expenditure limitations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Acts. "I know," he said, "that the realities require money which must be passed under the table."

Allen would like to see the Minnesota law serve as a model for a new Federal deductions plan. But he also has a more sweeping idea which he recently brought to Washington.

He wants to raise money, big money in total, but made up to small contributions, this way: Have Congress grant a Federal charter, such as that to the American Red Cross, to a new foundation for campaign contribution collections. The foundation would be run by a broadly representative board of directors "not packed with practical politicians," as Allen puts it. It would seek contributions from 10 cents up with some unspecified limitation to be set.

Up to this point Allen's proposal is somewhat similar to the one the advertising council was prepared to take on for the 1956 presidential election.

But Allen goes further. He also proposes to distribute the money collected this way: 25 percent each to national committees, State committees, congressional committees and county committees. But not on a 50-50 basis between the 2 major parties.

Allen suggests that of each 25 percent share half the money go to the majority party, as judged by the last election returns. The other half would be divided among opposition parties in proportion to their share of the minority vote at the last election. This would mean small amounts for socialists, prohibitionists, or splinter groups in various States and counties as well as on a national level. Of course, it also means that a Democrat's $10 contribution might end up helping the GOP or vice versa.

Allen would have the money paid out this way: The party committees would spend it as they see fit, drawing funds from the foundation on vouchers and accounting in detail on the public record.

If the scheme worked well, Allen figures State legislators could then charter State foundations to take over State and local contributions—or the Federal foundation might be limited to funds for Federal office, leaving to State foundations the job of raising funds for use in State and local campaigns. A good many variants on these ideas are possible. One point is important: A lot of people would contribute to a nonpartisan foundation who would not contribute to either party.

In Minnesota the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party sponsors the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education, modeled on European party fund-raising tactics and experiences. This foundation has begun to collect contributions from $1 to $100 and gets 1 percent of the net proceeds of such party affairs as the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners and congressional dinners for its endowment fund.

The idea of this foundation, in Allen's words, is "to improve political ethics" in the State "to the end that campaigns in Minnesota will be educational in value rather than merely biennial emotional binges." The word "educational" includes the idea of lecture courses, political "reading rooms" on the Swedish model, schools for candidates, fellowships for youthful and impoverished candidates and political internships such as some colleges and other groups now annually conduct in Washington Government and congressional offices.

Allen's ideas are certain to run into a lot of "practical" objections from "practical" politicians who would prefer to let things remain as they are. But the $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, already has opened up the contributions issue despite the "practical" men in Congress who would have preferred to keep the lid on. If the future investigation turns out to be meaningful, such ideas as those Allen offers may serve as models for cleaning up one of the least odoriferous phases of the democratic process.

Arab in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the January 1956 publication of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith contains a biographical sketch of the president of Haifa's Rotary Club, Mr. Fawzi John Banda. I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the article which is as follows:

ARAB IN ISRAEL—HAIFA'S ROTARIANS WERE UNANIMOUS IN THEIR CHOICE OF FAWZI BANDA

Arab-Israel tensions haven't destroyed the brotherhood spirit of this city's Rotary Club. Its president this year is Fawzi John Banda, a 48-year-old Palestinian Arab. He was the unanimous choice, a tribute to an urbane and deeply humanitarian personality which has endeared Banda to his fellow Rotarians, most of whom are Jews.

If his selection is a pleasant surprise to the outsider viewing it against the backdrop of Arab-Jewish animosity, it is accepted as commonplace among Haifa's 170,000 citizens. The honor—they agree—was deserved. "The man's enthusiasm for community work is inspirational," was a club member's simple explanation.

Banda himself is a shy man, but of strong moral convictions. "I wouldn't have accepted," he said, "if I felt there was any racial or nationalistic factor involved." Banda can, with pride, trace his ancestry back to the 13th century. For almost 600 years the family members have been faithful communicants of the Greek Orthodox Church.

Banda was born in 1907 in Acre, the son of a prosperous grain merchant. On sunny days he can see the city of his birth across the semicircle that is Haifa Bay. His adopted city of Haifa is not yet 40 years old as a modern, westernized port, although for 2,000

years it existed as a fishing village in the shadow of Acre, one of the world's oldest communities whose beginning is shrouded in the dawn of history.

But by the 20th century, ancient Acre had lost out to its younger, more energetic rival. Within 20 years, Haifa's population jumped from some 7,000 in 1910 to nearly 50,000 in 1930. Christian and Moslem Arabs, Jews, Germans, British, French, Italians, Armenians, and others lived side by side in the expanding city, keeping much to themselves socially, mixing only during working hours.

One of the few common meeting grounds was the Rotary Club, founded in 1932. Its membership reflected the cosmopolitan nature of the populace. "Whatever doubts might have been entertained by the skeptics [the official club history records], the success of the new club quickly set them at rest. Five religious denominations were represented among the members, who were also leaders in the respective ethnic communities.

"It is not easy to forget the anarchic conditions which prevailed during the late 1930's. One bright Wednesday, Hassan Shukri, then mayor of Haifa and a member of the club, showed up for the weekly luncheon, calm and unruffled, without any indication that only a few hours earlier there had been an attempt by Arab extremists on his life."

Up to 1947, the list of club presidents, included 11 Britons, 3 Jews, 1 Arab, and 1 Italian. To this day, English has remained the club's language.

Fawzi John Banda was educated in Roman Catholic and Protestant boarding schools, the French-Jewish Alliance School, and a German Templar institution. One result of this is that he speaks English, French, German, and some Hebrew, besides his native Arabic.

At the age of 11 Fawzi enrolled as a cub in the Baden-Powell Boy Scout movement. Six years later he was chosen to represent Palestine's Boy Scouts at a worldwide jamboree in England. His love for scouting kept Banda active in the movement long after his boyhood; he became a district scoutmaster and secretary of the Palestine branch of the Baden-Powell international group.

But when the Palestinian branch quietly but firmly instituted a restrictive racial policy, Banda, characteristically, quit the movement cold.

He studied accounting, banking, and insurance, becoming senior representative in Palestine for a large insurance firm. Young Banda wrote policies for Arabs and Jews; both respected his integrity in business and liked his gentle ways. In 1942, Banda was admitted to the Haifa Rotary Club, on recommendation of a British civil servant and an Arab medical officer. During the 13 years of his membership he served the group in a variety of tasks, and was both its secretary and a member of its board of directors.

Retiring and quite publicity-shy, Banda has always kept aloof from politics and public affairs. Even the social prominence that goes with a Rotary presidency makes him uncomfortable. He is unmarried, devoting much of his spare time to club work, to stamp collecting, and to community welfare.

The outbreak of war between Israel and the Arab States in May 1948 caught Banda in Lebanon on a business trip. The borders of newly born Israel, besieged by the armies of five Arab States, were sealed. Banda was, involuntarily, a refugee. When hostilities ended, Jewish Rotarians successfully pleaded his case and the Israeli Government allowed him to return.

Banda had been gone for 20 months. Haifa was not the same city as he remembered it. Most of its Arab residents had gone to Lebanon to await the outcome of the fighting, while Jewish refugees from Europe and the Middle East quickly filled the void. Death, destruction, and hatred were the legacy of the fighting.

Like his father in World War I, whose grain stocks had been confiscated, Fawzi Banda suffered his share of war damage. During his temporary exile, he lost his home and personal effects. But he kept his refined, dignified manners and the affection of his fellow citizens.

While he was gone, Haifa's Rotary Club experienced its most trying period. At the time there were 13 Arab members, 18 Jewish, 12 British, and 1 Dutch. Whatever may have been the political differences among them, they met on common ground at Rotary when they came, often crawling under gunfire, to the brotherhood of the Wednesday luncheon.

The spirit and the comradeship forged in those days has endured. Today members of the Haifa Rotary have a personal understanding of the needs for peace and true international cooperation.

To their minds, the virtues of brotherhood are exemplified in the character of Fawzi John Banda, the man they chose as their leader.

A War Is on in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recently Hon. Hugh G. Grant, of Augusta, Ga., who was formerly United States Minister to Albania and Thailand and an official of our State Department, delivered an address before Phi Delta Phi Legal Fraternity at the University of Georgia, in Athens.

The address is worthy of the earnest consideration of all who are seeking a proper solution of the race question in this country, and, under unanimous consent previously granted, I insert Mr. Grant's address herewith:

A WAR IS ON IN AMERICA—A RACIAL REVOLUTION INVOLVING OUR WHOLE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

(Address by Hugh G. Grant)

A war is on in the United States of America, a racial revolution, involving our whole social structure.

This racial revolution is spearheaded by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The NAACP was organized in New York City in 1909 by 5 persons, 4 of whom were white, including a Russian-trained revolutionist and an American social worker who is said to have left her Fifth Avenue home in order to live in a Negro settlement. The Negro member was W. E. B. DuBois, who has a long record of Communist, Communist-front, and subversive connections, according to the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives. DuBois is known today as the honorary chairman of the NAACP, of which he was the research director until 1949.

The NAACP is today the most powerful political pressure group in the United States. Although it is primarily a Negro organization its president is a white New York City lawyer and on its board of directors are several widely known white persons, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Senators Lehman, of New York, and Morse, of Oregon; Walter Reuther, of the CIO; and Eric Johnston, motion-picture czar.

The NAACP has enormous funds at its command and powerful allies, including the Urban League, with a racially mixed membership but predominantly Negro, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, and the American Jewish Committee. Other allies are the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., an interdenominational organization comprising some 25 Protestant churches; wealthy foundations, some tax exempt, such as Ford, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Rosenwald, and Marshall Field. It was the Carnegie Foundation which sponsored the investigation of the racial issue by Swedish socialist Gunnar Myrdal, whose An American Dilemma provided the psychological and sociological basis for the Supreme Court's school segregation decision.

Other influential allies of the NAACP are important sections of the American press, such as the New York Times and other big metropolitan newspapers; national magazines, including Life, Time, and Look; top political leaders in both the Republican and Democratic Parties, whose goal is to corral the Negro bloc vote; big labor groups, such as CIO–PAC, which are greedy for more members and greater political power; various interracial councils, such as the Southern Regional Council, successor to the defunct and notorious Southern Conference on Human Welfare; numerous prominent self-styled white liberals; and (strangest of all) a host of white Christian church members, both Protestant and Catholic, who, under the influence of false leadership, have confused the concept of Christian brotherhood with racial segregation. These misguided Christian people have ignored the fundamental fact of race—that it is God made and not manmade.

Behind the scenes, aiding and abetting the NAACP conspiracy to integrate the races, are Communists and Communist-fronters, who see in this plot a means of destroying the American Republic from within.

The goal of the racial revolutionists is a leveling off of our American society into a common racial mold, eliminating all racial distinctions on the false theory that this constitutes democracy. Members of various colored races are being brought into the American scene as an aid to breaking down the color line between whites and Negroes in the United States. Even the big national magazines, such as the Saturday Evening Post and McCalls, are publishing fiction stories in which there is mixing of the races, in lovemaking and marriage. You find examples of this also in the motion pictures and on the television screens. This racial theme is also being developed abroad through American Government-sponsored cultural programs such as the Porgy and Bess theatrical show with a Negro cast.

Never in all the history of these United States has there been such a widespread and insidious propaganda campaign.

The racial revolutionists propose to achieve their objectives in the United States in practically every phase of human behavior through judicial fiat, Federal executive decree, and State legislation. They have stormed the citadel of the Nation's highest Court and have captured the nine political judges of that heretofore august body.

The President of the United States, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and other top members of the present Republican administration have joined the procession of racial revolutionists, with an eye on the coming elections in 1956. Vice President NIXON extended greetings from President Eisenhower at the 46th annual convention of the NAACP in Atlantic City last summer. Said NIXON, "The greatest progress since 1865 has been made toward the objective to which this organization (NAACP) is dedicated," and the young and ambitious Vice President added, "The most important objective of all is the integration of the public-school systems."

The Capital of the Nation, Washington, D. C., under the impact of the Republican sponsorship of racial integration, is rapidly becoming a Negro city with more and more

Negro Federal officeholders and the racially integrated public schools. Thousands of white citizens have fled the Nation's Capital, settling in nearby Virginia and Maryland. Is there no limit to which our political leaders will go in their quest for Negro votes? How can Mr. RICHARD NIXON square his conscience with his comment at the NAACP Convention: "He (President Eisenhower) has consistently declined to play partisan politics with this (racial) issue. He has placed the full moral weight of his personal prestige and power behind a realistic program designed to realize our common objective."

And more recently we find Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., in a speech in New York before the Interfaith Movement, Inc., denouncing racial segregation and castigating southern white leaders as "hatemongers who apply the whiplash of intolerance," members of "the infamous fraternity of professional bigots" who are "just as determined and just as destructive" as Communists and Fascists.

It may be recalled that it was Mr. Herbert Brownell, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, who flew out to California for a secret conference with Gov. Earl Warren in regard to appointment as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This affair had all the earmarks of a political deal in the light of the important role subsequently played by Warren in the unanimous Court decision declaring public-school segregation unconstitutional. When a citizen of California appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee to voice opposition to Governor Warren's appointment, he was arrested and jailed on some minor charge which subsequently was dismissed in his home State, according to press reports.

Meanwhile, the liberal press was beating the propaganda tom-toms, bewailing the delay of Chairman LANGER'S Senate Judiciary Committee in giving the green light to the Warren appointment to the Supreme Court.

Speedy confirmation was a sacred duty, although the Senators share equal responsibility with the Chief Executive in such appointments—the "sacred bull" philosophy.

Let us take a brief look at the historical background of this racial revolution. Obviously, its roots are to be found in the nefarious slave trade which antedates the discovery of America. British, French, and Dutch slave traders were the early offenders. The first Negro slaves in America were landed at Jamestown, Va.; in 1619. Thereafter, British and New England slave traders took the lead in this business. Newport, Boston, and New York became the great slave ports in America, the South the slave market because of climatic conditions. While the Yankee traders were ravaging the African jungles for more slaves and piling up great fortunes in New England, the abolitionists of that section began their attack against the South, preaching about "the moral depravity of the southern slave owners." The "moral depravity" of the Yankee slave traders was overlooked.

Although the slave trade was outlawed by the Congress in 1807, a thriving business in the smuggling of slaves was carried on right up to the time of the War Between the States, which marks the real beginning of the racial revolution in the United States. After 4 years of bitter fratricial strife, constituting the great tragedy of the American scene, the South lay in ruins. The horde of Negroes, made free theoreticaly by Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, were still the responsibility of the impoverished southern white people.

Not satisfied with their decisive military victory, the Republican politicians of the North now plotted the destruction of the white civilization of the South. This was to be accomplished through three amendments to the Constitution, the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. In the proposed 14th amendment, particularly, were the seeds of destruction. This was recognized by the Southern States, which, with the exception of Tennessee, rejected the amendment, resulting in the failure of ratification. As the distinguished historian, Charles Wallace Collins, states, "that should have been the end of the matter."

An infuriated Republican Congress now adopted high-handed and extra-legal measures. In 1868 it placed the Southern States under rigid military rule, disfranchised the southern white men, and placed the Negroes in control under the supervision of avaricious northern carpetbaggers. Corruption and fraud were rampant. The southern people were helpless. The 14th amendment was ratified and placed in the Constitution at the point of Federal bayonets.

The 14th amendment was a fraud and a violation of the Constitution. And yet it was the only legal basis cited by Mr. Chief Justice Warren in his announcement of the infamous decision of May 17, 1954, outlawing segregation in the public school of the sovereign States. What a travesty on justice.

The southern white people survived the tragic era of reconstruction through their fortitude, courage, and racial heritage. They stood up and were counted in their vigorous opposition to northern tyranny. Through organization and with the help of a Supreme Court which recognized its obligations to uphold the Constitution they foiled the plot and regained control of their State and local affairs. The result—there was peace in the South for 60 years, two distinct races of people living side by side in friendly coexistence.

The second phase of this racial revolution began with the great Negro migration to the Northern industral centers in the late 1920's and the early thirties. Under the scheming white political bosses of the North and the NAACP, there migrating Negroes began to gain political power through simple manhood sufferage. The big labor bosses of the CIO began to admit them to membership. Result—Roosevelt's New Deal party captured the Negro bloc vote in 1936 and about the same time the President and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt began stacking the Supreme Court with New Deal politicians. President Truman followed along with his so-called civil-rights program, an all-out bid for the Negro bloc vote. Truman's attempt to force the nefarious Federal FEPC through the Congress failed as the result of a Senate filibuster led by Southerners with the assistance of some northern conservative Senators. (The Senate filibuster may serve a good purpose and should be retained, in my judgment).

Meanwhile, the NAACP and its allies pushed their campaign for racial integration in the North, resulting in the adoption of the civil rights codes by 19 northern State legislatures. These codes, in effect, constitute discrimination against the white man, as pointed out by Aldrich Blake, an authority on the scope and intent of the so-called civil rights revolution. FEPC laws have been adopted in eight northern States and it is only a matter of time when another attempt will be made to force a Federal FEPC upon the Nation's employers.

This national revolutionary program promoted by the NAACP and its satellites, constitutes an attack against our American constitutional Republic with its unique plan of the separation of Government powers, legislative, executive, and judicial, commonly known as the system of checks and balances. This system was designed by the Founding Fathers to establish and maintain a strong sovereign Nation and at the same time protect the rights of the people of the sovereign States. These rights were guaranteed in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as a Bill of Rights.

The Supreme Court of the United States has joined in the attack of the racial revolutionists against the American constitutional system. It has collaborated with the executive department of the Federal Government in its recent decrees affecting racial relations, which is a violation of our system of the separation of powers. The Supreme Court has not only scrapped the fundamental principles of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, but it has usurped the legislative prerogatives of the Congress and the legislatures of the sovereign States. Furthermore, the Supreme Court has ruthlessly violated the ancient common-law doctrine of stare decisis, which means that a principle established by a previous Supreme Court shall not be set aside by the Court.

The Supreme Court's recent decisions telling the people of the sovereign States how they shall conduct their educational and social systems is fantastic, a clear and unequivocal violation of the Constitution. It is centralized tyranny and dictatorship, in the same category with facism, nazism, and communism. We Americans have proudly boasted of our freedom. Are we going to retain this freedom? My answer is "Yes." What is yours?

At this point we should consider another factor in the establishment of our American constitutional Republic which is under attack. This Republic was established and developed by white people. While all of this loose talk about so-called "racial equality, the brotherhood of man, and democratic ideals" is being bandied about and shouted from the housetops, let us not lose sight of these historical facts: White men settled the American Colonies, developed the opposition to British tyranny, wrote the Declaration of Independence, fought and won the American Revolution; framed the Constitution and subsequently expanded the litle American Republic across the continent into a great Nation.

Now such achievements in the brief period of less than 300 years is no accident. Back of the sturdy determination and courage of the American white pioneers was a racial heritage which was developed through thousands of years of struggle, sacrifice and war.

And what of the racial heritage of the negroes, who, under the leadership of the NAACP and its allies, are now trying to force their way into our white institutions on the basis of full racial equality? The answer is obvious. Their forbears were primitive savages in the dark jungles of Africa. The chieftans of their ancestors actually aided the white traders in capturing the slaves for the overseas slave markets. There are today approximately 150 million negroes still living in a primitive state in Africa. The negro race has never made the slightest contribution to civilization.

I do not minimize the achievements of the American Negro. He has made remarkable progress under the friendly tutelage of the white man and through the system of racial segregation. If these American Negroes, who have many fine qualities, are let alone by the radical leaders of the NAACP and their white allies, they will continue to make greater progress, individually and collectively, as a race of people.

I shall always remember a conversation that I had several years ago with Dr. Robert R. Moton, successor to Booker T. Washington as the president of Tuskegee Institute, in Alabama. Dr. Moton, a fine-looking, full-blooded Negro, said to me that he was proud that he was a Negro, member of a distinct race of people, that his ambition in life was to make a contribution toward the development of his race and that the best way to do that was through the system of segregation.

What the American Negro needs is a program which will help him to develop pride of race. This can be achieved only through his own institutions in which he can develop his own special talents in competition and cooperation with members of his own race.

Pride of race is a far cry from the destructive program of the racial revolutionists, spearheaded by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The Negro leaders of the NAACP, many of whom are frustrated colored persons, are ashamed of their Negro blood. They are aiming at racial amalgamation.

Make no mistake about it. The ultimate goal of the NAACP is mongrelization, which means the passing of the Negro race from the American scene.

In order to attain this goal the NAACP, aided by its powerful allies, is attacking on all fronts—complete integration in the armed services, which has been attained through the political leadership of both parties; in both interstate and intrastate transportation systems; in both public and private housing projects; in recreational facilities (parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, and golf links), in sports, both professional and amateur; in hotels and restaurants; in the churches; and the grand climax—in the public schools of the Nation all the way from the kindergarten through the colleges and the universities.

This is revolution. We also have a cold war on the home front. The Daily Worker, of New York, on May 26, 1928, sounded the battle cry. Here it is:

"The Communist Party considers it as its historic duty to unite all workers regardless of their color against the common enemy, against the master class. The Negro race must understand that capitalism means social oppression and communism means social and racial equality."

The issue is joined. The best defense is offense. The white people of the Nation constituting the majority of the American citizenship, north, south, east, and west, must organize themselves by community, county, and State for the protetcion of their constitutional rights and to preserve their racial heritage and integrity, using every lawful means to this end.

Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of February 7, 1956, in opposition to the upper Colorado project. The editorial follows:

A SACRED BUREAUCRACY?

In Washington the other day Representative HOSMER, Republican, of California, told a news conference that the proposed Glen Canyon Dam in the upper Colorado project would be a "billion-dollar mud puddle."

Mr. HOSMER explained. The shale which lines the canyon walls of two rivers leading to the proposed reservoir, he said, dissolves in water and turns into mud.

To demonstrate, Mr. HOSMER produced a fist-sized chunk of shale which he said had been taken from a canyon wall. He put it into a bowl of water and within 5 minutes it had disintegrated to mud. This mud, Mr. HOSMER said, would soon fill up the reservoir. Moreover, as the shale disintegrated it would undermine a higher layer of sandstone, and chunks "as big as houses" would fall into the streams.

Promptly Representative DAWSON, Republican, of Utah, a Glen Canyon backer, took the floor to reply. Mr. HOSMER, he thundered, is trying to "destroy the confidence of the Nation in the Bureau of Reclamation."

Is the Bureau of Reclamation so sacred that its judgments cannot be questioned?

There are countries in which the bureaucrats may not be gainsaid, at least with safety. Happily, the United States is not among them.

Particularly in connection with gigantic reclamation projects, it is high time that someone started asking some pointed questions.

Government Bodies and Organizations Offically Opposed to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following list of governmental bodies and organizations which officially have recorded their opposition to the proposed upper Colorado River storage proposal. It undoubtedly is an incomplete list, but even as such, the imposing number of important groups included should give serious pause to anyone inclined to favor the project:

1. Engineers Joint Council.
2. American Society of Civil Engineers.
3. American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
4. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
5. The American Water Works Association.
6. American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
7. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
8. American Society for Engineering Education.
9. American Institute of Chemical Engineers.
10. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
11. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
12. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
13. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
14. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
15. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
16. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
17. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
18. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
19. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
20. Railway Employees Department, AFL.
21. American Public Power Association.
22. Colorado River Board of California.
23. Imperial Irrigation District.
24. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
25. Los Angeles City Council.
26. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.
27. Anaheim City Council.
28. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.
29. Calexico City Council.
30. Calexico Chamber of Commerce.
31. El Centro City Council.
32. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.
33. Holtville City Council.
34. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.
35. Imperial City Council.
36. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
37. Imperial County Farmer Bureau.
38. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.
39. Burbank City Council.
40. Los Angeles Clearing House Association.
41. Chula Vista City Council.
42. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.
43. Otay Municipal Water District.
44. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.
45. Property Owners Association of California.
46. California State Grange.
47. Glendale City Council.
48. Hemet City Council.
49. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.
50. Los Angeles City Council.
51. Los Angeles County Board of Supersors.
52. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
53. Orange County Board of Supervisors.
54. Pasadena Board of Directors.
55. Riverside County Board of Supervisors.
56. Santa Ana City Council.
57. San Diego County Board of Supervisors.
58. San Diego City Council.
59. San Diego County Water Authority.
60. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.
61. San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.
62. San Marino City Council.
63. Agricultural Council of California.
64. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
65. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield, Calif.
66. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
67. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.
68. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.
69. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.
70. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
71. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.
72. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.
73. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
74. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
75. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.
76. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.
77. California Prune and Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
78. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
79. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.
80. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
81. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
82. Challenge Cream & Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
83. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
84. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.
85. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.
86. Fontana Producers Egg and Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.
87. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.
88. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.
89. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.
90. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
91. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
92. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.
93. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.
94. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.

95. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.
96. San Diego Co-operative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.
97. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.
98. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.
99. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
100. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.
101. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.
102. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.
103. Coachella Valley County Water District.
104. California State Chamber of Commerce.
105. Brawley City Council.
106. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.
107. City of Calipatria.
108. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.
109. City of Beverly Hills.
110. Westmorland City Council.
111. San Jacinto City Council.
112. Torrance City Council.
113. Costa Mesa City Council.
114. Laguna Beach City Council.
115. City of Chino.
116. City of Compton.
117. Newport Beach City Council.
118. County Supervisors Association of California.
119. City of Fontana.
120. City of Fullerton.
121. City of Long Beach.
122. City of Ontario.
123. Perris City Council.
124. City of Pomona.
125. Santa Monica City Council.
126. Upland City Council.
127. California Academy of Sciences.
128. Citizens Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
129. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.
130. Whittier City Council.
131. City of Gardena, Calif.
132. City of Lakewood, Calif.
133. City Council of the City of El Segunda, Calif.
134. Seal Beach City Council, California.
135. City of La Habra, Calif.
136. National Avenue Business Men's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.
137. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
138. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
139. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
140. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
141. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
142. National City Chamber of Commerce.
143. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
144. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
145. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
146. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
147. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
148. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
149. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
150. California Taxpayers Association.

Arab Co-Op Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following report on a cooperative movement among Israel's Arabs. The report appears in the Israel Digest for February 3, 1956.

ARAB CO-OP FUND IS EXPANDING

JERUSALEM.—A report on the cooperative movement among Israel's Arabs was submitted to the shareholders of the Arab workers and farmers fund at its second meeting. The fund was founded in 1949 with the purpose of encouraging the development of cooperatives and loan societies among Israel's Arab citizens, and the extension of financial aid to the rural Arab farmer.

I£65,000 of the I£100,000 capital fund has been paid in by some 4,000 Arab shareholders from 78 towns and villages.

The fund has leased 3,500 dunams (875 acres) of state domain and is establishing a cooperative agricultural machinery unit.

Thirty-five Arab cooperatives were assisted by the fund during the past year. They have a membership of 1,500 persons and capital totaling I£63,527. The fund extended I£40,000 in investments and loans to these societies.

The fund was also instrumental in opening the Tamra irrigation project, in Galilee, undertaken by a special company established by the fund in cooperation with 80 villagers. Upon completion, this project will provide irrigation water for 2,000 dunams (500 acres) of land, 800 dunams (200 acres) are already under irrigation.

The fund also aided in the implementation of the irrigation system at Tira, in the Sharon.

Both projects were initiated by the Ministry of Agriculture, which allocated I£48,000 for this purpose. The Ministry has also extended I£50,000 to Arab farmers in addition to the I£100,000 recently lent to some 650 farmers in 58 villages.

The fund intends to expand its activities and to include cultural, social, and housing projects.

There are 192,000 Arabs in Israel, of whom about 80 percent are engaged in agriculture.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a resolution bearing on the subject of Americanism. This resolution was adopted by the department of Washington, American Legion, at its State convention, held in Seattle, August 11-13, 1955. The State chairman, Lawrence Timbers, was the author and presented the resolution to the floor of the convention.

Whereas the primary purpose of the American Legion is stated in the preamble to the Legion constitution, "To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America"; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America plainly states the purpose for the formation of the United States of America in the following words, "in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity"; and

Whereas this plainly states and means that the primary purpose is to provide the exercise of the above-stated rights to "ourselves and our posterity," and not to the people of any other nation; and

Whereas there has developed a movement among our people to endeavor to extend these rights and privileges to other nations by attempting to coerce our citizens with the dialectical fancies of a nebulous world government, to the detriment of ourselves and our posterity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion hereby again emphatically rededicates itself to the provisions embodied in the preamble of the Legion constitution; and be it furthur

Resolved, That the American Legion demand that every official and servant of the Government of the United States of America strictly adhere to his oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States in order that the blessings of liberty may continue to be secure to ourselves and our posterity; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be spread in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all Senators and Representatives to read, and that copies be sent to the State Department and to the members of the President's Cabinet, with the request that copies be supplied to all their personnel.

Welcoming a New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, American industry is showing a growing appreciation of the manifold advantages which the 7 counties of the 15th Congressional District offer in natural resources. I believe it appropriate that I also call to the attention of the Congress the enthusiastic and forward-looking attitude with which the people of one of these counties have accepted the challenge of the sudden promise of industrialization. I refer to Monroe County whose economy has been traditionally rural. Today, the people of this county stand on the threshold of new experience occasioned by the construction of the $90 million aluminum plant by the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. within its borders. This tremendous enterprise brings with it complex problems which must and will be solved by the determination of Monroe County citizens. This determination is typical of that in each of the counties which I have the honor to represent. It can be described best in the following editorial which appeared in the Marietta (Ohio) Daily Times, of February 8, 1956:

MONROE SHOWS ITS SPIRIT

Room could be made for between 300 and 500 new homes within the corporate limits of Woodsfield, county seat of Monroe County, according to a preliminary survey of the Woodsfield Central Planning Committee, a subdivision of the Monroe County Industrial Development Committee. That town, centrally located in Ohio's "little Swizerland," expects to grow. So do the other towns in the county that has just become a new industial frontier.

This county next door to us has come to life again. Its people are awakening to the fact that a challenging opportunity has come

to them, one that will take tremendous efforts and plenty of cooperation if they are to obtain potential benefits in full. The resurgence of civil consciousness is showing. It was displayed graphically in the special 16-page edition published last week by the Monroe County Beacon, which carried expressions of welcome to personnel of Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. from business concerns, civic organizations, and public officials. Large display space in the Beacon was taken for this purpose by Woodsfield merchants; by the communities of Hannibal, Sardis, Duffy, and Fly; by Beallsville, Jerusalem, and Malaga; by Clarington, the town more or less in the middle of the new riverfront industrial activity.

"Few things are handed to anyone on a silver platter," the Beacon reminded its readers editorially. It said every inhabitant and every town must realize the task ahead in living up to the opportunity which the sudden appearance of big industry presents.

"It is the job of every one of us to see that Monroe County gets the greatest amount of benefit that will be associated in one way or another with the opportunities that now lie before us in the industrial expansion that has become a reality after many lifetimes of hoping, hoping, hoping. * * * There will be areas that will benefit more than others, but in the end the prosperity created by employment for all our people will mean prosperity, or an opportunity to prosper, for every one of us."

Monroe County still has to show what it has and what it can do. It really has just got its feet wet in the big whirlpool of mid-20th century community competition. As the Beacon editorialist says:

"Now is the time for our people to organize and to sell Monroe County far and wide. Every service club, every organization, and every citizen has a job to do. We must organize and amply finance a Monroe County Publicity Service, its job to be salesmanship. We must buy space in out-of-town newspapers showing our schools, our churches, and other advantages we already have to make people want to live in our county. We must make plans for better things, road improvements, new homes, etc., and tell the world of these plans, too."

The spirit shown in the pages of that particular issue of the Beacon ought to be contagious. While Washington County is hoping to see the influence of the impending industrial boom around Clarington extend itself much farther down the valley, in the meantime we must doff our hats to Monroe County for the way it is facing its big challenge.

Leftwingers Must Have Issues So They Scream "Scandals"—All of Which Have Been Knocked Into Cocked Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, every now and then the press throughout the country contains editorials and articles indicating a realization of the feverish attempts of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers to cook up issues for the forthcoming elections regardless of how fictitious the basis may be for these issues. The following excerpts from the Myrtle Point (Oreg.) Herald of February 2, 1956, is indicative of this:

KNOCKIN' AROUND
(By George)

LEFTWINGERS MUST HAVE ISSUES SO THEY SCREAM "SCANDALS"—ALL OF WHICH HAVE BEEN KNOCKED INTO COCKED HAT

Our highly esteemed contemporary, the Coos Bay Times, in its issue of January 23, printed an editorial on the subject No Report on Giveaways.

The Times editorial started its "wiggle" thusly:

"In his message on the state of the Union the President dwells briefly on the importance of the wise use and conservation of our great national resources of land, forests, minerals, and water, and calls for faster progress and without delay, the development of these water resources. * * *"

However, he fails to give any report on the progress, thus far, of his partnership policy in the development of these resources, a policy sometimes referred to as the "giveaway."

Then Shelly goes on to mention some of those alleged giveaways, which, of course, includes Hells Canyon Dam, the Dixon-Yates contract * * * and then, of course, that mining claim timber steal—DICK NEUBERGER'S brain child, for the purpose of the character assassination of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. Space forbids going into this scandal in all its ramifications—it can be told—that scandal has exploded in the very faces of the leftwingers. * * * NEUBERGER'S attempt at the character assassination of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay in the Al Sarena timber steal so infuriated Mr. Ellsworth that he labeled it a giveaway "stink."

Shelly talks about the Truman administration knowing full well that Al Sarena was interested in the timber rights and not the minerals, had consistently refused to grant the application. Perhaps Shelly should study the Al Sarena case a wee bit before making such a statement. That's just a pack of leftwing press "hooey." No one connected with the Truman administration ever denied Al Sarena a patent. Shelly will find that truth out, if he will study the actual facts rather than jump at conclusions arrived at after listening to scandalmongering politicians.

Then, again, what happened to DICK'S howl of the great steal from the schools of the Nation when Ike returned the tidelands oil rights back to the lawful and moral owners. The reason the leftwingers have quieted down on that terrible scandal is because they knew, from the time of the accusation, that the tidelands oil had nothing to do with schools and that the scandal was made up of ballyhoo, purely for political reasons only. There wasn't any scandal connected with it, but, it did assist mightily in electing NEUBERGER—so what.

Flash: Now comes this boy NEUBERGER—not a scandal this time—he stoops to a lower level by making the statement that "the GOP might use drugs to keep President Eisenhower in a reelection campaign." Such a statement is not only malicious and cruel, it was downright cowardly. In fact, such a statement compares favorably with Shelly's recent open-letter editorial to Ike, informing him that he wasn't physically fit to be a candidate and insinuated that Ike was doing a disservice to the American people by not immediately announcing that he would not be a candidate. If the above-named gentlemen had any sense of shame they would crawl in a hole some place and pull the hole in after them.

Incidentally, Shelly loves to shout "scandal." Wonder why he overlooked DICK'S jackass publicity stunt to emancipate the downtrodden mamas, papas, sons, daughters, and baby squirrels of the White House lawn?

Statement by Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, at a Hearing Held by Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, February 25, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 25, 1956, Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture and submitted an excellent statement. I wish to include these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The cattle industry is now up against a serious problem in the marketing of heavyweight well-finished cattle. This is currently the most serious aspect of an overall heavy supply and depressed price situation. It is a situation that did not come into being overnight. The problem has been building up for the past few years.

The cattle situation became serious in 1953 because of a combination of increased numbers and a severe drought over wide areas, which forced increased marketings and lower prices. At that time the Department of Agriculture undertook a beef-purchase program to help bolster the cattle market. We purchased approximately 250 million pounds of beef and beef products at a cost of more than $90 million.

During 1954 and early 1955, the cattle market was more stabilized and, despite continued large marketings of cattle for slaughter, the cattle situation was not particularly unfavorable for most producers and feeders. By good fortune, the large increase in cattle and beef production has coincided with high employment and record incomes of consumers. More dollars have been available to be spent for meat than ever before.

Cattle and calf slaughter in 1955 turned out even larger than in 1954. The combined slaughter last year was the largest on record. Nearly 40 million head of cattle and calves were slaughtered. Just 5 years ago cattle and calf slaughter was only about 26 million head. In other words, cattle slaughter has increased over 50 percent in the past 5 years. And for the first 7 weeks of this year cattle slaughter under Federal inspection has been about 7 percent greater than slaughter in the corresponding period last year.

There is a basic difference between the present depressed market situation and that of 3 years ago. In 1953, the widespread drought over much of the principal cattle producing areas intensified the problem by forcing many cattlemen to market their stock because of lack of feed and water. The serious situation then was centered in the basic producing herds. Also, hog production 3 years ago was relatively small, and therefore, the competition for the consumer's dollar was much different than during recent months when sharply increased market supplies of pork were competing with the record output of beef.

As a result of the very large output of beef and the increase in pork output, the market for fed cattle last summer failed to advance as is usual for that time of year. The market for fed cattle was relatively stable at that time, but apparently many

cattle feeders felt that the market would advance seasonally. These feeders delayed marketing their cattle when they reached the usual weight and grade.

In the meantime, hog marketings increased sharply and coincidental with the fall movement of cattle off pastures and ranges, prices for the better grades of cattle weakened. This unusual and complex development has resulted in a large overproduction of long-fed overweight cattle this season. The market for heavyweight beef is relatively limited. Therefore, even a small overproduction of such beef has a considerable adverse effect, not only on the market for heavyweight cattle but also on other grades and weights as well.

On January 1 this year there was a record number of cattle on feed, 1 percent more than a year earlier. In 14 leading cattle feeding States the number of cattle on feed for 3 months or more was 30 percent greater than a year earlier. Also, in those 14 States there were 69 percent more cattle on feed weighing over 1,100 pounds. This illustrates the unusual situation which has developed in supplies of heavyweight fed cattle.

Cattle in the feed lots obviously have to move to market some time. Of course they had been showing up in slaughter before January 1, but as of the first of the year there still were burdensome supplies to be marketed. Since the first of the year these heavyweight cattle have been coming to market in a floodtide. This very heavy market movement has had an adverse effect on prices of almost all cattle. Understandably, prices of the highest grades have weakened most. Here are some figures on recent marketings of these long-fed cattle:

At five leading midwestern markets (Chicago, Omaha, Sioux City, Kansas City, and St. Joseph) in January, 184 percent more Prime steers were reported sold out of first hands for slaughter than a year earlier. There were 36 percent more Choice grade slaughter steers sold. The weights of these cattle also reflect the situation. At those five markets in January, all steers sold out of first hands for slaughter weighed an average of 42 pounds heavier than a year earlier. In fact, the Prime steers were 84 pounds heavier, and the Choice steers were 21 pounds heavier than last year.

For the first 7 weeks of this year, cattle slaughter under Federal inspection was about 7 percent greater than a year earlier. However, the weight of all cattle slaughtered was about 33 pounds greater than a year earlier. As a result, the production of beef so far this year has been about 11 percent greater than in early 1955, with an unusual proportion of the total beef produced being in the highest grades. This great abundance of high-grade beef has come into the markets at the same time that pork supplies have also been unusually large. This has been an exceptional occurrence, and undoubtedly caused both cattle and hog prices to drop to lower levels than otherwise would have been the case.

We in the Department have been greatly concerned over what has happened to these prices, not only prices received by producers but also prices paid by consumers. The studies we have made show that the reduced prices received by farmers have not been fully reflected in lowered prices paid by consumers. This has resulted in wider margins for processors and distributors. Marketing margins for beef alone have been growing wider since 1950.

In the case of United States Choice grade beef, for example, our studies show that the retail price declined 5 percent from the fourth quarter of 1954 to the final quarter of 1955. The farm value declined 19 percent. Charges for marketing beef advanced 26 percent during the period.

The price farmers received for Choice grade beef cattle declined $4.15 per hundred pounds from the first quarter of 1955 to the final quarter. About 60 percent of this reduction was associated with the widening of beef marketing margins. Our studies show that packer-wholesaler margins increased by $1.08 per hundred pounds of live weight cattle, and retail margins widened by $1.50 100 pounds of live weight cattle, or $2.54 per hundred pounds on a carcass weight basis. About 42 percent of the overall increase of marketing margins was accounted for at the packer-wholesaler level, and approximately 58 percent at the retail level.

We recognize that fluctuations in margins come about because cattle and beef prices do not maintain a fixed relationship to one another at any one point in the marketing channel. But a widening of margins such as that which has taken place since 1950 is a clear indication of a more permanent upward trend in the cost of marketing beef, which is a cause for concern on the part of beef producers and consumers.

There is no question whether costs borne by marketing agencies have increased during the last 6 years. Department records disclose a material rise in hourly wages paid to workers in the meatpacking and distributing industry. They also show a very substantial increase in the cost of supplies used in the packing and distributing operation. To the extent that rising costs have contributed to rising marketing margins, the meat industry has no alternative for doing other than it has done in adding such costs to the price of meat. Nevertheless, there is an indication of a gradual widening of profits and margins in packing and distributing beef that causes producers to raise justifiable complaints of having to bear more than the full force of the price decline on beef sold to consumers.

The meatpacking industry and the wholesale and retail distributors of beef need to be as much concerned as anyone about maintaining an economically sound beef production economy. The failure of any one segment of the industry has its impact on the other segments.

We in the Department are doing what we can to focus public attention on the recent trends in food marketing costs and in the distribution of the consumers' food dollar. The results of our studies to determine the extent to which marketing margins have been increased are being widely disseminated. They are being brought to the attention of the appropriate industry and related groups so that corrective action may be taken. The Department itself has no legal authority to force such action, but the public release of the facts themselves carries great weight in bringing about improvements. We have just sent to the printer a report which discusses in detail the trends in marketing margins for beef.

In the present situation of weakened prices for fed cattle, we have received and given consideration to many recommendations for providing assistance to the cattle industry. We have received a number of requests for a price support program on cattle, but have not found a sound and practical method that would work. Nor has any previous administration found such a method. Moreover, the cattle industry has traditionally been opposed to direct price supports or Government controls affecting their operations. In the present circumstance, we can expect improvement in the depressed cattle market as soon as the unusual backlog of heavyweight cattle has moved out of feed lots and the supply of cattle for slaughter becomes more normal.

The Department has taken a number of actions in recent months to help the cattle situation. The Department has been working very closely with all segments of the cattle and beef industry in intensive promotional efforts to stimulate consumer demand for beef during the curernt heavy supply period. The Department is cooperating with various trade groups, such as retailers and resturants, and with newspapers, magazines, radio stations, and TV outlets in focusing consumer attention on the plentiful supplies of beef. Retail and other trade groups have greatly intensified their merchandising activities in order to increase consumer buying of meat.

Beginning in December, the Department purchased 12 million pounds of frozen hamburger for nationwide distribution to the school lunch program. This quantity is in addition to the large volume of beef purchased locally by the participating schools.

At our request, the Department of Defense has accelerated its purchases of boneless beef from heavy cattle. We are informed that they are expanding purchases so as to accumulate a 90-day supply instead of the usual less than 60-day supply. This program for accelerated purchases of beef from heavy carcasses should be especially beneficial during this period of large marketings of heavy beef.

Direct action has also been taken by the Department to stimulate exports of beef. On February 10, for example, an agreement was made to sell 40 million pounds of beef, worth $10 million, to Israel under title I of Public Law 480. Also, during recent weeks a total of 20 million pounds of beef has been moving from the United States to Spain under an agreement worked out between the two Governments. We anticipate that additional export sales of a substantial volume of beef will materialize shortly as a result of discussions now under way with other foreign countries.

Through our agricultural attachés stationed abroad, prospective foreign purchasers are being kept informed on the availability of United States beef. At the same time exporters in this country are being advised of beef sales opportunities abroad as soon as they become apparent.

These several actions which we have been taking are helpful in the present situation. However, it should be pointed out that the overall cattle problem remains large and complex. This has just been made more evident by the latest information on the size and composition of the Nation's cattle herd. The annual report on livestock numbers as of January 1 shows this picture of our cattle inventory on farms and ranches.

Last year, cattlemen increased their herds again, for the seventh consecutive year. On January 1 there were 97.5 million head of cattle and calves on farms and ranches; a new record. Last year, numbers increased 873,000 head, instead of declining as had been expected on the basis of the rate of slaughter. There was a record large calf crop of 43 million head last year. And with our present huge breeding herd there undoubtedly will be a large calf crop this year, although, of course, not necessarily a new record.

You may recall that the low point of the present cattle numbers cycle was the beginning of 1949. Then there were 77 million head of cattle and calves. We now have 27 percent more cattle than at that time, 7 years ago. We now have about 60 percent more beef cows than at the beginning of 1949. It is easy to see that the problem that has risen from the high level of slaughter during the past year is not a short-time problem that faces cattlemen. It is a problem that has been built up over the past several years, and one that will take some time to work out. Short-time remedies, even of drastic nature, obviously cannot provide the needed solution. The basic solution to the heavy production appears to lie primarily with the cattle industry itself. In dealing with this problem, the cattle industry will need the help and counsel of Government, the cooperation of the meat industry, and, of course, the backing of the consumer, who, in the last

analysis, is the recipient of the abundant beef output.

Despite the present difficulty which is so pronounced in the marketing of heavyweight well finished beef animals, the cattle industry is in a fundamentally strong position. There are good prospects ahead. While we can expect the cattle cycle to work itself down from the present high record, it of course will not recede to the level of 7 years ago. The reasons for this are quite obvious.

During the last 7 years our population has increased very substantially and we can expect the rise to continue. In fact, looking ahead, we can expect an increase of about 25 million persons in the next decade. This would add to our present total population of around 165 million persons, almost as many more people as are now living in the States of New York and Pennsylvania.

Another important factor is the favorable trend in meat consumption. During the last year, beef consumption moved up to 81 pounds per capita, the highest on record. It surpassed by 2 pounds the previous record reached in 1954. Indications now are that beef consumption will set another new record and reach an estimated 82 pounds per capita for 1956. This would compare with an average of a little more than 54 pounds per capital during the 1935–39 period and an average of 64 pounds per capita during the 1947–49 period.

Our per capita consumption of beef in this country has been increasing very substantially during the last few years and undoubtedly can be increased still more. This provides a sound basis for continued growth in the industry. While for the time being a modest adjustment is needed in the cattle industry, it obviously must be combined with efforts to maintain a continuing high rate of consumption in our growing population.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and on February 18 the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore commemorated the anniversary with appropriate exercises. It was my privilege to be with them again to mark the event.

February 16, 1918, marked the proclamation of the reestablishment of Lithuania as an independent republic, after three insurrections against the Russians. But today Lithuania, together with other great nations behind the Iron Curtain, is waging another struggle, this time against world Communist expansion.

It is fitting, therefore, that on the observance of Lithuanian independence American sympathy for that fateful nation should once again be restated, as an added manifestation of the warm regard Americans hold for those Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain.

Freedom-loving Americans everywhere admire the spirit by which this small country had attained its independence, and it is our hope that, with the help of the Almighty God, Lithuania may soon again take its place among the free democracies of the world.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of Baltimore present at the celebration:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the intolerable conditions, which now prevail in eastern and central Europe, including Lithuania and her two Baltic neighbors Latvia and Estonia, should be of serious concern to western democracies, and principally to the United States, since no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of the vast area, which comprises a population of over 100 million people, who are separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain;

Whereas President Dwight Eisenhower in his recent letter of reply to Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin urged the carrying out of the wartime pledge to respect the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this gathering convey its deepest gratitude to the President and the Congress of the United States for their sympathy with and steadfast attitude toward the eventual restoration of the independence of Lithuania and at the same time urge that a resolution be promptly introduced in the United Nations to debate the forced captivity of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania by the Soviet Union in violation of its solemn treaty pledges.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE.
By THOMAS G. GRAY, *President*.
JUOZAS AUSTRA, *Secretary*.

The gathering was privileged to hear an address by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, which I would like to insert, under permission to extend my remarks:

Today's commemoration of the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuania's independence comes during a time when the Lithuanian nation is enslaved. The hardship endured under Russia's czars is incomparable with the present-day slavery imposed by the Red czars of Russia. The fate of Lithuanian deportees to Siberia is a very sad one indeed. Many have perished and many more other innocent Lithuanians will perish before the day of freedom dawns.

The enemy ridicules the martyrdom of enslaved peoples. The Lithuanian nation is represented by him as being jubilant because of its sons' blood, tears, because of its trampled rights and liberties, because of its chains of slavery. Soviet mockery is an insult to the memory and intelligence of the whole free world. Examples are not lacking. I will refer to but a few.

The Red imperialists have falsely announced to the world that the Lithuanian nation freely chose the fate of slavery. This did not hinder the Kremlin from driving hundreds of thousands of them to Siberia. They are returning the last Nazi so-called war criminals, but an extremely large number of innocent Lithuanians are left to perish in Siberia. We do not envy the return of the Germans from Soviet hell. We only think that much earlier, and long ago, the Lithuanians should have been permitted to return to their homeland. What an insult to reason to release what they consider war criminals and, at the same time, to condemn enormous numbers of Lithuanians to certain death in the slave labor camps of Siberia.

Evidently in the eyes of the Kremlin, Lithuanians are far more numerous and more horrible criminals than the Nazis who fought against them. But why does not one hear of Lithuanian criminals and Lithuanian bandits in the free world?

Soviet eyes fear no smoke. Their efforts are not directed toward the release of deportees to Siberia. Their efforts are directed to fishing for slaves among the refugees in the free Western World. Needless to say, that fishing expedition for human souls is doomed to failure so far as the Lithuanians are concerned.

Recently the Red lords, while on a visit to southern Asia, displayed how scandalized they are at colonialism. This they did with the full knowledge that the Baltic States have been transformed by these same lords into the lowest form of colonialism that the world has ever witnessed. An outsider can easily travel to any non-Russian colony in any continent. But it is unheard of that a westerner be admitted to a hermetically sealed colony called Lithuania. There certainly must be something there to hide.

Khrushchev was infuriated by President Eisenhower's and Secretary of State Dulles' expressed greetings, comforting words of hope and sincere wishes to the enslaved peoples last Christmas. He termed this "crude intervention." And this he said, in spite of the fact that it is not the United States but the Kremlin that has trampled on all pacts and treaties with the enslaved nations, interfered in the internal affairs of the Baltic States, enslaved them, and continues to keep them in bondage.

The West, according to Khruschev, is not interested in the souls of the enslaved but only in their purses. But the type of concern shown by the Bolsheviks toward the enslaved Lithuanians is entirely foreign to the Western World. It is not America, but Molotov who, for Judas' coins, traded Lithuania's territory with the Nazis. It is not the United States but the Kremlin that only a few weeks ago stretched its bloody paw to the gold purse of the Baltic States in Great Britain. The Lithuanian proverb says: One who smells blames it on to another.

On lies and deceit is based the enslavement of Lithuania and other nations, by lies and deceit Russian imperialism also seeks to "liberate" other nations.

Such is the sad side of the commemoration and of present-day reality.

The sources of comfort and hope of the enslaved Lithuanians are more effective than the blows of the enemy. According to Paparonis:

"Lietuva's body is racked by her foes,
But her free soul they will never conquer."

The source of the Lithuanian nation's comfort and hope is, in the first place, God Himself. Christ is a shining example to the suffering Lithuanian nation. He Himself was in His lifetime homeless in the midst of His nation. He was also a refugee in Egypt and the victim of Golgotha. But the finale of that world drama was the triumph of the crucified.

The Lithuanians also gather strength from their past history. Vytautas the Great also suffered the fate of a refugee. He was even a prisoner of the Teutonic knights. He, too, ended his reign nobly and gloriously.

The third source of comfort and hope of the Lithuanians is history. It speaks loudly of the fate of tyrants. The emblem of the neighboring State of Virginia with its inscription, "Sic semper tyrannis," is very instructive in this respect.

Finally, the free world is the source of comfort and hope of the enslaved Lithuanians. Never in its long history has Lithuania been the object of so much moral support abroad as here in these United States. The President and Secretary of State, numerous Senators and Congressmen, governors and mayors, speakers and writers, by public statements and resolutions, by pen and by speeches, and by television programs, such as those of Bishop Sheen, re-

peatedly extended sympathy and comfort, as well as hope in its future freedom, to the suffering Lithuanian nation. It is impossible to enumerate all friends of Lithuania. I dare not even attempt to enumerate the contributions of the Lithuanian-Americans to the cause of the liberation of the land of their ancestors. To all friends, patrons, and fellow countrymen, I venture to express the deep gratitude of the Lithuanian Minister, the Honorable P. Zadeikis, and that of the Lithuanian nation.

The country of the green ruta, of wayside crosses and shrines, has become the holy land of martyrs for God and country and freedom-loving peoples everywhere. As Poet Bradunas, of Baltimore, said:

"May the blood from every martyr's grave
Give strength to make the Lithuanians brave."

May that strength maintain our hope, increase our efforts, strengthen our perseverance, and unite our forces. Let us firmly believe that the glorious, long-awaited day will certainly come, when Providence will put a stop to the rage of the enemy in the land of our fathers, and turn away that scourge from the Lithuanian horizon. I conclude with a verse of Brazdzionis:

"O God, Who reigns on high
Extend Thy ruling hand,
Light freedom in the sky,
Protect and free our land."

In connection with Lithuania's struggle for freedom and independence, I believe it is appropriate to include an article from the Marian, a magazine published by the Congregation of Marian Fathers, entitled "The United States Penny's Birthday," written by Francis J. Jancius, M. I. C., which follows:

THE UNITED STATES PENNY'S BIRTHDAY

(By Francis J. Jancius)

This year the penny, the lowliest coin of our monetary system, celebrates a birthday—its 43d. It will pass unnoticed and unheralded by the average American citizen, who is too busy to concern himself with the story of the coin that most frequently passes through his hands.

If asked, Mr. Average American would probably reply that the penny was cast to honor the memory of a great man, one of our Nation's most illustrious Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. And he would be right.

But, if the penny could speak for itself, it would add more, much more, to that reply. It would tell us that its story does not begin just 43 years ago. Instead, it would take us back many more years into the past and across a wide ocean to a land washed by the white-capped waves of the Baltic Sea.

And here, just a few short years after the tragic assassination of Honest Abe, its story would begin in the village of Siauliai, Lithuania, where on June 12, 1871, Victor D. Baranauskas, the designer of our Lincoln penny, first saw the light of day. His father was a skilled engraver and maker of seals. From his father young Victor learned all the skills and secrets of a difficult trade. At the age of 16 he was already established in his own shop and his fame was spreading throughout the countryside. Somewhat later, he transferred his business to the thriving metropolis of Kaunas.

In Kaunas, Victor's reputation grew by leaps and bounds. His amazing skill became the envy of his competitors and led him into serious trouble, which caused him to flee the country.

Someone, whether from jealousy or misguided patriotic zeal, informed the Russian police that young Baranauskas was a skilled counterfeiter and forger. Since the Russian governors of Lithuania had no proof of counterfeiting and forgery, they did not arrest Baranauskas immediately. Instead in an attempt to catch him redhanded, a watch was maintained night and day.

One day, unknown to Baranauskas, two members of the secret police entered his shop and inquired about some work. They showed him the signature of a famous government official and asked him to make an engraving of it. So well did the young artist perform the work that the police had difficulty distinguishing the facsimile from the original. This was all the proof they needed. They declared young Baranauskas a forger. Exile to Siberia and its dreaded labor camps threatened to cut short his career.

Baranauskas fled the country. In 1890, he came to New York where he found work in a medal-engraving shop. He worked by day and studied by night. Here he changed his name to Brenner.

Baranauskas was commissioned to make a cut of Beethoven for a New York musical society medal. The critics lavished praise on his work. His feet were firmly planted on the first rung of the ladder to success.

In 1898, he went to Paris where for 3 years he studied at the famous Academie Julian. At the Paris World's Fair in 1900, his exhibits took the highest honors. In 1901 and 1904, at Buffalo and St. Louis, Baranauskas again took the highest honors.

In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt, the famed colonel of the Roughriders, visited Baranauskas' studio to pose for a Panama Canal medal. A bronze plaque of Lincoln on the studio wall so captivated the President that he immediately commissioned Baranauskas to make a similar one for a new United States penny.

In 1909, the new United States penny was released. It was the first coin bearing the image of an American President. Art critics raved over the beauty of the new 1-cent piece. And truly, it was an outstanding piece of work, worthy of all praise.

Quite a furor was raised, however, because Baranauskas had signed his work with his initials. They were to be found on the opposite side of the coin. So great was the public's reaction that after a week orders were issued to remove the initials and to recall all coins already cast from that mold. To this day the coin remains a collector's item.

Lincoln and Baranauskas—two great lovers of freedom. The one, a President famed for freeing the slaves, the other, a great artist, who fled persecution and in the freedom of our land rose to fame and fortune.

We Americans of Lithuanian descent can rightfully be proud of Baranauskas and his achievements. His monument, the United States penny, is a significant Lithuanian contribution to our American culture.

This article was the inspiration for an award-winning script in the Voice of Democracy contest, written by Gabriel G. Kajeckas, a Washington high-school student and son of the counselor of the Lithuanian Legation. Young Kajeckas was 1 of the 4 national winners of the contest, each of whom receive a $500 college scholarship check, a television, clock radio, trophy and certificate from the sponsors. More than 1.5 million students from public, private, and parochial high schools participated in the Voice of Democrary contest, which is based on writing and reading a 5-minute script on the meaning of democracy.

Last Friday, at a luncheon at the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, the four winners were given the Poor Richard Almanac award by Mr. George Neil, president of the Poor Richard Club. The award consisted of a certificate and a medal. The medal was issued in connection with the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. Only 400 were minted, and Sir Winston Churchill was the recipient of one of them.

Gabriel Kajeckas is a senior at Gonzaga High School, where he is on the debating team, a member of the dramatic society, the sodality, is active in publicity work, and a cheer leader. He hopes to continue his studies at Holy Cross or Georgetown University. Last week he served as a member of the panel of the College Press Conference which interviewed our Ambassador to India, John Sherman Cooper, on the ABC TV-radio program. His award-winning script follows:

"Democracy cannot be defined." How many times have we heard this statement, and how many times have we agreed? Yet, we find that such is not the case, for democracy can be defined, here in my hand I hold its definition. It is small and insignificant, and yet it represents America, it symbolizes our way of life, it speaks for democracy.

"What is it," you ask, "that can be held in my hand, and yet represent the unlimitedness of America?" The answer is simple, but so often overlooked. The answer is, "A mere coin, a penny."

But how can a penny define democracy? How can something we take so much for granted, how can it speak for democracy? Because engraved on this little copper coin is the definition of democracy. Look at it, and you will understand.

On it, the first thing we see is the strong, determined profile of a great man, the man who made all men in this country free and equal, and without whom we would never have been one and indivisible, Abraham Lincoln.

Then we see the word "liberty" engraved on the metallic surface. Liberty that gives my father the right to operate a restaurant if he so schooses; that gives your brother the right to be printer; that gives each and every one of us the right to worship as we please, vote as we choose, and live as we wish. Indeed, this is more than just the word "liberty" engraved on a small coin, this is a way of life for the American people.

Next, we turn our gaze to the words "E Pluribus Unum," an ancient phrase, brought to life in our lives, meaning one from many, existing as a country of diverse interests, and yet a country of one in unity. But how can a country be unified in which there is a fruit stand next to a jewelry store, where 160 million people of different nationalities, races, and creeds are intermingled, where 9 million of these people can exist in a concrete maze of tall buildings and winding streets, where a general and a railsplitter can become President, where a youth can address an adult audience with his own thoughts and can be heard with attention? This is a gigantic dream come true, a living miracle. And this, my friends, is the miracle of America. And the reason for this miracle, why we are the United States, is also stamped on this small copper coin. The reason for this mircale is God. Therefore, in God We Trust, and it is in this trust that we are one, that we are free, that we have life, that we have the miracle that is America. These are the ideas generated by a small coin, a coin that we pass through our hands daily. These are the ideas that add up to our definition of democracy, our democracy of freedom, equality, unity, and trust in God.

Democracy, my friends, is an old idea. But having been betrayed by so many ancient lands, it was brought to a new land—a land of red men and virgin forests, a land of peaceful rivers and fruitful plains inhabited only by the buffalo. And in this land, through the tearful sufferings of Valley Forge and the sweat and blood of Bunker Hill, this

spirit was fanned into a roaring fire of freedom which became our democracy.

This spirit that has made our country the greatest nation on earth is as old as the human race. But the forces of hate, lust, and greed are also as old as the human race, and from time immemorial have opposed all justice, honor, and law in the world.

And so, my friends, these representations of justice, honor, and law on this small coin are not enough to preserve our way of life—we, as the inheritors of this coin and its defined freedom—we must take these words from the coin and inscribe them on our hearts, and in our spirit—and then, through the common usage of a small coin, realizing its value as representative of our way of life—we can continue this flaming spirit of democracy.

And then, this little coin alone won't speak for democracy—then, we will speak for democracy, and if we speak for democracy, then the eternal engraving of the American people will read: "There will always be a democracy—and there will always be an America."

Widespread Opposition to Upper Colorado River Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, nationwide interest in a correct evaluation of the proposed upper Colorado River project has become evident as the true facts concerning this project are brought to light.

The upper Colorado River project is a gigantic undertaking which will require financing from Federal tax funds collected from every taxpayer in the United States, and for this reason the people's Representatives from every State in the Union must give careful consideration to the merits of this proposed project as well as to its actual cost to each taxpayer to determine whether this cost in Federal tax dollars can be justified.

The following two editorials appeared recently in leading newspapers in cities thousands of miles from the States where the upper Colorado River project would be constructed, and they justify that the use of Federal funds for this project, so far, cannot be justified by the facts:

[From the La Salle (Ill.) News-Tribune of January 31, 1956]

EDITOR CORNERED

(By Floyd Esche)

Why should a Member of Congress from California be sending me rocks, I wondered as I spilled the handful of gray and red chips on my desk. It can't be because the News-Tribune's supply of rocks to hurl at Congress is exhausted—there is an inexhaustible supply all over the country.

So I read the material sent with them by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, California. The instructions were to put this Chinle rock in a clean ashtray and pour water on it. This rock, the note continued, came from the walls of Glen Canyon, where the Bureau of Reclamation wants to build Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, the key unit of the proposed gigantic upper Colorado River project.

There was also a geologist's certification that he (a Ph. D., no less) had personally clambered around some canyons to collect these samples in an area to be covered by the proposed reservoir.

I had trouble finding a clean ashtray, but finally located one. It's true. The rocks, about the size of a pecan, disintegrated in a few minutes.

Representative HOSMER has demanded the dam project be held up while geologists determine whether taxpayers would be building a good dam or a mud puddle costing $4 billion.

It sounds like a question worth asking.

If the Congressman from California has proved nothing else, he has proved a good publicity man. I will never be surprised again at what the mail from Congressmen contains.

[From the Wakefield (Mass.) Item of February 1, 1956]

DAM OR MUD PUDDLE

The Federal Government is thinking of spending $421 million to construct a dam. It appears that after the dam were built, the rock which forms steep walls of the lake which would be formed would disintegrate into mud and slide into the water.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, has challenged the wisdom of such a dam, planned for the Glen Canyon of the upper Colorado River. He presents his evidence that very shortly instead of a supply of water the dam would hold back a huge mud puddle.

The representative has the testimony of qualified geologists that they have inspected the location and find a soft shale called Chinle composing the walls of the canyon. This, when covered with water, crumbles. And Representative HOSMER proves it.

He has sent small samples of the shale to newspapers and other places to publicize what would happen if the dam were built. The pieces can be put into a dish and covered with water, and in a few minutes the rock has become mud.

The planned dam is far removed from New England, but Federal funds would build it. The representative's dramatic presentation of evidence that the dam would become a mud-filled puddle is convincing, and his plea that the eventual condition of the dam should be determined before any money is spent in construction most certainly must be given weighty consideration.

Tribute to Cantor Aaron Horowitz, of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the outstanding record that has been achieved by one of my constituents, Cantor Aaron Horowitz, of Congregation B'nai Jacob, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

This fine spiritual leader has served for the past 60 years, without interruption, as a cantor in orthodox Judaism, a record of longevity that perhaps exceeds that of any other cantor in the United States.

He has served well the spiritual needs of his congregation, B'nai Jacob, for 33 years, and still serves the congregation fully and actively.

During his 60 years of cantorial service, Cantor Horowitz has participated in approximately 44,000 daily synagogue services. That figure perhaps also establishes a record in this country.

Cantor Horowitz, in addition to his accomplishments in orthodox Judaism, is a splendid musician and composer as well as a Biblical and Talmudic scholar.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you can readily see that I am speaking of a fine, well-balanced and outstanding individual—a man of great spiritual strength and dignity.

As befitting a man of such stature, his congregation tendered to him and his wife a testimonial dinner on Sunday, February 26, 1956.

I would like to join his many friends and admirers in wishing Cantor Horowith many more years of service to his congregation.

Washington, Too, Had His Second-Term Health Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether President Eisenhower intends to be a candidate for reelection continues to be the all-absorbing subject whenever any two persons meet in conversation. It will continue to be so until the President makes an announcement.

In writing upon the subject in my weekly Washington in Review, on January 12, last, I said:

I am of the opinion that the President's health, under certain conditions, might have a bearing in determining his final answer. I do not think, however, that it would necessarily be a controlling reason. I have a strong feeling that fear that it might be detrimental to his health or even mean his possible death for him to continue the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency would not, standing alone, determine him to answer "No; I will not be a candidate." We all well know that at no time during his service in the Army of his country would any possibility of death deter him from the full performance of his patriotic duty, whatever it might be.

Thus, it is my thought that if the President should feel that the world situation is such that continued peace would be imperiled by his relinquishment of the office of President, that then in such case he would feel an obligation to continue regardless of the possible physical consequences to himself. I am strongly of the opinion that fear of death or physical harm would no more determine him to avoid responsibility in time of peace than it would in time of war. President Eisenhower is too patriotic, and his love of country is too strong to permit him to make any decision other than what he thought necessary for the best interests of his country, regardless of any personal physical considerations.

Thus, it seems to me that in the final analysis, I would expect the President's decision to be based primarily on world conditions, and, if they be such as to cause him to feel that his continuation in the office of President is either necessary or advisable, that then he would respond and assume the duties in the same patriotic spirit that we all know would actuate him to accept responsibility in a time of national emergency growing out of a war that required his services.

On Wednesday, February 22, 1956, the Courier-Post of Camden, N. J., carried an editorial entitled "Washington, Too, Had His Second-Term Health Problem." It was an exceedingly interesting article, particularly because of the fact that President George Washington had a similar question of health facing him, before deciding to be a candidate for a second term, as now confronts President Eisenhower.

The editorial to which I have referred reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, TOO, HAD HIS SECOND-TERM HEALTH PROBLEM

As President Eisenhower ponders his great decision, it is interesting to recall that George Washington would have preferred not to run for a second term because of his health.

Though the first President was a strong, powerful man, the rigors of the Revolution and his earlier campaigns and travels had left their mark on him when, at the age of 61, he came to the end of his first term.

To Thomas Jefferson, Washington wrote that he felt himself "growing old," that his memory was "becoming worse" and his health "less firm." He prepared a farewell address, but it was only delivered, in amended form, at the end of his second term instead of the first. In it he said:

"I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power * * * to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. * * * But mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence impelled me to abandon the idea."

The troubled foreign affairs to which Washington referred arose primarily from the outbreak of the French Revolution and the ensuing war between France and England, with the strong sympathy felt for France by many of Britain's recent colonists, especially the Jeffersonians, which was fanned by the machinations of the French envoy to this country, Citizen Genet.

Washington was determined that the infant Nation would not imperil its precarious existence by taking sides in the European conflict. So to make sure of that, he subordinated his personal inclinations to the country's welfare and accepted a second term.

During this term the excesses of the French revolution made his neutrality policy popular instead of unpopular, and there were notable achievements in several fields.

Threats from hostile Indians were lessened. Open resistance to excise tax collections was put down. Access to the Mississippi was assured. The national credit was made firm. The Nation's international standing was strengthened.

It was fortunate for the United States that health which was less robust at the end of his first term than it was at the beginning did not deter Washington from a second one. The second term added greatly to his luster. Without it he might not have been called first in peace as well as first in war and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

There are certain striking parallels between Washington and Eisenhower, though it would be foolish to stretch them too far. But one of them is the perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations that existed in 1792 and exists again in 1956.

It would be a strange working of fate, but entirely conceivable, if the 34th President should decide for the same reasons as the first to forego his own personal desires and serve a second term.

Mr. Speaker, thus, it will be seen there are certain striking parallels between Presidents Washington and Eisenhower in this matter of health. As President Washington accepted the responsibility of a second term because of the perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations that existed in 1792, so it can be hoped that President Eisenhower in 1956 will also accept the responsibility of a second term because, as stated in my news release, "the world situation is such that continued peace would be imperiled by his relinquishment of the office of President."

We need President Eisenhower today for the same reasons that the world conditions in 1792 created a need for President Washington at that time.

What a Price for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Washington, the Bremerton Sun, in reprinting a Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News front-page editorial headed "What a Price for Peace," cites it as a fine example of clear thinking and courage. Under permission to have this editorial appear with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I introduce it with the Bremerton Sun's own nomination, which I second, that the Tuscaloosa News' bold utterance on behalf of law and order may win the highest award possible for courageous journalism:

WHAT A PRICE FOR PEACE
(From the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News)

When mobs start imposing their frenzied will on universities, we have a bad situation.

But that is what has happened at the University of Alabama. And it is a development over which the University of Alabama, the people of this State, and the community of Tuscaloosa should be deeply ashamed—and more than a little afraid.

Our Government's authority springs from the will of the people. But their wishes, if we are to be guided by democratic processes, must be expressed by ballot at the polls, by action in the legislative halls, and finally by interpretation from the bench. No intelligent expression ever has come from a crazed mob, and it never will.

And make no mistake. There was a mob, in the worst sense, at the University of Alabama yesterday.

Every person who witnessed the events there with comparative detachment speaks of the tragic nearness with which our great university came to being associated with a murder—yes; we said murder.

And "if they could have gotten their hands on her, they would have killed her," that was the considered judgment, often expressed, of many who watched the action without participating in it.

The target was Autherine Lucy. Her "crimes"? She was born black, and she was moving against southern custom and tradition—but with the law, right on up to the United States Supreme Court, on her side.

What does it mean today at the University of Alabama, and here in Tuscaloosa, to have the law on your side?

The answer has to be: Nothing—that is, if a mob disagrees with you and the courts.

As matters now stand, the university administration and trustees have knuckled under to the pressures and desires of a mob. What is to keep the same mob, if uncontrolled again, from taking over in any other field where it decides to impose its wishes? Apparently, nothing.

What is the answer to a mob? We think that is clear. It lies in firm, decisive action. It lies in the use of whatever force is necessary to restrain and subdue anyone who is violating the law.

Not a single university student has been arrested on the campus and that is no indictment against the men in uniform, but against higher levels which failed to give them clean-cut authority to go along with responsibility.

What has happened here is far more important than whether a Negro girl is admitted to the university. We have a breakdown of law and order, an abject surrender to what is expedient rather than a courageous stand for what is right.

Yes; there's peace on the university campus this morning. But what a price has been paid for it.

Important Vote Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, when the upper Colorado River storage project bill comes up for a vote this week most of the Members of this honorable body will be concerned primarily with the extent to which this legislation will serve the best interests of the entire Nation. Its opponents have sought through propaganda to characterize it as a project which would serve only the upper basin States of the Colorado River. That is far from being the truth as is shown in an editorial in the Washington Star of Sunday, February 26, 1956. I present herewith for inclusion in my remarks that editorial, which I commend to the careful attention of all of my colleagues in the House:

IMPORTANT VOTE COMING

The upper Colorado River storage project has been cleared for debate and an early vote in the House this week. Indications are that the vote will be close. Despite the removal from the measure of the controversial Echo Park Dam project, and the absence of any public versus private power issue, opposition of the lower basin States led by California continues, while many Eastern and Midwestern lawmakers are reported dubious as to the justification for the relatively large expenditure involved.

The House bill, as presently constituted, would authorize a series of dams and storage reservoirs at strategic points along the rivers of the upper Colorado Basin. The

chief immediate purpose of the project is the control of the immensely valuable waters of the great inland drainage area to permit regulation of the rivers' flow, now highly variable and, in many years, largely wasted.

President Eisenhower and congressional leaders of both parties have urged approval of the project as a needed contribution to the national interest. The value of a dependable source of water and power in the four-State area—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—has been greatly increased in recent years as a result of the important discoveries in strategic minerals, notably uranium, in the region.

Now that any possible threat to national parks and monuments have been averted by the elimination of Echo Park Dam site and inclusion of definite safeguards for the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, the national interest in general and the needs of the great intermountain empire in particular call for approval of this legislation. We hope that sectional interests in California and disinterest on the eastern seaboard will not combine to defeat a measure of such great importance to the future of the entire Nation.

Dental Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an editorial from the Chicago Daily Sun-Times entitled "Dental Research."

As the Sun-Times so aptly says, health is "one of our most precious assets." But the editorial also notes that dental research—an important part of a total health research program—has been handicapped by lack of funds, and it supports the American Dental Association's request for increased appropriations for research grants. I, too, support this request by the dentists themselves to speed research on the causes and treatment of dental ailments. The sooner we put some teeth into dental research the better.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

DENTAL RESEARCH

Of the various forms of health research in this country, perhaps the most poorly endowed is dental research. Dental diseases are more annoying than dramatic and hence do not attract the kind of public financial support given in the fight against cancer and other maladies associated with a high death rate.

The Nation's 43 dental schools and 7 dental research centers are practically without endowment. In fact, the single largest sum dedicated to dental research comes from the dentists themselves, who currently spend about $250,000 a year through the American Dental Association.

With considerable reluctance, the ADA has concluded that the only practical way to speed dental research is through larger Federal grants. In a recent appearance before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, ADA secretary, urged that the $800,000 earmarked for research in President Eisenhower's public health program be increased nearly 500 percent—to $3,855,000.

Dr. Hillenbrand pointed out that while Federal funds for other health activities had increased as much as 6,000 percent in only a few years, the amount for dental health had gone up a mere 23 percent.

He proposed that the extra research funds be used to help increase the effectiveness of fluoridation, to help find a sugar that will not cause decay, to help bring pyorrhea and gingivitis under greater control, and to help find whatever relationship may exist between oral hygiene and cancer of the mouth and certain heart conditions. He said that adequate research could do much more than has been done to spare millions of children the deforming and disabling conditions that accompany severely crooked teeth.

By and large Dr. Hillenbrand and the ADA have made out a good case for what actually amounts to an infinitesimal increase in Federal appropriations. Congress would be wise to grant the request in the interest of improving one of our most precious assets—national health.

Moscow Turns on Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the New York Times]
MOSCOW TURNS ON STALIN

Even the most calloused observer of the Soviet scene must be astounded by the speed and extent to which the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party has been turned into an anti-Stalinist demonstration. Khrushchev, Malenkov, Mikoyan and Suslov once vied with each other to praise Stalin, whom Khrushchev once called the "father, wise teacher and directing genius of the party, the Soviet people and the workers of the whole world." Now these same men compete to find the most bitter phrases to apply to Stalin's regime. "Twenty years of dictatorship and lies" sums up their characterization of the Stalinist era.

Mikoyan has gone furthest of all. He has explicitly opened the Pandora's box of official Soviet history and exposed a few of the lies and falsehoods contained therein. So far Mikoyan has only rehabilitated two of Stalin's many victims, Kossior and Antonov-Ovseyenko, but the process can hardly stop there. Virtually all of Lenin's closest associates in the Bolshevik Revolution and the first few years of Soviet power—Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov and many others—were put to death at Stalin's order and put into Soviet history as "traitors" and "enemies of the people." In the land of falsehood, even a small gleam of truth is a dangerous thing. Can the new revision of Soviet history about to begin be contained within the limits the present leadership deems desirable, or will the whole edifice of Stalinist lies, frameups, and murders be exposed?

Why has this startling reversal taken place? Most likely Khrushchev and his fellows are responding to the great revulsion against Stalin and Stalinism among the people. The Khrushchev gang, Stalin's creatures and accomplices, hope to retain their power by harnessing this torrent of popular sentiment themselves. Abroad, they presumably hope to impress democratic Socialists, anti-Communist Russians and others that the Soviet dictatorship has been reformed and is now different from the monstrous evil that was Stalinism.

But we should not be tricked. The men who denounce Stalin now were trained by him and their hands are as bloody as were Stalin's with the blood of innocent millions. They have no claim to power other than that they were, as they once phrased it, the "closest comrades-at-arms of the great Stalin." It is good that they have begun to confess some of Stalin's crimes against the Soviet people. Stalin is dead and cannot be punished. When will the Russian people call his living accomplices to account for their share in those crimes?

[From the Christian Science Monitor]
KHRUSHCHEV TELLS THE WORLD

The Khrushchev speech to the Communist Party Congress provides a most timely service for the free world, including cold-war neutrals as well as the Western alliance. No one else could have done that service better. No non-Russians, nor any other Russian, could have spoken with such authority about Soviet aims.

It will be well to believe that Nikita S. Khrushchev, head of the Soviet Communist Party and now clearly top man in the Kremlin, means what he says.

And what is this? Simply, starkly, that the Soviet Union will use international communism to destroy other nations' ways of life and government throughout the free world, allied or neutral. Foreign aid programs, trade, disarmament—these are all subservient considerations in Soviet foreign policy. Subservient, that is, to a central objective that amounts to aggression short only of major war.

Coexistence as Mr. Khrushchev spells it is not an end, but a means to an end. The end is the omniexistence of Communist dictatorship and the nonexistence of any other form of government.

The Soviet Union, he has told the Communist Party meeting, is now strong enough to achieve this aim without war. But the aim is as fixed as ever. The atom may have produced an East-West military stalemate. But it does not, in Mr. Khrushchev's plan, prevent communism from infiltrating free world politics.

Wherever possible, Communists should form popular fronts with Socialists and other leftist groups, he says. Perhaps this will work readily in some neutral Asian countries. In Western Europe, however, Socialists may take warning from the experience of their brothers in former popular-front governments in what are now Russian satellite countries. From that they learned that defense of political liberty must take primacy over defense of economic liberty.

In France today one of the few encouraging signs in the domestic political picture has been the refusal of Socialists to ally themselves with Communists in recent electioneering. In Britain even Socialists who were once impressed by Russian rather than American peace statements have lately been alienated from Moscow by the anti-British campaign Mr. Khrushchev launched on his Indian tour.

Mr. Khrushchev's speech is another call to the Western nations to close ranks against an unremitting—if momentarily smiling—antagonist. There need not be war, he assures us all. But we should note the reasoning back of this. It is that the Soviet Union can get all its wants—even though to that there is no limit—without war.

When in history could not free men have had peace with oppressors on such terms as these?

President Gronchi of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, President of Italy, will address a joint session of Congress. It is my understanding that he will ask for no new American grants-in-aid, but he is sure to stress the need for increased economic and financial collaboration between the United States and Italy in order to strengthen the ties that bind the two countries. Before his departure from Italy on his visit to America, those seeking to weaken Italo-American relations and to drive Italy into the Communist camp wrongly and deliberately sought to represent President Gronchi as only a lukewarm friend of Italy's Western allies. President Gronchi's background belies this accusation.

Giovanni Gronchi is a very pious, religious and devoted family man. He is strongly opposed to dictatorship in any form. During the Mussolini regime he was deprived of his seat in Parliament because of his opposition to fascism. In the later period of World War II he not only fought back the Fascist elements but was also active in the anti-Nazi resistance movement, and thereafter became one of the founders of the new democratic Republic of Italy.

Since then he has fervently opposed communism in Italy and throughout the world. His methods are not those of violence and revolution. Basically, he is a scholar and a man of intellect. He believes in reforms, in upholding the rights of the working people, and in improving the lot of all the underprivileged, but that all this is to be done in an orderly fashion and in a democratic way. Thus, he strips the Communists of their most effective appeals to the masses. Were Signor Gronchi in American politics, he would undoubtedly be classified as a liberal Democrat or a Lincoln Republican.

Insofar as NATO is concerned, Gronchi believes that greater emphasis should be made on the economic phases of the North Atlantic Treaty rather than stressing too much the military aspects as is done at the present time. He is not alone in this thinking. During the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris last July, which I had the honor to attend as a member of the United States congressional delegation, there was considerable talk on this subject. It was noted by a number of delegates that NATO was set up as a practical organization, geared for immediate and collective action not only in the military field but also in the political and economic fields. Yet the emphasis was almost entirely on the military clauses of the treaty binding the Atlantic nations and very little on the other clauses of the treaty. This, it was felt by many at the Conference, was regrettable because by developing the political and economic aspects of the treaty the nations forming the Atlantic alliance would be considerably strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, because President Gronchi has been maligned, misrepresented and maliciously misquoted, I was happy to read in the New York Times magazine section yesterday a very fine analysis of the man Giovanni Gronchi by Mr. Arnaldo Cortesi, the New York Times correspondent in Rome, who has followed Mr. Gronchi's career for many years.

I should like also to call to the attention of my colleagues an interview on the television program Between the Lines yesterday by Mr. Lester Wolff, the producer of that program, with Italy's Foreign Minister Gaetano Martino, who is accompanying President Gronchi on his visit to the United States. I believe this interview is further evidence at this time of the traditional friendship between Italy and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, let us give a genuine and warm welcome to our Italian friends and allies. Let us do our part to help the country they represent to become totally free from the scourge of Communist influence and disruption. Let us help make Italy one of our stanchest allies and supporters in the struggle for a free world. I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest greetings to the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi, and to his Foreign Minister, Gaetano Martino, and wish them a most pleasant and successful visit to our country.

The New York Times article and the television interview mentioned above are inserted in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks. They read as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1956]

PRESIDENTIAL VISITOR FROM ITALY

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME.—Giovanni Gronchi, the third President of Ltaly, was elected by Parliament in 1955 and immediately made it plain that he was something new in the European experience of parliamentary republics.

He does not subscribe to the European view that Presidents, like the children of a bygone age, should be seen and not heard. He does not conceive of them as mere figureheads. He thinks they have better things to do than to look decorative at public functions and to hold more or less superfluous "consultations" at times of cabinet crises.

In this he is significantly broadening the major powers conferred on him by the constitution—the veto power (all laws must have his signature) and the power to send messages to Parliament on any subject, to dissolve Parliament or either chamber, and to nominate Premiers. The framers of the Italian Constitution intended to model their republic on France, and it was thus considered axiomatic that the Italian President would do nothing and say nothing of political significance. The first two did follow the French precedent, but Gronchi has clearly indicated his belief that as President he has not only the right but the duty to urge his views on the Government and the nation.

In little less than a year since he was elected President Gronchi has delivered more speeches of political significance in all parts of Italy than any other European President has done in the whole of a term. His influence has always been exerted in favor of a policy based on the idea that the best way to fight communism is to steal its thunder by moving resolutely toward the working masses and the poor with a policy of pronounced left-wing flavor.

His insistence that to be elected President is not the same thing as being put on the political shelf has made Gronchi a far more powerful figure in politics than any of his European counterparts. Nevertheless when he arrives in Washington on an official visit this week as the guest of the United States Government, neither he nor the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Prof. Gaetano Martino, who accompanies him, will have any specific demands to make. They have, above all, no intention of asking for new American grants-in-aid. They will, however, certainly make out a case for increased economic and financial collaboration between the United States and Italy, pointing out particularly how vast a field is available in Italy for American loans and investments.

In their journey across the Atlantic, which will take them also to Canada, Gronchi and Martino count on cementing the already excellent relations among the three countries concerned. While in Washington they expect to discuss all aspects of the international situation frankly with their American opposite numbers and to reach a more perfect alinement of Italian and American policy within the framework of the Atlantic Pact.

President Gronchi is a self-made man of humble origins who graduated first to considerable success as an industrialist and later to the highest political position of his country. At the age of 68 he is a vigorous man of less than average height, with horn-rimmed spectacles, a full head of almost completely white hair, and a healthy out-of-doors complexion. He radiates energy and self-confidence and is clearly a go-getter.

Even in Italy, where the population is almost solidly Catholic, Gronchi distinguishes himself as a devout and practicing Catholic. It follows that he is anti-Communist to the innermost fiber of his being. A man of deep and wide culture, he understands and reads English without difficulty, but does not trust himself to speak it. The address that he is to make to a joint session of Congress will, therefore, be delivered in Italian.

This will not be Gronchi's first visit to America. He was there as a businessman for a month at the end or 1935 and the beginning of 1936. He returned, again on business, in May 1940, but was obliged to cut his stay short because of Italy's entry into the war on Germany's side. He has been married twice, and lives in Rome—not in the rather stuffy splendor of the Quirinal Palace, formerly the residence of Italian Kings, but in his private home, together with his second wife, a pretty woman 25 years his junior; their son, Mario 13; and their daughter, Maria Cecilia, 11. Signora Gronchi will accompany him on his trip to America. An affectionate husband and father, Gronchi is a home-loving person whose main hobbies are fishing, oriental art, and classical music. He has been known to miss important political appointments because he had gone to the zoo or circus with his children.

In his Washington talks, Gronchi believes he will be aided by the fact that he is acquainted with most of the men with whom he will be dealing. He met President Eisenhower before either was President, and also knows the American Secretary of State. Indeed, Gronchi professes a very high regard for Mr. Dulles and often expresses appreciation of the courtesy that Dulles did him by stopping off in Rome to speak to him when he was on his way to the second Geneva Conference.

Gronchi has often been represented as an adversary of the Atlantic Pact and a lukewarm friend, at best, of Italy's allies. He denies the charge most emphatically. He says that adherence to the Atlantic Pact is the necessary basis of Italian foreign policy, and declares it unthinkable that Italy should

ever abandon the alliance. He recalls that, as long ago as 1953, when he was still President (Speaker) of the Chamber, he said to Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce: "I wish you could persuade them in America that only the Communists and leftwing Socialists are against the Atlantic Pact; and new perhaps not even the Socialists."

When pressed for an explanation of why he is regarded in many quarters as an enemy of the Atlantic Pact, Gronchi says the reason is that he disagreed with the way—and only with the way—in which Italy joined the alliance in 1949. He felt that Italy should have exacted some political advantage, and particularly guaranties about Trieste, in exchange for her adhesion to the treaty. As far as treaty itself is concerned, he says he has always been heartily in agreement with it.

The problem now is, Gronchi adds, not whether Italy should or should not remain in the Atlantic alliance. She is in and will remain in, wholly and unreservedly, he says. The problem is to make the alliance work as efficiently as possible. What is required, Gronchi believes, is to lay greater stress on the economic clauses of the treaty, thus emphasizing that the Atlantic alliance is an Atlantic community of nations. The present tendency, Gronchi feels, is to think too much of the military clauses and not enough of the others.

Another fault, in Gronchi's opinion, is that the lesser powers in the alliance (which in effect means all except the United States, Britain, and France) should be permitted to contribute more than they do at present. This could be done by calling more frequent meetings of the Atlantic Council and by consulting smaller nations in all matters of policy toward the East.

He is perfectly aware, Gronchi says, that the greatest burden of responsibility must necessarily be shouldered by the big powers. That is inevitable and entirely as it should be. He is, however, strongly of the opinion that to share out more responsibility to the smaller states would increase the cohesion among all members of the alliance.

In the minds of most people, both in Italy and outside Italy, Gronchi is the advocate of the opening to the left, or in other words, the man who would like to see room made in the Cabinet for the leftwing Socialists, who are now in alliance with the Communists. In his inaugural speech he said things that were widely interpreted to mean that he wanted the Socialists in the Cabinet with the least possible delay. On second thought, he now says he does not want anything of the sort, and he points out that he spoke of the Socialists being in the Government not as an imminent but as a remote possibility.

"As I said in the Christian Democratic Congress of 1954 in Naples," Gronchi points out, "I have never conceived of the opening to the left as meaning that the Government parties were to negotiate with the leftwing Socialists in the hope of inducing them to enter the Cabinet. My idea is the exact opposite. It is the leftwing Socialists who must move away from the Communists and toward the Christian Democrats and the other center parties, until they are worthy of entering the Cabinet and their admission becomes logical and almost inevitable."

The movement of the leftwing Socialists away from the Communists and toward the center has already begun, Gronchi thinks, and what the Christian Democrats should now do is to accelerate it. The Christian Democratic Party, he says, has a good program, which was approved in 1946 and never repudiated. It provides for a social development of the economy by means of land reform, expansion of housing, measures to combat unemployment, and the like.

Let this program be applied integrally and with courage, Gronchi urges. He believes the leftwing Socialists would soon find themselves facing a difficult dilemma. They would have to decide whether to stick to their Communist allies or break away from them in support of the Government's reform program. If they decided to stay with the Communists, they would be extremely vulnerable at the next election, Gronchi thinks.

The President of Italy is in agreement with most Western European statesmen that Germany is the central world problem of this moment. It may well be that this problem holds the balance between war and peace. Gronchi would like to see the West adopt a more dynamic policy where Germany is concerned, though he does not say just what such a policy should be. He feels that the presence of millions of refugees and the division of Germany into two parts can easily produce irredentist feelings and attitudes, and may even bring into being a body of German opinion favorable to direct negotiations with the Russians.

What Gronchi fears is that the Soviets may make some headway with their propaganda that it is only Germany's NATO membership that stands in the path of German reunification. It is an argument, he thinks, that is likely to find a more and more receptive audience as resurgent German nationalism gains ground; and the West must find some way of combating it.

Giovanni Gronchi was born in Pontedera, a small town in the province of Pisa, Tuscany, on September 1, 1887. His father, Sperandio, was an accountant in a food-processing plant, and eked out a miserable living with odd jobs, which included selling salamis and sausages for a local manufacturer. His mother died in 1896, when Giovanni was a small boy of 6, and his father remarried shortly afterward.

Things began to look up when a gifted priest, Don Giuseppe Carlini, became interested in the boy and prevailed upon his father to send him to high school. Giovanni soon stood out as a brilliant student and paid for most of his subsequent education with the scholarships he won. Don Carlini was also responsible for introducing young Gronchi to the Catholic youth movement, and so getting him started in politics.

From that point, Gronchi never looked back. He delivered his first public speech at the age of 12, was elected chairman of the newly founded Catholic club of Pontedera at 16, and at 20 ran for office for the first time, being soundly beaten in a municipal election.

In 1909, with a degree from the famous normal school of Pisa, a state college founded by Napoleon, young Gronchi taught in high schools in Pisa, Parma, and Bergamo. In 1913, he married Cecilia Comparini, whom he had known in the Catholic youth movement. When Italy entered the First World War 2 years later, Gronchi, though a professed pacifist, did his full duty and returned home when it was over with the rank of captain and 1 silver and 2 bronze medals for gallantry.

On his return from war, Gronchi participated in the Catholic congress of Bologna in 1919, which gave birth to the Catholic political movement that took the name of Italian Popular Party. The present dominant Christian Democratic Party is its successor. Gronchi was one of the 133 deputies that the P. P., as the Popular Party was known, elected to the first postwar chamber. He was vitally interested in the Catholic labor movement, and in 1920 was appointed national secretary general of the "white," or Catholic, labor confederation.

He was soon in the forefront of his party's losing struggle with fascism. When, after the 1922 march on Rome, his party decided to collaborate with fascism, Gronchi was Undersecretary for Industry and Commerce in one of Mussolini's cabinets. But he soon resigned and resumed the fight against fascism.

Gronchi was reelected a deputy in 1924, and shortly thereafter suffered the loss of his father and his wife. After the murder of Giacomo Matteotti, he joined the anti-Fascist Parliament known as "The Aventine." In 1926, the Fascists deprived him formally of his seat in Parliament.

If he had now wished to resume teaching, Gronchi would have had to take an oath of allegiance to fascism. He preferred to make a new life for himself. At the age of 39, he found himself selling neckties and falling far short of making enough to support himself. Then he became a traveling salesman for a paint manufacturer. A few years later, he had founded his own firm and was on his way to becoming a successful and prosperous manufacturer. His plant was first at Brugherio, near Milan, and later at Casoria, near Naples.

In 1941, during the Second World War, Gronchi married again. His second wife was the former Carla Bissantini, whom he had first met in 1926. In the closing stages of the war, Gronchi played an important part in the anti-Nazi resistance movement as a member of the National Liberation Committee of northern Italy. After the liberation, he was one of the men who reorganized the old Popular Party into the Christian Democratic Party.

As one of the big men in the dominant party, Gronchi found himself in all the early postwar Cabinets. He was Minister of Industry and Commerce in the 2 Cabinets headed by Ivanoe Bonomi, in that headed by Ferruccio Parri, and in the first of the late Alcide De Gasperi's 8 successive Cabinets. In 1948, he was elected president of the Chamber of Deputies, and he held this post for 7 years, a record that ahs been exceeded by only two persons in Italian parliamentary history.

On April 29, 1955, a joint session of the Senate and the Chamber elected Gronchi President of the Italian Republic on the fourth ballot by 658 votes out of 833. It was a most confused election, which in the end saw almost the entire Parliament, including both the extreme left and the extreme right as well as most of the Christian Democrats and the center, voting for Gronchi.

Italian Presidents are elected for 7-year terms, and Gronchi will therefore be President until 1962. He looks upon it as a good omen that his presidency has been opened, within 1 year of his election, by a trip to the United States. He is confident that a better understanding will result from it, and that this will strengthen Italo-American friendship and make it more enduring.

INTERVIEW WITH FOREIGN MINISTER GAETANO MARTINO, OF ITALY, BY LESTER WOLFF FOR BETWEEN THE LINES TELEVISION PROGRAM, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1956

Question. What is the purpose of your visit to the United States?

Answer. As you know the visit takes place as a result of an official invitation of President Eisenhower to President Gronchi. It certainly was a very courteous gesture which can't but furrther improve the good relations between our two countries. I think that the first and most important purpose of the visit is to strengthen, through a more personal and informal exchange of views at high level, the traditional friendship between Italy and the United States.

Question. Can you give us, Excellency, some information on Italy's economic situation today?

Answer. Italy's economy is steadily improving as the figures of our statistics show. Since the huge destructions of the war, which left the country in an almost hopeless situation, the recovery has been amazing. Today Italy has overstepped, in almost every sector, the prewar economic standards. Of course, we shall never forget that these wonderful results have been quickly reached be-

cause, side by side with the tenacity and the will to fight for a better future of our people, we had the generous American contribution which helped us through, and is still helping us to reach our goals.

Question. Do you think the death of Minister Vanoni may affect Italian policies?

Answer. The death of Ezio Vanoni, our Minister for Budget, is certainly a great loss for our nation. He not only was a well-known expert for economic affairs, the author of the recovery plan that bears his name, but also an honest and good citizen and a convinced friend of your country.

I, personally, do not think that his death will change the course of the economic policy of the Government. The general pattern of said policy is decided and accepted by the Cabinet as a whole and I do not see any reason to modify it.

Question. Could you, Mr. Minister, give us the names of men who, according to your opinion, are to be watched for Italy's future?

Answer. Well, this is a rather difficult question to answer. Still, as I have faith in the future of my country, I think I'll take on me to answer: all the boys and girls of the new generation.

Question. And now, Excellency, may we have your idea on Italy's attitude toward America and on what can be done to further improve the relations between the two countries?

Answer. Our attitude toward America is one of friendship and trust. We belong to the same western civilization and we cherish the same ideals. Our nations are bound in the same defensive alliance in order to protect that civilization and those ideals. As I already said, I think that this mutual friendship can be further promoted by a better reciprocal knowledge of our people. I, therefore, think that visits of officials, experts, or even plain tourists, also scholarships, etc., should be encouraged and facilitated in both our countries so as to allow a better understanding of each other's problems, and of the methods to adopt in order to face and solve them.

Salute to Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared on February 15, 1956, in the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, on the occasion of the 70th anniversary year of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance and the 38th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence of Russia:

A dinner held last night at American Legion Home, 45 North River Street, served to direct attention to some of the activities of a large body of residents of Lithuanian origin in our midst. Primarily the dinner was held to note the 70th anniversary year of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance and the 38th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence of Russia.

As the history-minded must know, this declaration came on February 16, 1918, and eloquent note has been made by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles of the fact that the 38th anniversary will be observed generally tomorrow.

Plymouth saw the birth of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance on November 22, 1886. From small beginnings the alliance grew to a membership of some 20,000. An officer informed us that the bulk of the membership is in the anthracite fields. Leonard Simutis, editor of a Lithuanian language daily in Chicago, where 100,000 residents are of Lithuanian ancestry, is the president, and John J. Grigalus, a Boston lawyer, is vice president. The six other officers reside in this region. Among them is William Kvetkas, of Academy Street, the secretary. He has held the office for 18 years and prior to that served 14 years, first as trustee and then as treasurer.

Of timely interest is the invitation the organization's spiritual director, Rev. John F. Boll, has received to give the invocation at an opening session of the House of Representatives at Washington one day soon. The alliance was formed as a mutual benefit organization and has continued through the years to serve its original basic purpose, but not the least of its values is found in occasional social gatherings, such as last night's held on the eve of Lent and almost on the eve of Lithuanian Day.

February Is Catholic Press Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, February is being commemorated all over this Nation as Catholic Press Month. It is with great pleasure that I pay tribute today to those publications which faithfully report on events of significant and special interest to Catholic readers.

The Catholic press of the United States is filling a definite need. It is primarily concerned with giving a more detailed report on Catholic events than do secular papers and evaluating the changing times in which we live. The high quality and uniform excellence of our Catholic press is confirmed by the high esteem in which it is held by all its readers. They look to it for the guidance and interpretation so badly needed by all of us today.

The paper with which I happen to be most familiar, and which I salute also today, is the Catholic Courier Journal, which is the official newspaper of the diocese of Rochester. Its circulation is over 53,000. Its coverage of the news is complete, timely, and well written. By means of wire services from all over the world, the Courier Journal is able to supply its readers with the latest, up-to-the-minute happenings soon after they take place. This fine paper also carries accurate accounts of important Catholic events and is noted for its complete coverage of significant Catholic news.

Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Courier Journal of my city is just one of many fine Catholic newspapers of this country. It is an integral part of the network of diocesan papers which, though restricted in its readership and area of coverage, is a most effective and good influence on our public life.

The Catholic press is serving its ends well. It is a strong and enlightening influence in the homes of all who read it. As Catholic Press Month draws to a close, I salute these publications for their past accomplishments and wish them continued success in the years ahead.

Our Most Impoverished Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, wide national attention has been given to a booklet issued by the Christian Century, of Chicago, and containing reprints of a series of articles by Dr. Harold E. Fey on our treatment of American Indians. The Christian Century is one of the outstanding and most influential Protestant publications in the country. Work is a Catholic newspaper, excellently edited, and of wide circulation. The following article from the July 1955 issue of Work indicates a unanimity of opinion in a considerable segment of both Protestant and Catholic circles on the question of our treatment of the American Indians. The article follows:

A ROVING EDITOR PROVIDES AN ANSWER—WHAT PEOPLE IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ARE IN DEEPEST POVERTY?

(By Bob Senser)

The people who once owned all the wealth of this country are now its most impoverished citizens. While a few Indians own oil wells and other riches, as a group the 400,000 United States Indians "live in deeper poverty than any other racial group in the Nation."

So says Harold E. Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century, in a new booklet titled "Indian Rights and American Justice."

"The original American is buried to his neck in legal paper," Dr. Fey points out. Congress has passed more than 5,000 statutes on the Indian since 1900, as a followup to United States Indian treaties which swore they would endure "so long as the grass shall grow and the waters run."

Yet all these legal papers have spared the Indian only a small part of his original inheritance. The tribes were squeezed into less and less land—and into the most barren. "As a result of the Indian Allotment Act of 1887, Indian landholdings (in 80 years) shrank from 139 million to 48 million acres," Dr. Fey says.

Sixty-five percent of Indian land has an annual rainfall of less than 15 inches, less than half of Indiana (where there are only a scattering of Indians).

"Throughout large sections of Indian country," the booklet states, "water for human use is transported long distances in rusty metal barrels, often with no cover except a burlap bag spread over the top to prevent loss by splashing or evaporation. * * *

"Lack of clean water helps explain why the incidence among Navaho children of diarrhea and enteritis is 20 times that in the general population, why life expectancy among the Papagos (Arizona) is 17 years, against 68 for the Nation as a whole." (The average Indian life expectancy is 36.)

Dr. Fey recalls how Congress in 1859 set up the Pima Indian Reservation in Arizona, where the Gila and Salt Rivers were to be reserved for the use of the Indians. "But after the Civil War white squatters, first Mormons and then others, settled upstream and took the water of the river for their own use. In a few years the ancient canals of the Pimas went dry, and for nearly 40 years these peaceful farmers fought a losing fight against starvation."

In many other places, too, the choice land that in 1900 had still been in Indian hands was lost to the whites.

An erosion of Indian rights has taken place since 1950, Dr. Fey charges. Samples of the evidence that he cites to prove this:

"Land belonging to Indians in New Mexico was sold without their consent.

"Government representatives interfered with the election of tribal officers of the Blackfeet Tribe in Montana.

"The practice of consulting Indians on legislation or other matters affecting their welfare was virtually stopped.

"Some tribes could not get statements concerning balances in their tribal funds on deposit with the United States Treasury, and finally had to appeal to the United States Indian Claims Commission for the information."

Dr. Fey's booklet examines in detail the plight of the Klamath Indians of Oregon, the Pimas of Arizona, the Chippewas of North Dakota, the Navahos of Arizona and New Mexico, and the Cherokees of North Carolina and Tennessee. But he discusses not only the Indian problem, but the problem of the white man's conscionce:

"Since the beginning of this century our Government has spent more than a billion dollars to improve the economic condition of this minority. But the simple materialistic faith that filling stomachs solves all other problems, which seems to underlie our policy toward underdeveloped countries with communism, has not solved the problem of our relations with the Indians.

"The only policy we have not tried consistently, determinedly, and on a large scale, is the policy of study of the Indian heritage, respect for the Indian as an individual and for his social groups as essential to his way of life."

The booklet, which originally appeared as a series of 8 articles in the Protestant weekly, Christian Century, has a Protestant mission emphasis in several sections, but most of its 24 pages are loaded with facts for anyone interested in justice for the original Americans.

Shall We Tolerate Those Flying Saloons?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Harry C. Kenney entitled, "Shall We Tolerate Those Flying Saloons?" which was published in the February issue of the Christian Herald. I am very much interested in this subject matter since I have introduced legislation in the House to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers in flight.

The article follows:

SHALL WE TOLERATE THOSE FLYING SALOONS?

(By Harry C. Kenney)

Sky-high drunks not only make airplane trips less enjoyable, but potentially present a serious threat to the chances of your landing safely at your destination. This is no mere conflict of morality between drinker and nondrinker. The peril is impartial. Airborne alcohol endangers not only the lives of nondrinkers, but the lives of the drinkers themselves.

With air travel constantly and phenomenally growing (in 1954, for example, more people flew the oceans than crossed them by ship for the first time in history), the alcoholic headache aloft is destined to become worse, not better, unless something is done about it promptly.

I have flown well over 100,000 miles in this country and abroad, and there have been few flights when I have not been disturbed or concerned over the threat to the safety of the flight due to intoxicating liquors served to passengers.

One such experience occurred on a major airline nonstop flight scheduled for New York to Miami. As the huge, heavily loaded plane raced down the runway the fire warning mechanism sounded. Fortunately the crew had enough runway distance to halt without taking off.

In 2 hours we tried it again. Once more the fire alarm sounded, indicating serious trouble with one of the engines. We returned to the airport and waited until another plane could be readied. By the time we took off for the third try the passengers were rightfully nervous.

A fine-looking businessman sat opposite me. The stewardess served him drinks and he called for more. Soon he was under the influence—and yet he was served more liquor. Suddenly he let out a shrilling, startling, between-the-teeth whistle which just about sent the nervous passengers through the ceiling of the plane.

The passenger wanted the stewardess and more liquor. In the process he made obvious advances to the stewardess, tried to buy everyone on the plane a drink, and conducted passenger-bumping excursions up and down the aisle.

The male steward tried to quiet him down but he became argumentative and difficult. He was going to "get" the jobs of the personnel and he knew his "rights." Finally, the captain had to leave the cockpit, come back, take away the man's matches and cigarettes, strap him in a seat, and assign the very busy steward to watch over him. Passenger comfort was devastated and the safety of the flight was seriously jeopardized.

What is it going to take to convince the Nation's airline executives and the Civil Aeronautics Board that serving liquor in airplanes is gambling with passengers' lives?

Overwhelming evidence is piling up that the incidents of disturbance, anxiety and danger due to drinking and drunks aboard have reached the alarm stage not only for many passengers but for many of those persons responsible for the safe conduct of a plane.

A flight engineer writes that "to be of assistance to a stewardess and do a job" he opened a champagne bottle in the cockpit with his pocket knife. The cork came out with a loud explosion "and with a motion similar to a small projectile." He admitted that the bottle should never have been brought to the cockpit and that "since the cork was made of rather heavy rubber material, had it been aimed just right it could have hit a feather button, an instrument or a crew member with obvious results."

The engineer said the incident "really shook me, particularly when I fully realized all its possibilities. From such acorns, oaks of disaster grow."

A publisher of a large newspaper writes: "I have observed with great concern the procedure in both types of flights: (a) where drinks are provided free; (b) where they are sold. My reaction has been very definitely negative to the whole idea. To see fine young women pushing the sale of liquor in an otherwise refined atmosphere, is very irritating to me. Serving liquor on planes is still very distasteful to nondrinkers as well as to those who believe liquor is a contributing hazard."

Yet airlines that encourage drinking aloft forbid cigar smoking, because its heavy fumes may disturb other passengers.

An overseas captain reports two cases of intoxicated, hard-to-control men passengers and one case of a drunken woman who insisted on parading up and down the aisle nude.

One airline captain with 12 years' experience says: "I feel that the airlines not only lowered their standards but added a hazard to the safe conduct of a flight when they started serving drinks. I feel that in-flight is definitely not the time for liquor."

A major airline pilot has stated: "I have had two cases when I had to order an obviously intoxicated person from the cockpit at night during final approach to landing."

Another airline pilot writes: "Once I saw a dozing drinker light several cigarettes and drop each one of them down in the upholstery still burning." This same pilot reports the experience of another drinker who "attacked the plane's captain and had to be tied with a rope on the floor where he spent the rest of the flight."

A woman who has flown the Atlantic twice writes about the discomfort caused by the liquor served all passengers who accepted it. "Passengers got noisy in a very short while on the return trip, and nothing was done to quiet them down." A stewardess told her: "Aside from the noise, the smell, and the problems liquor brings with it, there is always the possibility that in an emergency at least half of the passengers could not be relied upon to be of service to themselves or others. They might even hinder the rescue of other passengers."

She was referring to the possibility of "ditching" in the ocean. At such a time all passengers would be expected to be helpful. There would be excitement. Precision and clear thinking would be vital. Getting passengers into "Mae Wests" and launching the liferafts would demand speed.

Where would a drunk fit into this picture? He would be a threat to the whole situation and endanger the rescue operations. Not only would he be a severe hazard but ironically would require special attention because he was drunk and would steal precious time and attention. His own chances of survival would be drastically reduced.

Air flight personnel have to contend constantly with "champagne flights" and "cocktail hour" flights over land and sea. Such schedules are dramatically headlined in national advertising. Can two stewardesses and a steward (sometimes only two stewardesses) be expected to take care of the requests and needs of 50 to 90 passengers for an hour and a half to eight hours and longer and still handle the drinkers?

Some airline officials contend that drinking on planes is no more dangerous than drinking on trains. This just doesn't stand up. The trains are on the ground, on tracks. The engineer and fireman never leave their posts to handle drunks. There are numerous conductors and trainmen to deal with difficult situations. There are separate drinking cars or drinking compartments and the nondrinker and family groups do not have to be subjected to an atmosphere that is contrary to their thinking, education and beliefs.

The pilot of a plane from necessity is closely associated with the passengers and

yet should he be expected to leave his post at times when his job needs him most? Take the regulation which states that the cockpit door should never be locked. This is provided as an escape possibility in case of a crash. However, each airline determines whether the door shall be open or not during takeoffs and landings.

Several airlines leave the door open during these times because if there is a crash there is no likelihood of the door's jamming. There are many times when the pilot has to land in weather so bad that he has to be talked down. Is this the time to contend with drinkers? Is this the time to be concerned whether a drunk is going to get into the cockpit and take a swing at the captain?

The above incidents are not rare. Yet one major airline official declares—and it is generally accepted by the others that serve liquor: "We know of no evidence which will support any suggestion that the safety of operation is diminished by the limited service of alcoholic beverages which we permit and provide."

This is not the way the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association sees it. This organization has passed a resolution opposing bar service aloft "in the interest of the safety of the flying public." President of the ALSSA Rowland K. Quinn, Jr., says this resolution was adopted "because of the safety hazard and deterioration of reasonable passenger discipline necessary to provide for the pleasure and safety of all passengers."

Mr. Quinn further states: "The modern aircraft is a complex machine. The cockpit crew should not be expected to double as bouncers in the cocktail lounge. As a general rule, stewardesses today are younger and less mature than they were even a few years ago, when all applicants were required to be trained nurses. It is unreasonable to expect a young woman scarcely 20 years old to function as the enforcement agency in their flying saloons. The airlines should have recognized these problems and acted on their own volition. However, since they have not and do not intend to do so, Federal legislation should be enacted to protect the flying public and crews against the inherent dangers existing as a result of uncontrolled drinking on commercial aircraft.

The executive board of the Air Line Pilots Association also has called on commercial aviation companies to discontinue serving liquor or set-ups on flights. Clarence N. Sayen, president of the association, says: "We feel that drinking aboard airplanes is a growing problem that alarms pilots who are charged with the safe conduct of a flight."

Harold L. Pearson, former president Air Transport Association, drew up a code which he hoped his fellow executives in the industry would adopt. It included such points as these: No person giving evidence of intoxication shall be permitted to board an aircraft; no beverage service will be available to intoxicated persons or minors; no liquor service on Sundays or national election days; service will be confined to the hours between noon and midnight; no service on flights of less than 2 hours duration. No service on coach flights; beverage service shall not be permitted to interfere with serving of meals or comfort of passengers; and ATA should be empowered to police the industry code.

While any and every attempt to bring about the control or denial of serving liquor aloft is to be applauded, there are wide loopholes in the above suggested code. Take, for example, the item which suggests no liquor service on flights of less than 2 hours. Do not the longer flights provide the greater danger? There is time to consume more liquor, the planes fly higher, farther, and faster. Long trips require larger planes which carry more passengers and are subject to a different set of flying problems from the short routes.

Mr. Pearson presented the 15-point code in full before airline delegates to the recent Air Traffic Conference gathering in San Francisco. The airline officials refused to adopt even this compromise set of liquor controls. An ATA spokesman said the group "found the code unacceptable" and "left the matter with the individual airlines."

Mr. Pearson also could get little satisfaction from CAB. The acting chairman of the Government regulatory organization said in reply to Mr. Pearson's letter of complaint that it was keeping the liquor question in mind; that while protests against drinking in flight "have become more pronounced, CAB will determine when public safety is involved and will take corrective steps as they are required."

CAB can stop the serving of liquor whenever it wants to and can accomplish the job within 24 hours. But what is its position? It is stated in a memorandum on policy:

"The serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air-carrier airplanes in flight is not specifically prohibited or restricted by Federal law. * * * The Board has held in the past that the matter is one subject to State law enforcement. Notwithstanding * * * it is possible that if the privilege were abused, safety might be jeopardized. * * * Consequently the Board has been vigilant in examining all complaints of this nature * * * and as a result of these investigations we do not believe there is any evidence to show, on the basis of present practice, that safety of flight is jeopardized."

No evidence, they say.

Capital Airlines, which does not serve liquor and yet is not taking sides over the conflict, complained to the CAB that another airline, a competitor, was serving drinks over States where the sale of alcoholic beverages was illegal. Capital claimed that the practice not only was illegal but unfair competition, and what was CAB going to do about it?

The Board dismissed the complaint without action and stated that: "* * * it is not thought that any action thereon or investigation thereof by the Board at this time would be in the interest of the public."

Some day, however, some organization is likely to investigate the extent to which airlines can be prevented from serving liquor over dry States. This could well be a provocative investigation. Mr. Quinn declares: "The carriers possibly proclaim that they religiously observe State liquor laws. This is so absurd as to be laughable. The cabin crews haven't the vaguest idea what State restrictions are imposed upon the serving and sale of liquor. Moreover, it is pretty difficult to know at 25,000 feet when you pass over the State line."

Thus the merry-go-round turns. The airlines' own trade association refuses to act as a body and has tossed the ball back to the individual airlines. Some airlines have tossed the ball to CAB. It has tossed it back to the airlines. The pilots, stewardesses, and stewards are on record against liquor. Many passengers have objected. Incidents of danger and potential danger have been recorded by flight personnel. In the meantime, the planes are flying high in more ways than one.

Who wants liquor on airlines? A few years ago the companies queried passengers on drinks in flight. In a 60-day survey customers of one company registered a 78-percent vote against liquor. In all cases the vote was against the service.

One airline president said: "You may rest assured that as long as I have any connection with this company no such equipment (bars to serve alcoholic beverages) will be installed."

Another declared: "Public opinion is against the practice and we will serve neither cocktails nor other forms of intoxicants."

These lines are now serving liquor.

What started it?

One major airline serving the New York to Miami "race-track run" takes the credit for starting it domestically in 1950. It felt that red-carpet treatment with drinks at $1 each (with no limit) would not only bring in business but provide passengers with "appetizers, relaxation, and a sense of luxury." Representatives of this airline say the company does not make money on the service, and yet it has no intention of giving it up.

Another major airline flying to Miami held off serving beverages for 2 years but finally gave in to the competition. Gradually liquor went aboard on flights to other parts of the country, and more airlines gave in to meet the competition.

Today it is on record that several airline spokesmen have declared in effect: "We wish the idea had never come up. It's been just one big headache. If only the airlines could get together and agree to stop, we would be ready tomorrow."

Why can't it be that simple? Because 2 or 3 major companies insist upon serving liquor.

What is being done to help them see the light? Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, South Carolina, told this reporter that he has already written the CAB requesting that it impose a ban on serving liquor aboard commercial airlines. Also, "if nothing is done by the CAB, then it is highly probable that I will introduce legislation during this session of Congress that will impose Federal restrictions on this menace to public safety."

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, Massachusetts, also told this reporter, "I have been hoping that the airlines concerned would take some action to banish the serving of liquor in the air, but evidently they do not care to do so. I plan to introduce legislation in this session of Congress to make it a Federal crime to serve liquor aloft."

Congressman LANE further stated that "the practice of serving liquor 'upstairs' is a contradiction of all other safety measures. It is a thoughtless invitation to a new kind of disaster, which, fortunately, has not yet occurred. That it will happen is inevitable, unless this practice is stopped."

It is also reliably stated in Washington that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communication will soon begin extensive hearings on aviation legislation and the permissive attitude of the CAB."

There is growing evidence that either CAB or the airlines are going to be forced one way or another to either eliminate, or drastically control, liquor serving aloft.

There is an ironic factor to this whole business. Numerous executives of airlines have told this reporter, off record, of course, that they would be very happy if liquor were not served on airplanes. Most of them lose money on the service; it is a messy business; it takes the time of flight personnel; it takes up pay-load space; it has caused trouble; and now it is creating a national issue.

Another ironic point is that the airlines have always made safety their most important goal. They spare no expense to maintain fabulous safety records. Their overhaul bases are a marvel of scientific and engineering skill. Their pilots and stewardesses and stewards are trained to perfection. Their weather observation and training challenges the best in the world. Their adoption of advanced equipment in the electronic field such as radar is quick and every aviation safety item is explored and adopted if helpful.

Yet, one passenger could brush this all aside with the swish of a bottle.

What can individuals do about the problem?

1. Register objections with Senators and Congressmen and urge legislation outlawing liquor aboard commercial aircraft.

2. Inform the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington of your own unfortunate experiences caused by the serving of liquor in planes.

3. Express your opinion to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, and to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington.

4. Select airlines that do not serve liquor whenever possible and let the airline know why you have done this.

5. Write to the executives of airlines expressing your position. In the pockets on the back of the seats in most planes there is a card asking how you have enjoyed your trip and for recommendations for improvement. Use these cards, write your opinions and send them in.

6. If you are asked whether you would like a cocktail, not only say "No," but express your objection to paying for the drinks others are consuming. On many luxury flights, cocktails are served "free" but all the passengers are actually paying for them.

7. Compliment airlines which do not serve liquor—from the ticket counter to the president's office.

Scattering Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I am against sending any more American dollars to India. I think that the moment has come in which we should remember the Scriptural admonition:

He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

India's leaders have been scattering abroad and carrying water on both shoulders too long, and the sooner we stop bowing and scraping to Nehru and Menon the sooner we will regain the respect of the peoples of Pakistan and Ceylon and other countries who have dared to take a positive stand against communism. It will take a little bit of backbone, but the American people have always had plenty of this, and I hope that Mr. Dulles will demonstrate some of it during his forthcoming visit to Mr. Nehru's country.

Peter Edson, in an article appearing in the February 24 Washington Daily News, points to the growing impatience of Americans who are tired of bearing the insults of Nehru, an impatience which will reveal itself succinctly when Congress begins to debate the subject of foreign aid before many days have passed.

The article follows:

DULLES AND NEHRU

(By Peter Edson)

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles goes to India in March with half a dozen foul-ball strikes called against him.

It is an open secret that India's Prime Minister Nehru has no great love for him. The strain is said to go back to a slight which Mr. Dulles gave Mr. Nehru while negotiating the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Then in 1953 when the United States opposed India's participation in the Korean cease-fire talks—because India hadn't been in the war—Mr. Nehru called Mr. Dulles' policy "immature," for two reasons.

First, Mr. Nehru thought neutrals might bring the two opponents together. Second, he thought Asians should have a voice in settling Asian problems—not non-Asians.

As it worked out, India was the neutral power that handled prisoner exchange after the Korean armistice.

Mr. Dulles has been in South Asia three times since he became Secretary of State, but in India only once.

In September 1954 Mr. Dulles went to Manila where he signed the SEATO Pact, creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. India did not attend and has not joined the alliance, since Mr. Nehru opposes all such military pacts.

Mr. Dulles went to the SEATO Conference in Bangkok a year ago. Afterwards he visited Burma to assure Premier U Nu that SEATO offered no threat to his neutrality. The job of reassuring Mr. Nehru on this score was left to Anthony Eden.

Mr. Dulles capped his own unpopularity in India when he made his unfortunate Goa statement about having discussed Portuguese "provinces" in the Far East during the Washington visit of Portugal's Foreign Minister Gunha in December.

This being the situation, about the only thing Messrs. Dulles and Nehru can talk about to improve their relations will be American participation in India's current 5-year industrialization plan.

Because Mr. Nehru's unwillingness to play better ball with the United States and because of a complete inability in this country in general and the United States Congress in particular to comprehend what India is up to and where it's going, the chances of large-scale aid seem dim.

Any change in the existing situation which Secretary Dulles can bring about on his forthcoming visit should be an improvement. Because the present state of strained relations couldn't be worse.

A Plea for Highway Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Hearst newspapers are to be complimented for their services in the past few years in their campaign for the adoption of an adequate Federal highway program. In view of the recent renewed controversy on the method of financing the better-roads program by increased Federal aid, I commend to my colleagues a particularly appropriate and sensible editorial on this subject which recently appeared in the Detroit Times and in all Hearst newspapers throughout the country.

The editorial follows:

A PLEA FOR HIGHWAY SANITY

The battle, in and out of the newspapers, between the American Automobile Association and the American Trucking Association would be interesting if it were not so discouraging.

The fight, and it is a real one, revolves around the new taxes needed to finance a better roads program through increased Federal aid.

The AAA insists that the truckers pay a higher rate of taxation than the passenger car owners.

The ATA insists that it is willing to pay higher taxes, but it insists that they be applied "across the board" so that they pay at the same rate as the private motorist.

This is a difference of tax philosophy that apparently cannot be settled by compromise.

If this is so, may the Detroit Times and the Hearst newspapers make a constructive suggestion so that the better roads in which America is in dire need will not be sacrificed to organizational policy.

The suggestion is this:

State your cases to the Members of the House Ways and Means Committee, the men upon whom the responsibility has been placed to write a new tax schedule.

Abide by their decision and support the subsequent highway bill reported out.

To act in any other way seems to us to be a piece of sophomoric folly in the light of a great national need for both truckers and private car drivers.

A folly, we believe, we can no longer afford. Any of us.

Pension Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 of last year I introduced H. R. 656, which provides that World War I veterans shall receive substantially the same pension benefits as those received by the veterans of the Spanish-American War. The rates are set forth in the bill, but in brief, a World War I veteran at the age of 62 would receive $101.59 a month, without a means test.

World War I ended more than 37 years ago. Thirty-five years after the close of the Revolutionary War, the veterans of that war were given a pension on the basis of service alone. Similar pensions were bestowed by a grateful Nation 39 years from the end of the Mexican War, and just 24 years after the Civil War was over the veterans of that conflict were granted pensions as a matter of right.

Only 18 years elapsed before a system of general pensions was set up for the Spanish-American War Veterans. But in the period more than twice that long, since the Armistice of 1918, no such benefits have yet been provided for the veterans of World War I.

I am a veteran of both World War I and World War II. During World War I, I was in a branch of service which we in that first Air Corps considered hazardous. During World War II, I was a "retread," performing office work, and was as safe as if I had been at home in bed. Nevertheless, I am very proud of my World War II service.

I entered the Army in that war when I was 46 years of age. To have taken preliminary training at an Army school at that age, together with the financial sacrifices I made, gives me much pride

in my World War II service, and, for that reason, I generally wear the "ruptured duck" service emblem in my lapel. However, I cannot help but contrast the difference in the way the veterans of the two world wars were treated at the close of each conflict.

When their service was ended, the World War II veterans were each given mustering-out pay of $200 to $300, which cost the Government approximately $4 billion, without a question. Veterans of World War I were given mustering-out pay of only $60 apiece in 1918 and 1919. At that time, $60 would not purchase a suit of clothes.

A man who enters the military service in wartime must give up his job or position, and when that service ends there generally follows a period of hardship during which he must find employment and readjust himself to civilian life. The Government did very little to help the veterans of World War I tide themselves over this period. Even men released from prison are given a suit of clothes and travel fare home. They are treated with more consideration than was accorded the veterans of World War I.

And then came the long struggle to right that wrong. First, the Government gave World War I veterans the so-called adjusted-service certificates. The Government ascertained the amount of mustering-out pay that it should have paid to these veterans at the time of their discharge. An increment was added to make up for delay in payment. There was determined how much paid-up insurance due in 20 years could be bought with each veteran's adjusted-service credits, and each veteran was given a certificate for that amount of paid-up insurance, due in 20 years.

At first, the veterans were permitted to borrow on 10 percent of the face amount of these certificates; then legislation was passed permitting them to borrow on 50 percent; and, finally, in 1936, a law was passed over a Presidential veto to pay the veterans of World War I the full amount of their adjusted-service certificates — or mustering-out pay. Three similar bills had been vetoed by other Presidents.

So, 18 years after they were discharged, World War I veterans got their due mustering-out pay. The amount they received, under the forced-investment or insurance idea of the adjusted-service certificates, was $3.8 billion. The expenditure involved would have been much less—only about $1.5 billion—if the veterans of World War I had been paid this money due them when they were mustered out of service, as were the veterans of World War II.

In addition to mustering-out pay, since World War II, veterans have been given terminal-leave pay which cost the Government $3.1 billion, and unemployment compensation which cost the Government $3.8 billion. They have been given social-security credits for the time they spent in military service. Complete figures as to the cost of these are not available, but it will amount to something over $600 million. None of these benefits were given the veterans of World War I.

The veterans of World War II were also given the GI bill of rights. Under this program, they received on-the-job training and academic education. To date, these benefits have cost the Government approximatley $15 billion. These veterans also were given the benefit of guaranteed loans to purchase homes, to go into business, or to start farming. Loans for veterans' homes, alone, have totaled $30 billion, and $16 billion of this sum has been guaranteed by the Government.

Similar benefits were granted to the veterans of the Korean conflict, although in some instances they were not so great as those granted World War II veterans.

Excluding disability pensions—which are available to veterans of both World Wars—and aside from the housing-loan program, which has cost relatively little but provided an enormous benefit, World War II and Korean veterans have received benefits at a direct cost of about $26.5 billion. This figure will almost certainly exceed $30 billion within 10 years from now.

That sum is 20 times the amount given World War I veterans as adjusted-service credits, before the increment made because of delay in payment. Twenty million World War II and Korea veterans will have received 20 times the benefits which were begrudgingly granted the 4.6 million veterans who survived World War I. That is a benefits ratio of more than 4 to 1 against World War I veterans.

Now World War II and Korea veterans have received these benefits because of the activity and work that World War I veterans unselfishly gave in support of the GI bill proposal. The veterans' organizations were very active in initiating this program, and, in 1943, a group of Members of Congress who had served in the First World War met and decided on a course of action to obtain for the veterans of World War II the benefits which those Members thought should have been provided after World War I. And that movement was, of course, successful.

These benefits which World War II veterans have received have been money well spent. Any benefits of any kind that we might now provide World War I veterans would come to them late in life when their days of opportunity are, for the most part, long past. It was a priceless advantage to veterans of World War II to have their education and readjustment benefits when most of them were young and their days of opportunity were just dawning.

It has been estimated by a Census Bureau expert that the sum of $9,000 invested in college education for a young man will increase his lifetime earning capacity by $103,000. That is a return, or a benefit, of more than 11 times the investment. Multiply the World War II veterans' education-benefits payment of $15 billion by 11; the product is $165 billion in final economic benefits to those veterans. And the benefits of the housing-loan program are countless and beyond all calculation.

The educational provisions, alone, of the GI bill of rights have added materially to the wealth of America by providing us with trained scientists, engineers, doctors, lawyers, businessmen, farmers, skilled laborers, and followers of many other useful occupations. This is a wise program and America is much richer for it.

But don't forget, it was the veterans of World War I whose support assured the veterans of World War II of these benefits. And don't forget, either, that World War I veterans got no such benefits—either in terms of first cost or final result.

Many veterans of World War II have said to me that they appreciate greatly what has been done in their behalf by the World War I veterans who supported the GI bill. They said that, without this support, they would never have received these benefits. And they say, too, that they would like to see World War I veterans treated with the same fairness as were veterans of other wars.

Whenever it has been proposed to do anything for the veterans of World War I, someone has always stated that the cost will be prohibitive—that general pensions for them would drive the Government bankrupt. These opponents of such a program launch into a flight of astronomical figures which might overawe and frighten off people who have not taken a look at our budget history.

Let us look at the situation in the year 1910. That was the 45th year after the end of the Civil War, by which time all who fought in that war could have qualified for a service pension. That year, we paid Civil War veterans pensions totaling $105,399,354. The total of all Federal expenditures for that year was $693.6 million.

Thus we see that, in 1910, the Government spent 15.2 percent of the total budget on Civil War veterans' pensions. I think everyone will agree that the country did not go bankrupt then (and I might mention, incidentally, that the Treasury ran a deficit of $18 million that year).

Now let us suppose that my bill, H. R. 656, had already been enacted and were in effect during this year, 1956. Approximately 1,272,000 World War I veterans now at least 62 years old could qualify. And assume that everyone of those veterans did apply for a pension, and did qualify. And suppose those in good health got $101 a month, and those who are invalids got $135 a month—resulting, for the whole number, in an average monthly payment of perhaps $120 apiece. On that basis, the total cost for this year, 1956, would be $1.8 billion. That cost would be 2.8 percent of the total Federal expenditures estimated for the current year.

These figures I have mentioned are without reference to the sum which will be paid out this year under the currently existing, but inadequate, World War I pension program. That sum is approximately $480 million for veterans' pensions. Both as to Civil War pensions and as to World War I pensions, I have excluded any reference to sums paid as dependents' pensions, for convenience of discussion and comparison. If you consider the $480-million sum already due to be paid, my bill would add $1.3 billion to the current annual cost—an

increase of 2.1 percent over present total expenditures.

So, if paying Civil War veterans' pensions amounting to 15 percent of the total budget did not break up the Treasury and drive the country to disaster in 1910, it is reasonable to believe that World War I veterans' pensions of 2 to 3 percent of the national budget would bankrupt us in 1956? I don't believe that it is.

Now, someone may say that the Federal budget is a far different thing today from what it was in 1910, and that the Government has taken on new and costlier responsibilities. Granted, it may have. So, let us just make a comparison of pension costs with the national income, then and now.

The national income in 1910 was $25.6 billion. The sum of $105 million paid as pensions to Civil War veterans that year amounted to approximately one-half of 1 percent of the national income. And to pay World War I veterans the pension I propose—$1.8 billion for the year 1956—would take from the estimated national income of $340 billion a portion no greater than one-half of 1 percent. By 1963, when the budget cost of H. R. 656 probably would reach its peak, it is highly unlikely that this cost would ever have reached 1 percent of the national income, even if the national income does not increase at all—and we have assurances on every hand that our national income will increase, substantially.

Someone may say: "But look at the burden the Government now has to bear in paying pensions to other veterans—those of the Indian wars and the Spanish-American War." And I say: So was there a burden in 1910 of paying pensions not only to Civil War veterans, but also to the veterans of the War of 1812 and the war with Mexico, as well as the Indian wars. A total of 23 percent of the Federal expenditures that year went for veterans' pensions of various types. Today, we set aside only 7.4 percent of the Federal budget for veterans' benefits of every description.

Maybe someone else will say: "But in this modern age we fight total wars, when ever fit person of military age must serve without expectation of compensation in money." My answer to this is, that, happily, we have not yet had to fight such a total war. But some of the wars we have fought have been more nearly total than others. And World War I was, fortunately for the United States, one of the least total of all.

This country has fought in 6 really major conflicts, and more of the population stayed safely at home in their ordinary pursuits during World War I than in any of the other 5. During the Revolutionary War, 14.2 percent of the population saw military service; 7.4 percent served in the war of 1812; 9.7 percent of the available population performed Federal service during the Civil War; 11 percent served in World War II; 4.4 percent served in the Korean conflict; while only 4 percent of the population was called up for service in World War I. Relatively speaking, those who served in World War I were but a few selected from among the many.

I believe that the figures I have presented here should convince any reasonable person that this country can afford to pay the veterans of World War I the pension I have proposed in H. R. 656, with certainly no more—and probably less— strain than was imposed by Civil War veterans' pensions in 1910. The Government affords a great many more things today in the cause of ordinary human justice than was thought it could afford 45 years ago, and, to my mind, we have already delayed long enough, now, in affording ordinary human justice to the vetrans of World War I. It is time some action was taken.

For the veterans of World War I, the sands in the hourglass of time are running low. Today, their average life expectancy is only 15 years. Of the 4.6 million who came home when the fighting in France was done, barely 3 million remain. Taps has already sounded for more than one-third of the doughboys of 1918. Every passing day, 235 of them die. Tomorrow, 235 of them whom we could have pensioned today will be dead. A year from now, 90,000 more of the boys who faced shot, shell, and gas in the trenches will have gone to eternity—unpensioned and very nearly forgotten.

I think there is a just cause in the argument for World War I service pensions. And I know that when the case for them is put squarely to those who oppose these pensions, some of these opponents become sheepish, and their arguments weaken and falter. Their last resort of opposition is that these pensions would cost too much at present. To me, that is an admission that we have not done right by our World War I veterans, and that a service pension for them would be only just and proper, "but for the cost."

Surely no one would want to say that, while these veterans in all fairness are deserving of these benefits, we had better wait until death has thinned their number still more, and start paying them pensions when it can be done more cheaply. Surely no one would want to play such a cold-blooded waiting game as that.

I prefer to believe that all of us will recognize now the justice in the proposal to pension those veterans, and that we will take steps now to do now what ought to be done. And there are bills now pending on which action can be taken to produce the appropriate result.

I have no extreme pride of authorship in H. R. 656. There are other good bills which are similar to mine. Among them I would mention H. R. 170, by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], H. R. 551, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], and H. R. 4264, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Let me urge that favorable action be taken on some one of these bills. Let the veterans of World War I be treated with the same consideration as those of the other wars in which our Nation has fought. Let there be no generation of forgotten men among America's veterans.

Bad for Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, those who have attended the hearings just concluded before the House Committee on Ways and Means have had difficulty in reconciling the position of two Cabinet members, Secretaries Humphrey and Weeks, with the statement of the President in support of the bills now pending in the House to put the President's road program into effect.

This certainly looks like sabotage right within the President's own Cabinet. The writer of the editorial appearing in the New York Journal of February 23, which I am submitting herewith, is certainly right in saying that this unusual situation requires that the President "again make his position clear and undo the damage done to a project in which he has a personal interest."

The editorial follows:

BAD FOR ROADS

President Eisenhower's highway program in Washington is suffering today from foot-dragging and sabotage from members of his own Cabinet.

Whether accidentally or by design, the performances of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks as witnesses before the House Ways and Means Committee definitely lessened the chances of passage of a highway bill that will carry out the President's program.

The position taken by Humphrey perhaps can be rationalized to be that simply of a treasurer desiring to balance his books whether any roads get built or not.

The position of Secretary Weeks was just plain baffling.

The committee heard Weeks because he has supervision of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Weeks read a long prepared statement praising those sections of the highway bill with which the committee has no responsibility and very little concern.

He was then questioned on the tax features of the bill, which are totally the concern of the committee and presumably the reason for Weeks' appearance.

The Secretary had no advice and no counsel.

He was unable to answer questions that almost everybody in the room, including the spectators, could have answered readily.

Not only did he not know the answers, he refused to let two officials of the Bureau of Public Roads give the answers themselves.

It was more than sheer ignorance.

It was obvious to everyone present that Weeks was not going to help the Democrats write a tax bill to finance the Eisenhower highway program.

If the Eisenhower program is voted down in the House because of lack of Republican support, the blame can be traced directly to the attitude shown by Humphrey and Weeks.

They were negative witnesses.

Apparently the President will have to state his position again.

He will have to state it bluntly and specifically so that no one will confuse his position with that taken by his two Cabinet members.

He has said already that he will support a highway bill financed by higher taxes, and in saying so he attempted to make the bill bipartisan.

At least that is the way everybody but Humphrey and Weeks saw it.

Their actions have served only to confuse those Republicans who will have to vote on the bill.

They are wondering which administration position is the official one.

The Weeks' performance looked particularly bad because he was preceded as a witness by a Republican who intelligently and enthusiastically supported the highway bill and its tax schedule.

He was Charles P. Taft, mayor of Cincinnati, and a brother of the late United States Senator Robert Taft.

Taft disagreed with previous testimony given by Humphrey and certainly will disagree with the position taken by Weeks.

The facts are that a Republican Ohio mayor did more to advance the Eisenhower highway program, for which he has no responsibility, than the two responsible Cabinet officers put together.

The New York Journal-American and the other Hearst newspapers regard it as of vital importance that the President again make his position clear and undo the damage done to a project in which he has a deep personal interest.

Taking From Peter To Pay Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

This is the anomaly that is presented to the House in its consideration of the upper Colorado River project.

I wish to insert in the RECORD the letter I have directed to each Member of the House, together with a copy of the "expert testimony" of the distinguished former Governor of Nebraska, Robert LeRoy Cochran, who is eminently qualified to speak on the subject:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1956.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Enclosed is a reprint of a recent interview in Newsweek magazine with Robert L. Cochran, relating to the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. Cochran recently retired from the United States Bureau of the Budget, where he served more than 10 years as an expert on the financial and engineering aspects of Federal water-conservation projects. His distinguished career dates back to 1915 when he entered the office of the State engineer of Nebraska. He also served an unprecedented three consecutive terms as the Governor of that State.

Now free to speak publicly, Mr. Cochran points out the economic folly of authorizing the upper Colorado River project and also points out that the power features of the project, which are supposed to help pay the costs, may well be obsolete before the repayment period begins.

He further states that 90 percent of the irrigation costs would be Federal subsidy and that with the pending soil-bank proposal, Congress is faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

I hope you will find it possible to take the time to read Mr. Cochran's statements prior to action by the House on the matter.

Sincerely,

CECIL R. KING,
Member of Congress.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

(By Raymond Moley)

On January 31 Robert LeRoy Cochran retired from the United States Bureau of the Budget, where he served more than 10 years as an expert on the financial and engineering aspects of Federal water-conservation projects. His distinguished career suggests that there is no man in the United States better qualified to advise in that field of Federal activity. Beginning in 1915, he spent 20 years in the office of the State engineer of Nebraska, during 12 of which he was head of that department. In 1934 he was elected on the Democratic ticket Governor of his State, and was reelected in 1936 and 1938. This was the first time in the history of the State that a governor was elected for three consecutive terms. In addition to this unparalleled official experience in a reclamation State, he himself has owned a reclamation farm for 40 years.

He is now free to speak publicly, and I have asked him a number of questions concerning the multibillion-dollar upper Colorado storage project which is now before Congress.

Question. Governor Cochran, since the great majority of the readers of this article are interested in the Colorado River storage project as taxpayers rather than as beneficiaries, I believe they would like to have your opinion concerning the possibility of repayment to the Treasury of the money spent for power and irrigation. What is the formula proposed by the Interior Department for repayment?

Answer. It is called the Colibran fomula. It proposes that the power features be paid off first, with interest, from the revenues from the sale of electricity. After those expenditures are liquidated, which it is estimated will take about 50 years, the power profits would be used to pay off the costs of the irrigation aspects of the plan. Such repayment, if ever made, would take considerably more than another half century.

Question. What is your opinion about the practical prospects of repayment?

Answer. According to the claims of the Bureau of Reclamation and the congressional sponsors of the project, the cash boxes from which most of the repayment must come are power installations, the largest of which is Glen Canyon near the Utah-Arizona border. On the basis of the figures submitted, only Glen Canyon could be justified as financially feasible. Even if the revenues from that one dam were as good as anticipated, they would be entirely consumed in paying the deficits on the other power dams. That would leave nothing at all for the repayment of the irrigation costs during the first 50-year period.

The analysis presented by the department was based upon a 50-year period, generally considered to be the useful life of a project. Such a period may be too long in the light of the future potentials of power production from atomic energy and other sources.

Question. How then could the costs of the irrigation aspects of the upper Colorado project be paid back to the Federal Government?

Answer. A small proportion (about 15 percent) of the construction costs alone would be repaid by the farmers during the first interest-free 50 years. While it is proposed that the balance (85 percent) be paid back out of the revenues of the power aspects of the plan, we have already see that there is no validity in that claim. Payment from that source would not begin anyhow until after about 50 years. By that time, the power features might well be obsolete. It should be emphasized that there appears to be a very serious doubt as to whether any power revenues would ever be applied to the payment of irrigation costs in the upper Colorado basin. I submit that a proposal to start payment after 50 years on a debt for any purpose is not worth the paper it is written on.

Meanwhile, because of the high construction costs per acre of the irrigation works and the accumulating unpaid interest, the Federal subsidy would be enormous. Under the ultraliberal construction of the reclamation law by the department, freedom from interest extends not only through the 40 or 50 years beyond a development period, but indefinitely into the future.

Something like 90 percent of the irrigation costs (including interest) would be Federal subsidy. Besides, experience with reclamation projects indicates that after 30 years or so it is necessary in a considerable number of cases to spend further money on rehabilitation. This is another large item of expense for the Federal Government. There is also the fact that there is pending in Congress a proposal to subsidize a soil bank of land now under production. We are faced with subsidies for taking land out of production and with subsidies for putting land into production at the same time.

Question. But proponents of the upper Colorado storage project, ignoring the fact that in humid or semihumid sections of the country there are millions of acres which might with relatively small cost be prepared for cultivation, say that new irrigated land will be neecssary by 1975 because of the rapidly increasing population in the United States. What about that argument for bringing new irrigated land into cultivation?

Answer. Such a claim must be balanced against the fact that through technology increased production can be and is being obtained from fewer acres. It will be very many years, if ever, before such land as is proposed in this project could be needed.

I would conclude that if Congress proposes to pay this immense subsidy to bring this arid land into production, it should be done in the open. As it is, the subsidy is pretty well concealed by means of a repayment formula which is absolutely without validity.

Gaining Momentum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I recently called the attention of the House to the fact that Eastman Kodak Co. has formally recognized Good Friday as a day of deep spiritual meaning to the Christian world, and has designated it as a paid holiday.

My attention has since been drawn to the fact that another large company in my district, the Massey-Harris Ferguson Co., of Batavia, N. Y., has also signed a contract with its employees in which Good Friday is designated as a paid holiday, thanks in large measure to the interest and efforts of the works manager of the plant, Mr. Robert L. Benson. I am indebted to Mr. M. O. Clement, civil

defense director of Genesee County, for this information.

Regardless of one's faith, the increasing recognition by industry of the spiritual significance of Good Friday underscores the fact that this is indeed one nation, under God, indivisible.

American Friends of the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS,
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call to the attention of our colleagues the report on American Friends of the Middle East, which appears in the January 1956 issue of the ADL Bulletin. The report is condensed from the forthcoming book Cross-Currents, by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, which is a documented study of the use of antisemitism as a political whip by men high in international councils.

The report follows:

THE FACTS ABOUT AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE MIDDLE EAST—SPECIAL PLEADERS FOR ARAB NATIONS

(From the pages of a new, exciting book, Cross-Currents, by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein)

When it was organized in June 1951, American Friends of the Middle East took full-page ads in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune to proclaim its objectives. They were of the very highest: to thwart Communist aggression in the Middle East and to strengthen the bonds of "culture and religion, of literature and education," between Americans and the Middle Eastern peoples. Whatever information it disseminated on the Middle East was to be objectively presented.

Founder of AFME is the noted journalist Dorothy Thompson—later its president—and the roster of charter members include Dr. Garland Evans Hopkins—later executive vice president—Dr. Phillip Hitti of Princeton, and Dr. Millar Burrows, author of Palestine Is Our Business. Thus, with a welter of vague and fairly expensive verbiage, this "committee to increase appreciation of common spiritual values" was started.

AFME has since carried on a wide variety of activities: pamphleteering; issuing a newsletter, clipsheets and news releases; organizing group discussions; presenting TV shows; producing films; operating a lecture bureau and a travel bureau; providing travel funds to and from the Arab countries; awarding scholarships and prizes, and promoting numerous student activities, art shows and social functions.

But in doing all this, the purported aim of AFME to tear away "the curtain of obscurity and distortion" about the Middle East gets lost in its own partisanship. For AFME has been insistently pro-Arab and anti-Israel.

If, contrary to its spiritual and humanitarian claims, AFME were admittedly a pro-Arab propaganda organization, admittedly an apologist for Arab deeds and misdeeds and a supporter of Arab nationalist claims against Israel, and admittedly an opponent of the right of European governments to be in Moslem countries, it would be perfectly within its rights. There is nothing improper in special pleading or in appealing for American public sympathy and support. The opportunity to promote causes is a part of our democratic process. But by the same token, the American people are entitled to know what the real aim is, what real interests are being represented, and who puts up the money.

Actually, AFME is a propaganda organization for the Arabs and Moslems, doing a job along modern public relations lines that for years the Arabs had demonstrated they were unable to do for themselves.

The membership, the financing and the character of its contentions reflect AFME's narrow partisan nature. In its almost 5 years of existence the group has actually enrolled only about 2,000 members; their combined dues would hardly defray operational costs. Since the general membership contributes only a small part of the organization's funds and since it has little to say about policy, it is misleading to assert that the agency has a grassroots base. The real strength of AFME is in its budget of approximately $500,000 a year, mostly from a few oil companies with interests in the Arab countries and from the Dearborn Foundation of Chicago.

Whether AFME is an unbiased educational and cultural organization or a propaganda outfit can best be determined by its own statements. Does it present both sides of an issue fairly?

A content analysis of published materials issued by AFME in a 7-month period in 1953, was made recently by a University of Chicago graduate student. He found that roughly two-thirds was clearly pro-Arab propaganda; one-fourth was definitely anti-Israel. The plight of the Arab refugees received most attention. The anti-Israel items dwelt on alleged Israeli indifference toward Arab refugees, aggressive territorial ambitions, atrocities, and the like. A rare favorable comment about Israel was usually the preface to a much larger criticism.

In a letter to the New York Times, published July 29, 1951, Miss Thompson demurred that her group was "not directed against Israel * * *." It was, she said, merely "determined to try to see to it that the problems and achievements of the other Middle Eastern States are not totally ignored."

In the light of AFME's original statements stressing the vast importance of the Middle East to Americans, the newly defined aim of publicizing "ignored" countries meant that Miss Thompson's earlier press release, which insisted that "we are not a propaganda organization, and we are not out to grind axes for anyone," was not as accurate as it might have been. While claiming impartiality, Miss Thompson has justified AFME's exclusive concern for the Arabs by explaining: "I consider it one of the principal tasks of AFME at this time to help in breaking down the tendency on the part of the American press and radio either to disregard everything friendly to the Arabs, or to print only distorted and even untrue statements about them."

On August 20, 1951, Miss Thompson sent a letter to AFME members charging the American press and radio with an anti-Arab bias. She also enclosed a copy of a letter written by novelist and biographer Vincent Sheean, a charter member of AFME. If Miss Thompson's cause was to inform the public about the Middle East, she was indeed reticent about publicizing what Mr. Sheean had to say on the subject. "I believe you will agree with me," she wrote, "that it would be unwise for us to give (Mr. Sheean's letter) to the press."

The Sheean letter was addressed to the minority leader of the House of Representatives, JOSEPH W. MARTIN. It opposed a pending bill to grant economic aid to Israel. The letter also reproved Mr. MARTIN for his praise of Israel's Army as a possible addition to democracy's arsenal. For one thing, Sheean asserted, Israel has "one of the most active Communist organizations in the Middle East." The important thing, though, was that "rightly or wrongly, the Arab States are * * * convinced that the Israeli Army is designed as the instrument of an expansionist policy, with boundless ambitions."

The "cultural" value of AFME is appreciated in the proper quarters. Omar Haliq, an Arab league representative in the United States, acknowledged in a memo to Cairo on September 30, 1951, that the organization and its founder had been giving the Arab league invaluable aid.

In April 1952, Miss Thompson and Dr. Hopkins visited the Middle East. There, they learned that Abdul Rahman Azzam Pasha, a founder of the Arab league, had expressed his approval of AFME's objectives. And the Syrian Government awarded Miss Thompson its medal of honor for defending the Arab cause in the United States.

AFME's first annual conference in New York was timed to coincide with the beginning of the Eisenhower term in January 1953. Its lecture bureau began functioning at about the same time, booking both American speakers and visiting Arabs. Typical of what audiences heard were the statements made by a Jordan lawyer, Anwar Nashashibi, on his tour. Communism in the Middle East, said Nashashibi blandly, "is directed by Red underground movements in the Arab States and the legal Communist Party in Israel."

At the conference, representatives of 30 organizations and an audience of about 200 heard a panel of speakers that included ambassadors and U. N. delegates from Arab countries. The theme of the 2-day meeting was "Partnership in Meeting Needs of the Middle East." Evidently Israel was considered, at best, a silent partner.

The speakers, to be sure, demonstrated an impressive unanimity of opinion. On one question, however, Dr. Charles Malik, Lebanon's U. N. delegate, seemed strangely at variance with the Syrian speaker, Farid Zeineddine. The Lebanese diplomat exhorted "Americans who trace their origin to Lebanon and Syria" and who "take an active interest in our destiny and development" to "deepen and develop their activity" in their many organizations. But Zeineddine attacked Zionists as members of "a movement which develops loyalty to Israel, destroying loyalty to the individual's own country."

Perhaps what seems like a disagreement here can be explained by the premise that, to the Arab world, dual loyalty works on a double standard. One wonders what Dorothy Thompson, who in December 1951 told the Jewish Graduate Society at Columbia University that being a Zionist impaired a Jew's relations with his fellow Americans, felt about Dr. Malik's speech.

In any case Miss Thompson appeared to be well satisfied with the results of AFME's first conference. She summarized its orientation in one of her regular news columns. She wrote: "the consensus expressed was * * * that the favoritism showed by America to Israel is disastrous to American influence and even to the improvement of Israel-Arab relations."

But all of AFME was not as content as it might have been. Two of its board members resigned because AFME was not pro-Arab enough. Dr. Hopkins explained that as executive vice president he was in the position of a middle-of-the-road conciliator.

If Dr. Hopkins is indeed at the center of AFME's opinion range, what are the extremists like?

Garland Evans Hopkins is a man who privately argues that his major aim as head of the American Friends of the Middle East is to bring peace and understanding between the Arab nations and Israel. Perhaps so. But if that is his purpose, he wastes precious time trying to bring Dr. Ezzat Tannous

around to the same constructive view. Dr. Tannous, director of the Palestine Arab refugee office in New York, is the diplomat who asserts that "the outside world must keep in mind that the Arabs refuse to accept the principle that the Zionists have any territorial claim in Palestine."

What rapport is possible between the two opposing forces if the Arabs insist, as Dr. Tannous claims they do, that the price of peace with Israel is its self-liquidation?

A peacemaker would not contend, as Hopkins does, that the United Press and Associated Press are two wire services which refuse out of fear to tell the truth about the Middle East. Nor would he refer to the New York Times as "a Zionist newspaper." These are the words of a disputant, nor an impartial conciliator. But they are Hopkins' words.

Blinking the obvious implications, Hopkins, too, is the Middle East expert who, speaking to several luncheon guests in February 1953, supported the Arab threat that "unless the United States goes along with Arab wishes, the Arabs will turn Communist." It was at this same luncheon that Hopkins said in effect that Jews could not rely on the American people's sense of justice and fair play in the event of a war in the Middle East brought on by "Israel's intransigence." In such event, he said, perhaps unintentionally making it sound more like something other than fear, there would be a wave of unprecedented anti-Semitism in the United States, with probable excesses.

But when an Armenian newspaper correspondent sent a dispatch back home indicating that some Arab embassies in the United States were dubious about supporting AFME because the organization favored an Arab-Israel accord, Dr. Hopkins rushed off to the embassies to quash the idea.

Substantial contributions, reportedly from American oil companies and wealthy individuals sympathetic to its aims, keep AFME well financed. The AFME tourist program has glowed proudly over the excellent liaisons it has established with middle eastern consulates. AFME's Phoenix Lecture Bureau sends its cultural envoys to all parts of the country. Lectures, conferences, and essay contests featuring Middle Eastern tours as prizes have attracted American college students to the Arab line. AFME has opened several regional offices in this country as well as middle eastern branches with representatives in several Arab cities.

You can find a striking similarity in the propaganda material of the Arabs and of AFME. While AFME does not go in for violent name-calling as the Arabs do, there is always a polite deprecation of everything connected with Israel. AFME never touches on subjects which the Arab governments and the Arab League shy away from: Notably, recognition of Israel, restortation of normal business relations, mutual development of waterways, and the like. In the numerous AFME publications there is also a notable absence of sympathy for the impoverished farm tenants and others working under intolerable conditions in Arab countries. Mention of arbitrary domination by Arab petty kings and dictators is, of course, taboo in AFME literature.

In December 1954, Dorothy Thompson, speaking at an AFME meeting in Washington, said that Israel's evolution "was not compatible with what was humane or even democratic." Though she herself had once been Zionist because she "was touched by the tragedies which befell European Jewry under the Nazis," a visit to Israel years later had convinced her that she had been "misled on basic assumptions."

But who is misleading whom? AFME, with its respectable humanitarian front and the respectable names on its board—including the Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of President Eisenhower's Washington church—is succeeding in a propaganda field where more blatant organizations like the old Arab Office and the Institute of Arab-American Affairs had failed.

Further Foreign Aid Appropriations Opposed by Illinois Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by the international trade committee of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association which was approved by the board of directors of that organization on February 10. The directors of the association do not believe that the friendship of foreign countries can be secured and retained by undertaking to outbid the insincere and unreliable promises of the Communists.

The statement follows:

FOREIGN AID STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMITTEE APPROVED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 10, 1956

The state of the Union message of the President again proposes the continuation of foreign aid and requests congressional authority to make foreign economic aid commitments for a period longer than 1 year. According to press reports Congress will be asked for $4.9 billion in additional aid funds. The new requests for aid are designed to meet the shift in Soviet tactics and their offer of aid to Asiatic and Middle Eastern nations.

Although European nations have attained their highest production levels, it is reported that they are seeking more aid from the United States and preparing plans for new long-term projects.

During the past 10 years the United States provided more than $51 billion in foreign aid. The effectiveness of these huge handouts have been questioned by Government representatives and by our business leaders.

The committee of 55 businessmen sent abroad by the Mutual Security Agency in February of 1953 found tremendous waste and duplication in the administration of the program—too many people doing too many things. The committee recommended that further financial aid be reduced substantially for the next year and discontinued by June 1954; and that the use of foreign-aid funds be limited to direct military aid.

The citizens advisory committee to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate, in submitting its report to the United States Senate, made the following recommendations:

"The unprecedented use of outright governmental grants as a financing device in the postwar period is a result of the emergency situations created by recent wars.

"The use of such grants as a long-run solution to the problem of financing trade is completely inconsistent both with the economic philosophy and with the welfare of this Nation.

"This committee believes that the need for economic-grants-in-aid as a financing device no longer exists. It recommends therefore that no further appropriations for such grants be made. Any grants made for humanitarian purposes, such as disaster relief, abroad, or for political or military purposes, should explicitly be defined as such."

Since the inception of the foreign-aid program in 1948, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association questioned the need for such huge aid and our ability to furnish same. The association held:

That continued dissipation of American assets and the continued expenditure of huge sums for foreign giveaway plans impose unwarranted additional tax burdens upon the citizens of this country at a time when they are already overwhelmed with taxation.

That the alarming expansion of our national debt, which is resulting in part from the continuation of the elaborate foreign aid programs, is placing a stupendous burden upon our future generations.

That the continued conformity to vague and academic plans to distribute our wealth among all of the people of the world will eventually undermine the economic stability of this country.

A group of representative Illinois industrialists, who participated in an extensive trade tour of Europe under the sponsorship of the IMA in 1954, in their report to the board of directors of the association, recommended:

That we should stop dissipating the American taxpayers' funds on impractical and costly give-away programs, most of which are not needed or desired by the people of Europe.

That our European economic-aid programs, with the exception of the program in Spain, be discontinued and the Foreign Operations Administration liquidated.

That economic aid already committed be administered by our State Department.

That military aid necessary to safeguard the security of the United States be administered by our Defense Department.

That all programs for European economic and military aid be closely supervised by a special congressional committee established for that purpose.

That we should cooperate in every appropriate manenr in encouraging international trade policies which substitute trade for aid.

The board of directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association reaffirms its opposition to the perpetuation and extension of foreign economic-aid programs. The directors of the association do not believe that the friendship of foreign countries can be secured and retained by undertaking to outbid the insincere and unreliable promises of the Communists. The directors submit that our foreign policy should be based upon the achievement of our own objectives. The directors of the IMA also submit that any necessary military aid, which may be authorized by Congress, should be limited to short-time commitments.

Giveraway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, I present a letter which was printed recently in the Washington Post and Times Herald. The writer of the letter, Dr. David B. Charlton, is a distinguished citizen of Portland, Oreg. He is a noted naturalist and an ardent conservationist. The letter re-

ferred to, together with a footnote by the editor of the newspaper, follows:

GIVERAWAY

A little campaign is on now to discredit the record of former Congressman Wesley D'Ewart in the hope that his appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Interior will not be confirmed.

It is true that the organized conservation groups were opposed to the so-called stockmen's bill, which was introduced by Mr. D'Ewart. However, those who know and have worked with him recognize his intellectual honesty, knowledge of forestry and public land matters, and fairness in dealing with controversial legislation. I wish the same could be said of his most vocal critics.

It appears that your own opinions have been influenced by some of the misrepresentation going the rounds these days. For example, in your editorial of October 14, 1955, entitled "Giveraway," you refer to Mr. D'Ewart as being floor manager for a bill introduced by Representative ELLSWORTH "which would have permitted private timber operators to carry their logging into public parks."

Now, of course, that is an outright misstatement of fact, for the bill specifically excludes parks in the proposed timberland exchanges. I suggest you read H. R. 4646 of the 83d Congress, which is the bill referred to, along with its supplementary report. The bill was incorrectly represented in 1954 for political purposes and is being dug up now for the same reasons.

It is unfortunate that the true intent of the bill and the problem it was designed to meet were not explained to the rank and file conservationists who were urged to defeat it by their leaders and by certain politicians. A difference of opinion is one thing, but false representation is quite another.

DAVID B. CHARLTON, Ph. D.
PORTLAND, OREG.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—It is a fact that in a supplemental report issued 6 months after its original report on H. R. 4646, and after the bill had been denounced on the House floor, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved an amendment specifically excluding parks from the proposed timberland exchanges. The editorial should therefore, have referred not to public parks but to national forests.

Important Vote Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, another of the Nation's great newspapers—the Washington Evening Star—has seen through the smog of distortion put out by southern California spokesmen. Yesterday, February 26, 1956, this newspaper carried an editorial in favor of passage of the upper Colorado River storage project.

The editorial follows:

IMPORTANT VOTE COMING

The upper Colorado River storage project has been cleared for debate and an early vote in the House this week. Indications are that the vote will be close. Despite the removal from the measure of the controversial Echo Park dam project, and the absence of any public versus private power issue, opposition of the lower basin States led by California continues, while many Eastern and Midwestern lawmakers are reported dubious as to the justification for the relatively large expenditure involved.

The House bill, as presently constituted, would authorize a series of dams and storage reservoirs at strategic points along the rivers of the upper Colorado Basin. The chief immediate purpose of the project is the control of the immensely valuable waters of the great inland drainage area to permit regulation of the rivers' flow, now highly variable and, in many years, largely wasted.

President Eisenhower and congressional leaders of both parties have urged approval of the project as a needed contribution to the national interest. The value of a dependable source of water and power in the four-State area—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—has been greatly increased in recent years as a result of the important discoveries in strategic minerals, notably uranium, in the region.

Now that any possible threat to national parks and monuments has been averted by the elimination of Echo Park dam site and inclusion of definite safeguards for the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, the national interest in general and the needs of the great intermountain empire in particular call for approval of this legislation. We hope that sectional interests in California and disinterest on the eastern seaboard will not combine to defeat a measure of such great importance to the future of the entire Nation.

Battle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the speech delivered by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the Freedoms Foundation awards presentation, Valley Forge, Pa., February 22, 1956.

The speech follows:

BATTLE FOR FREEDOM

Here at Valley Forge, at the historic winter refuge of General Washington's struggling Army, we have gathered to warm our hearts and minds to our great task—the battle for freedom. We are here to present citations and awards to selected individuals and organizations for their outstanding contributions in the cause of freedom.

In so doing, we achieve a corollary purpose. We reaffirm the ideals and principles which made this country great; and by this reaffirmation, we rededicate our lives and our spirits to the furtherance of our national security.

Now, it could be presumptive for me to try to tell you distinguished award winners about freedom. By these awards you are about to receive, you have proven your own great understanding and belief.

Therefore, rather than describe what freedom is, the thought occurred to me that I would do better to discuss with you from my experience, some of the things we must do to win today's battle for freedom.

In large measure, the actions we must take are first individual. Then we must take our individual actions and band them together so that individual actions become collective, and together they become part and parcel to our national strength.

Let me say this: It is not enough for only a relatively few to strive and work for the defense of freedom. It never will be.

Freedom is not a one-way street. It is not merely a God-given right and privilege. We cannot speak of it with our lips, and then deny it with our lives.

Freedom is our heritage. As such, it constitutes an irreplaceable asset. Like any possession of value, it must be protected; and it must be made secure for generations to follow.

Individually, every American citizen should both expect and want to guard our country and our way of life. Collectively, Americans everywhere must be united in conscientious action against any threat to our liberty.

For every freedom, there is a corresponding responsibility. There is something for each of us to do. Let each one look for, find, and do that duty.

Unfortunately, the long-term continuance of our society is too often taken for granted. Liberty is too often regarded as a gift rather than a reward for effort.

When liberty is taken for granted and regarded as a gift, apathy and complacency creep into our lives. Unconsciously our guard is lowered.

To me, it seems obvious that we should never take our freedom for granted. Let me tell you why.

Freedom is not free. History is replete with instances to prove that nations who take their liberty for granted are apt to fall prey to tyrannical forces, from within as well as without.

Right now, strong forces in the world oppose and threaten our American ideals. Ruthless men still maintain power through force, and would extend their power through any means, even conquest, if they could. Those forces constitute a form of evil as tyrannical in its concepts as any ever known.

That evil is international communism. Constant struggle is its keynote, and its struggle is worldwide. At issue is the true nature of man himself.

Now, the Communists have made amazing gains largely because they have been so everlastingly willing to pursue by any stratagem their objectives and beliefs.

On the other hand, we who are free have many times been inarticulate and overcomplacent. We have lacked the urgency, the verbal ability or the desire to explain and exemplify adequately our way of life.

In fact, right now, I have the feeling that we Americans are not doing enough to explain or defend publicly before the world the fundamentals of freedom.

It is evident we are not doing enough to convince others of the basic responsibilities which underlie our collective security arrangements with our friends overseas. We are not doing enough to convince others that the path of freedom is the best path for the welfare of all peoples—that it is truly worthy of personal sacrifices.

Today, the drums of Communist hate roll out alternating choruses of harsh invectives and soothing lullabies.

In my role as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I must listen to those drums and not be misled by their attempts to confuse us. I believe Communists desist from aggression only so long as free peoples are ready, able, and willing to stoutly defend their liberty.

In this regard, American opposition to Communist aims must be more than military strength to resist aggression.

And so it is. The ideals and concepts of individual self-determination, which are supported by our Nation, are not only in direct opposition to the Soviet creed; but are, in themselves, a threat to that creed. Therefore, their extermination becomes a major Communist objective.

If I were a dictator, the first book I would exterminate would be the Bible. I would destroy it because I realize that our whole concept of democracy came from that Book.

In the Bible, and particularly in Jesus' spiritual concepts of God and man, all men

can find the key to victory, not only over one evil system, but in the greater crusade against all falsehood. Mankind, however, appears to come slowly to the realization that freedom is not won and held solely by material means.

It seems to me liberty is given to man like a piece of land. It is entrusted to him for faithful cultivation and safekeeping. Man can nourish it and provide it the necessary safeguards; but only if he is self-reliant enough—and if his dedication to free principles is great enough.

In this, dollars, bombs, and all the wonders of science are not enough. Nor is high office, or special political and financial success sufficient.

Then what is sufficient? There probably is no one simple answer.

Safeguarding freedom is the responsibility of every individual. It is a personal trust. It depends on the sensitive, conscientious actions of the individual. Man, or at least enough men, must be sensitive to their rights, their obligations, and their responsibilities to freedom to make it work.

First, we must know what we mean by our way of life. This you here do understand.

Second, we must be convinced that it represents the very best way of life in today's world—and I think we here are convinced.

But more than this, we must be able to explain and demonstrate this conviction to others. This then is a third task.

Fourth, we must be everlastingly willing to work for freedom, and safeguard it for our future. Part of this task is the maintenance of a strong national defense.

Fifth, we must give support to resolute peoples who want freedom and are willing to resist aggression.

Altogether, these tasks constitute a challenge for us to assume the responsibilities and duties of freemen for the advancement of freedom.

I recognize that the actions I outline are not easy tasks. In fact, we will find our freedom tasks demanding—demanding courage, humility, selflessness, service, and lots of hard work; and demanding an unshakable belief in the manner of life which we defend.

These tasks may even demand our lives. And in the final analysis, there is no greater sacrifice than for a man to lay down his life for God and country. In the end, truth, justice, and faith will win.

You award winners can take great satisfaction from all you have done to make people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of American principles. I congratulate each of you, and I congratulate the freedoms foundation. I hope each of you will always "go onward and upward" working to further these principles.

Never think the part that you and I play as individuals is so infinitesimally small as to be of no importance. Each has his or her role to play. Each can provide faith, courage, and teamwork. The sum total can amount to a powerful force for preparedness; and it can inspire the strength and will of peoples throughout the world to live in freedom.

The Al Sarena Timber Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, considerable space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been used in recent weeks for the insertion of what appeared to be politically inspired statements regarding the patenting of some mining claims in the Rogue River watershed of Oregon, known as the Al Sarena mine. It think it appropriate that the RECORD now carry some clearly stated facts on this case by one who is well qualified to state them. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include material from a newspaper, there follows a letter written to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald by Mr. E. C. Finney, and which was printed by that newspaper February 22, 1956.

THE AL SARENA TIMBER CASE

I have noted with interest a letter regarding the Al Serena Mines case signed by Girard Davidson which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 15. Mr. Davidson relies upon his experience as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for 4 years to lend color and weight to his observations.

I, too, have had some experience in the Department of the Interior, having served in that agency of Government for 39 years, including 8 years as First Assistant Secretary and 4 years as Solicitor. Much of my experience in the lower grades dealt specifically with the examination and adjudication of mining claims. I feel that I am at least as well qualified as Mr. Davidson to comment on the matter.

Because of my past association with the Department I have attended closely the record of the hearings in the Al Sarena case and the surrounding developments with more than casual interest.

Mr. Davidson's entire letter should be given the same weight as the valuation that he put on the timber in his first paragraph; that of $500,000. Since the case was pending before the Department 18 months without decision while he was Assistant Secretary, he should know that the Forest Service valuation in the Department of the Interior record is $77,000 and that was made in 1950, 2 years after the patent application was filed.

He knows that the value of the timber has increased tremendously since the matter has become a political issue; one figure has gone as high as $600,000. An increase from $77,000 to $600,000 over a course of 5 years, if it is legitimate, should be a matter of great technical interest to silvaculturalists or timber economists.

I have also noted his statement in the third paragraph that the Interior Department denied patents under Secretary Chapman's tenure. He knows, as a former Assistant Secretary, that when any reference to a departmental decision is made it refers to a secretarial decision. He knows that the matter was an open and pending case before the Department from the time it was appealed from the Bureau of Land Management in 1951 until Mr. Davidson and Secretary Chapman went out of office and that it was still open and pending after they left office.

I have noticed in reading the press accounts of this case that those who are attacking the Al Serena decision constantly attempt to convey the impression that the matter had been decided and closed and the patents finally denied by the last administration. This was not the case and they know it.

Mr. Davidson also mentions the low price paid for the claims. He, as Assistant Secretary, should know that the price of $5 per acre is a statutory price set by Congress and that no Secretary of the Interior may change it upward or downward.

I have also noticed an attempt by those attacking the decision to convey the impression that Secretary McKay somehow or other negotiated the $5 per acre price with the mining claimants. As a matter of fact, the $5 per acre price was billed under Secretary Chapman's administration and payment was received under his administration and final certificates were issued under his administration, and the land went onto the tax rolls of Jackson County, Oreg., under that administration.

I was particularly concerned about Mr. Davidson's reference to the law of discovery. He, as a lawyer, must know that the United States Supreme Court has held that commercial production is not a requirement for the issuance of a mining patent. The rule, which was stated in *Chrisman* v. *Miller*, is that a miner should be justified in spending further time and money with the hope of developing a paying mine.

His statement that the Forest Service produced careful assays also caught my attention. The Forest Service mineral examiner in his first inspection of the premises took samples off some but not all of the claims. He took his samples to a small local firm and issued his instructions on assaying. The results showed only traces of minerals on all of the claims sampled, including claims which had produced upward of $30,000 in gold. The examiner himself said that he was highly suspicious of these assays and it prompted him to return for further sampling.

The second sampling was also only partial and they did not even bother with some of the claims which they had sampled before. They put the ore into unsealed bags and it seems they lost track of them for a few days. In other words, one cannot be sure that the samples they took were the ones which were assayed.

On the other hand, the evidence on which Under Secretary Davis relied in his final decision was based on samples taken by the Bureau of Mines itself in a very meticulous fashion, and that Bureau also checked on the qualifications of the assayer mutually selected by the claimants and the Bureau of Mines. These samples were kept in sealed bags and no one lost track of them. Solicitor Davis was clearly justified in giving them the weight of his consideration.

Mr. Davidson's statement that the Solicitor would have a choice of allowing or denying the patents when sufficient evidence of mineralization and compliance with the law was shown shows a philosophical attitude with which I cannot agree. I believe that when Congress and the Supreme Court of the land express their intent clearly it is up to the administrative officials of Government to carry them out and not to attempt legislation by administrative decision.

It was a matter of some concern to see that Mr. Davidson represented that after the decision by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management the mining claimants appealed to Secretary Douglas McKay. I believe he knows that the appeal was made to Secretary Chapman and that it remained in Secretary Chapman's office without action for 18 months and that it was in that condition when he left office.

I appreciate fully the need to protect and conserve our national forest. This protection and conservation should be done within the framework of our laws and not according to the current emotional climate.

I object to Mr. Davidson's statement that in order to issue the Al Sarena patents Mr. Davis had to circumvent the rules of the Department of the Interior. That is wholly incorrect. Mr. Davis complied with the ancient rule of the Department that justice should be done as stated in *Dawkins* v. *Hedin*. Solicitor White before him felt that the record was incomplete and that it should be supplemented.

If Mr. Davidson objects to the issuance of patents on mining claims when compliance of the law is shown, then he should object to the issuance of all mining patents issued during the last 20 years.

E. C. FINNEY.

WASHINGTON.

Tribute to America's Kindergarten Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the proud firsts in Wisconsin has always naturally taken the deepest of pride in its founding of America's kindergarten movement.

Watertown, Wis., now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding, takes pride in the role played by Marguerite Schurz, wife of the famous Carl Schurz, in establishing for the first time in the New World what has been called a garden whose plants are human—a school where youngsters could take the first step into the formal learning process, while enjoying the laughter and playtime of childhood.

Since the time of Marguerite Schurz, the education movement of my own State has contributed many other significant improvements to United States education, and we hope to continue to do so.

I send to the desk the text of an article which was published in the Thursday, February 16, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, entitled "The First Kindergarten in America," and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST KINDERGARTEN IN AMERICA—WATERTOWN, WIS., CELEBRATES THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STARTING THERE OF INSTRUCTION FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN BY MRS. CARL SCHURZ, WIFE OF THE FIERY GERMAN REVOLUTIONARY

(By E. C. Kiessling)

Almost a million and a half children will attend kindergarten classes in our country this year. Yet, a century ago there were only six kindergarteners in the whole Western Hemisphere, and all of them could have been found in one small room in Watertown, Wis., where a comely young matron, Margarethe Meyer Schurz, had just opened the first kindergarten in America.

Both Watertown and Wisconsin are celebrating the centennial of that even during 1956.

One hundred years ago Watertown was the second largest city in Wisconsin, the bustling terminus of a plank road and a new railroad from Milwaukee. People and goods were pouring into the town, and, for a brief interval, it was the distributing center for western Wisconsin.

Among the newcomers was Carl Schurz, fiery German revolutionary who had made a name for himself on two continents by rescuing his favorite professor, Gottfried Kinkel, from a Berlin prison under the noses of the Prussian police.

Imbued with the ideals of freedom and democracy, Schurz had brought his bride to America and was on the lookout for a booming grassroots community where he could put his ideas into practice and at the same time cash in on rising values in real estate.

Watertown in the middle fifties seemed a sure bet to Schurz. Several of his relatives had already settled there. He had paid a high price for an 89-acre farm about a mile and a half from the center of town and divided it into building lots. On an imposing elevation overlooking the city, he began the construction of a new house, which was just about finished when his wife and their 3-year-old daughter, Agatha, arrived in August 1856.

SAT AT FEET OF KINDERGARTEN'S FATHER

Daughter of a wealthy, cultured Hamburg family, Margarethe Meyer had been only 19 at the time of her marriage in 1852. She became the mother of five children and an excellent housekeeper, in spite of a tendency to frailty. Carl paid her this compliment in a letter to a friend:

"She has worked herself so effectively into our life here, and proved herself so splendidly practical therein, that (without boasting) our house is the pleasantest to be seen far and near, and everyone of whatever nationality is at ease with us. My children thrive splendidly."

As a 16-year-old girl, she and an older sister had sat at the feet of Friedrich Froebel, father of the kindergarten. Margarethe had taken such excellent notes of his conversations with children that the master called them the best things ever written about him. They were sent to Berlin on loan, only to be lost in the mail. This misfortune has usually been ascribed to the inefficiency of the Prussian post office, but it may have been due to the efficiency of the Prussian Government, which had just passed through the revolution of 1848 and was intensely suspicious of everything new in education and politics. About that time it issued a decree outlawing kindergartens in Prussia.

The loss of the manuscript mattered little to Mrs. Schurz, however. In her pretty head, covered with brunet curls, were stored all the essential facts of the new education, as it was called. She had had practical experience, too, helping her sister establish a kindergarten in London. It was during her short sojourn there that she met and married Carl.

A SPECIAL KNACK WITH CHILDREN

In Watertown four little cousins came to visit Agatha, and it wasn't long before Frau Schurz was playing kindergarten games and singing kindergarten songs with them. Word got around that she had a special knack with preschool-age children and a system for helping them accustom themselves to life. She was only too happy to yield to the request of friends and relatives to have their children join the little group.

Since it was rather far for little folks to walk out to the Schurz farm, she looked around for a suitable room in town and found one at the corner of Jones and Second Streets. It was fitted out with a piano, chairs and other kindergarten materials, and there, one day in November or December, 1856 (the exact date is not known), half a dozen toddlers—five girls and a boy—gathered to take part in the mother songs, stories, dances, exercises with yarnballs and geometric figures, and the nature study that constituted the curriculum of the Froebelian kindergarten.

The course was conducted in German. It continued during all of that school year and the following year.

"AND GET BACK CHAIRS IN CHANGE"

Unfortunately, neither Margarethe nor Carl seem to have been quite aware of the historic significance of the first course of instruction for preschool-age children in our country. If Margarethe had only written up her own classes as fully as she did those of Froebel, what a priceless record her notes would be today; or if Carl, a prolific writer, had just once described his wife's kindergarten as vividly as he described almost everything else in the pioneer town.

From his pen we know now, during the first year of the kindergarten, farmers used to come to town with wagonloads of wheat, how they were paid in cash and how they dispersed into the stores with filled pockets to purchase goods to their heart's content, while newly arrived immigrants—the green ones—stood and gaped enviously.

From his pen we also know what happened in the next year when the short but sharp depression of 1857 brought ruin to half the merchants and made money so scarce that Carl jokingly suggested that they might soon have to buy groceries with their table and get back their chairs in change.

That depression—and the continuation of the railroad toward La Crosse, turning Watertown from a terminal into a transit town—blighted the bright hopes of the Schurzes for quick wealth. It also spelled the end of the kindergarten, for they moved to Milwaukee late in 1858 and spent only the summers in Watertown during the next 2 years. By that time Carl was already launched on the career that would make him Lincoln's minister to Spain, a Civil War general, a United States Senator, and Secretary of the Interior under President Hayes.

But Mrs. Schurz's contribution to the kindergarten was far from over when she left Watertown. In 1859 she and Agatha accompanied Carl to Boston, where he was to deliver an important speech at a Jefferson day dinner.

They stayed with a family in which there were four rather noisy children. Another visitor, Miss Elizabeth Peabody, noted that the presence of Agatha had the effect in the house of a calm coming upon the storm of young life.

Many years later Miss Peabody wrote an account of that visit and of what it meant to her.

AMERICA'S FIRST PUBLIC KINDERGARTEN

"That child of yours is a miracle," she exclaimed, "so childlike and unconscious, yet so wise and able."

"No miracle, but only brought up in a kindergarten," replied Mrs. Schurz.

"A kindergarten? What is that?"

"A garden whose plants are human. Did you ever hear of Froebel?"

By the time Mrs. Schurz had told her all about Froebel, Elizabeth Peabody had become a convert. The next year she opened a kindergarten of her own.

In 1870, after studying the technique at first hand in Germany, she founded the first public kindergarten in America at Boston.

Margarethe Schurz, meanwhile, succumbed to ill health and invalidism, and died in 1876. Her husband lived for another 31 years, lovingly attended by Agatha, the first kindergartner, and her sister, Marianne.

And Watertown, after its brief dream of becoming a metropolis, lapsed into a quiet midland town, developing a culture all its own and treasuring memories of the first kindergarten.

The building in which it was held still stands, though in altered form, and near the door, attached to a stone, is a bronze plaque paying tribute to Mrs. Schurz. In this centennial year various programs will commemorate the achievement of the vivacious little lady who began it all.

Construction of Colorado River Project Will Not Affect Current Agricultural Surplus Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado project will not add to the agricultural surpluses for the following reasons:

(a) The construction schedule will prevent any material farm production within 10 years of the date of authorization. The surplus may be resolved by that time.

(b) During the second 10 years of construction not more than one-half the 132,020 acres can possibly be brought into production.

(c) The principal crops to be grown on this acreage will be specialty crops, fruits and vegetables, alfalfa and and forage for cattle and sheep which feed on the ranges during the summer. The upper basin States are even now in a deficit feed area—and Federal aid has had to be extended to them.

(d) Most of the wheat grown in the upper basin States is on dry land. As water is put on these areas the land goes out of wheat and into other crops.

(e) The population of the United States is growing at a very rapid rate and it is estimated that by 1975 every acre of tillable land will be required to provide the food and fibre needs of the United States. By the time this project comes into full production the crops grown will be urgently needed.

(f) The principal of the soil bank will not be violated. In the case of this project it is the water bank that is needed. This project must be started now so that the water now wasting into the sea may be put in the "water bank"—storage reservoirs—and made available to be drawn upon when the facilities are ready to put the water to beneficial consumptive uses. It will take at least 7 years to build the dams and 10 to 15 years to fill them. The water bank must be filled as soon as possible while water which is wasting into the sea is available for the filling.

IMMEDIATE PLANNING VITAL TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS

If construction were begun tomorrow on the proposed upper Colorado River storage project, that project would not add to our surpluses of agricultural commodities.

First, the estimated schedule of construction shows that there will be little acreage put into production during the first 10 years after authorization:

(a) It will take 10 years to develop and let contracts for construction of the storage reservoirs to provide regulation of the river and to put water in the bank, so to speak, for use downstream during dry years and to produce power—a by-product, revenue from the sale of which will help pay for the project.

(b) The first lands brought into production are scheduled for the Le Barge participating project in Wyoming, which will in 1962—some 6 years from now—amount to 797 acres. In 1963 the Le Barge project will irrigate another 797 acres and the Smith Fork project will bring in 757 new acres. By 1966, 10 years from now, only 35,007 new acres will have been brought into production.

Second, during the next 10 years of development, the average new acreage to be brought into production will be less than 3,000 new acres per State per year.

(a) By 1975 every participating project will have completed its development except the central Utah project, which will bring into production 1,586 acres annually until 1980.

(b) Land taken out of production in these four States annually for urban development, highway construction, and defense installations greatly exceeds the additions which the upper Colorado River storage project will make to cropland acreage.

Third, by the end of the second 10-year period—1975—assuming the project were authorized today, it is estimated that our food requirements will be 41 percent greater than in 1950. The greatest increased needs will be for those foods, the production of which comprises the major agricultural activity of the four upper basin States—fruits, vegetables, alfalfa, forage, and seed grains.

(a) A 41.6-percent increase in beef production; a 51.8-percent increase in lamb production; and a 66.3-percent increase in chickens and turkeys will be required to meet consumptive demands.

(b) A 43.8-percent increase in fluid milk production will be required to meet consumptive needs.

(c) A 37.2 percent in fruit production, excluding citrus fruits; and a 62.6-percent increase in processed vegetables will be needed for consumption.

(d) A 43-percent increase in livestock including feed and forage will be needed by 1975.

UPPER BASIN CROPS WILL BE URGENTLY NEEDED AND ECONOMICALLY PROVIDED

In 1952 the President's Materials Policy Commission, based upon a now-antiquated population estimate of 193 million in 1975, concluded that by 1975 we would need a 41-percent increase in our total consumptive food requirements over those of 1950.

The Commission estimated that by 1975 a 49.4-percent increase in meat would be required. On a per capita basis this represents an increase in consumption of 17.2 percent. In other words, whereas we were consuming individually 146.1 pounds in 1950, each of us would consuce in 1975, 171.1 pounds.

This is in keeping with the trend in the consumption pattern of the American people toward livestock products, and away from cereal crops. But in the light of more recent population studies by the Census Bureau, it is very likely that we shall need instead of a 49-percent increase anywhere from a 55- to a 65-percent increase in meat production. The Census Bureau now estimates that by 1975, we probably shall have a population of 228 million—35 million more than the President's Materials Policy Commission forecast about 4 years ago. This may even be for short of an accurate forecast since as Dr. Ray E. Hoffman pointed out in his study, "The Reclamation of Land for Agricultural Purposes," contained in volume 3 of the Hoover Commission Task Force's Report on Water Resources and Power:

> The United States is now experiencing a substantial increase in population * * * population growth provides the most obvious indication of future food and fiber requirements. The rapid increase in population numbers in the United States was almost completely unexpected by experts in the field. National thinking and policy have been slow to adjust from the forecasts made by population experts during the 1930's to the effect that static population was in store for the United States at an early date. In 1947, for example, Whelpton prepared a forecast for the Bureau of the Census in which he forecast a projection of a population of 156,775,000 in 1960, and 169,801,000 in 1975. The 1960 forecast was exceeded in 1952 and the 1975 forecast will certainly be exceeded by 1960 (pp. 1161–1162).

In any event, if we judge the future by the past, we are going to have an expanding population which will require a large increase in livestock production. Livestock production is the principal agricultural commodity produced in the intermountain States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. To the livestock producers in these areas, increased livestock production requires more water for without water the necessary feed and forage crops cannot be produced to sustain larger cattle numbers some 20 to 30 years from now.

This is the purpose of the agricultural features of the upper Colorado River Storage project, and it especially explains why the LeBarge, Seedskadee, Lyman and Florida irrigation, or participating projects, as they are called, are scheduled for early construction. These projects will provide water for high valley irrigated farming areas devoted primarily to the growing of forage crops and hay meadows.

The valleys of moderate to high elevation in the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are from 4,400 to 6,000 feet in elevation. They have a variable growing season of from 100 to 185 days and variable precipitation from less than 10 to 16 inches. In these areas, forage crops for livestock use as a supplement to range grazing in the mountains predominate.

The relatively narrow valleys in high mountains are above 6,000 feet in elevation. Here the growing season is less than 100 days, and the precipitation more than 15 inches. Here the main production of forage is limited to hay meadows.

Mr. Speaker, some critics of the upper Colorado River storage project, especially the southern California critics, have made fun of irrigation projects whose principal purpose is to irrigate forage and pasture crops. First, may I point out that alfalfa, meadow hay, and other forage crops for livestock are in short supply in the intermountain States. Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming are deficit feed-producing States. Second, the alfalfa and meadow hay produced in these valleys of moderate to high and high elevations are not under price support. Third, although we may have surplus beef cattle num-

bers now, such will not be the case 20 to 30 years from now when the Colorado River storage project is completed.

Research results recently published by the Department of Agriculture make it very clear that hay can be produced on high mountain valley meadows with startling results. For example, on July 25, 1955, the Department announced that:

High-protein superhay grown on mountain meadows in Colorado, proved as efficient in producing gains in beef cattle as commercial protein supplements in tests conducted cooperatively by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station.

Although superhay is too high in protein to be used as the basic ration for beef cattle, western ranchers are interested in it because it can be produced economically on small plots and fed as a supplement to average quality hay.

At Pack County, Colo., 2-year-old bred heifers fed crude protein in the form of 2.6 pounds per day of superhay containing 15.6 percent crude protein gained 0.88 pound per day. However, heifers fed the same amount of crude protein as cottonseed cake gained only 0.74 pound daily. Both rations included 12.5 pounds per day of average quality hay.

The high-protein hay used in the tests was produced by the application of 400 pounds per acre of nitrogen fertilizer to an intermittently irrigated soil. When two harvestings were made, hay yields of 5½ tons per acre containing 22 percent crude protein were found to be possible. Winter feeding often lasts 180 days in these regions and commercial protein supplements are added to low-quality hay ration to maintain a good breeding herd and to insure a satisfactory calf crop.

Through recently conducted research, grass-legume forage production on irrigated land can be remarkably increased by better management practices. On August 24, 1955, the Department of Agriculture announced that:

1. Frequent irrigation—7 to 11 days intervals—produced almost a fourth more forage when the surface soil layers contained 60 percent to 65 percent of the available soil moisture.

2. Cutting the plants when 12 inches high rather than more frequent clipping at 6-inch height, produced about 2,800 pounds more forage per acre.

3. Application of nitrogen in three 100-pound applications produced a total yield of 10,300 pounds of forage per acre, if they were staggered to help production during late summer when it normally falls off.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the growing of grass-legume forage on irrigated lands is an efficient use of water in an area specializing in livestock production.

Southern California critics of the upper Colorado River storage project have been critical of producing alfalfa on, as they put it, the marginal lands which the participating or irrigation projects would bring into production.

Rather an odd charge, is it not, when one stops to think that over 20 percent of the total irrigated land in the 17 Western States, including California, is devoted to its production. Odder still, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the results of experiments at the Department of Agriculture's Salinity Laboratory at Riverside, Calif., reported August 10, 1955, show that "an unusually high salt tolerance was found to be characteristic of alfalfa."

Much of the soil in the West is high in salt content, which makes the growing of many crops difficult. But alfalfa's outstanding ability to grow on salty land is highly important to the livestock economy of the West in general and that of the intermountain States of Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico in particular.

Specifically these experiments revealed that:

First. Alfalfa can withstand appreciable salt concentrates without showing any symptoms of leaf burning—a common result when other crops are grown on lands having a high salt content.

Second. Alfalfa grown on salty soil was just as rich in provitamin A as that grown on salt-free control plots; in fact, in many cases the salty soil increased the amount of provitamin A present.

Third. Most varieties of alfalfa produced one cutting per year more on the salt plots than on the control plot.

Fourth. All varieties showed greater salt tolerance in cool weather than in hot weather. This is an important and desirable characteristic in mountain valleys having 100-day growing seasons or less.

In a few words, Mr. Speaker, land not generally suitable to the economic production of high value cash crops are quite capable of yielding quality alfalfa, meadow hay, and grass-legume forage crops where adequate water is available. There production is high, as these research results indicate is and can be the case, they provide a source of relatively cheap, nutritious, and succulent feed of high animal canning capacity.

In the light of our anticipated needs for a 55 to 65 percent increase in meat production by 1975, when the Census Bureau estimates we will have a population of 228 million, it is important that we not permit our concern with temporary and short-run low prices for livestock to obscure our vision with respect to the need for planning and devising means of assuring an adequate supply of meat products 25 to 30 years from now.

As Dr. Hoffman phrased it in his study for the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power:

It is ironic that one of this Nation's most pressing domestic problems, agricultural surpluses, is an outgrowth of something so necessary to the general welfare as a highly productive agriculture. It is important that long-run questions of food and fiber requirements are not obscured and sidetracked by periodic problems of surpluses.

The agricultural features of the upper Colorado River storage project represent a step in the direction of planning for the production of our long-range food and fiber requirements.

UTAH'S RECLAMATION PROJECTS DO NOT ADD TO SURPLUS CROPS IN GOVERNMENT STORAGE

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Reclamation, published in October 1955, the reclamation achievements of the Strawberry Valley project located near Provo, Utah.

In the light of the propaganda campaign the southern California water users interests have urged against the upper Colorado River project, I believe a résumé of the agricultural aspects of the Strawberry project will serve to further reveal the erroneous nature of their criticism. Especially this is in light of their statement that construction of that project would add to our agricultural surpluses.

In Utah, the agricultural areas are in typical valleys wherever a stream emerges from the mountains or where water supplies can be made available. Here at the mouths of those canyons and in those mountain valleys are located the cities and towns and the agricultural and industrial developments. The elevation of these valleys varies from 4,500 to 5,000 feet. The growing season varies from 110 to 185 days. The annual precipitation varies from 12 to 18 inches in the irrigated area most of which comes during the nongrowing season. Soils are generally highly productive.

It is for just such a valley that the Strawberry reclamation project provides water in Utah County, Utah. The project, for which construction was authorized in 1905, furnishes approximately 60,000 acre-feet of water to irrigate about 42,000 acres of new lands and lands which need supplemental water. The crops produced on these project lands are feed grains and forage crops for livestock, fruits, and vegetables, as the United States Bureau of Reclamation reports point out:

The principal crops produced from an acreage standpoint are alfalfa hay and small grains. Three cuttings of alfalfa are obtained, with the project average per acre yield running between 3 and 4 tons; however, 7 tons are not uncommon. In 1954 the acreage of irrigated barley comprised over 60 percent of the small grains which was used almost entirely in local feed lots for the fattening of beef cattle and sheep. The new strains of barley are yielding over 100 bushels per acre on the better farms. Virtually all the wheat grown is fed to poultry and used in the fattening ration for beef cattle along with barley.

Most of the vegetable and truck crops such as sweet corn, canning peas, lima beans, and tomatoes are processed by the two large canneries located on the project. These canned goods are shipped both to eastern and western markets. Quality fruit, apples, peaches, cherries, apricots, and berries are grown on the project and shipped by rail and truck principally to the East and Midwest (p. 10).

Yes, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the southern California opponents of the upper Colorado River project have said, the agriculture of the four upper basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming is predominantly a livestock enterprise. The feed grains—oats, barley, corn, wheat, and rye—produced in these States does not go under price support and into Government warehouses, but primarily is fed to livestock.

For example, on reclamation projects in Utah, including the Strawberry project:

First, 1,647,155 bushels of barley were produced in 1954, but only 36,402 bushels or 2.2 percent was placed under price support.

Second, 15,751 bushels of corn were produced in 1954, but only 8 bushels or

.05 percent was placed under price support.

Third, 360 bushels of rye were produced and none was placed under price support.

Fourth, 475,046 bushels of oats were produced in 1954, but only 1,663 bushels or 3.5 percent were placed under price support.

Fifth, 921,029 bushels of wheat were produced in 1954, but only 71,748 or 7.7 percent was placed under price support.

The rangelands of the surrounding mountains and plateaus can be used for grazing only during the summer months, and as a result only about 54 percent of the annual forage requirements for beef cattle and sheep in Utah can be obtained from rangelands. The other 46 percent of the forage requirements for sheep and cattle must be produced in the irrigated valleys. This is why such a small amount of the feed grains, although eligible for price support, ever ends up in Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses. There grains are not produced for commercial sale, but rather for livestock feed. Without adequate water to irrigate these valley croplands, it would not be possible for Utah and the other intermountain States to produce feeder cattle, one of its principal agricultural products.

The importance of irrigated cropland to the livestock industry of the intermountain West is well exemplified by the Strawberry project as the Bureau of Reclamation publication points out.

When the project was authorized by Congress 56,000 acres of watershed lands surrounding the reservoir and suitable for controlled grazing were withdrawn from the public domain in order that this area might be properly protected against erosion. The grazing lands are administered by the association, and the grazing permits which are issued only to members of the association, are based upon the water rights held in the association. This source of summer grazing together with the Forest Service land and public domain desert lands to the west, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, has encouraged the raising of cattle and sheep. Complete use of the surrounding mountain and desert-grazing lands, much of which is seasonal in nature and usable only where there is a stable feed base, is dependent on the Strawberry Valley project. The livestock which use the surrounding grazing lands in the summer are fattened for market during the winter months or held over for breeding stock, using the hay and grain grown on the project lands (p. 12).

In Utah, as well as the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming, the acreage and yield of irrigated lands fluctuates each year with the available water supply. Nearly every year there is a considerable amount of land which does not have a full year's supply of water.

Mr. Speaker, this is one reason why the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project means so much to the farmers and livestock producers of the four States concerned. Water will stabilize crop production, it will make possible a greater production of feed and forage crops and permit a full utilization of the range resources of the area.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SAYS: "IRRIGATED LANDS IN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS DO NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT NATIONAL CROP SURPLUSES"

Opponents of the Colorado River project have reproduced in the RECORD a table prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation showing by participating irrigation project the crops to be grown which are also eligible for price support. The supplication and impression they wanted to create by this action was that the 132,360 new acres to be supplied water, and the 233,930 acres to be supplied supplemental water by this project, will create huge surpluses of agricultural commodities.

At the same time, they also should have placed in the RECORD, so that you could have all the facts, the Bureau of Reclamation's recent publication, Federal Reclamation and the Crop Surplus Problem. This study makes the following points with respect to the impact of reclamation farm production upon national production and the agricultural surplus problem:

1. Irrigated land in Federal reclamation projects does not significantly affect national crop surpluses. Traditionally about half of the cropped acreage on reclamation projects is planted to crops used exclusively for feed and forage essential to proper utilization of the 7-million acre western range. Much of the remaining acreage is planted to fruits, nuts, seed, vegetable and related crops, many of which are still in short supply, and all of which are needed to supply the Nation's protective foods.

2. Reclamation project harvests have a negligible effect on the price-support program of the United States Department of Agriculture. On September 30, 1955, approximately 86 percent of the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in price-supported commodities was in wheat, upland cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice.

(a) Wheat production on Federal reclamation projects constitutes less than 2 percent of United States production. It is planted primarily for local feed purposes and to balance crop rotations. For these reasons, wheat production is reduced more than 50 percent when western dry farmland is converted to irrigation.

It is general information that the upper basin States will produce no cotton, tobacco, or rice, and very little corn under the Colorado project.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Urges Passage of the Colorado River Storage Project

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River storage project has been violently opposed by certain selfish interests in southern California. This opposition is obviously motivated by sectional interest, as southern California will gain fabulous wealth if it can keep Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico from developing and using the water that rightfully belongs to these States.

We have tried diligently to place the true facts concerning the Colorado River storage project before this Congress. We have at all times invited the closest study of these facts.

In the past 10 days 2 major newspapers of Washington, D. C.—the Star and the Post and Times Herald—have strongly endorsed the Colorado River storage project. Now other influential papers throughout the Nation—newspapers outside the area directly concerned and so without any possibility of sectional interest—are adding their considered opinions that the Colorado River storage project is a worthwhile investment for the Nation.

The highly respected St. Louis Post-Dispatch has now fully endorsed the project. This is particularly impressive, as the same newspaper was opposed to the project a year ago, solely on the ground that the proposed Echo Park Dam would invade the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Now that the Echo Park issue has been permanently removed from consideration, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has made an objective analysis of the project as an investment in the Nation's future and come up with the logical conclusion: That the storage project should be built.

The Post-Dispatch has not only analyzed the Colorado storage project, it has also analyzed the opposition to the project that stems from southern California. It strongly condemns what it accurately terms the "dog in the manger" attitude of southern California, and points out that "the narrow interests of one State cannot be allowed to take precedence over the general interest."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the full text of the editorial of Friday, February 24, 1956 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Where the Colorado Winds," as an extension of my remarks:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 24, 1956]

WHERE THE COLORADO WINDS

The upper Colorado development project is due to come to a vote within a few days in the House of Representatives. Since the objectionable Echo Park Dam, which would have invaded Dinosaur National Monument in northwest Colorado, has been stricken out, the measure is deserving of support. California is taking a dog-in-the-manger attitude and fighting the bill both fairly and unfairly, but we trust Congress will not lose sight of the issues involved that are bigger even than California.

Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico are affected by this legislation as well as California. So is Mexico. The apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River system between the upper and lower Colorado Valley, and between the United States and Mexico, is dependent upon prudent storage and timely withdrawal of those waters. That is what the development project is intended to accomplish.

Water is the difference between desert and habitation, between barrenness and productiveness, in the parts of the United States involved in this project. It cannot be permitted to continue wasting away. Nor can the narrow interests of one State be allowed to take precedence over the general interest. To still destructive quarrels and to enhance the usefulness and wealth of a considerable region of our country, the upper Colorado project is very much needed.

Persecution of the Church in Ukraine and Other Communist Dominated Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, persecution of the church in Communist countries is one of the most brutal and vicious symptoms of barbarian and atheistic communism. The Moscow tyrants see in the church the symbol of our modern civilization and the one great threat to their dream of world occupation. For that reason, they have set out on a ruthless campaign of terrorism, consisting of murder and imprisonment of church prelates and deprivation of their civil rights.

Despite a number of protests by our Government, these persecutions continue and there is no present likelihood that the Communists intend to heed our protests. The United Nations is an organization which was formed to maintain world peace through enforcement of respect for human rights and international decency. There is no room in that organization for a government which refuses to respect these rights. It is, therefore, high time that our representative in the United Nations insist on placing on the agenda the question of the persecution of the church in the Communist-dominated countries.

I am glad to say that Congress has already assumed its share of responsibility to act. The Select Committee on Communist Aggression has presented to Congress a valuable report showing the astounding extent of this persecution. Unfortunately the executive department of our Government has failed to put the recommendations of that committee into effect.

I am informed that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, headed by the Honorable THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, will shortly take additional testimony from recent exiles and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to substantiate the charges of the continuance of this horrible condition in countries occupied by the Communists.

I sincerely hope and trust that the persecution of the church, not only in Ukraine, but in all countries under Communist domination will be fully considered by that committee.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith a copy of a memorandum, many of which have been received by me from constituents urging action on this important issue:

MEMORANDUM

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December 1917, Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the eastern provinces of this country. The Soviets were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terrorized the people with threats of exile, torture, and death.

First, the Communists attacked the church in eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as for example the golden domed Michalivsky monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters, and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity.

Though article 123 of the Soviet Constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U. S. S. R., explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of western Ukraine (1939–1941), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This anti-Christian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christianity in Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1945, the Soviets arrested the Metropolitan of Halych and Archbishop of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. SS. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops' terms expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the "Church of the Catacombs," as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to acknowledge the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—this church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave labor camps. The Reds exterminated all 5 dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,400 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church, and faith.

Therefore, I respectfully request to present to Congress the dreadful situation of the religious persecution in Ukraine and ask to propose that Congress inquire into this anti-Christian terror, and that a special designated congressional committee hold hearings of witnesses of the aforesaid situation.

I, also, request that the Secretary of State propose to the American delegation in the United Nations that the condition of the persecuted church in Ukraine be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly.

Ship of State in Need of a Rudder?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Constantine Brown which appeared in the Evening Star on February 21. No comment.

SHIP OF STATE IN NEED OF RUDDER?—OUTCOME OF GERMAN AND GREEK VOTES DRAMATIZES WOES UNITED STATES FACES IN EUROPE

(By Constantine Brown)

Isolationism is dead and buried in America. Yet we may become isolated in our attempt to prevent the free world from being engulfed by the Reds during the progressive deterioration of the political conditions in Europe which are increasingly playing into our enemies' hands. The Sunday results of a local election in Germany and the general election in Greece dramatize the existing trends. These, coupled with a hit-or-miss foreign policy which gives the outside world the impression that the American ship of state is without compass or rudder, give some of our political men more headaches than all our immediate domestic problems combined.

Our politicians are reluctant to place before the public these facts of life in their full nakedness, lest they be denounced as pessimists or defeatists. Yet they do not doubt—especially after Marshal Zhukov's speech last Friday—we are now in an unprecedentedly difficult position.

Before we tangled with the Axis Powers in the last war we had a cushion between us and our enemies. The resistance of the Western Powers which had been attacked by the totalitarians gave us some time to improve our defenses. We have endeavored since 1950 to recreate that cushion by organizing the farflung NATO and SEATO and by bringing Germany into a European defense system which seems now to be dying on the vine.

The elections in Rhine-Westphalia, the largest and most populous of the German federated states, provided a serious setback for Chancellor Adenauer. Opponents of his policies of creating a German military establishment to join NATO combined their forces and won the election in that province. This was a demonstration favoring neutralism—the price asked by Moscow to permit the unity of the former Reich—and will result in a further legislative delay in the creation of a 500,00-man army. The results in Rhine-Westphalia, it is feared here, will have a strong impact on future similar elections in Western Germany and tend to damage further the brittle fabric of the Western defense system.

A number of explanations may be given as to why the Germans are shying away from the enactment of laws which would create an army to defend their borders. The most plausible, however, is that they have lost confidence that America really persist in its determination to stand up strongly against

the Russians and the Chinese. They hear the Russian swashbucklers tell the world that they can crush any resistance and at the same time reports from the United States that we are falling behind these potential aggressors in a number of nonconventional weapons. The Germans, like some other allies, are concerned over the fact that at a time when the Soviets may demand "What will it be, surrender or aggression?" we are counting dollars for our defense system instead of having "crash" programs.

Other considerations, but also akin to lack of confidence in America, have produced this week's election results in Greece. The anti-Communist Government headed by Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis won a flimsy majority in Parliament but lost by 200,000 in popular votes. Here again the ballots were cast by extremists: Those who favor an immediate reconcilation with the Communist group and want to go along with Moscow's coexistence, and those who are irked over the Cyprus problem and angry at Turkey. They want to break away from NATO and accept the U. S. S. R.'s promises of economic assistance.

The Communists, clothed as nationalists, are at the bottom of the violence which has marked for months the struggle for unity between Cyprus and Greece. The strong-fist measures of the British forces in Cyprus have made a serious dent on the Greek public. So have the Soviet approaches through Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Our policies in Greece have done nothing recently to endear us to that ally. Dulles alone cannot win friends, as our policymakers should have learned from our experiences in all the allied countries where neutralism has been gaining important ground in the last few years.

What painful surprises we may face within the next few months in the Far East and in the Middle East cannot be answered yet. But the situation as it is today bodes nothing favorable to our efforts to preserve at least a part of the world free. Our policymakers seem to juggle with words which apparently have nothing to do with their uncertain and obscure actions.

February Birthdays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an article concerning birthdays of noted Americans during the month of February. The article was written by Mrs. Walradth who publishes a weekly newpaper in the thriving Brookings County community, White, S. Dak. I am certain that if all Americans gave proper recognition not only to the births of these noted men but also to their basic philosophies we would find ouselves marching more firmly along the road leading to a greater America. The article follows:

It is hoped that this month, with its emphasis on the birthdays of our greatest Americans, will kindle in our hearts a renewed patriotism and a stronger allegiance to the principles of Americanism. That we will have a strengthening of faith that right makes might, not the opposite. If the ragged continentals could outclass the well-trained English, it was because their cause was just and so the hosts of the righteous fought on their side. Think of this when you are tempted to believe that communism is stronger than a system that has for its motto, "In God we trust."

Accomplishments of the Subcommittee on Government Information of the House Committee on Government Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a speech by Hugh Boyd, publisher of the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News and Sunday Times and a member of the freedom of information committee of the National Editorial Association, which is headed by Guy Easterly, publisher of the La Follette (Tenn.) Press. The following speech, given January 20, 1956, at the annual convention of the New England Weekly Press Association in Boston, Mass., lists the accomplishments of the Subcommittee on Government Information of the House Committee on Government Operations:

The opportunity of speaking to you regarding the Moss subcommittee, its aims and its progress means a great deal to me.

The correct title of this committee is the Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. This takes too long to say so I'll simply call it the Moss committee.

During the past few years I have been an observer and, at times a participant in the work being done to preserve freedom of information and to safeguard the people's right to know.

Despite our personal viewpoints on this effort, it is crystal clear that any effective work must be soundly based upon a firm grasp of the problem, of its extent and of its consequences.

Therefore, a discussion of the Moss committee will, I hope, shed a little light on the whole issue of the withholding of news from the press and the Congress and its inevitable result—the denial of the people's right to know.

It's particularly significant that we can discuss this question before New England editors, the journalistic heirs of the publishing responsibilities and restrictions of colonial times.

It's especially significant that this discussion should be held in Boston, the city where on September 25, 1690, the first regularly published newspaper in this country appeared.

Here the Englishman Benjamin Harris published the paper entitled "Public Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestic." It was to have been published monthly.

Four days after its publication the governor and council issued the statement that the paper had been published—

1. Without the least privity or countenance of authority.

2. Declared their high resentment and disallowance of said pamphlet.

3. Ordered that same be suppressed and called in.

4. Forbade anyone in future to set forth anything in print without license first obtained.

There may be a connection between a discussion of the Moss committee and public occurrences.

Obviously there is no longer any possibility of a paper being licensed or being terminated by government edict.

However, the Moss committee work, if successful, may result in lessening the limits of access to news which apparently have been imposed by certain Government officials and Government agencies.

Now as to the committee itself. What is it? Why is it? What are its functions, actions, and responsibilities?

Perhaps the best place to start is at the beginning. I would like to emphasize the thought expressed in two paragraphs of a letter of June 9, 1955, written by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, to Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California's Third Congressional District, establishing the subcommittee. These thoughts, to me, define the basic philosophy of the committee's founding as well as its mission:

"An informed public makes the difference between mob rule and democratic government. If the pertinent and necessary information on governmental activities is denied the public, the result is a weakening of the democratic process and the ultimate atrophy of our form of government.

"You will seek practicable solutions for such shortcomings, and remedies for such derelictions, as you may find and report your findings to the full committee with recommendations for action."

Now who is Congressman Moss? Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, representative from California's new Third Congressional District, serves on two important committees in the House of Representatives—the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and the Government Operations Committee.

Congressman Moss has been active in political affairs since 1937, when he joined the Young Democrats Club of Sacramento. In 1938 he became a member of the California Democratic State Central Committee. He was a director of the California Young Democrats from 1938 to 1942, and was a Young Democrat national committeeman from 1942 to 1944.

Congressman Moss has been a salesman, office manager, and credit manager in Sacramento, and he established his own retail business there after World War II. He is a real estate broker. He served in the United States Navy during World War II.

What are his views on access to news? They are fully explained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1955, which carries remarks made by the Congressman, entitled "Is There a 'Paper Curtain' in Washington?"

Included among the Moss committee staff working on this program are three former newspapermen: Staff Director Samuel J. Archibald, who has worked on papers in Colorado and California; J. Lacey Reynolds, senior consultant, who is a veteran Washington correspondent, and Jacob Scher, an experienced Chicago newspaperman who is now professor of journalism at Northwestern Univrsity. Scher is also the editor of the Freedom of Information News Digest, published by the National Editorial Association.

So you see the staff selected had a solid background in newspaper work. This has been invaluable in both the preliminary and the continuing work of the committee.

Now the committee had been named, the staff selected, and it was time to take the first step.

On June 23, 1955, Moss stated that contacts with newspapers and newspaper organizations had been made. Staff members were discussing the question of availability of news from Government sources with these newspapers and newspaper organizations.

The second step was the preparation and distribution of a questionnaire regarding governmental policies, practices, and procedures in regard to making information available to the public.

The questionnaire was 5½ pages long; it contained 80 questions, and it was distributed to 63 executive departments and independent agencies.

To give you an idea of the type of questions that were asked, I'll read from the questionnaire:

"1. What categories and types of information possessed by your agency are not available to—

"(a) The press and other information media serving the general public?

"(b) The Congress?

"(c) Other Federal agencies?

"(d) Business, trade, and other groups with an economic interest in the information?

"(e) Research specialists, scientists, public affairs organizations, and similar groups or individuals?

"2. On what do you base authority for denying access to or not making available such information? Please provide copies of regulations, directives, letters, policy statements, etc., bearing on the withholding of information by your agency. Please cite any court decision and statutes which relate to your agency.

"4. If the information from your agency is restricted on security grounds, list the specific statutes, Presidential directives, or other bases for such action.

"(a) What steps have been taken by your agency to insure that security classification procedures are not being abused?

"(b) What persons in your agency are authorized to apply security classifications in the first instance?

"(c) What provisions are made for review of initial security classification decisions?

"(d) Who reviews initial classifications?

"(e) How often does your agency review classified material to determine whether some of the material should be downgraded or declassified?

"(f) Who revises classifications?

"(g) What consideration is given to the public's right to know and to the importance of an informed public in the successful operation of the democratic form of government?

"(h) What methods are used to determine whether potential enemy states already possess the information?

"(i) What consideration is given to the importance of uniform availability of classified information among scientists, economists, administrators, and others entitled to special access to such information?

"9. Do you receive from other agencies complete and timely information when requested?

"(a) In how many instances was information desired from other agencies denied from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955? Please explain.

"(b) In how many instances was information possessed by your agency denied to other agencies from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955? Please explain.

"(c) Please suggest ways of improving the flow of information among Federal agencies.

"10. How can the job of making available timely, factual, and pertinent information on the affairs of your agency be improved? Please recommend any neccssary legislation."

II. PRESS

"1. How many press conferences were held by your agency from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955?

"(a) Who held these press conferences?

"(b) What is the basis for accreditation of persons attending the conferences and, if special accreditation is required over and above the general accreditation of the Senate and House press galleries, what are the requirements?

"(c) Are transcripts of the press conferences available?

"2. How many formal or informal 'back ground' or 'briefing' sessions have been held by your agency for the press from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955, and who, in general was invited?"

The replies took up more than 500 pages. They are compiled and printed in a report.

Now everything was ready for the third, and perhaps the most important, step—the holding of hearings.

Hearings were started on Monday, November 7, in Washington and continued through the week. On the opening day several reporters and editors were invited to appear before the committee. I was included in that group.

We were told by Chairman Moss that we were not appearing as witnesses and that this was not a hearing. Moss stated that it was an informal discussion to give the subcommittee members and the public the opportunity to learn the views of the specialists in the field of information and particularly their views on the free flow of information from the Federal executive agencies to the public.

Some of those testifying were sharply critical of the Government news policies. General charges of news suppression were made, specific instances of withholding of news were cited, and one newsman charged a governmental department with managing the news in order to create an impression which would reflect favorably on the Government.

Representatives from the Treasury, Agriculture, and Post Office Departments and from the Civil Service Commission testified during the first week's hearings.

A further 1-day hearing was held on January 13, 1956, when R. Karl Honaman, former Deputy Assistant for Public Affairs to the Secretary of Defense, appeared.

Starting on Monday, January 23, further hearings will be held. It is expected that representatives of the following agencies will appear at these hearings: Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, and National Labor Relations Board.

In addition to these agencies the Moss committee has indicated that the Pentagon, Departments of Commerce, Interior, State, and Justice, and the Budget Bureau probably will be heard sometime during the coming months. It is also expected that a panel of scientists may be heard, discussing matters which have a scientific aspect.

So much for the hearings and the committee work to date. Before giving my own views of the progress and the potentialities of this committee work, I would like to refer to the views of others.

First, this is what Chairman Moss had to say on November 10, 1955, at the conclusion of the first week's hearings:

"On the basis of the record that has been made during this first set of hearings of the Government Information Subcommittee, it appears evident that nonsecurity information has been withheld from the public which should not have been withheld. The subcommittee will continue its study of the extent of news suppression and the reasons for it.

"Some of the regulations which the subcommittee has reviewed indicate that virtually unlimited discretion, of questionable legal status, is sometimes passed down departmental hierarchies to subordinates. Also, there have been exaggerated claims of authority to withhold information based on a theory of inherent powers stemming from the Presidency. There are indications that some officials in Washington today believe they have authority to exercise Presidential powers without the President's authorization or his prior knowledge or even subsequent review of their acts.

Some agency regulations governing information are overrestrictive. They often reflect an attitude contrary to the policy statements contained in the agency replies to the subcommittee's questionnaire.

"Some outstanding inconsistencies in approach and asserted authority between the Federal agencies have been revealed.

"In some agencies discretionary authority is concentrated too heavily at the top for the free flow of news.

"I believe that a clear need for new legislation has been established. Some of the restrictions revealed by the subcommittee's inquiry lead back to statutes. Some statutes appear to have been misapplied. There was testimony that in the tax field some information will not be released without specific statutory authority. This is a curious reversal of the sound principle that the people have a constitutional right to Government information, unless provided otherwise by statutes, which are within the legislative powers of the Congress or Presidential orders issued pursuant to the President's constitutional powers.

"We can all agree on one point, I feel certain. The flow of information to the American public and to the Congress is a matter of the utmost significance under our form of government. I think all will agree, also, that the Federal Government should be brought closer to the people. This will require a breaking down of any existing barriers to the free circulation of facts, opinions, and ideas.

"This subcommittee will go about its task of studying the many complex problems it will encounter in carrying out its mission in a thorough and nonpartisan manner. In the course of its inquiry, the subcommittee will seek the advice of citizens and organizations in the fields of public affairs, business, labor, agriculture, science, and research."

Moss made some other important and revealing remarks when he discussed his committee work before members of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, meeting in Colorado Springs on November 18.

Among other things, he reported that:

"In my opinion, the subcommittee's first hearings were extremely beneficial in indicating information attitudes of executive department officials. However, as a byproduct, I think we can point to some concrete accomplishments in our job of freeing the avenues of communication between the Federal Government and the public.

"The Comptroller of the Currency, for example, has agreed to consider a change in the policy of not reporting action on the mergers of national banks. He told the subcommittee his approval of mergers, and the conditions which he attached, were reported to the public only after the final decision had been reached. He said this has been the policy since Civil War days. Now, however, we may look forward to a fuller flow of information prior to the time mergers are finalized.

"Another agency, the Treasury Department, has agreed to back legislation to open up additional information for the public. As the result of the subcommittee's inquiry—and the display of public interest in the freedom of information question—the Treasury Department will sponsor legislation to make applications from nonprofit organizations available to the public.

"Newspaper organizations and individual reporters and editors have been fighting for months for public access to these records. The Treasury Department admits it has the authority to exempt nonprofit and nonpolitical groups from taxes; but, believe it or not, it says it has no authority to make public the reasons for granting the exemptions. An almost constant legal wrangle over whether new legislation is needed to make these facts public has been going on for 2 years. But

things are now looking up. On the morning of their appearance before the Government Information Subcommittee the Treasury Department decided to resolve the wrangle and back legislation to make the records public.

"The Agriculture Department, after discussing information practices with the subcommittee, announced consideration of a plan to release more information on the special advisory groups which help the Department formulate important farm policies.

"Even the Civil Service Commission agreed to study rewording of its regulations which seem to warn employees not to discuss anything with the public or the press. The Commission contended its very restrictive regulation was not really its policy statement on release of information. Instead, Commission witnesses said, the policy followed more nearly a six-page statement read at the opening of the subcommittee hearing. The Civil Service Commission now is considering clarifying the facts for those employees who take their cues from the published regulations instead of from statements before committees.

"I think the pattern clearly demonstrated is that of emphasis upon the freezing rather than the freeing of information. If we can bring about a change in attitude on the part of Government, recognizing the need in a democracy for people to have full and complete information about the Government, and if we can, perhaps, make a few changes in basic law clearly to establish the right of the people to know, the committee will have contributed importantly to better government."

Now for the opinions of two well-known reporters who are thoroughly familiar with the committee work and the hearings to date.

Murrey Marder, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, writing in the December issue of Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, said:

"The encouraging opening can be gaged by what the committee demonstrated in its ability to—

"(a) Understand the problem of access to information;

"(b) Search out the real underwater obstacles which impede the flow;

"(c) Gain the cooperation of Federal witnesses in the search for improvement;

"(d) Above all, avoid the danger of turning the whole inquiry into a political head-hunting or ax-grinding foray.

"If it hadn't held a single hearing, the subcommittee, as far as some Washington newsmen are concerned, would have justified its existence in obtaining and publishing its 552-page summary of replies from 63 executive agencies to questionnaires on their information practices and policies. This is a long-sought bible in the freedom of information field; a basic text for examining—and questioning—what the agencies claim as their withholding authority.

"More fundamentally, the subcommittee succeeded in establishing that some Federal agencies do regard that section 1002 of the Administrative Procedure Act does amount to (as Dr. Harold L. Cross and others have long contended) a public records law which is a positive legal basis for disclosure of information.

"The hearings also established that some other agencies, on the contrary, regard the same law as a standard for the withholding of information.

"And to compound the picture, 38 agencies, departments boards and commissions don't refer to the law in either respect.

"The nailing down of those contradictions is a major accomplishment in itself. The subcommittee believes that alone shows the great need for cleansing the atmosphere in Government, so that there can be a mutual starting point for applying the ground rules on access to information."

Allen Drury, writing in the New York Sunday Times on November 23, describes an attitude displayed by some Government officials regarding the withholding of news. He said:

"At the extreme, this attitude is represented by the Civil Service Commission whose counsel, Lawrence V. Meloy, and chairman, Philip Young, told the subcommittee that their agency had an inherent right to withhold information from the public. This was promptly labeled 'arrogant' and 'fantastic' by the subcommittee, but the Commission's top officials were obviously in no mood to change their ways until Congress forces them to do it.

"The other agencies that have testified to date in the hearings have not ventured to go anywhere near as far as Mr. Young and his counsel. None, in fact, has claimed anything inherent about the withholding of the news. But many have cited as their authority a letter written by President Eisenhower to the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, on May 17, 1954.

"This letter was designed to prevent testimony at the Army-McCarthy hearings by the former Army counsel, John Adams, concerning a conference among Executive Department officials at the White House. The President argued that these matters were confidential matters within the Executive Department. His position was accepted by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, and Mr. Adams was not required to testify on that point."

And now, having given you the opinions of some of the experts, I would like to give you my own regarding the long-range accomplishments of the Moss committee and its hearings.

I realize that it is premature to draw final conclusions, but perhaps it is not too early to sense trends.

My views are based on certain experiences as a newspaperman in daily contact with the issue of access to news. My views are also based in part on the fact that I have worked with the Moss committee staff members, testified at the opening hearing and attended subsequent sessions.

To date the Moss committee has accomplished the following:

1. It has conducted a study and not an investigation.

2. Its questions have been asked and answers given to a wide range of practices, methods and laws which the Government employs in disseminating news.

3. It has focused the spotlight of publicity and public attention on the Government's handling of news.

Now we know the details of the problem which exists. The situation may be corrected by passage of legislation or by naming a watchdog committee which will keep governmental news policies under careful and continuing scrutiny.

Congressman Moss has assured me that he hopes newspapermen who are members of this audience will write his committee. The committee is interested in knowing of your views of the work done by the committee to date, your comments, favorable or otherwise, regarding the conduct of the hearings and your suggestions regarding the conduct of future hearings. He is particularly interested in your views as to what might best be done to insure the full and free flow of the news from Government sources to your readers.

As responsible newspapermen we are being given the facts.

As responsible newspapermen it is up to us to see that these facts are acted upon and that the people's right to know is protected and preserved.

Democrats Fear Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial by Gould Lincoln in the February 22 Washington Evening Star. No doubt the Democrats will continue to feed misrepresentation, vilification, and tailored illusion into their big propaganda guns, but when factual contrast is made as it is here between the Eisenhower administration and the previous Democrat regimes, we find the Democrat artillery not only backfires, but, as usual, goes off half cocked.

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)
DEMOCRATS' FEAR OF EISENHOWER

It's no secret the Democrats have hoped for many months that President Eisenhower would not stand for a second term. It was true before the President suffered a heart attack. It's true today. The fact the President has regained his health to such a marked degree that heart experts say he could serve another 5 to 10 years in the White House has sent cold shivers down the Democratic backs.

They fear their hope—that he will not run—will be dashed. And this fear is making itself evident in a new rash of propaganda, emanating from themselves and their protagonists. First, that the President is not doing a job and will be unable to do one, because of his lack of health, and that he should not run for another term. Second, that Vice President Nixon is not qualified, either for his present office or to take over the presidency should anything happen to Mr. Eisenhower.

Contrast to Roosevelt

This line of talk—that the President should now decline to run, even though the doctors assure him he can carry on as President for 5 years or more—comes with poor grace from a political party which insisted on nominating and electing—not for a second term but for a fourth term—a President who was so ill that he lived only 83 days, including inauguration day. President Eisenhower himself, his physicians and his press secretary, James A Hagerty, have told the American people the facts about the Persident's health, the extent of his recovery—quite a contrast. The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt was reelected for his fourth term in the midst of World War II, and he took part in the vital Yalta Conference, where the Russian Communists gained so much—as history has revealed—February 4–11, 1945, just 2 months before he died.

President Eisenhower is engaged in making his own estimate of his probable strength to carry on as Chief Executive. It will be an honest estimate. The Democratic attempt to prejudice this estimate—if he decides he can run—in the minds of the people is indicative of the campaign which will be carried on against Eisenhower. It will be designed to shake the faith of the people in the President.

The smear campaign which the Democrats have in full course against Vice President NIXON shouldn't fool anyone. They hate NIXON because in his campaign speeches he has been foremost in pointing to their failure to understand the Russian Communist

threat—during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. They hate him because he was a chief instrument in forcing the trial of Alger Hiss—which former President Truman agreed was a "red herring," when questioned by a reporter. Mr. Truman and numerous other Democratic leaders have charged that NIXON called them "traitors" and the Democratic Party "the party of treason." He never did, and none of them have been able to produce evidence he did. Apparently, they find it much easier to answer a charge that they were treasonable—a charge which was not made but has been set up as a straw man by the Democrats—than to answer a charge they were stupid in their dealing with Communists at home and abroad.

The latest line of Democratic attack on NIXON relates to the Vice President's recent address before the National Republican Club in New York and his claims that the racial minorities—particularly the Negroes—have made greater advances in the 3 years of Eisenhower administration than in any years since the Emancipation Proclamation itself. Instead of answering these claims, the Democrats have charged that Nixon improperly dragged the Supreme Court into politics when he said that Chief Justice Warren, a Republican, had spoken for a unanimous Supreme Court, ordering an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools. Mr. NIXON's own notes for the speech show that he wrote: "And, speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, a great California Republican, Chief Justice Earl Warren, has ordered an end, etc." In the draft handed to the press, however, the word California was removed, and the comma shifted so that the phrase read "a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren."

The Court and politics

The fact remains, of course, that the order desegregating the public schools of America came during the Eisenhower administration, and that the opinion of the court was handed down by the Chief Justice, who was a Republican governor of California before his appointment to the Supreme Court. As for dragging the Supreme Court into politics, Mr. NIXON never approached the efforts of Roosevelt and Truman in that regard. The former tried to get legislation to pack the Court for the New Deal. Mr. Truman, as told by himself, tried to get the late Chief Justice Fred Vinson to become the Democratic nominee for President in 1952. This is contrary to the Eisenhower view of what a President should do.

Michigan's Neglected Gem: Isle Royale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of Congress to one of the most beautiful spots in America, Michigan's Isle Royale. This national park, located 600 miles from Detroit, and 450 miles from Chicago, is the second largest island in the United States.

This island park, located within driving distance of 35 million people, should be one of the most popular spots in America and yet less than 5,000 persons visited Isle Royale in 1955. Why?

The situation is a result of inadequate accommodations for tourists on the island and lack of transportation to and from the mainland. Somewhat of a frustrating cycle exists in this instance, for until more cabins and hotels are constructed to house tourists, it will not be profitable to operate expanded boat service to Isle Royale. It is regrettable that, for want of funds, our citizens are denied access to one of Nature's finest playgrounds.

Some of the sights to be seen in this park are not to be found anywhere else in the Midwest. A herd of 300 moose roam the island; wolves and coyotes are heard after the moon comes up, and the fishing along virgin shores and inland lakes is a caster's delight.

What is needed to make Isle Royale the vacationland it should be? Living quarters, such as hotels, motels, and shelters for campers are needed, plus docking facilities for private boats and a seaplane for summer patrol.

I hope that the Park Service, which has fared well this year at the hands of the Appropriations Committee, will not be unmindful of Isle Royale and its needs for the benefit of the lovers of the great outdoors.

Storm Over the Sand Dunes—!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway and the completion of the Calsag inland waterway project, I am confident that the future holds for Chicago the fulfillment of her destiny as one of the greatest of all ocean seaports.

At one time Chicago was the center of water transportation on the Great Lakes. It was a great era, an era in which young boys, having their ambitions set on becoming captains of sailing vessels or steamships, left home at very early ages and grew up with the Great Lakes. From handy boys on sailing and steam vessels many of them did advance to the posts of command.

The names of sailing craft and passenger ships were as well known in every family circle in the Great Lakes region as now are known the names of popular movie and TV personalities. Among my boyhood memories is the recollection of the hot indignation among many Republicans at the naming of the newest luxury excursion steamship in honor of the city of Cleveland. It was during the campaign of Grover Cleveland for the Presidency. Many Republican merchants refused to permit the picture of the new steamship to be hung in their stores, as then was the custom. They thought it was a Democratic trick to take advantage of lake shipping popularity to win votes for a candidate who had the good fortune to have a name similar to that of the city in Ohio after which the new steamship was named.

Times changed. Chicago grew mightily and expanded in many great activities, but her position as a center of shipping and passenger transportation on the Great Lakes diminished. Now with the St. Lawrence seaway and the anticipated completion of Cal-Sag she is destined to regain, multiplied a thousandfold, the glory of the past.

The Chicago River and the deepened connection of Lake Michigan with Lake Calumet, to the south, are the natural and the inevitable centers of this development. But the Governor of Indiana is advancing a different idea. He would destroy one of the great natural picturesque regions of the Nation, sacred to the sentiment of conservationists everywhere, to build a giant harbor for ocean-going vessels against need and sound marine engineering judgment.

In order that my colleagues may have full and timely understanding, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Chicago Sun-Times of January 1, 1956, and in an extension of my remarks to follow will include an explanatory letter from John A. Brown, an eminent attorney of Chicago, who is a recognized authority in the field.

The article from the Chicago Sun-Times follows:

STORM OVER THE SAND DUNES
(By Jack McPhaul)

Spearheaded by women battling to save the scenic beauty surrounding their homes, a new storm is sweeping across the Chicago area's great nature-made sand pile.

As has been true for 40 years, housewives again are in the forefront of a spirited campaign to halt the threatened march of industry into the nationally famed Indiana Sand Dunes. The majestic dunes, some towering as high as 200 feet, begin about 40 miles south of Chicago's Loop and extend along the shore of Lake Michigan for some 25 miles between the Indiana cities of Gary and Michigan City.

The strife, which last week was producing heated charges and countercharges, centers about a proposal to build a multimillion-dollar commercial harbor in the heart of the picturesque region of homes, recreation areas, and places for scientific study.

As the wind-driven waves continued the centuries-old process of grinding up the rock of the lake bed to form new dunes, the struggle ashore pitted homeowners and land conservationists against proponents of an expanding industrial area.

Supported by some Congressmen and other political leaders, Indiana's Gov. George N. Craig is pushing preliminary plans for the construction of a giant harbor for ocean-going vessels between the residential communities of Ogden Dunes and Dune Acres.

An imposing force has lined up against the proposal. These include home owners in the two communities and adjacent areas. Some of the residents commute to jobs in Chicago. Other Chicagoans have summer homes in the dunes. Many of the homes (valued at from $5,000 to $50,000) are situated on high ridges and enjoy commanding views of the lake and the woodlands beyond the dunes.

Some 700 residents have allied themselves in an organization called the Save the Dunes Council. Recently, the group announced plans for a nationwide campaign to raise $1 million if necessary to spike Craig's harbor plan.

Richard H. Pough, conservation chairman of New York's American Museum of Natural History and president of Nature Conservancy, a national organization devoted to the preservation of natural areas, has been in Indiana to help in the anti-harbor fight and has stated he will attempt to obtain support for the council in the East.

Other Indiana groups supporting the council include the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Garden Clubs, Izaak Walton League and Audubon Society.

Proponents of the harbor, who say it would handle ocean cargoes shipped through the St. Lawrence Seaway, scheduled for completion in 1959, predict that the construction would give the sand dunes area a new industrial city as large and as important as Gary. They visualize steel and woolen mills, chemical plants, grain elevators and coal shipping facilities arising on 4,000 acres in the vicinity of the deep waterway port.

Mrs. James H. Buell, longtime Ogden Dunes resident and chairman of the Save the Dunes Council, retorts that the harbor and area industrialization would "destroy the last of the scenic dunes and effectively wall off the citizens of Indiana from their lakefront heritage."

Cost of the harbor has been estimated at from $35 million to $70 million. The governor's plan is to have the State sell bonds for construction to private interests.

The council agrees that Indiana needs additional harbor facilities, but contends that the same goals can be achieved at far less cost by improving and expanding the Michigan City port.

The council hopes to keep the harbor from its front door by raising sufficient money to buy some 2,000 acres that would be necessary for the port project. This land, said Mrs. Buell, would be turned over to the State park or extension of the present Indiana Dunes State Park.

In 1917, when industry attempted an invasion, Chicago and Indiana women participated in a dunes pageant which opened a campaign that ultimately persuaded the State to spend $1 million for a park.

Pough described the dunes as a "biological treasure house." He predicted that if such open spaces were not preserved the southern end of Lake Michigan would be in 25 years a "metropolitan slum."

Storm Over the Sand Dunes—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from John A. Brown, a distinguished Chicago lawyer and authority on the subject of shipping on the Great Lakes, as follows:

MY DEAR BARRATT: I am enclosing an article that appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times relative to the attempt on the part of Gov. George Craig, of Indiana, to obtain necessary funds from the Government to cause the building of a commercial harbor a few miles east of Gary, and in the heart of the dunes, which are nature's own contribution to the health and happiness of thousands of persons, especially in the hot and humid days of summer.

It is pretty hard to understand the insistence of the Governor when the rank and file of the citizens of Indiana are so strongly against his ideas, and I might add to their objections the thousands of citizens of Illinois—your constituents—who have invested so many thousands of dollars for more than half a century in building their homes in Duneland, both summer and year-round homes, along or near Lake Michigan's shores, all of whom have joined with the citizens of Indiana in preserving the dunes in their present state—some 3,500 acres of duneland now comprising the Prairie Club of Chicago, Dune Acres, Inc., and the out-of-doors groups of people from both of these States.

I hear so much about the so-called necessity urged by Governor Craig that, in order to place the matter squarely before you in asking your aid in blocking Governor Craig's scheme, let me give you a little history of lake traffic and conditions, and I speak from actual experience, as I was the attorney for certain of those interested in lake commerce, especially the Barry Bros., Independent Tug Line, and the Hursen Steamship Line, which maintained both way daily trips of freight and passenger boats between Chicago, Racine, and Milwaukee, as well as a branch of that company maintaining the same service between Chicago, Waukegan, and Kenosha.

In the latter part of the nineties Chicago had been a great inland port, practically so because of four of the commodities which it was the headquarters for on its lake travel.

The first was lumber from Michigan. Second, iron ore from Wisconsin and northern Michigan. Third, grain from all of the Middle West. Fourth, coal, hard and soft, from Buffalo, Erie, Ashtabula, and Cleveland.

The mode of lake travel was principally sailing vessels of which about 2,000 were the means of such commodities reaching Chicago.

The railroads from the East built up their lines of great steamers known as package carriers that brought to all of the lake ports, such as Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth on Lake Superior, which were at Buffalo and Cleveland transferred from the respective railroads to the steamers operated by such roads as the New York Central, Pennsylvania Railroad, Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, and other companies, and the ability of Chicago to handle such shipments to it, for its own use, as well as for its being the headquarters for the Middle West securing such goods, made it, and laid its foundation as the great city of the inland country.

Perhaps it was unfortunate that in the early days Chicago had no docks along its lake front to meet the needs of such lake traffic. All of the commodities brought by the sailing vessels were towed up the Chicago River, and its north and south branches, to the respective lumber yard slips, the grain elevators, the steel mills, and the coal docks. And owing to the many bridges between the mouth of the river and the respective docks and slips, the package carriers of the railroad companies were also towed to their respective yards for transfer of their goods not alone to Chicago, but to the entire West.

Barry Bros., Inc., line had 31 tugs, the Dunham Co. some dozen tugs, and a number of other tugs were necessary to properly land the vessels at the required docks and yards, and Chicago grew and prospered under such conditions.

I might also add that the Goodrich, the Graham & Morton, the Northern Steamship Co., and Hursen, and other lines maintained passenger services to all of Lake Michigan ports on both sides of the lake, and many of these boats brought in the fruits from Michigan and Wisconsin fruit belts to Chicago, as a distributing line, while during the summer months the *Whaleback* and *Virginia* made trips daily to Milwaukee, while the Goodrich and Graham and Morton companies called at all western Michigan ports up to Mackinac Island.

As you realize, BARRATT, time marches on, and conditions change, and with such changes came a complete abandonment of the aforesaid conditions.

First of all, the Michigan timber lands were stripped of all their pine and most of their hardwood. Next, the grain that came in by lake and by the Illinois and Michigan canal found its way to Port Arthur, Tex. Duluth shipped direct for export to Buffalo and Port Arthur. And Fort William built enormous grain elevators, and shipped the grain from the Canadian Provinces to Montreal for export to Europe.

As a result, the enormous elevators along the Chicago River, and its north and south branches, were closed, torn down, or from time to time burned up.

The coal docks were still operating, but only to small trade, as factory after factory turned to gas and electricity, thereby eliminating the coal from those factories, as well as the apartment buildings and homes found oil and gas excellent substitutes for heating purposes, and at the present time oil has gone away beyond coal in industries, and there are but few coal carriers on the lake, although its prices are away above those of the early days. Then too the Interstate Commerce Commission has barred the package freight carriers, as well as the railroads, carrying their coal as previously.

You of course recognize today that nearly all of the railroads are diesel equipped so that demand for coal has vanished.

As for the iron ore for the steel mills of the district are now all located at South Chicago, Hammond, Indiana Harbor, and Gary, where each company has its own docks and yards, and there is no requirement of tugs to dock them, and so Chicago has lost all of that commerce.

Well it did not require any crystal ball for observation to show what has happened to Chicago as a lake port, despite all of its railroads to take all commodities to all parts of the western country.

With the disappearance of all of the sailing vessels and the railroad package freight steamers, there was a disappearance of the Barry and Dunham tug lines, most of which were taken over by the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., and even the building of the city's municipal pier at the mouth of the Chicago River—which I bitterly opposed—did not offer any inducement, or consideration, for a continuance of lake traffic, which had been such an aid to the young and growing city and railway center.

For a short time the lake boats as passenger recreation boats, plied principally as fruit carriers and excursion steamers, but Graham and Morton and Goodrich cut off all of their steamers to Lake Michigan ports, and so even the passenger excursion boats, with the rest of the shipping industry, vanished off the lakes. * * *

Thus passed the position of Chicago as the great inland port city. The north and west side tunnels were closed and city transportation by streetcars was resumed with newer bridges across the rivers, and Chicago with all its manufacturing facilities, and its "white elephant municipal pier," has vanished as a port, and if anyone is so simple and so foolish as to even imagine that the building of a harbor such as Governor Craig desires, and is so insistent on, that party as well as the governor should spend a short time contemplating Chicago's condition as a lake port, as above set forth, and he would find it but a sort of repetition of Chicago's folly in the construction of its municipal pier.

So turning now to the plan suggested by Governor Craig, let us call his attention to the fact that there is no such stream as the Chicago River was to furnish docks, piers, warehouses, and grain elevators for shipping

to such a place as the cargo that would have to be reshipped by railroads, none of which are as yet anywhere near to such a harbor.

Then too he overlooks entirely the fact that the Chicago River furnished dockage for the 2,000 sailing vessels, as well as the railroad package carriers, and these required miles of docage not alone along the main stream, but on both the north and south branches of the Chicago River the city was able to provide such dockage by merely putting in landings along both banks of that stream.

Also no consideration has been given to the fact that were such a harbor constructed near the Burns Ditch, it would require constant dredging to keep the sand from piling up on the dock, which is a condition that prevails all along the Indiana and Michigan west shores.

If Indiana yearns for a harbor there is no place along its shores east of Gary other than Michigan City which has a wide river running back a mile or so from the lake along its banks could readily be constructed docks, warehouses and opportunities to transfer to the railroads and trucking lines that run through Michigan City all of the space required for shipping all of these fantastic cargoes to come from goodness only knows where either incoming or outgoing.

I think that your Government records show the amounts set aside each year for the dredging to keep clear from sand not alone Michigan City, but all of the ports along the west shores of Michigan itself, whose shipping of any kind is but almost negative save for the rail ferries and a few oil tankers from Michigan.

Michigan City has railroad facilities east, south, and west, as well as countrywide trucking systems, and it seems ridiculous to even think that shipping coming from the upper lake would bypass not alone Chicago and its South Chicago and Calumet Lake Harbor, to take the changes of running aground the drifting sands that now pile up out from the Burns Ditch, and such harbor when millions of Government money would be wasted on it, would turn out to be what Chicago's municipal pier is, which is the biggest hoax ever perpetrated on Chicago as the creation of a world harbor and port.

Even the airlines today are drawing from the railways thousands of tons of shipments, and we only have to look back a couple of years to see the manner in which our airplanes furnished thousands of tons of coal to Berlin despite the efforts of the Iron Curtain of Russia to prevent the same.

The passage of the legislation carrying into effect the Calumet-Sag Waterway is another reason for opposition to Governor Craig's ideas of a Burns Ditch Harbor.

It is needless for me to offer you any information regarding that legislation in which you have been so active and so successful, but it is my understanding that the port of Indiana Harbor will be connected with that stream that now furnished a harbor for that district. * * * The Calumet-Sag Channel will be joined to the Indiana Harbor River and its docks and harbor facilities, thereby withdrawing any hope of a Burns Ditch being available or even needed by Indiana. * * *

I hope that you may be able to present the opposition of your constituents and the thouands of Indianans who are also against any such follies as is sought by Governor Craig, and that he may realize that he can return to his Indiana homestead where:

"Through the sycamores the candle lights are shining,
On the banks of the Wabash far away."

And when he can dream away in peace his visions of such lights from a harbor on Lake Michigan where now the classic and picturesque dunes are sited and awake to find that they like his ideas in that regard are but dreams.

And so with my best regards, I remain, as ever,

Cordially yours,

JOHN A. BROWN.

School Man Opposes Federal Aid to Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from a friend and constituent, who is greatly disturbed over the possibility that the Congress may approve the Federal aid to education bill now pending. This man has been interested in schools for many years. He has been a teacher and has served as clerk of his local school district board. He has served as a member of a committee to study the local high-school situation where he lives. He is vehemently opposed to Federal interference and states that there is absolutely no need for such interference in local school districts of Wisconsin.

The membership of this House, Mr. Speaker, will be interested in the point of view expressed by my friend.

FEBRUARY 18, 1956.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LORRY: The prospects of the Federal Government entering the field of education in the form of financial aid for the construction of schools is a matter of deep concern to me and I am sure that most people who have given the question any serious study also feel that it would be a step in the wrong direction. Believing sincerely that the solution to our primary- and secondary-school problems does not lie in Federal intervention, I take this opportunity to convey to you some of my observations, based upon a good many years of interest in public schools, including past experience as a teacher, present membership on a district school board in Kenosha County, and serving on local committees and groups dealing with meeting the financial burdens not only of the building of adequate public schools, but also their expenses of operations.

What I have to say is all in opposition to the proposed Federal-aid program for financing new schools, based upon the following as some of my more important reasons:

1. It has not been shown that the States and their localities are not well able to finance themselves the costs of needed school facilities. The recent White House conference on education bears this out in one of the reports to the meeting which has been reported as saying, "No State represened has a demonstrated financial incapacity to build the schools it will need during the next 5 years. But, with the exception of a few States, none of the States presently has plans which indicate a political determination powerful enough to overcome all of the obstacles." In other words, this report would seem to imply that Federal aid should come not because of financial incapability but for lack of a sufficiently powerful political determination. The advocates of Federal intervention, therefore, hope to justify it on some fuzzy and weak concept of "political determination," while, at the same time, outwardly representing to the public through the press and otherwise that the States and their localities just are not financially able to provide all of the needed school facilities.

2. The costs of financing new school buildings are only a part of the problem. The increased annual costs of operations are even more important to consider, for certainly every added schoolroom means at least one new teacher, with all of the instruction, operating, and maintenance costs going along, and these in total are often many times the annual debt and interest costs arising from the construction of the school buildings. Therefore, if a locality is to be considered as too poor to build a new school, and therefore entitled to Federal financial aid, just what is going to be done about the much more burdensome operating costs? Will the Federal Government then be called upon for aid in costs of operations also, even though present advocates of Federal aid for construction only may say they do not contemplate any Federal participation in or control over the actual school operations? If the States and their localities are to stand the much greater burdens of the annual operating costs of our schools to be financed through annual tax levies, they can also bear the much lesser burdens of financing new school buildings and facilities. The old saying, "It is not the original cost, but the upkeep," certainly applies to schools as well as to other matters coming up in our daily lives.

3. In Wisconsin the debts of localities arising for school construction are normally paid off over a 20-year period, together with interest at rates which currently are low because of the tax-free income status for Federal purposes. Just recently the representative Wisconsin community, Waterford, in Racine County, has announced the issue of $400,000 in school bonds, maturing over a 20-year period at a 2½-percent rate, with the earlier maturities quoted on a basis to yield less than 2 percent. While all districts may not be as favorably situated as Waterford, there are few who do not now have sufficient borrowing limits to finance their needed school facilities and at reasonable rates of interest. Since the past year, because of a referendum passed by the voters of Wisconsin, all local school districts can now borrow up to 5 percent of the equalized value of all taxable property in the district. Previous to this amendment the debt limit was 5 percent of the assessed valuation, and, because of low assessed values in most districts in comparison to the full equalized values, many were unable under the law to borrow sufficient money to finance their needed building programs. The Wisconsin law now in effect on borrowing limits is generally believed to be adequate to meet all needs, since the equalized values used as a base are up to date and in line with the higher current going values for property.

4. Wisconsin laws now provide for State and county aids to elementary and secondary schools, but it is believed by many that they are inadequate and that in some districts the heavy tax load falling on local property should be relieved somewhat through increased State aids in varying amounts according to the local need as indicated by the ratio of school population to equalized property values or on some other equitable basis. This is a matter for consideration of our State legislature which will recognize, I am sure, that our State is well able to provide an adequate program of school aids through taxes levied on a State level. It is also believed that county aids can be increased to some extent to spread the tax load and afford relief to the harder hit local districts.

5. Should the Federal Government enter the field of financing public school construc-

tion costs, the substantial sums required would either further unbalance the Federal budget or result in increased taxes which of course the States and their localities would have to bear, but they would never receive back the full amounts taken from them as the added expense of another Federal bureau would first take off a big slice for payrollers who would be ever intent upon enlarging their activities and perpetuating themselves, with the result of there being created just one more Federal agency that would just go on and on forever.

There are many other good and sound arguments against the proposed Federal-aid program for schools, but none for it that I am aware of, except perhaps that it will no doubt be made a political issue with every legislator voting against it, stamped as an enemy of education and our public schools. In my experience with schools it has been very gratifying to meet so many intelligent and responsible people who are fully aware that education of our children is about the most important problem facing us and who are willing to give freely of their time to work it out. These people with the assistance of our entire State educational organization, are well capable of solving all of our school difficulties without assistance from Washington.

Why should this administration be maneuvered into adopting a Federal school-aid program for the States and their localities because of the demands of a small pressure group, when it is clear that there has not been demonstrated any lack of financial ability on the part of such States and their localities? This move certainly would be contrary to the basic principles of the Republican Party and to the 1952 platform where it was announced clearly that education is the function of the States. If it was a State function then it still is, for nothing has happened since 1952 to make the situation any different. A change in policy now can be interpreted only as a silly political move to attract a certain segment of votes.

It may require some courage on the part of the Members of Congress to resist and vote against Federal aid for school construction, but in meeting this situation they should keep in mind that most of the States as has been shown for Wisconsin, are fully able to provide all of the educational requirements of our children and we will do the job better and more economically, and also in the American way, if the Federal Government will just please stay out of it entirely.

Sincerely yours.

Harper's Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an article appearing as a letter to the editor in the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. This letter from a Wilmot, S. Dak., farmer answers the article in Harper's magazine which caused quite a stir in agricultural circles not too long ago. The letter follows:

HARPER'S ANSWERED

To the EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

You are to be commended for publishing the article which appeared in Harper's magazine by John Fisher. This article should be brought to the attention of every farmer in South Dakota; and, of course, Harper's doesn't have a large circulation in rural areas. I am going to make an effort to see that every farmer in Roberts County at least has an opportunity to read this. The reaction of any hard-working farmer after reading this article would be in language that isn't printable. If Mr. Fisher ever comes to South Dakota and the farmers find out about it, there will be a vacancy on the editorial staff of Harper's magazine. This man is, I believe, one of the editors of Harper's. What he doesn't know about farming conditions in the Middle West would make an immense volume. His viewpoint is merely that of the average person from the East only his is so badly distorted it should be ignored.

I am going to quote from his article. He says: "The farmers are being subsidized to produce millions of tons of food which we don't need, can't possibly use, and can't even give away." Just what commodity, Mr. Fisher, has won all our major wars? If he had been in our midwestern territory during World Wars I and II he would have seen men and women who should have been retired trying to do all the farm work so that their sons could fight for democracy. Again I quote: "At least 1 million farm families should be nudged off the land and helped to find some useful occupation." Just where, Mr. Fisher, would you put them? Statistics prove that the average age of farmers who would be removed from the land is 50 years. Just where would they go? Join the unemployed in your already overcrowded cities? The small farmer is still a very important part of our American way of life.

In closing, we extend a cordial invitation to Mr. Fisher to come to South Dakota. Then, if and when he gets back East, he will have an entirely different point of view.

ALEC MCDONALD.

WILMOT, S. DAK.

City to City Food Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include the story of the Winston-Salem to Karachi CARE food crusade which was cosponsored by the Winston-Salem Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Winston-Salem Junior Woman's Club. I am indeed proud of my fellow citizens, and I am happy to publicly recognize and herald the accomplishment.

THE STORY OF THE WINSTON-SALEM TO KARACHI CARE FOOD CRUSADE COSPONSORED BY THE WINSTON-SALEM JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND THE WINSTON-SALEM JUNIOR WOMAN'S CLUB

THE CONCEPTION

The idea for the Winston-Salem to Karachi CARE food crusade was born at a meeting of the international relations committee of the Winston-Salem Junior Chamber of Commerce on August 7, 1955. It was inspired by having heard a spot announcement on the radio which said little more than CARE was sending United States Government surplus food (being stored at a cost to the taxpayer of a half million dollars a day) to countries in need of emergency food at a rate of 100 pounds for $1.

It seemed that this was a most worthy project which was going almost unnoticed by the American people. Previous personal experience with CARE inspired our complete confidence in this nonprofit organization, and we wished to call this program to the attention of our people with a money raising drive attended by some good publicity.

We decided we could best sell our campaign to our community by adopting some city overseas as the specific recipient of a gift from the city of Winston-Salem. We wrote immediately to CARE asking if they could arrange this city-to-city gift as sort of a special part of their food crusade.

Although gifts through CARE, under the food crusade, had not been retaining their identity, the CARE officials agreed that if a sufficient amount of money was raised, they would arrange for the Winston-Salem gift to retain its identity. They further assured our committee that they would supply Winston-Salem with publicity about its gift arriving in Karachi. This was to be the first such city-to-city campaign to take place in the United States.

CHOOSING THE CITY

We then asked CARE to name a city in the Orient most desperately in need of emergency food relief. It came as a surprise to us when the city of Karachi, Pakistan was named. We did not realize fully until later in what desperate status this city is, due to the combined effects of an increase in the population of the city from 350,000 in 1947 to 1,200,000 in 1955, and a series of droughts and floods in Pakistan which proved most disastrous to their food crop. The population increase of 850,000 in 8 years has largely been due to an influx of refugees from religious persecution from India, although a portion is also due to Karachi having been made the capital of Pakistan. The refugees are in a pathetic plight, living in city streets without even tents or beds, inadequately clothed, and having to live on a diet which allows on the average of 1 meal a day, or 1 meal every other day. This starvation diet, plus the floods carrying germs into neighboring villages, has caused a series of epidemics of tuberculosis, cholera, and dysentry in the city, which has killed many adults and children alike.

These factors, plus Pakistan's well-known loyalty to the United States, and firmly anti-Communist beliefs, made Karachi the one city really deserving of any help we could send her. We feel that a friend who has backed our country in all of its foreign endeavors to control communism, deserves our help when it needs us, rather than just when we need it.

EARLY PLANNING

We regret that the planning of the crusade was delayed several months by sickness in our clubs, by Winston-Salem's united fund drive which would not allow competition, and by conflicts of business matters of several key members of our committee.

At the end of November 1955, however, planning was again revived on a serious scale. A date for the drive was set for January 9, to February 6, 1956. An outline of events was prepared and a special crusade committee was set up to run the campaign. This committee consisted of a general chairman, and subchairmen in charge of publicity, solicitations, treasury, and a banquet which we planned for a date near the close of the crusade.

We felt sure that the only chance we stood of raising money was by soliciting from individuals. The businesses in the community had given all the money they intended to for the year to the united fund drive. Due to this drive which is based on the idea of having just one solicitation in the whole year for all of the local charities, a certain

hostility has built up in the community against all extra solicitations. To make our drive a success, we were going to have to contact and get our message across to every individual in the community.

The ideal way to accomplish this purpose would have been a door-to-door campaign, but in a city of 100,000 this would have been impossible for a club of 250 members. We therefore decided to concentrate on getting our message to groups in the community who themselves could help us in contacting the greatest number of individuals. We chose to work through the approximately 50 churches, 250 civic clubs, and the 25 parent-teachers associations in the community.

GETTING COSPONSOR

Since approximately half of our contacts were going to be to organization leaders who are women, we felt that we needed the support and help of one of the leading women's civic clubs. The Junior Woman's Club, which is the largest and hardest working of these clubs in Winston-Salem, was our choice. We therefore, offered them the position of cosponsoring the project.

At a meeting of the board of the Junior Woman's Club, their president presented a motion that they join with the junior chamber as cosponsors, and it was unanimously accepted. Henceforward, our two clubs acted as one on this project, and a cochairman from the Junior Woman's Club was added to the committee staff.

APPROVAL OF SOLICITATIONS COMMITTEE

The next step was to get the approval of our Winston-Salem public solicitations committee. This was applied for in December, but was not actually given until January 7, because of the fact that the board did not meet in December.

PUBLICITY

Plans for publicity were gotten underway at the end of December. Problems that had to be solved by our publicity committee were: Lack of knowledge on the part of most of our citizens of Karachi, Pakistan, and CARE and how it operates. A conference was held with each of the editors of our cities' two newspapers and plans were made for approximately 15 news stories of which 14 were printed.

During the campaign the chairman for the junior chamber was interviewed on television once and the chairman for the Junior Woman's Club was interviewed on radio once. A farm delegation from Pakistan which happened to be traveling through our territory was also interviewed on television. Spot announcements in support of the campaign were given on radio, television, and in the three city movie theaters at frequent intervals. Two maps, one of the world showing the relationship of Winston-Salem and Karachi to each other, and one of Pakistan was prepared by us for use on television.

Another method used to increase the interest of our city in Pakistan and Karachi was a program sponsored in our grade schools by the Junior Woman's Club. This was the studying of Pakistan in geography classes, and of making pictures during art periods of the life of American schoolchildren. Two hundred and fifty of these were sent with the money to CARE for distribution to schoolchildren in Karachi. Each picture bears the name and address of the Winston-Salem child who drew it, and it is hoped that children in Karachi will reply to them, and that many long-lasting friendships will be built up. The interest our children took in their studies of Pakistan and Karachi was very noticeable, and may, perhaps, have increased the interest of their parents.

SOLICITING

The job of soliciting was shared about equally between the junior chamber and the Junior Woman's Club. Methods used varied according to the type of organization being contacted.

At the beginning of the drive, a 3-page letter was sent to the presidents of each of the 250 civic clubs in Winson-Salem. A little over half of these were women's groups and, following the letters, were contacted personally by members of the Junior Woman's Club; the remainder by the junior chamber. The Junior Woman's Club, working through the Council of Church Women, also contacted approximately 175 women's church circles.

On January 9, 1956, members of the junior chamber spoke before a meeting of the Winston-Salem Association of Ministers. As a result, the association unanimously passed a resolution pledging the ministers to support the crusade, each according to the law and rules of his church. The solicitations committee worked with the ministers during the campaign, helping them with volunteer speakers and collectors to carry the crusade message to the congregations.

The Junior Woman's Club and the junior chamber jointly contacted, with speakers and collectors, all the parent-teacher associations in the city, and in all but a very few cases, their gifts were overwhelmingly generous.

The junior chamber also put out collection boxes and posters in the downtown business area. Of all the methods used to collect money, this proved to be the least successful.

DUTIES OF THE TREASURER

All the money collected was channeled through the office of the junior chamber where it was carefully counted and a list kept of the name of each donor. Every one of these donors received a letter of thanks at the end of the campaign.

The treasurer of the crusade collected the money from the junior chamber's office daily, rechecked the amount, and deposited it in a special account at a local bank. At the end of the drive, a cashier's check for the total amount of $3,138.15 was sent directly to CARE in New York City. At the rate of 100 pounds for $1 this amounted to 313,815 pounds. It seems to us most noteworthy, the small amount of money required to send enough food to feed a city for a considerable period of time.

BANQUET

As before indicated, it was decided early in the planning of the crusade to hold a banquet near the close of the campaign to highlight it, and, we hoped to celebrate its success. The Honorable Marshall C. Kurfees, mayor of Winston-Salem, proclaimed the week of January 22 to 28 as CARE Crusade for Karachi Week, and the date January 30 was selected for the banquet to close it out. The banquet was to be a regular membership meeting of both the junior chamber of commerce and the Junior Woman's Club, jointly; the first of its kind in the history of the two clubs.

We wanted to have a speaker for the dinner who could represent Pakistan and tell us a little of the Pakistani outlook. The first person who came to mind was His Excellency, Mr. Mohammed Ali, Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States. Mr. Ali had, until the fall of 1955, been the Premier of Pakistan, and had, following this, returned to the post of Ambassador to the United States which he had held before becoming Premier. The warmth and sincerity of his affection for the United States was well known, and we felt sure he would attend our dinner if he could.

On January 10, he sent a telegram of his acceptance, and shortly afterward wrote that he would be able to spend the whole day of January 30 in Winston-Salem. Plans were immediately made for his whole stay in our city. A leading citizen was chosen to act as official hostess representing our city, and a press interview, a television interview, and a complete tour of the city was arranged. Two breakfasts, a luncheon, as well as the evening banquet, were planned for him. In spite of his extremely busy schedule, he remained completely fresh and relaxed throughout the whole day.

SUBJECT OF ADDRESS

In his most vigorous address at the banquet, he expressed himself as warmly in favor of the strong stand against communism by our Government, and lashed out hard at those countries who, in trying to remain neutral in the life and death struggle between the "religion" of communism and the free and peaceful religions of the free world, were "committing an immoral act" by enjoying the benefits of the United States holding the Communists at bay, without actively supporting the United States policy.

He felt sure in his own mind that, if it were not for the United States great superiority in atomic weapons, Russia would have attacked the free world long ago. "God help the free world if this superiority is overcome," he said. He left little doubt in our minds that, as long as he had a place in his government, Pakistan would never fail to come immediately to the aid of the United States in any time of danger.

On the subject of religion he had a great deal to say. He devoted several minutes to explain the basic beliefs of his religion, the religion of Islam. When he was finished, we all felt that the Mohammedan and Christian religion had much in common and could well be happy to call each other brothers.

The strong belief of the people in Pakistan in the religion of Islam, he declared, would prevent them ever from turning to the false doctrines of communism as long as they were not driven out of their reasons by starvation. Only in countries where there has been a religious vacuum, he said, has communism made any headway. We note considerable truth in this statement.

On the subject of starvation, though, he had a grim word to say. The food situation in both East and West Pakistan is extremely bad, especially in the densely populated areas, due to the recent severe floods in both parts of his country. He confirmed what we had heard about hundreds of thousands of people having to live on an average of one meal every other day, and of epidemics, brought by floodwaters contaminating the water supply, and threatening the lives of the whole population.

He had the highest praise, however, for the way the United States has come to the aid of his country in these times of crises, and we were very touched by the warmth and sincerity of his thanks for our modest contribution.

We were genuinely sorry to have to say goodbye to him when he left on his early morning flight back to Washington to greet Sir Anthony Eden, a duty which he had delayed a day in order to make his visit to us.

CLOSING OUT THE CAMPAIGN

During the day of the banquet we had to announce to the community that we were being forced to extend the closing date of our drive from February 3, to February 15, 1956, because the job of making all our contacts was taking longer than we had expected. Many clubs simply did not hold meetings other than every 2 months or 6 weeks, and were not holding one at which they could collect donations until the second week in February. We found that it is impossible to wind up a drive of this nature in just 1 week.

On February 16, 1956, a cashier's check for $3,138.15, the total amount collected during the drive, was sent to CARE.

CONCLUSION

We are hoping that our Ambassador to Pakistan, the Honorable Horace A. Hildreth, will arrange on our behalf, a small ceremony with the mayor of Karachi, the Honorable Bagh Ali, presenting to him a letter telling of the sincerest best wishes of the people of Winston-Salem for his country's

and his city's future; the letter to be written by the Honorable Marshall C. Kurfees, mayor of Winston-Salem.

We further hope that newspapers in Karachi will carry our story, to their people so that they will know of our gift, and of our desire to be of help to them in this time of need. Our only regret is that our resources are so limited that we cannot help all of the most deserving people in both East and West Pakistan. It is our greatest wish that the people of this small, but gallant country, will understand our gesture and the great feeling of good will with which it was made. We hope that, in this day of a world growing increasingly smaller, that we have made friends among our new neighbors to the East.

We further hope that newspapers in our country will carry our story to other communities in our Nation and give them inspiration to follow our example. It is a type of campaign that is easily adopted to any community, and not at all too difficult for any civic minded group to carry out. This is really a great and noble project that our Government is helping CARE to conduct; it is worthy of the fullest support of every person in the United States. May this first city to city food crusade not be the last.

The Threat to Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal on last Thursday, February 23, under the caption "Review and Outlook," carried a sound and sensible article under the heading "The Threat to Civil Liberties."

The article was in answer to a letter printed on the same page from two officials of that radical outfit, The American Civil Liberties Union.

The Civil Liberties Union letter was a continuation of an attack upon the Senate Eastland committee, in keeping with the usual and customary practice of the Civil Liberties Union in defending supporters of communism and attacking opponents of communism.

I insert herewith the article under Review and Outlook, and immediately following it the letter which occasioned the article:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE THREAT TO CIVIL LIBERTIES

On this page today is a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union and its New York affiliate which says that this newspaper is "not sufficiently alert to the threat to civil liberties" when Senators question newspapermen about past and present Communist affiliations.

Mr. Malin and Mr. Rundquist agree with us that it would be bad if Communists on American newspapers ever reached the point, either through numbers or power, of control over the presentation of news. But they think that until there is some evidence that the content of newspapers is a danger, Congress has no right to investigate individual newspapermen and newspapers.

The ACLU officials take comfort for their views from the Federal court of appeals rule in the Watkins case. In a 2 to 1 decision on January 26 the court overruled the conviction for contempt of Congress of John T. Watkins, a labor leader, who refused in 1954 to identify Communists in the union he headed. The court said the committee which cited Mr. Watkins was not pursuing a "valid legislative purpose" in its questions.

Frankly, we don't know what the court means when it says there was no valid legislative purpose in such questions, unless it means that every time a committee of Congress holds a hearing Congress ought to pass a law. But that is not the only purpose of the power of Congress to investigate in pursuit of legislation. Sometimes hearings serve the purpose of showing that no new laws are needed.

In any event, the 2–1 ruling last month of the court of appeals is not the last word on the subject. The court Monday set aside the earlier three-judge decision and the Watkins' case will be reheard by all eight members of the court. They—or the Supreme Court—may, well reason that Congress has a right to ask responsible questions and that, unless the witness invokes the fifth amendment's protection against self-incrimination, the Congress has the right to require an answer.

We do not see how it can be otherwise. The Supreme Court has held that communism represents a "clear and present danger." The rule upheld legislation by Congress which resulted from evidence gathered in hearings by questions asked by Congressmen. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was created to look into dangers to the Nation's security from subversive forces, such as communism.

Is the Senate—or the House—to look only in certain places and not in others for Communist intrigue? Should newspapermen enjoy some special privilege which exempts them from questioning about communism? If the answer to those questions is an unqualified "Yes," would not the result be to create sanctuaries for communism?

And if the answer is, as the ACLU suggests, that Congress should question no newspaperman about communism until there is some evidence that the content of newspapers is a danger, isn't that like saying than a man should not put a lock on the house until there is evidence that he has been robbed?

We certainly don't agree with that. And apparently neither do the newspapers whose employees refused to answer questions put to them by the Senate subcommittee. Those newspapers fired the men.

It is true that the first amendment forbids Congress to make laws affecting freedom of the press or of speech. But the Senators are not attacking press freedom when they subpena newspapermen to testify about communism. What they are after is to ascertain the extent of the Communist plot whether in government, or in the schools, or in the newspapers.

The letter from Mr. Malin and Mr. Rundquiest mentions the need for an informed citizenry. Exactly. We think the more the public knows about who the Communists are, where they are, and what they are doing, the more likely the public is to understand the nature of the Communist design.

If we are not sufficiently alert to suit the ACLU, it is because we do not believe any threat to civil liberties exists in asking newspapermen or anybody else to testify about communism.

But we are alert to communism, and communism represents the greatest threat to civil liberties that exists anywhere the ACLU cares to look.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—PLAGUE OF CONFORMITY

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

While your paper is generally a stalwart defender of civil liberties, we believe that your editorial of January 9 criticizing the position taken by the American Civil Liberties Union and its New York affiliate on the Eastland committee newspaper investigation is not sufficiently alert to the threat to civil liberties in such investigations.

We agree with your argument that it would be dangerous for this country if Communists on newspapers pressured some great question of national import into channels of their own design. But, as you point out, we are far from any such danger. Our argument is that unless there is some evidence that the content of the newspapers is a danger, a legislative committee should not investigate individual newspapermen and newspapers. It cannot investigate merely for the sake of exposing individuals or papers: The Constitution does not give the legislature any such power—as a United States court of appeals has just made crystal clear in the Watkins case.

By questioning newspapermen about their associations when there was no evidence of danger from their newspaper work, the Eastland committee acted as though the work record of these men was unimportant, and as though writings should be accepted as good or bad depending on who wrote them. This approach is largely responsible for the conformity that has plagued our country today in this period of security tension. It is a pressure toward a blind acceptance or rejection of ideas depending on whether they are uttered by an approved authority, and it discourages consideration of ideas on their merits and a free and fearless debate of various points of view. And by creating the suspicion that our newspapers are Communist-slanted, the Eastland committee is also discouraging our citizenry from informing itself and keeping alert to the issues of the day.

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Executive Director.
GEORGE E. RUNDQUIST,
Executive Director, New York Civil Liberties Union.
NEW YORK CITY.

Application of Federal Tax Laws in the Possessions of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to cite a study prepared for me by the Library of Congress on the application of our Federal tax laws in the possessions of the United States. I think it will be of interest to the House.

The study follows:

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL TAX LAWS IN THE POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

There is some variation in the application of Federal internal revenue laws in the Territories and possessions of the United States. The tax relationships between this country and some of its more important possessions are briefly described below:

PUERTO RICO

In general, the internal revenue laws of the United States do not apply in Puerto Rico. This principle was originally set forth in the Foraker Act (the Organic Act of 1900) [1] and the Organic Act of 1917.[2] The

Footnotes at end of speech.

law today provides that Puerto Ricans are exempt from Federal income taxes. The only exception to this rule is that income received from the United States, such as that received as an employee of the Federal Government, is subject to Federal taxation.[3] Puerto Rican products shipped to the mainland of the United States are taxed in the same way as products of domestic manufacture, but the revenue derived from this source is turned over to the treasury of Puerto Rico.[4]

VIRGIN ISLANDS

The income tax laws in force in the United States apply also to citizens of the Virgin Islands. The proceeds from such taxes, however, are paid into the treasury of the Virgin Islands.[5] As in Puerto Rico, articles shipped to the United States are subject to taxation, but these receipts are also turned over to the government of the Virgin Islands.[6] Other taxes levied in the islands by the United States Government, such as quarantine, naturalization, immigration, and passport fees, are also reserved for the local treasury.[7]

GUAM

Under the provisions of the Organic Act of Guam enacted in 1950, residents of Guam are subject to Federal income taxes.[8] Again, the revenues from income taxes, customs duties levied on articles shipped to the United States and from quarantine, passport, immigration, and naturalization fees are returned to the treasury of Guam.[9]

HAWAII AND ALASKA

The Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are treated somewhat differently with respect to Federal taxation. They are subject to the same internal revenue laws as are any of the 48 States.[10] Unlike Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, the amount collected under these laws is not returned to the Territorial treasuries, but is paid directly into the Federal Treasury. In the fiscal year 1945, the Federal Government received $44,537,000 from Alaska and $126,340,000 from Hawaii in internal-revenue collections.

The principle of "no taxation without representation" has been advanced by some as the reason for the practice of returning taxes collected to the local treasuries of Puero Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. This principle, however, does not fully explain the tax advantage enjoyed by these three possessions over Alaska and Hawaii. It is true that Alaska and Hawaii do enjoy greater representation than the Virgin Islands and Guam in that they are represented in the United States Congress by a Delegate. Puerto Rico, however, which pays no Federal taxes, is also represented in Congress by a Resident Commissioner. While these three representatives may introduce bills and participate in committee and House debates, they do not exercise any vote, either in the committees or on the House floor.

It should be pointed out that the Federal Government does return a portion of Federal taxes received to Alaska and Hawaii in the form of various grants-in-aid. However, while Guam receives no grants-in-aid and the Virgin Islands receive a very small amount, Puerto Rico receives more than all of the Territories and possessions combined. This is borne out by the following statistics for the fiscal year 1954:[11]

Grants-in-aid received

Puerto Rico	$55,018,868
Hawaii	29,038,862
Alaska	11,232,846
Virgin Islands	793,061

A more significant reason for the more favorable tax treatment accorded Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam is that returning these revenues represents an effort to improve the general economic well-being of these possessions. While recent economic data are relatively scarce, some idea of their comparative economic condition may be given from the following statistics on median income of persons receiving income reported by the Bureau of the Census for 1950:

Median income

Alaska	$2,072
Hawaii	2,728
Puerto Rico	378
Virgin Islands (St. John Island only)	579
Guam	(1)

[1] Not reported.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[3] Act of Apr. 12, 1900 (31 Stat. 78, ch. 191, sec. 4).
[4] Act of Mar. 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 954, ch. 145, sec. 9).
[5] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (sec. 933 (1)).
[6] Ibid. (sec. 7652 (1) and (3)).
[7] 48 U. S. C. 1397.
[8] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (sec. 7652 (b) (1) and (3)).
[9] 48 U. S. C. 1398.
[10] 48 U. S. C. 1421 i.
[11] 48 U. S. S. 1421 h.
[12] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (sec. 7701 (9)).
[13] U. S. Treasury Department Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, 1954. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955, p. 702.

Junior Good Will Dinner Sponsored by Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1956, there was conducted in Boston the junior good will dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. This committee, of which I am proud to be a member, includes outstanding citizens of Greater Boston and of Massachusetts, of all creeds, color, and of all racial origins. The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews was organized in October 1936 for the purpose of bringing a greater understanding among our people, for it must always be remembered that we are a people and not a race.

The dinner held on February 1 was the fifth annual junior good will dinner sponsored by the above committee, and on the occasion of this year's dinner, it was in cooperation with the Boston Red Sox and Hon. John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston.

I am very proud to be a member of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and to be associated with the fine public-spirited gentlemen who are members of the committee.

It is very interesting to note that the junior good will dinner is different from anything held anywhere in the country due to the fact that it was conceived 5 years ago by Hon. Michael T. Kelleher, vice chairman of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, whose one thought was that in bringing boys together from all the public and parochial high schools of Boston, and have them sit with the leaders of our community, it would be a great contribution in obtaining the confidence of these young men and to help them develop an understanding of what is expected of them as future good citizens, and to enable them to realize that they should be ready to assume leadership in the community. In addition, that such dinners would contribute greatly to breaking down juvenile delinquency.

This program—the junior good will dinner—might well be carried out in other cities and communities throughout the country. During the 5 years' existence of these dinners they have done a great deal of good in Greater Boston. It is a known fact that not one of the boys who have attended these dinners—at least 600 during the past several years—has ever been involved in any matter which could be classified as delinquency.

In conducting these dinners the committee has had the cooperation of the mayor of Boston, Hon. John B. Hynes, also the support and cooperation of the archdiocesan superintendent of schools in the archdiocese of Boston, also the superintendent of the public school system of Boston. From its very inception Rt. Rev. Msgr. Timothy F. O'Leary archdiocesan superintendent of parochial schools, has made the selection of young men from the parochial schools who will attend the dinner, and Mr. D. Leo Daley, assistant superintendent of the public schools of Boston, the selection of the boys from the public high schools.

There is a real human relation story involved in these dinners that I am sure will be of interest to others throughout the country.

I might also say that the leading figure in the success of the Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—a great American organization—and of the junior good will dinners conducted by this committee, is the secretary, Mr. Ben G. Shapiro who, throughout the years, has given untiringly of his efforts to bring about a better understanding among the people of Greater Boston and of Massachusetts.

It is also an important fact that the committee is a separate and independent one, without any paid workers of any kind whatsoever, and that all of this work is done voluntarily. It is also interesting to note that this Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants, and Jews is thoroughly appreciated by the people of Greater Boston and of Massachusetts, and that the great work of understanding among our people that they have done and are doing is thoroughly appreciated.

On the occasion of the junior good will dinner on February 1, 1956, four young men from parochial high schools and public high schools, made addresses:

First. Ronald Janey, who is a member and president of the senior class of

Brighton High School, of the Brighton section of Boston, Mass.

Second. John M. Regan, a senior at the Mission High School of the Roxbury section of Boston, Mass.

Third. Kenneth W. McAuley, IV Z–31, Boston Technical High School, Boston, Mass.

Fourth. Felix E. Smith, of the Roxbury Memorial High School—boys of the Roxbury section of Boston, Mass.

I include, with pleasure, in my extension, the well-prepared remarks made by these four young men at the junior good will dinner.

I also include, in my extension, an article written by Paul Ganley, which appeared in the Boston Traveler of January 31, 1956.

If the extension of these remarks arouse the interest of persons in other sections of the country who may desire information for the purpose of determining whether or not such dinners should be conducted in their communities, I suggest that they communicate with Mr. Ben G. Shapiro, 286 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.

TALK GIVEN BY RONALD JANEY, MEMBER OF THE SENIOR CLASS, BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL, AT THE GOOD WILL DINNER ON FEBRUARY 1, 1956

After 3 years of competition in the various high school sports I have at last become aware of the underlying significance of any athletic contest. From my participation, I have learned many things.

First, I now realize the importance of conforming to the rules. Imagine, for instance, a football game being played without benefit of coaching, or carefully thought out rules. Suppose there were no restrictions as to tackling, ruffing the kicker, pushing or punching an opponent. Why, it is almost impossible to describe the chaos that would result. A field of play would become a field of combat, and the players almost like Roman gladiators, fighting to the death. Almost any other game I could mention—baseball, basketball, hockey or soccer—would produce the very same result, if they were not played in accordance with the rules.

Second, I have come to appreciate the full value of concerted effort. After a football player has scored a touchdown, the jubilant cheers and admiration of excited spectators bring to him an almost indescribable feeling of joy and well being. It is the wise and humble fellow who, hearing them, realizes it was the quarterback who called the scoring play, the center and guards who opened a huge gap in the line, the tackles and ends who threw key blocks, and that every act in itself was a part of that touchdown.

Without his interference, Clarence Peaks could not have made his many spectacular runs for Michigan State in the Rose Bowl game this year. Howard Cassady from Ohio State could not be the outstanding player he is had he not had the help of the other players.

Third, I now realize the qualities needed in a true sportsman. To a true sportsman the race, creed or color of an adversary is unimportant. He respects the ability of his opponent in itself, for there is no correlation between the religion a man upholds and his athletic achievement.

These three lessons, brought out and intensified my participation in sports, will serve me well throughout life. If I abide by the discipline, the team spirit, the tolerance, which characterize a game in the sports world, I shall do my part in making this a better world for all.

May God and good will serve as a beacon, and continue to guide the thoughts of the leaders of our Nation, the youth of our Nation, and every American citizen.

TALK BY JOHN M. REGAN, SENIOR AT MISSION HIGH SCHOOL, ROXBURY, AT JUNIOR GOOD WILL DINNER OF MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, FEBRUARY 1, 1956

Glancing around me tonight, I see a group of men gathered in an atmosphere of universal friendship, each with his individual religious beliefs. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, each separated by the singular dictates of his own conviction but strongly united by mutual understanding and mutual respect. This application of charity, the universal love of one's fellowman, has long been the espoused cause of religious leaders. It is the cause championed by every God-fearing man. Our very presence in this building tonight is living proof that America, your country and mine, has taken into her heart and fully realized the importance of the commands of God.

We all recognize these 10 precepts of the Almighty. We each attend our own place of worship, there to give honor to the Father of all men. And we realize, full well, our relationship with our fellowmen, referring to that unity as the brotherhood of man, the activation of fraternal charity.

The United States has come a long way on the obstacle-marked road that leads to universal harmony and understanding. Seldom do men enter public life in trepidation, fearing that they will be slandered because of their religious convictions. Gone are the days when many Americans, by their deeds, gave lie to the basic principles of humanity. The professions have opened to freely admit members of all creeds and religion now is to be held in high esteem by the vast multitude of American citizens.

Today our Government with its variety of men possessing different beliefs is truly the Government of the people. Each official by his practice of a religion, proves that the rebirth of spiritual fervor in our country is not momentary. And with our increased interests in things supernatural comes the thought that all of us are children of God, brothers equal to one another.

But brotherhood is not new in America. Every religion had its distinguished representatives fighting for freedom during the Revolution. Both our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States recognize the equality of man under God.

America has always realized the importance of minorities, whether they be religious or political. Before the entire world, our deeds aimed at freeing men from the bonds of bigotry have proven the sincerity of our motivations. Yes, the United States has thrown open before the eyes of the world each separate portal of prejudice.

Not in America do the inhuman tactics of a dictator give constant lie to his beguiling words. God knows that our Government has done its utmost to help the individual.

Our Nation is free and strong, mainly because of its belief that all men are created equal. Let us consider our country and ourselves well tonight, for such is the time and place for thought. Look about you. See your fellow Americans, each of varying beliefs, yet all united in the same thought, the tenet that brings us here together, man's universal brotherhood.

Because of this belief, that famed Nation "under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all shall not perish from the earth."

TALK BY KENNETH W. MCAULEY, IV Z–31, BOSTON TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL, AT THE JUNIOR GOOD WILL DINNER, FEBRUARY 1, 1956, AT FENWAY PARK, MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE, CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS

Thank you, sir.

Reverend Clergy, Your Honor, distinguished guests, and brethren, first, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the committee for inviting us to its fifth annual junior good will dinner, and to tell you, if I can, just what it means to me to be here with you tonight—

1. It is a boy's dream of pitching a no-hitter.

2. It is a boy's dream of collecting the reward.

3. It is a boy's dream of brotherhood.

And it is for me truly the thrill that comes once in a lifetime.

I was fortunate to have been born and raised in a so-called melting-pot section. I attend one of the largest central high schools in the East. I go to church, I have a job, and I belong to a club. I play ball—foot, basket, and base. I know all colors, all races, and all creeds as my neighbors and as my friends. We boys in the West End have played together, worked together, gone to school together; we have fought; we have forgiven. Sometimes we have won and sometimes we have lost; but the important thing, gentlemen, is that what we have done we have done together.

I remember that once I was prejudiced. It was a common prejudice. I don't know where it sprang from, but somehow or other I found myself growing up with a hatred—a real, genuine dislike. I did not like spinach. I never tasted it, but, as young as I was, I knew that no self-respecting 9-year-old would have anything to do with the despised leaf. The spinach growers of America found themselves with quite a problem. To solve it, they didn't force it upon us, they didn't change the color, they didn't put it in a pretty package, and they didn't call it by any other name. No; they invented "Popeye."

As I have grown older and a little wiser, I hope I have come to realize that the planned effort of your committee to bring the boys and men of our community together in comradeship and good will at these annual dinners is having its desired effect in the youth of Boston. After sitting down to a good meal—after shaking hands with Joe Cronin—what boy would not stand up for the idea of brotherhood?

Someday I hope to become an aeronautical engineer. I know that I shall have to depend on the cooperation and good will of my fellow man in order to achieve my station in life. As a student of science, I have learned that Galileo, a Catholic, introduced the laws of falling bodies; that Newton, a Protestant, discovered the laws of mechanics; and that Hertz, a Jew, discovered the laws that govern radio waves. The people today who use the information of these three gentlemen are those on all four corners of the earth. I know that life today depends on the good will and cooperation of every man. I know that we are challenged to live together and to team together. Gentlemen, you have given us the ball. You have shown us the goal. We will not let you down.

SPEECH OF FELIX E. SMITH OF THE ROXBURY MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL (BOYS) AT THE JUNIOR GOOD WILL DINNER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, FEBRUARY 1, 1956

Recently, I heard a story that filled me with high inspiration. It was told by a guest speaker to a group of people all of whom must have been awakened to the most cher-

ished principle of our democracy. I remember distinctly that the tears welled in the eyes of the speaker as he related the effects of the tragic events of World War II. He told us that he was torn from the roots of his homeland, and driven to many strange European cities; that he witnessed the unmerciful killings of many of his relatives; and, finally, of the answer to his earnest prayers when from the deck of a ship he saw in the distance the torch in the hand of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. The stirring effects of his magnificent speech were not fully realized until he uttered his final phrase. "My most precious possession in this world is my citizenship in the United States of America."

Fellow Americans, I wonder how many of us who have been fortunate to have escaped such tragedy in life by our birth in these United States appreciate fully this precious privilege of citizenship. Each of us may ask himself, "What do I mean when I refer to this word citizenship?" To me citizenship can be conceived in similarity to the largest and deepest ocean, for it embraces all facets of our way of life. It doesn't mean merely that we assume the responsibility of voting. It means that we pledge allegiance to our Government; that we belong, and thus make every effort to govern our lives in a democratic spirit. It is a patriotic feeling, a feeling that suggests the grandeur of our democracy. As every worthy ideal needs cultivating, so too does citizenship. How can this be done? I believe, first of all, by acquiring an infinite knowledge of the history of our country, especially striving to gain an interpretation of the Constitution of the United States with respect to its basic fundamentals, that of the sacred rights of the individual, and the benefits which the Constitution guarantees us. Secondly, we should become aware of an appreciation of these benefits. Among these not only our privileges, but our responsibilities. To me it means specifically that we may fully understand the privileges of the ballot; its great power for good, and its great power for evil, which power if neglected can place our country in jeopardy. Underlying this realization we should carry with us the feeling of our Founding Fathers a little over 179 years ago when 56 of them pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to preserve the cause of liberty.

Therefore, in our role of good citizens we should instill in our minds that the United States of America is a land for every race, creed, and nationality, a land under the Stars and Stripes, a symbol established by blood and preserved for peace in this land of liberty. It is one Nation indivisible, under God, a land where the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish.

[From the Boston Traveler of January 31, 1956]

HAND OF BROTHERHOOD—YOUNG, OLD TO GATHER TOMORROW IN FIFTH ANNUAL GOOD WILL DINNER

(By Paul Ganley)

Some of the city's most successful men will break bread with 150 Greater Boston high-school boys tomorrow.

The occasion will be the fifth annual junior good will dinner at Fenway Park sponsored by the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

Boys from all walks of life will chat with men in the top echelons of Boston's civic, business, and professional ranks in an atmosphere of brotherhood and neighborliness.

A special treat for the boys will be the presentation of a citation to Tom Yawkey, Red Sox owner, for his personal example of sportsmanship, democracy, and fair play.

No boy who has attended these banquets has ever run afoul of the law. This phenomenal record stems from an idea born in 1933.

At that time Ben G. Shapiro, of Brookline, now secretary of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews entertain a group of Universalists.

In the course of events Shapiro told a friend, "Men get to know each other better as individuals when they sit down and break bread together."

He enthusiastically worked to further the idea and, later, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews was formed.

ALL WORKERS VOLUNTEERS

The group of dedicated men worked to create a spirit of neighborliness and among men. All the workers are volunteers. None are paid for their services.

In 1936 the group held its first annual dinner honoring persons who set an example of brotherhood in community work.

The first citations went to the late Cardinal O'Connell, Rabbi Harry Levi, and Myron C. Taylor, who served as special Ambassador to the Vatican under President Roosevelt.

Last year's honors went to Jack Benny, Maryland's Governor, Theodore R. McKeldin, and Gen. Walter Bedell Smith.

The committee has also raised funds from members for a variety of worthy projects. Educational institutions have received thousands of dollars for the development of understanding and brotherhood.

DINNER SET 5 YEARS AGO

Then, 5 years ago, Michael T. Kelleher, former fire commissioner, and Joe Cronin developed the idea of holding an annual informal dinner at which boys would meet top-flight men. Thus the junior good will dinner was started.

Kelleher won't be at the dinner this year since he is on a world tour for the National Catholic Welfare Association and the United Defense Fund.

At the dinner, four Greater Boston high-school students will speak on what good citizenship means to them.

They will be John M. Regan, of Mission High School, Roxbury; Ronald Janey, of Brighton High School; Kenneth W. MacAuley, of Boston Technical High School; and Felix E. Smith, of Roxbury Memorial High School.

ONE HUNDRED DOLLAR AWARD FOR ESSAY

The committee will later award a $100 bond in honor of the late Harry Agganis to the student who writes the best essay on good citizenship after attending the banquet.

The boys will be especially thrilled by the dinner in the Red Sox press headquarters in the light of Joe Cronin's recent election to the Baseball Hall of Fame, says Ben Shapiro.

D. Leo Daley, assistant superintendent of Boston schools, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Timothy F. O'Leary, diocesan superintendent of parochial schools, head a committee selecting the boys to be guests at the dinner.

CIVIC HEADS TO ATTEND

John I. Ahern will serve as master of ceremonies. The committee on arrangements includes: Ahern, Sidney R. Rabb, Thomas A. Pappas, H. D. Hodgkinson, Ben G. Shapiro, Ralph M. Eastman, and Joseph McKenney.

Outstanding civic, business, and community leaders who are members of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews will act as hosts to the students.

They will include Registrar of Motor Vehicles Rudolph King, Sidney Rabb, H. D. Hodgkinson, Thomas A. Pappas, John I. Ahern, Joseph Kaplan, Paul T. Rothwell, Harry J. Blake, Walter F. Downey, and Thomas Dignan.

Also Joseph M. Linsey, John A. Volpe, Attorney Garrett H. Byrne, Walter A. Brown, Ralph Lowell, Edward W. Brooke, M. H. O'Connell, D. Leo Daley, Rt. Rev. Timothy O'Leary, and George Wiswell.

Other Nations Hold Claims on More Than Half of the Gold at Fort Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the U. S. News & World Report in an article in the February 24 issue, emphasizes the fact that the gold supplies of this country are growing dangerously short. This article points up these facts:

Three years ago United States gold reserve totaled $23.3 billion.

Now United States gold reserve is down to $21.8 billion.

Other nations hold claims against United States gold totaling $13.8 billion.

So, in an emergency, there is left available for United States needs, a gold reserve of $8.0 billion.

To back our currency and bank deposits, the United States needs a gold reserve of $12.0 billion.

In other words, we are $4.0 billion short now and the United States could get into a tight gold-supply position if foreign countries would decide to withdraw the gold reserves on which they hold claims.

The article further emphasizes how the United States speeds flow of gold to Europe. Last year Europe earned $5.6 billion from sales to the United States. Additionally, Europe was given $1.1 billion in United States aid and private gifts; therefore the total dollar income from the United States to Europe was $6.7 billion. Europe spent $5.6 billion in dollars for United States goods and services. This left a balance of dollars redeemable in United States gold of $1.1 billion. Thus, the $1.1 billion of United States aid in 1955 was not needed to cover Europe's dollar expenditures. So it increased the claim that Europe can make against the United States gold supply. The full text of the article is as follows:

WHO OWNS THE GOLD AT FORT KNOX?—OTHER NATIONS HOLD CLAIMS FOR $13.8 BILLION

The United States, which is used to thinking of itself as having an abundance of gold, now finds that, in an emergency, it could be caught short.

Foreigners actually could drain away more than half the gold in Government hands, including the huge hoard at Fort Knox, Ky.

That would mean less gold backing for the paper money people use.

Such a heavy drain is not likely to develop under present conditions, officials say. Here is the situation that makes it possible, however, if conditions in the world should change for the worse.

GOLD IN HOCK

The United States now holds $21.8 billion worth of gold, far more than any other country. The pile seems big enough to inspire confidence.

On closer study, however, it appears that $13.8 billion of the gold is in hock. Foreign governments and firms have that much in business claims and United States dollars which they can exchange for gold at any time. These claims on United States gold are officially known as short-term liabilities of the United States.

That leaves $8 billion of United States gold, free of all claims.

However, the law requires $12 billion of gold backing for United States money, figured on the basis of $25 gold for every $100 of currency in the form of Federal Reserve notes and deposits in Federal Reserve banks.

Thus, if foreigners were to claim all the gold they are entitled to, the United States would be short of meeting the legal requirement by $4 billion.

There are amounts owed to United States business by other countries, but these total only 1.4 billions. There is no assurance they would be used to reduce the gold loss.

WHEN UNITED STATES WAS RICHER

A few years ago, there was not even a remote danger of an emergency. The United States emerged from World War II with enough gold to take care of the foreign claims, and to provide backing for United States money, with 2 billions of gold to spare.

In foreign circles there was a suggestion that the United States should divide some of it up among its allies.

Britain's foreign secretary, Ernest Bevin, said the United States should redistribute some of the gold in Fort Knox.

The Bevin proposal was rejected by the United States Treasury as preposterous. Now, it is becoming clear that a sharing of gold was in the making even then, through the means of foreign aid.

That was not apparent in the first few years of the aid programs, however. United States supply of gold reached a peak of 24.6 billions in 1949. Thereafter it shrank to less than 22 billions.

Meanwhile, foreign holdings of dollars and other short-term claims against the United States have grown rapidly.

WHY GOLD GOES ABROAD

Ordinarily such a flow of gold and dollars would mean that the United States was unable to sell enough in world markets to pay for goods and services obtained there. This, of course, is not the case. The United States consistently sells more than it buys.

The explanation for the flow of gold and dollars lies in foreign aid, as the chart on page 31 indicates.

In 1955 Western Europe made just about enough in its trade with the United States to pay its own way. In addition, the Europeans got more than 800 millions in help from the United States Government and nearly 300 millions in gifts from generous Americans.

Eventually most of those dollars wound up in European bank accounts as possible claims on United States gold.

Officials point out that most of the Government grants to Europe are for military equipment and supplies. In many cases weapons are bought by the United States in one country and given to another for its armed forces. The country making the weapons gets the dollars.

WELL-HEELED NATIONS

Thanks to such transactions, on top of booming trade, many West European treasuries today are in good shape. That is the chief reason why some Congressmen are questioning the need for continuing to give aid to Europe.

However, officials point out that all foreign countries have not been equally fortunate in building holdings of United States dollars or gold.

For instance, Britain and Denmark have been losing some of these reserves during the past year. Cutting off aid would hurt them, as well as the big gainers.

Among the countries that have large credits that could be changed into United States gold are Western Germany with more than 1.4 billion, France and Canada with more than a billion each, Japan with nearly a billion, and Switzerland and Italy with more than three-fourths of a billion each.

Britain's holdings of gold and dollars are given officially as 2.1 billions. However, a large part of this is in gold already. Only 645 millions is listed publicly as dollar claims.

HOW UPSET COULD COME

The feeling in official circles is that these foreign countries will not demand any large amount of United States gold under present conditions. But foreign interest in gold could be aroused in several ways.

A strong suspicion that the United States planned to increase the price of gold above the present $35 per ounce could cause a rush to exchange paper money for hard metal. The United States, after maintaining very nearly the same price of gold for nearly 140 years, from the time of President Washington, raised the price in 1934. It had been $20.67.

Since World War II there has been growing pressure, especially from mining interests at home and abroad, for another increase. Mining costs have gone up. Other prices have gone up. "Why not gold?" the miners ask.

Such a move would mean big profits for those who can turn dollars in for gold at the old price and resell it at the new price. United States citizens couldn't profit this way, because they are not allowed to exchange dollars for gold, but foreign countries could.

The United States has insisted firmly that it will not raise the price. At times, some doubt arises in foriegn circles and some dollars are exchanged for gold. But the trend never gets far, because of confidence in the United States position.

That confidence would weaken, however, if business went into a bad depression. Then foreigners would remember the way the United States raised the price of gold to cope with its last big depression.

A slump abroad also could touch off demand for United States gold. If prices stayed high in the United States and went down in other countries, it would be advantageous for foreigners to buy less here and more in other markets. Fewer dollars would be needed, and dollars would be cashed in for gold.

WHAT TO DO

Despite its optimism, the Government is considering what steps to take if the drain on gold approaches a danger point. Officials recall that a flow of gold out of United States in 1931–32 hampered efforts to overcome the depression.

Things that can be done are few and difficult. Aid could be cut off to keep foreigners from getting more claims on United States gold. Reductions could be made in the supply of money and the Federal Reserve deposits.

In a pinch, the United States could even raise the price of gold, despite its denials. Then each ounce of gold in Fort Knox would be legal backing for more dollars, in line with the 25-percent requirment. Or Congress could be asked to wipe out that rule.

So far, the official decision is to study the situation but do nothing that might arouse concern abroad. Meanwhile, the United States finds huge resources of gold and dollars piling up in foreign hands, while the United States gold reserve is weakened.

The Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recently written article by David Lawrence, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Lawrence emphasizes the responsibility of the United Nations to find a workable solution to the present Middle East enigma, a solution short of an all-out arms race which could only lead to disaster for Israel and the Arab States and which would surely precipitate and hasten a third world war. Mr. Lawrence also succinctly points out the danger to our own country, if this controversial issue is allowed to be injected into the presidential and congressional races to be used as a political football in an effort to gain votes from one side or the other. The article follows:

ONLY THE U. N. CAN HELP IN THE MIDEAST CRISIS

Time was when, if any events occurred which threatened the peace of the world, there would be a special meeting of the United Nations Assembly and a general discussion of the pros and cons of the problem.

This is what is called moral force—a mobilization of world opinion.

But today there is little inclination to call the United Nations assembly into session to take up the acute situation in the Middle East.

Maybe it's because the United Nations itself, through its "package deals" and its logrolling tactics, is afraid to tackle a factional controversy within its own ranks. Ever since the U. N. Security Council adopted a resolution of censure of Israel—a move that was interpreted in that country as partisan and as hostile to its interests—there has been difficulty in getting the U. N. itself to take a broad perspective on the whole Middle East problem.

It is true the U. N. had a commission on the spot and that it reported on the border raids. But it was a mistake to leave the matter to a military commission instead of one especially chosen to look into all phases. Instead of a resolution of censure of any other action on the border raids, the U. N. Assembly might well have used the occasion to call a halt to the use of force or the threat to use force on the part of any of the countries involved in the Middle East friction.

Until the U. N. steps in and demands that all the nations in the Middle East suspend their arms race, the situation may go from bad to worse. It is most unfortunate that the United States should be placed in the position of being required to take unilateral action. Whether Saudi Arabia gets tanks or Israel gets arms is not a matter for the Washington Government alone but for all the nations of the free world to consider.

Actually, the present crisis was provoked by the Soviet Union, which entered into negotiations to supply Egypt with arms. This, in turn, stirred the apprehension of the people of Israel. A chain reaction has been started which has aroused, too, the countries of the Arab world. All this is to the advantage of the Communists, who are fishing in troubled waters.

The solution lies in the charter of the United Nations, which is empowered to take up any dispute that threatens the peace of the world. Certainly, since the Soviet Union has been guilty of starting an arms race in the Middle East, a resolution of censure for this is long overdue.

The question is broader than any single country's interests. The United States Government wants to remain friendly with Israel and to furnish economic aid. But, at the same time, Saudi Arabia has made available a military base for the use of the American air forces. All this is well known to Moscow, which plays one side against the other.

The United States moreover, is in the midst of a presidential and congressional campaign, and the Middle East issue gets into American politics no matter how hard people in this country may strive to keep it out. For some of the candidates are bound to issue statements seeking to benefit by the vote of one group or the other of sympathizers with the factions in the Middle East controversy.

But when all the governments take up a question in the United Nations and debate it in the open, this can override any domestic attitudes or political quarrels as world opinion begins to mobilize.

There can be no peace in the Middle East unless the free world is united and examines the controversy as the United Nations, by its charter, is specifically obligated to do.

Collective action is always to be preferred to unilateral action, and the U. N. has a chance to recover lost ground by calling a special meeting to devise ways and means of ending the arms race in the Middle East. By exposing fully the causes of the friction in that part of the globe and by placing all the facts on the table, a way can then be found to introduce mediation and moral suasion—for neither side really wants a war.

The McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following analysis of the McCarran-Walter Act, which appeared in the December 1955 issue of the Foreign Service Journal. The author, Mr. Fred M. Wren, spent 22 years in the Immigration Service before he was appointed visa officer at Halifax in 1946. Since then he has served in Montreal and Zurich. In 1948, 1949, and 1950 he had several details in the Visa Office in Washington, helping to write the visa regulations, and assisting in the preparation of a visa manual and a visa handbook for the use of visa officers in the field.

The article follows:

On June 27, 1952, a well-known bill became law when the Congress passed Public Law 414 over the veto of President Truman. Although the first sentence of the new legislation contained permissive authority to call it the Immigration and Nationality Act, it is only within the past few months that this title has begun to have much meaning to Americans outside the legal profession. Like many other pieces of highly publicized legislation, the law derived its first popular name from the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees which sponsored its passage, and it was thus unofficially christened as the McCarran-Walter Act. * * * When the law became effective on December 24, 1952, it became known internationally as the McCarran Act.

The act, which became effective on December 24, 1952, can now be evaluated more accurately than was possible 3 years ago. At that time the criticism of the act by its opponents, both in and outside of the United States, combined with the equally defensive praise from its sponsors created a babel through which the quiet voices of logic and objective analysis could not be heard. This din has now subsided.

During the 3 years the act has been in operation the administration and practical application of its provisions have been closely studied, both by the responsible officers charged with its enforcement, and by various organizations and individuals whose interests were affected in one way or another by the new law. These studies have served, not only to demonstrate the merits and deficiencies of the act, but also to bring into proper focus the divergent interests which prompted criticism from some quarters and defense from others. Since any evaluation of these factors must, in the interests of accuracy, be made with some understanding both of the purpose for which the legislation was drafted and the extent to which the act has achieved that purpose, a summary of a few of the main points of its historical background may be in order.

For many years prior to 1940 various individuals and agencies has been asking Congress to study existing immigration and nationality laws, and then to draft and enact legislation which would include all the desirable and necessary features of the previous laws, while excluding obsolete and undesirable materials. Since more than 100 laws then in the statute books were involved, the scope of the proposed legislative study was immense. A start was made when the Nationality Act of 1940 repealed, either entirely or in part, more than 30 previous laws dealing with American nationality. The new law revised and codified many other widely scattered bits of previous legislation, to provide one basic act governing all procedures through which American citizenship might be acquired, maintained, or lost.

Necessarily held in abeyance throughout World War II, the project of revising existing immigration and nationality laws was undertaken in earnest in 1946. Preliminary studies were made of the existing laws, and in 1948 the appropriate committees of the Republican-dominated 80th Congress began to hold public hearings on a bipartisan omnibus immigration bill, sponsored in the respective legislative bodies by Senator Revercomb, of West Virginia, and Representative Fellows, of Maine. Legal and technical experts of the Departments of Justice and State, and other Federal, State, and municipal law enforcement agencies, testified concerning the administrative feasibility of the bill.

Representatives of organized labor, religious organizations, welfare agencies, educational institutions, and veterans' organizations appeared before the committees and voiced their views and suggestions. Racial groups complained of the racial discrimination inherent in many of the previous laws, and asked for relief through the provisions of the new one. Economists testified concerning the probable economic impact which would result from the enactment of the bill. Unaffiliated individual aliens facing deportation told their harrowing stories and asked for a sympathetic law which would permit them to remain in the United States. Other individuals, some aliens and some American citizens, told of close relatives, or friends, or eminent foreign personages who were prevented by various legal technicalities from entering the United States, and asked for legislation which would make their entries possible.

Against this background of conflicting interests and evidence the omnibus immigration bill gradually took form. The obviously obsolete provisions of the old laws were weeded out. Sections of the bill were revised, and new parts drafted in an attempt to overcome its shortcomings as revealed by the testimony of witnesses at the hearings. Some otherwise desirable features of the original bill had to be eliminated after expert testimony had convinced the committee members that enforcement might be difficult, or impossible, or contrary to the best interests of the United States.

Early in 1952 President Truman asked if the bill would be ready for enactment that summer. When informed that another year was desirable to finish, perfect, and implement the proposed legislation, he said that something must be done immediately. Senator LEHMAN and Representative CELLER then introduced almost identical bills calling for the immediate entry into the United States of 300,000 aliens, some of them displaced persons, some being refugees and escapees, while others were already registered as intending immigrants, but chargeable to hopelessly oversubscribed quotas. Senator LEHMAN proposed to utilize for these aliens the vast number of quota numbers which had not been used during the war years. Senator HENDRICKSON introduced a similar bill, also with White House approval. Senator McCarran fought these, saying that either of them would sabotage his omnibus bill. He was then told by his party leaders that some kind of immigration legislation had to be enacted in that session of Congress, and that if it was not to be Senator Lehman's or Senator Hendrickson's, he had better prepare his own for immediate passage. This was done with considerable difficulty, and thus the Immigration and Nationality Act came into being. The act was passed over President Truman's veto on June 27, 1952, to become effective 180 days later at 12:01 a. m. on December 24, 1952.

Although the law, as printed, is divided into 4 titles, each of which is subdivided into chapters and sections, it may, for critical purposes, be regarded as falling into 2 main parts. The first, applying almost solely to aliens, sets up criteria which determine an alien's eligibility to receive a visa, and his eligibility to admission into the United States. It also prescribes certain requirements to be met by him during his residence in the United States, so long as he remains an alien. In addition, it provides authority and machinery for his deportation from the United States in certain circumstances. The second part deals with American nationality, stating the conditions in which it is acquired at birth, and how it may be acquired by naturalization. It also provides for the loss of American nationality in certain circumstances.

The average American who has had no personal experience with the law, nor with any person who has been either favorably or adversely affected by it, often wonders what all the agitation is about. Why should one Congressman or Senator condemn the law as discriminatory or unjust, while another of the same party, whose intelligence and patriotism are equally unquestioned, defends it? Why, in the face of President Eisenhower's 1953 recommendation for a revision of the act, did the 83d Congress fail to take the action which he requested? Why do some reputable and respected civic organizations clamor for revision and repeal of the law, while other institutions, equally reputable and respected, throw their support to the defending forces? The answers to these specific questions must necessarily be as complex as the law itself.

Perhaps the best way to find the answers is to simplify the problem and to attack one of the act's main problems. This is simply the size and scope of the law. We used to have one law which stated how many immigrants could enter the United States annually. There was another law which rendered alien contract laborers inadmissible into the United States. Still another stated that a naturalized American citizen would lose his citizenship if he lived for 3 years in the country of his birth. Now, these were 3 of more than 50 laws which were repealed or amended by, or incorporated in, the Immigration and Nationality Act. A person might be in favor of one of them, he might strongly oppose another, and he couldn't care less about the rest of them. The point is that

formerly he could state conscientiously that he felt that one was good while another was bad. How can he comment on new legislation which includes them both?

That, boiled down to its fundamentals, is the McCarran Act. It is so big, and it affects so many people in so many different ways, that no intelligent man can point to the law and say that it's all bad. Conversely, no man or organization should be forced or induced to defend it blindly as representing legislative perfection.

Returning to details, let us discuss some of the good points of the act. For the purposes of this discussion the postulate has been adopted that any section which confers upon an alien an advantage not previously enjoyed, without detracting from privileges previously enjoyed by him, or by any other alien, and without detriment to the security or welfare of the United States, is good. On the other side of the ledger are placed items which, in the opinions of objective observers, have unnecessarily deprived aliens of privileges previously enjoyed, which have demonstrated racial discrimination, which have needlessly held our immigration policies up to international ridicule, which have ignored moral commitments or obligations to certain groups of aliens, and which have added to the mechanical workload of the various enforcement agencies, without a compensating contribution to the security or welfare of the United States.

1. Under the old law an American husband could petition for non-quota status for his alien wife, but an American wife could not obtain non-quota status for her alien husband. The new law makes this possible.

2. The old law permitted an alien husband to confer his quota nationality upon his accompanying alien wife, but the wife did not have the same privileges. This meant that a man born in England could get immediately available British quota numbers for himself and his Hungarian-born wife, but that a woman born in England could not bring her Hungarian-born husband within the British quota. The new law permits either spouse to confer quota nationality upon the other.

3. Under the old law persons "who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promise of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled" were excludable as alien contract laborers. Americans who advertised in the foreign press for prospective employees, or who volunteered to assist a prospective immigrant by lining up employment for him in the United States, were, by the same law, liable to fine and imprisonment. This law, which served a useful purpose in breaking up the peonage system utilized by some unscrupulous employers in the last years of the previous century, and in the early days of this one, became a legal bottleneck a few years later, preventing American industry from obtaining the foreign skills which have been needed so desperately. The new law canceled the prohibitions mentioned above.

4. Although foreign students are usually non-immigrants in every sense of the word, the old law required them to obtain what was known as an immigration visa, rather than the passport visa issued to other classes of non-immigrants. The new law properly placed the alien student in a non-immigrant category, and permits him to receive a passport visa which, on the basis of reciprocity between the United States and the country of which he is a national, is usually without charge to him.

5. Under the old law any alien who had ever been convicted of any crime or offense involving moral turpitude was excludable from the United States as a criminal. Petty theft had been judicially determined to involve moral turpitude. Thus we had the frequent case of a responsible man with an unblemished record of 20 or 30 years in his community, being inadmissible into the United States, due to some youthful prank. The new law gives the youthful offender, and even the single-conviction minor offender regardless of age, a chance for admission.

6. While the old law was harsh and unforgiving toward offenders who had been convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude, it made no provision for the exclusion of chronic offenders convicted of crimes in which a determination of moral turpitude had not been made judicially.

The new law changed all of this by rendering excludable an alien who, as the result of two or more convictions for offenses other than political, has been sentenced to confinement for more than 5 years.

7. Under the Immigration Act of 1924 a child born in India to a British Army family was chargeable to the quota for India. A child born to a European missionary family in China or Japan was chargeable to the quota of the country of birth. Since the quotas for many of these countries were and are oversubscribed to the extent that many years have to be spent on a quota waiting list before a quota number can be allocated on a worldwide registration priority basis, some cases of extreme hardship developed.

A wealthy English scientist decided to migrate to the United States to accept a responsible position with an American university. He and his wife and their two children born in England could get visas without trouble or delay. Their other child, born in China, would have to undergo 8 or 10 years of waiting time before a Chinese quota number could be obtained for him. Refusing to break up his family by going to the United States without his China-born son, the scientist remained in England, depriving the United States of badly needed professional skill.

The new law has made it possible to charge any of the children mentioned above to the quota of either of their European-born parents.

8. Prior to the enactment of the new law, an American citzen could, by petition to the Attorney General, confer nonquota status on his alien wife, and on his alien unmarried child less than 21 years of age. If, however, he married an alien widow with children, he could not obtain nonquota status for his stepchildren.

The new law corrects this situation by permitting him to petition for a step-child, as well as for his wife and his own children.

9. An alien legally admitted into the United States for permanent residence, and who wishes to visit Europe or Asia, can obtain from the Immigration and Naturalization Service before departure from this country, a reentry permit. This was also true under the old law, but each permit was valid for only one reentry. For the businessman who has to make frequent trips abroad the single reentry permit was slow, expensive, and bothersome. Under the new law the reentry permit may be retained by the traveler, and used for numerous return trips to the United States within the period of its validity.

10. Although the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which prevented the immigration of Chinese into the United States, was repealed in 1943, most natives of other countries of Asia, and of the islands adjacent to the eastern and southern coasts of Asia, were excludable on either geographical or racial grounds. For example, if a person born in Malaya of Malay parents were to apply for a visa or for admission into the United States, he would be refused under section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as a native of the Asiatic barred zone, while a child born in Canada to a Japanese father and a Canadian mother would be excludble under section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as a person ineligible to citizenship—since he could not meet the prerequisite for citizenship of possession of a preponderance of white or African blood.

The new law eliminated the geographical and racial grounds for exclusion—thus forming a logical foundation for the claim made by Senator McCarran and other defenders of the legislation, that for the first time in the history of the United States no one will be excludable from admission, or ineligible to citizenship, on racial grounds.

11. Under the Nationality Act of 1940, a child born outside the United States to parents, one of whom was a citizen and the other an alien, could be a citizen at birth only if the citizen parent had previously resided in the United States for 10 years, at least 5 of which had to be subsequent to the parent's 16th birthday. This underlined requirement made it impossible for an American citizen under 21 years of age to transmit American citizenship to his or her child born abroad in these circumstances.

The new law retains the 10 years of residence requirement, but says that the mandatory 5-year period may be subsequent to the 14th birthday. The change indicates that Congress has taken official recognition of the fact that American citizens between the ages of 19 and 21 are potential parents, and that they should be accorded the same privileges of citizenship as those extended to their more mature brothers and sisters.

SUBJECT TO UNFAVORABLE CRITICISM

The foregoing items are generally considered to be favorable. Let us look at some of the legal changes which have been the subjects of unfavorable criticism.

1. The establishment of subquotas has been attacked as an example of the law's racial discrimination. The Immigration Act of 1924 set up quotas for all the European countries. It also provided that a person born in any of the colonies or protectorates owned or administered by these quota countries should, for the purposes of the law, be considered as having been born in the mother country, and chargeable to the quota for that country. This meant that persons born in Bermuda or Malta were chargeable to the British quota, persons born in Martinique and Madagascar came under the French quota, etc. Since the quotas of most of the mother countries were small, and since few persons born to non-European parents in the colonies could qualify under other sections of law and regulation to obtain visas for the United States, the demand against European quotas from qualified colonial applicants was confined principally to the British quota, which has never been filled.

Large numbers of inhabitants of the British West Indies began to apply for and to receive visas under the British quota. Natives of Malta did the same. During the period from 1930 to 1946 immigration to the United States dwindled to a trickle, due first to widespread unemployment and later to wartime restrictions on travel of an unofficial nature. In 1946, however, with defense industries crying for labor of all kinds, and with transportation facilities once more available, the immigration flood began to flow once more. Each immigrant had to have a visa. Visas could be obtained by qualified applicants only from an American consular office. Administrative waiting lists were established in the lightly staffed consular offices in the Caribbean area, and prospective immigrants who had qualified in every respect under law and regulation to receive visas had to wait 2 or 3 years before the limited visa-issuing facilities of the consulates in question finally ground out their visas.

During the years 1950 to 1952 the word spread through the grapevine that a person who waited around Kingston, Nassau, Barbados, or Port of Spain, hoping to get a visa in 2 or 3 years, was silly. All he had to do was

to get out of the Caribbean area, and apply for his visa at an American consular office which was equipped with personnel and facilities to handle his case without delay. Hundreds, if not thousands, of West Indians began applying in Canada, in the United Kingdom—anywhere they could get to, where the visa production was better keyed to the law and regulations. Such was the situation during the final hearings on the McCarran-Walter Act.

The solution to the problem adopted by the committees, and thus made a part of the law as enacted, was to establish subquotas for all colonies and dependencies. Under the new law, each colony is given a subquota of 100 per year. This means, for example, that only 100 persons born in Jamaica can obtain quota visas in any 1 year, no matter whether the applications are made in Kingston, Montreal, London, or anywhere else in the world.

2. Section 212 of the law lists 31 categories of aliens who are both ineligible to receive visas and inadmissible into the United States. Paragraph (24) of that section is quoted to show what critics of the law mean when they claim that discriminatory features are frequently buried in a mass of technical phraseology which appears to the casual reader to be less sinister than confusing.

"(24) Aliens (other than those aliens who are nativeborn citizens of countries enumerated in section 101 (a) (27) (C) and aliens described in section 101 (a) (27) (B) who seek admission from foreign contiguous territory or adjacent islands, having arrived there on a vessel or aircraft of a nonsignatory line, or if signatory, a noncomplying transportation line under section 238 (a) and who have not resided for at least 2 years subsequent to such arrival in such territory or adjacent islands."

What does all this mean? In general, it means that an alien born outside the Western Hemisphere may encounter considerable difficulty and delay in obtaining a visa in foreign contiguous territory or adjacent islands; and that if he has, by good fortune, obtained a visa from some American consular office outside that area, his route of travel to the United States, as well as his means of transportation, are limited by the law. The following instance will show what this section has meant to one individual.

A Polish-born alien has waited 6 years on a quota waiting list in Buenos Aires, and has finally received an immigrant visa with which to join relatives in the United States. She decides to spend a month with a brother who lives in Mexico City before preceeding to New York. At the end of the month she applies for admission, presenting her valid visa at El Paso. She is refused admission under the authority of the section quoted above, since she has been in Mexico less than 2 years.

Proponents of the new law say that this section is not new, having been in both the 1917 and 1924 acts; that it is necessary on two grounds: (1) To prevent irresponsible transportation companies from dumping potential immigrants into areas physically near the United States, and (2) to provide a cooling-off period of 2 years for those enterprising aliens who do manage to reach those areas, thus providing the visa-issuing consular officers with a legal buffer against the demands for immediate visa services which would otherwise constitute a serious strain upon the limited facilities of various consular offices.

It is true that the old laws had similar restrictions pertaining to the entry of aliens from foreign contiguous territory, but this term included only Canada, Mexico, and the French islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. The new law's additional phrase "and adjacent islands" extended this discriminatory perimiter to include Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Trinidad, Martinique, "and other British, French, and Netherlands territory or possession in or bordering on the Caribbean Sea."

WHY TECHNICAL INTRICACIES

A natural question comes to the mind of the average person who is unfamiliar with the technical intricacies of this section of law. Why—if an alien has so much trouble if he arrives in one of these areas on a vessel or aircraft of a nonsignatory line—does he not avoid all this by traveling on a signatory line? A good question, with the joker in the answer that, except for Canada, none of the areas mentioned are served by any signatory line. Such a line is one which has signed a contract with the Attorney General giving it permission to disembark in Canada alien passengers destined to the United States. In return for this privilege the transportation line agrees to provide and maintain at its expense certain landing stations and inspection facilities, and to submit to and comply with all the requirements of the United States law which would apply were their alien passengers being landed at a port in the continental United States. Nearly every major steamship company and air line is signatory for the purpose of landing passengers in Canada. None is signatory for any of the other areas mentioned above. Consequently, no matter how an alien travels to any one of these areas—unless he enters it directly from the United States—he is bound by this section of law. He must either wait his 2 years, or purge himself of his legal ineligibility to enter the United States by moving to another country outside the proscribed perimeter. The Polish girl mentioned above chose the latter course. She flew back to Lima, Peru, and from there flew directly to New Orleans where she was admitted as a permanent resident immigrant without difficulty.

Pointing to this case, and many similar ones, critics ask what good purpose has been served by these long, expensive flights, other than to furnish business for foreign airlines. They also ask why this section of the law, the original purpose of which was nullified by the Immigration Act of 1924, has been carried over into the new law with a considerably broadened scope of applicability.

(3) As noted previously, the fact that an alien was born in the Asiatic barred zone prevented him from entering the United States as an immigrant under the old laws. The removal of this statutory ground for exclusion was hailed as the new law's major contribution to the fight against racial discrimination. Critics, however, claim that any practical advantage gained through that action was nullified by the establishment of the Asia-Pacific triangle quota area, and by the discriminatory application of the newly-established quotas to persons of oriental ancestry, regardless of their places of birth. A good example of what they are complaining about it furnished by the following case history.

John was born in England. His parents were Indians. He never went to India, being educated and growing to manhood in England. During World War II he served in the Royal Air Force, and married an English girl. After the war he migrated to Canada with his wife, and while living in Toronto a son was born. A business opportunity caused them to decide to move to the United States. The family applied for visas as immigrants. Since both husband and wife were born in England, and the child in Canada, no quota complications were foreseen. The new law furnished these in abundance.

Ordinarily a person born in England is chargeable to the instantly available British quota. But, since his parents were Indians, he was, under the new law, chargeable to the quota for India. How long would it take to get an Indian quota number? Fifteen or 20 years, at least. Then—a happy thought. They had heard that the new law provided that an immigrant spouse could be charged to the quota of the accompanying spouse. John's wife could get a British quota visa without delay—couldn't he take advantage of this liberal feature of the new law and obtain a British quota visa too? No. As the son of Indian parents he could come only under the quota for India. Could not the wife take her British quota visa, and after entering the United States alone, could she not petition for a preference for him under the Indian quota, as the husband of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence? Yes; she could do that. But the records showed that there were so many petitions on file for similar preference under the Indian quota that it would take 7 or 8 years before his turn would be reached, even after her petition for the preferential status should be approved. Fortunately, for their peace of mind, they decided not to leave Canada, and their applications for visas were withdrawn, before learning that the McCarran Act had placed their Canadian-born son under the quota for India.

Section 101 (a) (27) (C) of the act provides nonquota status to an immigrant "who was born in Canada, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or an independent country of Central or South America." There are no apparent limitations or qualifications of this statement—a person born in one of the areas named is a nonquota immigrant. Yet section 202 (a) (5) of the same law, without any reference to the section cited above, states that any alien who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle is, with certain exceptions which do not include persons born in the areas mentioned above, chargeable to the quota of his ancestry. This means that John's son, born in Canada to a British mother and an Indian father, is chargeable to the quota for India.

President Truman summed up the situation effectively in his veto message of June 25, 1952, 2 days before the Congress passed the legislation without his approval. He wrote, "The only consequential change in the 1924 quota system which the bill would make is to extend a small quota to each of the countries of Asia. But most of the beneficial effects of this gesture are offset by other provisions of the bill. The countries of Asia are told in one breath that they shall have quotas for their nationals, and in the next, that the nationals of the other countries, if their ancestry is as much as 50 percent Asian, shall be charged to these quotas. * * * These provisions are without justification."

4. Although our laws have, since 1873, prohibited the immigration of prostitutes, or persons coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution. It was not until the McCarran-Walter Act became effective that prostitution became one of the unforgivable sins. In order to exclude from admission under the old law it was necessary for the Government to prove that the applicant was, at the time of application, practicing prostitution, or planning to practice it in the United States. If, for example, a girl with a record of prostitution married an American citizen, and if there was nothing to indicate that she had continued to be a prostitute after marriage, or that she planned to resume the practice after eventual entry into the United States, there was no legal ground for refusing to issue a visa to her or to admit her upon arrival at a United States port of entry. The language of the new law, however, renders the same woman ineligible to receive a visa, and inadmissible at a port of entry. (Sec. 212 (a) (12): Aliens who are prostitutes "or who have

engaged in prostitution"; (quotation marks supplied to indicate new restriction).)

5. The problem of mortgaged quotas was not only unsolved, but made still more complex, by the implementation of the McCarran-Walter Act. The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and its subsequent amendments were passed in an attempt to relieve the plight of some of the more than a million displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy. About 400,000 persons were admitted into the United States under the provisions of this law, one of which was that if the quota to which a displaced person was chargeable was oversubscribed, he could get a quota number just the same—such number to be charged against that quota in a future year. Up to 50 percent of any quota could thus be mortgaged for the purposes of the Displaced Persons Act, for as many years as was necessary, until the demand was satisfied. The expiration of the act left more than 20 quotas mortgaged for many years to come—8 being obligated beyond the year 2000. Let's break this down and see what it means in an individual case.

Applicant A and his wife were both born in Latvia. In 1936 they moved to Paris, where A established himself in business. In 1946 they decided to go to the United States, and applied at the American Embassy in Paris for the necessary visas. They were told that the quota for Latvia was only 236 per year, and that they would have to wait for 3 or 4 years before their names would be reached on the waiting list. They are still waiting. The Displaced Persons Act was responsible for the mortgaging of half of the Latvian quota for every year up to and including 2274. Thus only 118 Latvian quota numbers are available for normal immigration purposes each year for more than 300 years. However, A and his wife were not discouraged. They were in no hurry to go. They had already waited a long time, and they thought that mortgaging one-half of the quota meant only that they would have to wait twice as long as originally anticipated. This was theoretically true prior to the effective date of the McCarran Act, section 203 of which initiated a series of preferences under the quota.

There are four of these preference categories, and any one of the first three may exhaust the entire quota for the year. If, by chance, there are any quota numbers left after the demands of the first three preference are filled, 25 percent of them go to a fourth preference group, and the remaining numbers may then be given to nonpreference applicants like Mr. and Mrs. A. Unfortunately for them, however, there have been no nonpreference numbers for about 2 years, and the A family still faces an indefinite waiting period, after having spent more than 9 years on the waiting list.

This situation was foreseen by various individuals and agencies at the time the McCarran Act was being considered by the congressional committees, and several different suggestions were made for its relief. Some witnesses advocated a statutory cancellation of the mortgage against future quotas. Others recommended that the four preference categories just mentioned be made into nonquota categories, thus leaving the unmortgaged half of the quotas available for nonpreference aliens. These suggestions were, however, unheeded, and both the mortgaged quotas and the preference provisions became parts of the new law. Other quotas under which a nonpreference registrant faces the same hopeless situation are China, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Rumania, Spain, Syria, Turkey, and, to a slightly lesser extent, Austria, Bulgaria, Danzig, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Free Territory of Trieste, U. S. S. R., and Yugoslavia.

6. One of the features of the act which has received criticism from legal experts and laymen alike is the almost unlimited discretionary authority placed in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States through its provisions. The criticism on this point was expressed in advance of the enactment of the law by President Truman, who stated in his veto message of June 25, 1952, "Some of these provisions would empower the Attorney General to deport any alien who has engaged or has had purpose to engage in activities 'prejudicial to the public interest' or 'subversive to the national security.' No standards or definitions are provided to guide discretion in the exercise of powers so sweeping. To punish undefined 'activities' departs from traditional American insistence on established standards of guilt. To punish an undefined 'purpose' is thought control. These provisions are worse than the infamous Alien Act of 1798, passed in a time of national fear and distrust of foreigners, which give the President power to deport any alien deemed 'dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.' Such powers are inconsistent with our democratic ideals. Conferring powers like that upon the Attorney General is unfair to him as well as to our alien residents."

7. The effects of the McCarran Act on American citizens who choose to live or work outside the United States at times have been attacked as restrictive and discriminatory. One of the changes brought about by the new law relates to the period of time which an American citizen by naturalization may remain outside the United States without forfeiting his citizenship. The old law provided that, with certain exceptions, a naturalized citizen would generally lose his nationality by residing continuously for 3 years in the country of his birth, or former nationality, or by residing "continuously for 5 years in any other foreign state." The phraseology of this law made it possible for a naturalized citizen to remain abroad indefinitely without losing his citizenship, provided he changed his residence occasionally. For example, a man born in France could live in France for 2 years and 11 months, and then move to Belgium where he could live for 4 years and 11 months, after which he could return to France and repeat the process as many times as he wanted to. The McCarran Act put a stop to this procedure.

With certain exceptions, based on employment by American interests, health, veteran's status, and similar considerations, the new law provided generally that a naturalized citizen would lose American nationality through continuous residence for 3 years in the country of his birth or former nationality, or through an aggregate of 5 years continuous residence in any other foreign state or states. The new law also provided that nationality would be lost under this foreign residence section, "whether such residence commenced before or after the effective date of this act." This retroactive effect of the act caused the immediate expatriation of many naturalized citizens who had been living abroad, and who were unable to return to the United States before the effective date.

8. Another section of the law—349 (a) (4)—has been attacked as being both discriminatory and unconstitutional. This provides that a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization shall lose his nationality by "accepting, serving in, or performing the duties of any office, post, or employment under the government of a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, if he has or acquires the nationality of such foreign state." This sounds innocuous, but the following case history will show how it worked out in an individual case.

A daughter was born to Swiss parents residing in the United States. Since Swiss law provides that children of Swiss parentage are Swiss nationals, regardless of the place of birth, this girl acquired both Swiss and American nationality at birth. After being educated in the United States she went to Switzerland at the age of 30, to visit her parents' old home and relatives. While there she was offered employment in a hospital in Zurich. She accepted this position early in 1952, after checking with American consular authorities to make sure that such employment would not affect her citizenship status, even though the hospital was operated by a branch of the Swiss Government. Under the old law a dual national would lose his American citizenship through employment by a foreign government only if (1) the position required the taking of an oath of allegiance to the employing government, or (2) if the position which the employee was to fill was one limited to nationals of the employing government. Since no oath of allegiance was required from any employee of the hospital, and since there were no nationalistic limitations to the position which she was to fill, she was told that this employment would not in any way affect her citizenship status.

She was working in the hospital on the effective date of the McCarran Act, of which she had had no advance notice. Early in 1953, when applying for an extension of her American passport, she was informed that the passport could not be extended because she was no longer an American citizen, having lost her citizenship under section 349 (a) (4) of the new law the moment it became effective on December 24, 1952. The girl was expatriated automatically on the effective date of the act and found that she was without recourse in the matter. There was no one to whom she could appeal, for the enforcing agency—the Department of State—has no discretion in its application of this part of the law.

It is impossible to weigh the favorable features of the act against the unfavorable ones, and, by doing so, determine whether the law is predominantly either good or bad, since the number of persons favorably affected by one section never corresponds to the number unfavorably affected by another. As stated earlier one can best judge the overall merits and deficiencies of the law through an appraisal of the degree of its success or failure in achieving the purposes for which it was drafted. The purpose of codifying and integrating all immigration and nationality laws within the framework of one statute was accomplished. The purpose of revoking obsolete laws was achieved. The purposes of removing racial bars to naturalization and immigration and of elimination of discrimination between sexes with respect to immigration have been fulfilled. With these major accomplishments listed on the credit side one may well ask what more can be expected from ane piece of legislation. And it is on this point alone—expectation—that the answer depends.

Defenders of the law point to these accomplishments and improvements, and state that the favorable results obtained exceed their original expectations. They concede that minor amendments are desirable to eliminate injustice and discrimination in certain individual cases, but they insist that the national origins quota system established in 1924 be perpetuated as a necessary foundation for American immigration policy. Critics, however, claim that the expectations, as well as the hopes and prayers of millions of people all over the world, have been sadly crushed by the McCarran Act, principally because it had perpetuated this quota system which they consider to be antiquated, unrealistic, and cruelly discriminatory against certain races, religions, and countries.

And thus we arrive at the fundamental issue—that of a national immigration policy. Since 1924 our policy has been based on the national origins quota system. From 1924 to 1929 the quota for any country was 2 percent of the number of foreign born persons

of such nationality who were residing in continental United States according to the census of 1890. In 1929 the factors in the formula were changed, resulting in quotas being set by mathematical proportion. The quota for any country bore the same relation to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants of the United States having that national origin bore to the total number of the inhabitants of the United States, according to the census of 1920. The minimum annual quota for any country was 100. The total of the quotas amounted annually to 154,277, until January 1, 1953, when the provisions of the McCarran Act increased them slightly to 154,657.

The national origins system has been under attack from its inception on the grounds that it was devised to cut down immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe, on the theory that Nordic peoples are more easily assimilable into the American population than the people most adversely affected by quota restrictions. It has been attacked on religious grounds as discriminating both against the Catholics of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, and the Jews of Poland, Hungary, and Rumania. It is the common belief of objective analysts that most of the uproar over the McCarran Act was not caused so much by anything the law did, as by what it did not do—create and implement a new and less restrictive immigration policy, permitting an up-to-date approach to modern migration problems. The McCarran Act, through the refusal of its framers and sponsors to depart from the traditional policy of quota restriction, thus became a target for criticism and abuse, not only from those adversely affected by any of its provisions, but also from those chronic and articulate opponents of the national origins system.

An objective appraisal of the current situation was furnished by Mr. Cabell Phillips, who wrote in the New York Times of April 7, 1955, "Senator HERBERT LEHMAN and Representative CELLER, both New York Democrats, joined forces a year and a half ago to supplant the McCarran-Walter Act with an omnibus immigration bill of their own. It differs from the present act in these principal ways: (1) abolition of the national origins basis for establishing quotas; (2) increase of the maximum annual quota to 250,000; (3) the transferability of unused quotas, and (4) amelioration of the security and eligibility requirements. They have reintroduced this measure in both the House and Senate in the present session. However, there is little evident intention in either Chamber to take it up at this session. This seeming apathy, however, is deceptive: it is less an absence of interest than an urge not to stir the issue's partisans. On the one hand is the natural urge of former immigrants (or their descendants) to share the blessings of 'the American dream' with their kinsmen abroad. Similarly, people who style themselves liberals, irrespective of their national origins, believe that the opportunities of American citizenship ought not to be denied others who sincerely want it. This theme figures strongly in the dogma of most of the so-called nationalist and patriotic societies. Opposed to freer immigration are the conservatives generally, and particularly those whose immigrant status is many generations old. They fear not only the 'mongrelizing' influence of heavy immigration on the 'American bloodstream' but also the influence of 'foreign ideologies' on our political thought. Thus the issue is a highly emotional one that cuts across traditional party lines. While both parties are publicly committed to easing the strictures of the present immigration law, it is a task from which both leaderships shrink."

Washington, the Perfect Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Timothy J. Murphy, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, delivered an outstanding address at the annual George Washington birthday luncheon at the George Mason Hotel in Alexandria, Va., February 22. It is a privilege for me to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to commend Commander Murphy for his pertinent remarks. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is one of the most important patriotic organizations in this country. I commend Commander Murphy's remarks to every patriotic American:

WASHINGTON, THE PERFECT CITIZEN

It is a privilege to be here today in Alexandria, Va., the old hometown of George Washington. To lay a wreath on his tomb at Mount Vernon is a superlative honor, one that will ever be cherished, both in my official capacity as the Commander in Chief and representative of the more than 1,250,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and personally as an American citizen, who with humble pride had the opportunity of paying respectful homage to our great hero.

All of us from earliest childhood were taught that Washington was truly great; later we learned in more detail why he was great. But what has impressed me most of late is the extent and the impact of his international renown—a universality—that resulted from the magnitude of his achievement and its indelible impress upon the history of civilization. That we say because he continues now as in his own lifetime to receive the applause and inspire, the reverence of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. And—it is a profound reverence—one that has not diminished with the years. In his lifetime, it was more personal. After the Revolution, Lord Erskine, one of England's greatest lawyers, when sending one of his speeches to Washington, wrote on a blank leaf: "I have a large acquaintance among the most exalted and valuable classes of men; but you are the only human being for whom I have ever felt an awful reverence."

Yes; the world revered and reveres Washington. Last November, when we, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, were honored by the award of the French Legion of Honor to its commander in chief, it was learned at the time that close to the spot where our ceremony took place in the Invalides, Napoleon, who had decreed a period of mourning for the French Army on news of the death of Washington, also ordered that there be delivered at the shrine of the French military, a funeral oration in eulogy of the great American. At the time, ships of the British fleet around the world, half-masted their flags on the news of his passing. All extraordinary honors that did much to enhance the prestige of the new American Republic.

Hundreds of speakers will talk about Washington today with appropriate emphasis on the more conspicuous aspects of his career; many will refer to his sage counsel both on domestic and foreign policy. Also, thousands of small boys and girls will, throughout the land, recount the traditional tales such as "cutting down the cherry tree" and other stories about Washington that are part of our most cherished folklore. Surely, every program and ceremony that emphasize the unselfish, highminded, and patriotic characteristics of Washington stimulate better Americanism.

And with Americanism in mind, I shall comment on Washington, the citizen, "the perfect citizen," Emerson called him. How did he become a perfect citizen? Some insight is gained as to how, when we ponder the two mottoes, the spirit of which he followed from early manhood. They were: "Deeds, not words" and "For God and country." And to attain or proximate such high goals, we might next ask, What were some of the finer qualities of character and conduct that he so consistently displayed.

Washington became the perfect citizen by living up to his mottoes. Love of country came first, and this meant to him a conscientious discharge of the public and military duties of his time and station in life; duties executed always with a high intelligence, and a manliness without vanity or ostentation. The Golden Rule seemed to be his guide whether it be the high business of state or his private and official relations with men. He chose wise counselors and from them drew the best collective wisdom. He was fearless of danger, and showed a courage, both moral and physical that became a part of his nature. With this combination of intellectual and moral qualities and a trust in Almighty God, Washington built an illustrious career that neither time nor distance have diminished in grandeur.

As with most truly great men, some of these superior qualities were shown early in life. Twenty years before the Revolution, Washington a young militia officer, was sent by the Royal Governor of Virginia, on a dangerous mission to a then distant French outpost, just south of Lake Erie. In this wilderness, he was to learn all he could as to preparations for war, in addition to delivering to the French commander an official British protest against alleged territorial encroachments. The 600-mile journey through the snow, the fording of ice-choked streams and rivers, the ever-present danger and close calls of Indian ambush, comprise a story of incredible hardship. For his valuable services little thanks were received from on high, but a good number of his intimates saw then the qualities of fortitude and self-sacrifice that characterized his later career.

Shortly after this historic feat, Washington gave up his colonial commission, mainly because of his disgust with the unjust precedence accorded officers with royal commissions over those of the Colonies. However, when General Braddock came in 1755, the young Virginian was persuaded by the British general to join his staff as a volunteer aide in the French-Indian War. At the murderous battle of Monongahela where Braddock himself and over one-half of his force were massacred, Washington had four bullets pass through his coat and two horses were shot out from under him. The campaign might have been different had Washington's prudent counsel been heeded. However, after 5 hard years of military service, Washington tried again to secure a Royal Army commission, but when refused, he promptly resigned. It is of significance that his next military commission was that of Commander in Chief of the Army of the United Colonies.

Fate is mysterious. Have you ever thought that had Washington become a midshipman in the Royal Navy, as once contemplated, or been granted the much sought after Royal

army commission, it is highly probably our country would have lost the services of an American, called by some historians, the indispensible man of the Revolution.

After the French-Indian War, Washington returned to his beloved Mount Vernon, but ever public spirited, he served for 15 continuous years in the House of Burgesses. Of this period, it is said, that Washington never failed to retain the affection of his constituents and his people; that, I believe, can be attributed to his belief in and fight for the sanctity and well-being of the individual.

Never was it more in evidence than the awful winter of 1777 and '78 at Valley Forge. In a struggle to feed, clothe, and pay his men, he set an example of endurance, inspiration, and courage seldom equaled in military history. Think of it—in a command of about 11,000 men, Washington reported nearly 3,000 unfit for duty. The last hope—an army in tatters, unpaid, hungry, and many barefoot. General Washington wrote: "Their march might be traced by the blood of their feet." And to add to his grief, a small clique of senior officers intrigued to have him relieved to command. But the great soul rose above it all. With envy for none and solicitude for all, he continued with the task of making an army out of a sick mob. Briefly, he suffered and he struggled and he won.

During this ordeal, Washington was calm and patient, soliciting Congress in strong but dignified letters. Leaders of less stature in Washington's place perhaps would have borne down harder on the apprehended deserters and other offenders against discipline; and also have become bitter in their relations with the Congress. But Washington, the just, adhered to the Golden Rule of his youth: "So whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them." This guiding principle eloquently bespoke his character after death. For when the long and carefully drawn will of Washington was read, the second item stipulated: "Upon the decease of my wife, it is my will and desire that all the slaves whom I hold in my own right shall receive their freedom." Further provision was made that those slaves who were old and infirm would be clothed and fed by his heirs as long as the slaves should live. This was the last act of a Christian gentleman who stressed acts and not words, and who did for others what he should have liked others do for him.

It is my belief that the righteousness and beautiful philsophy of the Golden Rule had much weight in influencing the aristocratic Washington to battle for the common man; to fight for the cause of individual liberty and equal opportunity. And were he with us today, we may safely assume that as the perfect citizen, he would teach and inspire others to teach, the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of living in the world's greatest democracy. Or, as he phrased it, "the greatest trust ever confided to a political society."

He would tell us also that a country should never forget her veterans. The general who took no salary but consistently demanded that all justice and possible compensation be given his officers and men, will live forever in our history as America's first and most distinguished veteran. After returning to Mount Vernon in 1783 after more than 8½ years of military service there were precious few who could tell him much about battle and personal sacrifice. Reminder—when we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars work to help the needy veteran and his widow, we are carrying on the tradtion of our first military commander.

His heartfelt appreciation of those who served under him is expressed in the words: "You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes." He gave "cordial and effectionate thanks" to his officers and soldiers for their devotion to him during the war.

Washington believed that people who profit from freedom must pay something back to the common fund. That is why he said: "Every man who is in the vigor of life ought to serve his country in whatever line it requires and he is fit for." A counsel that should be heeded by loyal Americans everywhere.

All of these precepts and sage counsel together with the life itself of the Father of our Country should provide intense patriotic inspiration to us who enjoy the fruits of his labor.

As the patriot we shall ever remember him as one who gave to the limit of his physical and mental powers to gain the individual freedom which you and I enjoy.

As the warrior we shall remember him as the Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, the victor at Yorktown, the battle that gained the independence which led to our present status as the most powerful democracy in the world.

As the statesman we shall ever remember him as our first President, and as a drafter and defender of the principle of constitutional Government.

A contemporary of our perfect citizen, who, when designing an inscription for the great man's tomb, captured perhaps in a few words the essence of his eventful career.

"Magnanimous in youth
Glorious through life
Great in death."

What greater could be said of any man?

A Farmer Is Amused at the Moaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to present the following letter from a North Dakota farmer, Paul Swardstrom, Hurdsfield, N. Dak. Mr. Swardstrom says he does not live in the most fertile area in the world, but he is working, getting along and enjoying the fruits of his own labor:

Hon. OTTO KRUEGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OTTO: It is with a little amusement that I listen to all this bemoaning of the farmers' plight as if the majority of the farmers were on the verge of bankruptcy and their families suffering from want. There is, certainly, no evidence of a farm depression in our area. Quite the contrary. Drive through main street of our little village any nice weekday afternoon and count the new-model cars parked along the sides; take inventory of all the new trucks, tractors, combines, and other modern machinery farmers have bought in the past year; note the new improvements in farm buildings, the TV antennas sprouting from farm homes, the new electric appliances from welders to water-pressure systems which have been installed and you can't help but conclude that farmers have been making money. Speaking for ourselves our net income (and we are just small farmers) has been greater all through the years than the yearly salary of our high-school superintendent.

Now I can only speak for ourselves, but I think we can rightly assume that we here in southern Wells County with our hills, sloughs, rocks, and gumbo haven't got the most fertile soil or the most ideal farming conditions in these United States. Nor are we, perhaps, the most efficient farmers in the country.

What I am trying tot say is that $2 wheat, 90-cent barley, and $3 flax is still a good money-making proposition; that Secretary Benson and his flexible price supports hasn't wrecked the farmer and that the majority of farmers aren't doing any kicking. It's the pig that can't get at the trough that does the squealing. And he makes so much noise you can't hear the contented grunts of the satisfied ones. Of course, the Talbots and Thatchers have their own peculiar axes to grind as have certain officeseekers. Most of us understand that.

We enjoy your articles in the Harvey Herald, OTTO. Your recent one about tree shelter belts is very apt. This is sound agricultural planning. Keep up the good work.

The soil-bank program seems the best answer to the farm surplus problem. But don't ruin it by tying it to 90 percent supports. We won't set aside the land if we can make more money cropping it.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL SWARDSTROM.

No Floors in Their Churches on Trinidad, British West Indies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a Baptist sect on the island of Trinidad, British West Indies, has no floors in its churches. A chauffeur on Trinidad developed the story in this way:

"There are many religions here. A Baptist group hasn't any floors in its churches.

"Why not?

"They love Mother Earth, believe it the supplier of strength and inspiration. It grows our food, nourishes our animals and gives us water to drink. These Baptists go on retreats lying in the ground, buried up to their chins. For over 20 days, they drink only fluids. They believe in this state, mother earth will give them visions and inspiration enough to carry them over until their next retreat. So they are most at home when they worship in their churches standing on the ground."

Mr. Speaker, when I related this story to Congressman BURDICK, of North Dakota, a Baptist, he said:

Well, don't you know, in politics, we say that a man with his feet on the ground can't be beat.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Employment and Rehabilitation of Physically Handicapped Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from A. J. Healy, national commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a copy of the current issue of the Purple Heart magazine. It is devoted, basically, to the cause of the employment and rehabilitation of the Nation's handicapped, particularly, of course, those who were disabled by reason of service in the uniform of our country.

The matter of employing the physically handicapped has long been one of my deepest interests. I have been pleased to cooperate with veterans' organizations, with the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, with the Wisconsin State Committee for the same purpose, and with other patriotic service groups.

I send to the desk two items from the Purple Heart magazine, the first, a brief summary editorial on hiring disabled veterans; the second, an article, by Col. Waldron E. Leonard, on properly employing the handicapped in the Government itself. I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I hope that the Military Order of the Purple Heart will be given the fullest possible support in its noble efforts along these lines, as well as in its other services to the combat-wounded.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED

Disabled veterans, trained under the Veterans' Administration vocational rehabilitation programs, have given America a message of hope over the past decade.

Through their achievements they have demonstrated that there is practically no type or degree of handicap that need be beyond the ken of rehabilitation; that there is practically no type of occupation out of reach of the properly trained, properly placed handicapped worker; that the handicapped, given the opportunity, can become valued, self-sustaining members of their community.

The record of the more than 600,000 disabled veterans who have received vocational rehabilitation training speaks for itself.

Many rehabilitated veterans of today never would have been considered for vocational rehabilitation in an earlier day. "Medically infeasible for training" would have been the verdict. But advanced rehabilitation techniques, coupled with the courage of the veterans themselves, have opened the doors to hope and achievement.

Veteran-trainees have had nearly every conceivable type of service-connected disability: 41 percent have bone injuries; 24 percent have had disorders of the nervous system; 8 percent have had tuberculosis; 7 percent have had diseases of the heart and circulatory system; the rest had a wide variety of other types of ailments.

Handicaps did not limit veterans' choices of training objectives. They set their sights for nearly every occupation at which man earns his living, from aeronautical engineer to zoologist, from office worker to machinist, from farmer to businessman. In all 35 percent trained for top positions in the professions and the managerial field; 38 percent for highly skilled trades; 14 percent in farming; and the other 13 percent for clerical, sales, and service jobs.

Disabled veterans have shown the world that there can be new hope for the handicapped. They have demonstrated that the emphasis can be shifted from disability to ability. The strength they have gained through rehabilitation is added strength for America.

WE CAN MEET THE EMPLOYMENT HANDICAPPED PROBLEM

(By Col. Waldron E. Leonard)

A veteran just left this office who had been hurt, a paraplegic, but no complaint or self-pity was expressed by him in any of our conversations. The wound he was suffering from was in the heart of disappointment in being assured in an interview several weeks ago that a position would be available for him in the near future. The disappointment was caused by the fact that he received a notice that a position as messenger was available and he could submit his qualifications for same.

It was difficult to try to explain how the error could occur that would cause him to be certified for this type of position, which job specifications certainly for this particular position would not qualify a paraplegic; or why after lengthy interviews that a counselor would not record or remember the physical condition of the applicant, but often I am afraid that those who have qualified for the responsibility of assisting the handicapped get careless in their interviews and leave the impression to the one seeking assistance that they have a motherly complex in sympathy for the applicant's condition or take the easiest route in discontinuing the interview regarding the applicant's qualifications for the possibility of employment by continuous suggestions of rehabilitation. While this program has rendered and is rendering excellent service, there certainly comes a time when counsellors should recognize that their responsibilities are assisting the handicapped in obtaining employment; which brings us to the subject of what employment.

Throughout the country various agencies are doing a splendid job familiarizing industry with the excellent service and performance of the so-called handicapped individual. Statistics are prepared and proof given in many instances that these employees are the most valuable and productive, but I believe that too much stress is given to the employment of the handicapped where he is so likely to be placed in a position other than he is qualified for, when perhaps with less effort a review of job descriptions where the handicapped could serve would be more helpful.

While proclamations are issued by the Federal Government, State government, and municipal governments encouraging industry to employ the handicapped and citations are given throughout the country by veterans' organizations and those interested for their cooperation in assisting in this program, it might be well if we could consider the possibilities of positions existing in Government that would seem a "natural" for many of our handicapped.

MUNICIPAL JOBS

For an example, in most towns and cities throughout the country hundreds of parking meters have been installed on the streets where coins are deposited for parking privileges. The requirement of the collectors for these meters is that they have a key and a sack, the key to unlock the meter and the sack to carry the coins. This about summarizes the entire responsibility. I wonder how many of the city fathers in issuing proclamations on employing the handicapped have thought of their responsibility.

Other positions in the municipal governments throughout the United States include traffic enumerators. This responsibility consists of standing or sitting in certain spaces on the street or in an office building in a window facing the traffic pushing a small button that totals the number of vehicles passing in a particular area so as to determine the flow of traffic for the purpose of installing stop signs, street lights, installation of bridges, widening highways, or generally improving traffic conditions in the area checked. Many cities have dozens of these enumerators. Their calculators are turned in to a centralized point at the end of the day and results tallied by clerks. Again, I wonder how many city fathers have given first consideration for these positions to the handicapped.

Many cities have discontinued the use of their acting police enforcement officers for walking along the sidewalks and issuing violation parking tickets and instead have employed auxiliary policemen and many cities are using ladies to carry out this responsibility. It appears to me that this type of position should be considered for the handicapped where qualified.

There are school guard crossing positions. Certainly no one would be more careful of your children and my children than those who know what it means to be hurt. These are just a few of the positions in your city that might be considered by the municipal government for the job opportunities of the handicapped.

STATE JOBS

In the State government you might review the qualifications needed to issue automobile license plates, watchmen or guards in State buildings or institutions, elevator operators in State buildings, positions of issuing traffic permits, road tests for applicants, and where toll roads and toll bridges are in existence and you see perfectly healthy individuals sitting on stools accepting payment for such privileges, ask yourself why the State government is not giving consideration to allocating these positions to the handicapped.

Several agencies of the Federal Government and the President's own Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped have done a remarkable job in calling to the attention of the public numerous instances where production increased or services rendered better by those listed as handicapped.

DISABILITY TO ABILITY

However, there seems to be a need for a committee or commission under the supervision of or working directly with the Civil Service Commission to iron out certain difficulties in job specifications and requirements that in some instances make it impossible for Government agencies to give assistance to the handicapped employment problem.

Certainly this review should not be limited to the positions heretofore described, as many of those referred to as handicapped do have administrative and supervisory qualifications that I feel are too often not given a position of responsibility due perhaps that a review of the actual duties required at the time of a vacancy might not correspond with the job specification sheet that had formerly been prepared for the position.

Perhaps the agency responsible for establishing rehabilitation centers should consider a business establishment in placing a new recruit, in allocating some funds direct to the agency for special attention, where he will most likely receive permanent employment after his initial training. Often in an organization where there are a variety of positions, it can be determined very soon as to whether the position the applicant is first placed on will be the most likely where he will succeed for future livelihood.

For an illustration, a veteran who was a former truck driver was given 3 years training as an automobile mechanic in rehabilitation centers. His service-connected disability left the veteran almost deaf. The factory manager discovered soon after his employment it was difficult for him to hear the motor running, thereby it being difficult for him to properly tune motors.

The manager of the plant noticed that the veteran was continuously visiting the fabric cutting table where seat covers were made. In talking with the veteran he found that he was fascinated by this type of work and transferred him to this department. In less than a year he was placed as general foreman in the department with several men under his supervision. This observation and consultation changed the employee from a disability to an ability and from a liability to an asset.

It might be well for Government agencies to consider giving an opportunity to some of the positions heretofore listed and certainly many others in their departments where satisfactory results could be obtained, first to the disabled veteran where qualified to perform such service, second, any handicapped person under the same circumstances, and third, to those of 40 years of age and over, who because of their age find it most difficult to obtain employment.

The Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, from the richness of his experience as director of a rural parish in Appanoose County, Iowa, the Reverend Banks Doggett, Jr., of Unionville, Iowa, has expressed in a letter to me his thoughts on the farm problem, and the conclusions he has reached on solving it. He is concerned with the spiritual and economic welfare of all people—those with whom he comes in contact on the family-sized farm and those who could be helped by the development of a better plan for research, production, and distribution of farm products.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Doggett's letter:

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
APPANOOSE COUNTY PARISH,
Centerville, Iowa, February 9, 1956.

Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Allow me to introduce myself to you. I am the Methodist minister appointed to the directorship of the Appanoose County parish. Perhaps you are familiar with this rural project. It has been one of the pioneer projects in rural work in our church. The churches of the county are cooperating together for a more effective ministry to the area. These churches are: Unionville; Wesley Chapel, south of Moravia; Iconium; Mystic; Brazil; Plano; Numa; Cincinnati; Zoar, southeast of Exline; Sharon Chapel, east of Centerville; and Fairview, southwest of Moravia.

The spiritual life of these communities is dependent upon several physical considerations. Our world has come to such a place that we cannot separate secular life from spiritual life. It appears that we now believe—that what one does during the week has an effect on what one does on Sunday; and that, what one does on Sunday, affects what one does the remainder of the week. This is as it should be.

I am very much concerned, therefore, with what goes on during the week for my people, for that is going to have an effect upon what we attempt to accomplish in the church on Sunday. Man's life is a single experience, composed of the experiences of every day. This brings us to the point I wish to visit with you about.

My concern is for the family life of rural-agricultural people. I share a like concern for the industrial worker. The peculiarity of the situation in this area—and in many other areas of the United States with which I am familiar—is that there is such a disparity between the plight of the industrial worker and the agricultural worker. I realize that certainly we must consider that the introduction of new industrial production into the consumer market is healthy. Also, that the produce of agriculure is not proportionately desired as the income of the consumer is increased. Man's appetite does not go up as does his paycheck, after he has attained a satisfactory level of sustenance. This is, I feel, one of the problems that we face. As agricultural production increases, we must be dependent upon population increases, foreign markets and the creation of new uses of agricultural production.

Therefore, I believe that the general agricultural economy will benefit from a more aggressive marketing of agricultural products on the foreign markets—even at less return possibly than for home consumption of the same products. A diversion of funds within the Agriculture Department from direct price supports to this end might possibly enable the reduction of our surplus stores. Possibly a stepped-up cooperation with the church and charitable distribution agencies could be worked out with the Government accepting a greater financial responsibility than at the present time. There certainly are depressed areas of the world that would benefit immeasurably from such humane charitableness. We must, however, be careful that our charitableness is not to an ostensibly distasteful degree. We cannot afford to swap food for goodwill. We must give food and accept that which comes as a matter of course. We need no more agonizing reappraisals in this regard.

My second interest lies in the development of more useful utilization of the agricultural production. This is an area of activity for both the private and governmental interest. The past has seen much from the Government to implement production. Now, we need a creative approach to research that will pave the way to a greater use of agriculture's produce. The long-run result of such a program will be helpful to stabilize the future.

So much for the future: Let us look to the present.

Here in Iowa we are concerned with pork and beef. In my native Southland, the concern is for cotton, tobacco, and perhaps rice and fruit. In the West there are other interests. Attempting to adjust to any program that will be fair to all is indeed a great difficulty. I think that before we adjust anywhere, we must know toward what we are working. We need a philosophy for agriculture in the United States. We have a great heritage in which, I feel, we can get a beginning. Our country developed because men were free. Free to own their own land, property, and personal effects. Out of this freedom came the reality of the family farm. Families formulated the great bulk of the agricultural work team. As farming became mechanized, family units became larger. This was as it should be. As men made fortunes in other areas, and as great companies accumulated wealth, they looked around for a place in which to invest. The Government made the investment in farms very enticing. This was through income-tax provisions—which were beneficial and fair to the family farm operator—but at the same time were of an even greater benefit to nonfarm investors. Now, much of the land is held by nonfarm operators. This is a deviation from the reality of the family farm as our heritage suggests to us.

I feel that some consideration should be given—by the Government—in its tax structure, to making the investment of wealth in farm properties for nonfarm people less attractive. Why should a man be allowed to write off his income in a profession to losses on another man's labor to his own benefit? Why not give the farm operator a fair opportunity in the farm market by eliminating the nonfarm bidder? We all know Iowa land is too high to operate with a proper return on investment. Is not the nonfarm ownership in part responsible for this disparity?

A second consideration for the present is that of production regulation. We are—to some extent—in difficulty because of the attempt to regulate at a point that regulation is impossible. The desire of man for greater gain will not be regulated by any mechanical, governmental system that is on a volunteer basis. Man volunteers to deprive himself from gain, only at a moral compulsion. Not many American farmers have that moral compulsion at the moment. Either there must be a program with the power of enforcement incorporated within, or there will be no adhering, in a significant way, to regulations for production.

I believe that an attempt to hinder the production is not only inhumane, but also un-Christian when we consider the world about us with its starving population. It may be that we must drop down the economic ladder a ways in order that we fulfill our moral responsibility to the world. Of course this is not a desirable goal. But, to guide the world toward the freedom and level of living that we know, we must of necessity show the way with willingness and

unselfish assistance. I do not favor the diversion of productive land to a state of inertia for the above stated reason.

I would think that if we could tackle the situation of ownership of the agricultural land by those who operate it in such a way as to make the family farm a reality again, we would see that the necessary adjustments in production would work out with the accepted law of supply and demand. Certainly, the efficient level of operation would be discovered and once again the agricultural needs of our country, and much of the world, would be met by free families operating their individual units without restriction or regulation. I firmly believe that our problem is not over production, but insufficient distribution; not too much Government assistance, but too little in the proper areas.

If we are to maintain our heritage of the family-farm operation, we would hope that there could be at the earliest possible date attention given to the beginning of such steps as are necessary, by the Government, with long-term credit, revision of the tax structure, exploration of all possible foreign markets, research for new uses of agricultural products, and immediate use of present surpluses for humanitarian relief in undeveloped areas as would begin us on the road to adjustment.

Accept my appreciation for your consideration of the ideas that have been running through my mind for many days. I know of your sincere interest in this matter which affects so directly your constituency of the 4th District from those of this country who support you in your good work.

Sincerely,

BANKS DOGGETT, Jr.,
Unionville, Iowa.

Upper Colorado River Project Would Damage the Nation's Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the crops to be grown on the upper Colorado scheme's participating irrigation projects will be largely grain and forage crops for dairy cows and sheep which will produce butter, milk products, and wool which are already in surplus and under Government subsidy and in storage at a fantastic cost.

The projects will service for the most part only marginal agricultural land much of it at high altitudes suffering frosts each month of the year and having a short growing season at best. Contrast this with the fact that there are at least 20 million acres of first-class land on existing farms in 19 States of the Middle West, South Atlantic, and Southern States that can be placed in production at any time they may be needed at a fraction of the cost. And contrast it with the further fact that Congress is now considering the soil-bank proposal which will take 40 million acres out of production.

The available land in the Middle West, South Atlantic, and Southern States for low-cost development has been listed by the Department of Agriculture as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

From Reclamation Bureau reports, a table has been compiled showing the type of crops which would be grown on each of the 33 projects proposed in the overall scheme, and whether or not they are supported crops. The table follows:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge	7,970	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Seedskadee	60,720	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
Lyman	40,600	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Silt	7,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Potatoes	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Smith Fork	10,430	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Paonia	17,040	Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Florida	18,950	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Alfalfa	
Pine River	15,150	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
Emery County	24,080	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sheep	Yes.
Central Utah	60,380	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Hammond	3,670	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beans	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Gooseberry	16,400	Alfalfa	
		Pasture	
		Grain	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Navaho	137,240	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Vegetables	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
San Juan-Chama	225,000	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Rabbit Ear	19,190	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Troublesome	13,640	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
West Divide	65,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook	31,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Dolores	66,000	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beans	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Sublette	84,000	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitgrowers	3,850	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Bostwick Park	6,870	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Dallas Creek	21,940	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
East River	2,750	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa	19,400	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Grand Mesa	25,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Ohio Creek	16,910	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Tomichi Creek	27,580	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Battlement Mesa	6,830	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Bluestone	10,875	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Vegetables	
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Eagle Divide	10,875	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Parshall	27,510	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
Woody Creek	2,965	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

What's the Matter With the Drought Relief Feed Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, everybody is talking about the farm problem, and here in the Senate we are trying to do something about it. We are all quite conscious of the farmer's plight. It is a confusing and vexing problem. We have not, however, heard all the stories.

The farm problem is particularly acute in the Southwest, Mr. President, where for the past 5 years the farmers and ranchers in Texas have suffered one of the worst droughts on record, along with the pressures of the cost-price squeeze.

During this period the Federal Government has taken steps to aid the drought-stricken farmer and rancher. The Federal drought-relief program was very beneficial to these people, but it now develops that these benefits—specifically the benefits received from the Government feed program—have been of an elusive character.

I call the attention of Senators to an editorial printed in the Texas Sheep and Goat Raiser magazine of February 1956. I am very concerned over the situation outlined in this editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE DROUGHT RELIEF FEED PROGRAM?

Reports from throughout the Southwest indicate that all is not rosy in the Government's drought relief feed program. Not only are many of the ranchmen and stock farmers confused—some are scared and will have nothing more to do with the program. Others are quite concerned because they have been asked to pay back to the Government that which they thought they were receiving under the relief program.

Many of the feed dealers have been under considerable pressure by Government investigators and according to their reports some of them are plenty tough and plenty rough. One or two feed dealers are known to be dropping out of the drought relief feed picture, and it is rumored that many are to have their permits to sell drought relief feed canceled in the immediate future because of varied and sundry deviations from printed instructions.

Much of the confusion existing in the industry at this time can be resolved by a centralization of focusing of the problems into one place where they can be studied and acted upon. It is doubtful whether the Federal or State Government will continue to push investigations which are imposing undue hardship upon either the feed dealer or the ranch people. The current situation, however, emphasizes that too little cooperative action—too little focusing of attention upon the problems confronting the dealers and growers.

Here is an outline, not too definite nor comprehensive but worth studying, of the situation at present:

In the late summer or early fall of 1954 the drought emergency feed program was established under which the Commodity Credit Corporation, through feed channels, made available to farmers and ranchmen feed from the Commodity Credit surplus stock at a discount of $1 per hundred pounds. The discount was handled through the FHA and ASC offices with purchase orders and dealers' certificates. The instruction that the feed dealers received from the ASC offices was very vague with the general idea being that the program was to be handled liberally in order that the farmer or ranchman might secure the utmost benefit from the program. No definite instruction was given to the feed dealer and each one was apparently left to interpret the instructions he received from the ASC office in his own manner.

This program went on for about a year, and about that time, the auditors began to appear and thoroughly check the records of the feed dealers, the apparent purpose being to enforce strictly certain rules that they had pertaining to the application of the program. It seems from reports that come in from areas where they have been working, that it is their purpose to disallow all the credits that they possibly can find a technicality to disallow. The procedure seems to be to charge back to the dealer anything that they can find any technical error in, and he in turn charges it back to the farmer or ranchman. Obviously, the dealer did not receive the credit and is therefore hardly in position to take the loss. On the other hand, the farmer or ranchman who did receive the credit is, in many cases, financially unable to take the loss. The local ASC offices were themselves so poorly informed as to the interpretation which the auditors would place upon the program that the information they gave to the dealers and the farmers and ranchmen was often misleading and led to more confusion. For instance, one ASC office was of the opinion that all purchase orders had been extended indefinitely and were valid until such time as they were specifically canceled out, presumably by auditors. Many dealers and ranchmen continued to use the orders in good faith at a time when, according to the auditors, they were no longer valid and many of these transactions were apparently being canceled out and the credits disallowed.

It would seem that in view of the confusion that resulted from the manner in which the program was set up and the poor and often inaccurate instructions that came from the ASC offices that the only fair way to correct the errors that had been made would be for someone to take retroactive action that would allow the credits which were disallowed because of technicalities and due to the ignorance of those who were participating in the program.

Now, we have a drought relief feed program.

We also have auditors and investigators.

Apparently we need some investigators to investigate the investigators.

The condition of this program today is not satisfactory.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Military Operations Subcommittee, of which I am a member, is holding hearings on the subject of civil defense, to lay the groundwork for needed revisions in the Federal civil-defense law.

There is a widespread belief in this country that civil defense is either futile against sudden massive assaults with nuclear weapons, or is hopelessly inadequate under present arrangements.

I am certainly of the opinion that civil defense offers a hope for the people of this country in terms of survival from bomb damage and that the people should be assured that adequate arrangements are being made for that purpose.

I believe that effective civil-defense measures can be taken if the need for them is sufficiently understood by the public. I personally intend to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 98. This resolution was introduced earlier in the 84th Congress by Congressman HOLIFIELD, to constitute the Federal Civil Defense Administration, an executive department of the Federal Government, headed by a Secretary.

In connection with its hearings, the subcommittee chairman, Congressman HOLIFIELD, wrote to the mayors of cities considered critical target areas, requesting their views on the national civil defense efforts today, its defects and recommendations for overcoming them.

In my own city of Baltimore, Mayor D'Alesandro requested Col. Frank Milani, director of our civil-defense organization, to prepare a report for the committee. This report has received favorable comment throughout the country.

In the belief that it is of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have asked permission to extend my remarks and have it inserted. I am also including some of the letters sent to Colonel Milani, commending him on his excellent report:

CIVIL DEFENSE ORGANIZATION,
Baltimore, Md., December 14, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor of Baltimore, City Hall, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MAYOR D'ALESANDRO: Pursuant to your instructions, the following report is submitted.

Congressman HOLIFIELD's letter and the enclosures certainly have come at a most opportune time when we are endeavoring to solve the multitude of problems in civil defense in the light of the present weapons effects and those newer weapons which now must be given attention.

Like a great many of my colleagues all over the country, I feel the great weight of responsibility which lies upon us in these uncertain times and their implications.

As you probably know, we in Baltimore have pursued the problem vigorously for a long time. We have been concerned in ap-

proaching the problem of civil defense from a realistic viewpoint and we find a great variety of stumbling blocks in our path in the attempt at arriving at realistic solutions.

It is therefore my intention to set forth my thoughts on this major problem in the above light, conforming to the three major problems Congressman HOLIFIELD's letter has posed:

1. The national civil defense effort today.
2. Civil defense major defects.
3. A solution to overcome these defects.

For your convenience, I have grouped the defects and solutions following each other.

1. THE NATIONAL CIVIL DEFENSE EFFORT TODAY

A. The Federal Civil Defense Administration cannot be blamed wholly for the civil-defense situation as it exists today. The major error of civil defense in its early days was that its preparations were based on concepts of the last war. With this major strike against it, it has suffered from lack of proper coordination and planning as a result of a public law which is inadequate to meet its responsibility. This was the second strike. The third strike is a continuing one dealing with an appropriate funding program which has caused the agency to work on a piecemeal basis rather than facing the problem of head on.

B. While a fair appraisal of the national civil-defense effort since 1950 would indicate that some progress has been made, in total it is microscopic in the overall national security. In the light of its gigantic responsibility to the Nation, it has occupied only a minute place in our efforts toward possible survival. In short, we have gone to the basement for bargains and come back with exactly what we have paid for.

C. The total effort is summed up in the attitude of the American public toward civil defense which has erroneously been tagged as public apathy. I do not subscribe to that viewpoint. Rather, in my opinion, there is indicated a lack of vigorous leadership in the entire Federal civil defense agency who are charged with producing a realistic civil-defense program and the public by its attitude has indicated a vote of no confidence in its operation. Couple this with the natural desire of the people for a peaceful era to which we all subscribe, and you end up with a general let-George-do-it complex. We must recognize that the American people need and want education, not propaganda. We recognize that America and its people have never been subjected to live frontiers, that they have lived in a vacuum of isolationism for a century and a half. These frontiers have been defined for us. We must make our people understand about air oceans which do not present any impediment to an aggressor. In short, we must take the public into our confidence, spare nothing. We recognize the aspirations and hopes of the American people and react in accordance with those aspirations and hopes. The overriding desire for peace, and with it a tendency on the part of the people to play at a peace game as though it were a reality and here now, must be recognized. Pure propaganda to turn this trend around won't do it. Scare speeches and frightening totals of destruction in the event of hydrogen attack won't do it, for Americans don't scare easily.

2. CIVIL DEFENSE MAJOR DEFECTS AND SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

Defect A: An anticipated public law which does not conform with the responsibility brought about by the atomic-hydrogen age and a civil defense within the security structure which will play its part as a deterrent to war. Within 10 years from the discovery of A and H bombs, nuclear weapons have developed into an immediate threat to the millions who live in our industrial complex and a potential menace to the biological future of the human race. The problem is now so vast that both military and civil defense against nuclear assault bear four major facets all closely integrated and dependent upon each other: (a) the threat of retaliation; (b) early warning and interception of bomb carriers; (c) evacuation of cities in the path of assault; and (d) reduction of vulnerability by peacetime dispersal of population and industry. These four when taken together while not promising absolute security in the atomic age can, however, establish and maintain for a number of years a highly unstable and precarious status quo in which outbreak of war will be made unlikely by the terrible risk the aggressor takes in unleashing it. This is a status quo in which our Nation may continue to spend a large part of its national income building weapons of mass destruction, erecting more and more elaborate electronic curtains around the American continent and shaping the political and economic life so as best to survive in a blow-up that may occur at any moment.

Solution A: (1) The Federal civil-defense agency must be given a dignified position in the governmental structure commensurate with its mission. If it is true that it must be considered a fourth arm of our national-security structure, then other agencies of Government and the Congress must recognize it as such.

(2) The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 should be completely overhauled and provide for, among other things, the reorganization of the Federal Civil Defense Administration internally after transfer of its responsibility and functioning within the framework of the Department of Defense. The top-level staffs of this reorganized agency should be sought not only from recognized civil-service lists but sought for their knowledge in their particular fields. This recognized agency, as the Department of Civil Defense, on a co-equal basis with the Army, Navy, and Air Force headed by a civilian Secretary of Civil Defense, should have representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Security Council.

Defect B: Lack of a national master disaster plan to mitigate and recover from the effects of nuclea rassault. At present, numerous bulletins and circulars are fed like crumbs to starving pigeons. The result is a conglomeration of virtually hundreds of uncoordinated plans, not even speaking the same professional language.

Solution B: The buildup of a national master disaster plan should be effected at an early date. Upon such a plan the State can base its planning on realistic and adequate information and in turn the local civil-defense authority do the same, thus creating a national pattern. The Federal agency could then more closely estimate its financial needs and approach Congress for the realistic budget which it merits.

Defect C: Lack of Federal positive leadership in moving away from parochial planning based upon political jurisdictional lines.

Solution C: Revision and enactment of legislation and issuance of regulations which will conform to the needs of a modern civil defense. The principal needs are:

(1) A number of mandatory features which will make local civil-defense organizations within a target complex fulfill civil-defense requirements. The hydrogen weapon has not yet recognized home rule.

(2) Legislation and/or regulations should point up the need of organizing critical target complexes upon an areawide basis. Hydrogen weapons and the yet to come inter-continental ballistics missiles, plus fallout implications, have outmoded the concept that each target city and the surrounding counties can afford the luxury of "going it alone," nor can dependency be placed on outmoded systems of so-called mutual aid. The need here is for whole groups of counties tightly knit together to act under one plan, and under single direction as an authority. This is nothing new in the life of urban administration—more an more of the urban everyday problems are finding the answer in the same field of authorities.

(3) The director, being locally appointed by the combined counties and target city, will be able to coordinate all civil-defense measures for the authority area, thus leaving the State to function in its proper capacity of coordination. The director is then in a position not only to carry out more effectvely preattack organization, training, and usage of existing resources, but he will be in a position to make an impact in the event of war-caused or natural disaster peculiar to the local situation.

Defect D: The volunteer system upon which civil defense has been created.

Solution D: (1) the use of virtually a total volunteer system in long-range civil defense planning is unrealistic and fails to recognize its inherent weaknesses.

(2) The use of volunteers should be limited in the preattack phase to cadre requirements. For example, if you need an eight-man team, in any service, secure one man, train him and assign him. When the time comes, if it ever does, surround him with seven others even though untrained. These eight men would create a greater impact at the time of disaster than the present system of "paper volunteers," who neither respond to training sessions nor have the enthusiasm to remain in civil defense. The volunteer civil defense corps structure, as we must design it, is incapable of holdng and training great masses of volunteers. It is, therefore, necessary that we devise a civil defense corps similar to the National Guard of the State to be administered by the local authority, all in cadre form, or if possible, a system built up from the selective service system which would make the civil defense corps selective.

(3) The civil defense corps should be authorized a minimum of 12 training periods per year, paid for by the Federal Government. Attendance at authorized civil defense schools and courses should be at Federal expense. The average target area, such as Baltimore, would require 50,000 volunteers to overcome a disaster of the scope envisioned. Ten percent of this total should be authorized for recruitment in cadre form throughout the area. With 5,000 selected, reasonably well-trained and controlled volunteers, the civil defense organization could make an impact upon a disaster situation and we may then reasonably assume "we could come off the floor fighting."

(4) The revised law should provide for the use of certain categories of older reserve and retired personnel of the Armed Forces for staff planning and assignment to keep positions in disaster control. We are wasting a wealth of readily available talent when we are forced to use untrained and inexperienced personnel in specialized fields.

Defect E: Public acceptance or nonacceptance of a civil-defense system.

Solution E: (1) I have attempted to point out at the beginning of my letter some of the more pressing problems on this defect. To solve them will require a thoroughly well-organized public education program in civil-defense, away and beyond the mere passing out of the too-few public information pamphlets issued to date. Even the job of public information pamphlets should be multiplied a thousandfold, and furnished to local authorities without cost and providing a postage-free method of distribution.

(2) The local civil-defense agency is incapable of doing a mass education job of this magnitude by itself—it must have Federal and State assistance in abundance, not driblets. The cost of such a program should be borne from Federal funds. Just enough leeway should be given the State and target

area so as to conform with its local peculiar needs. What is vital is that a start—an integrated, reasoned start—be made without delay and that we abandon the present half-hearted, haphazard methods of public education.

(3) Specifically, the greatest medium for education of the public is at our disposal—television. The World War II concept of holding meetings and gatherings to educate has long been outmoded, yet locally we cling to it as a drowning man to a straw. We must bring the school of civil defense education into the living room of every home. Programs must be designed which are simple and to the point, with enough interest and warmth to hold the viewer, whether adult or child. The pressure idea should be avoided as a plague. Fanfare and showmanship have no place in civil defense. Dignity and maturity of purpose must be the keynote. This kind of approach cannot be left to local capabilities which are limited in financial capabilities and moreover, should be part of a nationwide integrated program.

(4) If we do the kind of public education job which is acceptable to the public, we will automatically be giving basic civil defense training to those who, at a later date, may become members of the Civil Defense Corps, thus the entire American public becomes a potential pool of partially trained civil-defense volunteers. The educational program should be designed with this in mind. It can be fitted to the needs of the family unit to safeguard itself and yet automatically absorb the basic training needs of the volunteer.

Defect F: Unrealism in spreading a modern civil-defense equally in the 48 States when we know that our survival is dependent upon a relatively small number of complexes termed "critical target areas."

Solution F: The Federal agency must exercise forthrightness in informing the public of the necessity to concentrate the major portion of our civil-defense energies on the designated critical target complexes, for herein lie our strength and industrial power to sustain the whole Nation and to give us the chance for maximum survival. There is little or no point in selecting noncritical areas for major civil-defense effort or to designate areas known to be of a very low target evaluation, merely because the Bureau of the Census by its own necessary criteria includes such areas within the scope of its terminology. It is absolutely essential that we husband our civil-defense energies and that the public be taken into civil-defense confidence, and told the facts of life.

Defect G: Unrealism in placing the major responsibility of civil-defense operations upon the local level, where it belongs, and allowing these localities virtually to shift for themselves.

Solution G: A closer relationship must exist between the Federal agency and local civil defense, with less chain of command paperwork and more chain of command personal contact. While the role of the State is clearly one of coordination, general guidance and administrative control over Federal and State funds, there must be a closer and more direct relationship between the Federal agency and the critical-target area. For the sake of the target area, the director and his staff must possess direct access at least to field offices of the Federal Civil Defense Agency. The planning and operating in mitigating and recovery functions must and will devolve upon the target area and it is patently necessary that, with a National master disaster plan in existence, the critical target area should be in a position of close contact and coordination with Federal civil-defense field offices for preattack planning if the local target-area staff is not to be submerged by the State.

Defect H: Lack of vigorous Federal leadership in bringing business and industry into the civil-defense program from top management level as coequal partners in solving the problem of continuity of industrial capability.

Solution H: (1) Civil defense must and will fail miserably, no matter how well administered or by whom, unless business and industry is in full support of civil defense, in fact as well as vocally.

(2) The labor force involved in our economic and industrial system is so closely allied outside the store, office, or factory to the total civil-defense problem that business and industry cannot afford to stand aloof, awaiting a trumpet call from some unknown and mysterious source.

(3) Business and industry must be assured from a Federal level that civil defense in a plant does not mean the outlay of great sums of money. It must be assured that while the Federal Government supports and urges industrial dispersal, it does so on the basis of feasibility and practicability. It must be assured that in cooperating to the extent of preparation in the expansion of existing plant-protection programs, it does so primarily for its own benefit. The appropriate Federal agencies must be responsible for assuring top industrial management, if necessary industry by industry, if the plant-security program of civil defense is to be solved at the local level.

Defect I: Failure to recognize that nuclear assault upon our cities in itself is a complicated matter and that local authorities do not possess the resources to maintain adequate staffs.

Solution I: In this particular defect is revealed the total inadequacy of the present Public Law 920 which prohibits the use of Federal funds for administrative purposes. If we are to overcome this crack in the civil-defense dike we had better take another good hard look at this part of the Federal law and make some rapid changes to:

(1) Allow for use by the critical target areas the funds to share in the cost of employing the necessary key disaster control personnel in each of the critical target areas. Here again the dormant talent of retired and noncritical Reserve officer personnel should be encouraged to turn to the problem of civil defense at the local level. With adequate funds these officers could be utilized almost on the same level as duty with active forces at a fraction of the cost.

(2) Experience has proved that the Federal Government would be sharing to a greater degree in its responsibility to the local level by a major share in maintaining these staffs on the basis of monetary and operational support than by standing at a considerable distance on the sideline. The expenditure involved would be a small price to pay for disaster control insurance for the United States.

(3) The core of these disaster control staffs, which must be prepared to function rapidly, must be on the ground to plan, to train and to operate, and by leavening the staff with personnel from local divisions of government, plus a volunteer segment, the maximum capabilities possible is secured.

Defect J: Failure to give top priority to local civil defense access to Federal surplus property and material.

Solution J: A prime example of local civil defense blocks is the problem of logistical support of civil defense. The requirement of civil defense funding for purchase of needed equipment for preattack training and stockpiling is far beyond the means of the average city government. Yet the means for satisfying many of these needs are available from the immense quantities of Federal surplus property. Without delay the pending bill in Congress should be passed, or included in a revision of Public Law 920, which will give top priority to the local civil defense organizations to acquire such property wherever it may be found.

Defect K: The antiquated and unrealistic policy of placing major reliance upon existing agencies of local government for the bulk of preattack civil defense planning in their spheres.

Solution K: The theory of utilizing city and county resources and manpower at the time of war-caused or natural disaster is a separate problem from that of preattack planning by agencies of local government. The actual use of manpower and material existing at local government level for planning, training, and administration has been assumed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration as simply there for the taking at any time. Nothing can be further from the truth. The truth is that such factors as interdepartmental cost accounting which any well-managed city or county carries on has not been taken into consideration. Local government budgets do not provide for such excess expenditures by the various departments. Personnel problems to carry out day-to-day city service functions are acute and existing staffs overburdened now. It is therefore my view that:

(1) Local government resources and manpower should be considered as available to civil defense only at the time of disaster on the same scale as any other private or industrial manpower and resource availability.

(2) To begin with, these resources when carefully analyzed, plus the possible loss in manpower and resources as a result of disaster, comprise only a very small percent of the total requirement. Too great a stress has been placed upon its utilization, thus blinding us to the true facts. The Federal Civil Defense Administration and State policy of utilizing existing local government agencies and resources upon which to build the whole local civil defense structure should be limited to integrating these resources in manpower, equipment, and facilities for disaster operations only. For preattack purposes of organizing, planning, and training, the problems involved should not be made a requirement to be shouldered by the separate divisions of city government unless a department or departments actually possess the capability as has been the case in some departments of Baltimore City.

(3) Present Federal and State laws should be revised so as to permit the Federal Civil Defense Agency and the State to participate with critical target areas in funds for administrative, planning, and operational costs, backed up by the logical integration of the organized available manpower and resources at the time of disaster.

Defect L: A poorly conceived matching fund program.

Solution L: The entire matching fund program should be revised in the light of the several recommendations made herein. The keynote of such a revision should be flexibility in administering the funds.

Defect M: Overriding recognition by the Federal Civil Defense Administration of State prerogatives, to the extent of submerging the critical target city operations in many cases.

Solution M: The local civil defense organization has been submerged by present Federal policies of dealing with State and local civil defense organizations. The job of mitigating and recovering from effects of as assault on a critical target city is the responsibility, in the final analysis, of the local authority. To plan for and be ready to operate in the event of disaster there must be close relationship between the critical target area and the Federal agency and its field staffs for preattack planning purposes. This in no way violates the chain of command through the State, but rather will tend to lay the groundwork for better understanding and operations at the time of disaster. thus tending to bring back the

critical target area into proper focus in the civil defense picture.

SUMMARY

Elmer Davis in the American Scholar recently said: "This is a time of peril; we need the best leadership we can get, and also the best informed followership—if we are going to dig our way out." He might have followed it up by adding "out of the morass of civil-defense darkness."

The very wording of Public Law 920 indicates on open sesame for the divestment of responsible leadership. Somewhere along the line the notion that local government does not want any part of State or Federal "on the ground leadership" was born. Federal civil defense has consistently refused to come up with an overall master disaster plan for the country as a whole. The result of such a notion is that there are 49 plans for States, 70 or more for separate critical target areas, and virtually hundreds more by cities or counties across the country. How can an "informed followership" be secured under such circumstances?

Admittedly, civil defense has made a degree of progress since the inception of Federal Civil Defense Administration in 1950. Were we confronted with the civil-defense problems of the 1942 blockbuster, we could afford the luxury of patting ourselves on the back for a job well done under trying conditions. However, we are in no position to afford the luxury of laissez faire conduct under thermonuclear and intercontinental ballistic missiles considerations. Admittedly again, through no fault of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, we have lost at least one whole year in planning for the problem of radioactive fallout. We have been given a national evacuation policy as a result of increased weapons yield without the necessary technical information to plan realistically. Only recently has some action been provided in this particular field.

Civil defense, as now constituted, cannot and will not make any appreciable impact against a massive war-caused disaster. Until some rapid remedial measures are taken to offset the conditions as they exist today in civil defense, we may be in for a rude awakening should we be so unfortunate as to be on the receiving end of a massive air assault by thermonuclear or guided missiles weapons. Right now the best we can say for American civil defense is that it is on paper, such as it may be. Time is no longer on our side. The hour glass has run its course.

With reference to the two enclosures, House Joint Resolution 98 and House Concurrent Resolution 108, I believe I have covered these in the body of my letter.

Of necessity, this is a long answer to three major problems. However, I believe you wanted a forthright viewpoint.

Sincerely,

FRANK MILANI, *Director.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1956.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor, City of Baltimore,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MAYOR D'ALESANDRO: Thank you for your letter of December 16 transmitting the very excellent report of your civil defense director, Col. Frank Milani.

I am sure you are aware of the wide distribution and general acclaim which Colonel Milani's report has enjoyed throughout the country. We have secured a supply of copies which we are distributing to members of our subcommittee. I believe that every interested person should have an opportunity to read Colonel Milani's penetrating comments. I want also to express our appreciation for the cooperation which Colonel Milani and his staff have extended to the subcommittee in recent months. If it is at all possible I hope that our hearing schedule will make it possible for us to meet with you and your staff personally. Please advise me if you wish further details of this subcommittee's hearing program.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

CIVIL DEFENSE,
WHEELING-OHIO COUNTY CHAPTER,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
February 3, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Director, Civil Defense Organization,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MILANI: Received a copy of your detailed report dated December 14, 1956, addressed to Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Mayor of Baltimore, and I want to compliment you on this excellent writing on the civil defense situation.

Some of the civil defense problems we have been experiencing in this area, are well expressed in your report, and I agree with the point of view you have so well written.

If you have any additional copies of this report, will appreciate your mailing me 1 or 2 copies of same.

I again congratulate you on this fine report, and am sure that other civil defense directors who received copies, enjoyed reading this constructive analysis on civil defense problems.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. CROCK,
Director, Wheeling-Ohio County Civil Defense.

OFFICE OF DIRECTOR
OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.,
COUNTY BUILDING,
Rockville, Md., January 17, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Director of Civil Defense,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you very much for the copy of your report to Mayor D'Alesandro and for the copy of your budget figures as well. The latter by comparison may stir our "powers that be" to greater generosity?

The report to the Mayor was eloquent, forceful, and pointed up some glaring deficiencies. I recognize that you did not consider it a panacea for all of our ailments. However, someone must focus attention on our sickness or the proper cures never would be forthcoming. Sorry indeed that I find myself unable to take an optimistic viewpoint toward all the faults getting fixed, but nevertheless, thank you for sending me a copy of your diagnosis, Doctor.

Cordially yours

G. ROY HARTWIG,
Deputy Director of Civil Defense.

KENT COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
Grand Rapids, Mich., January 16, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Director, Civil Defense Organization,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MILANI: We are in receipt of your mimeographed report on civil defense to Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, Md.

We have read this report with a great deal of interest. We particularly like that section of your report on pages 7 and 8, under section K, as we have long felt that civil defense cannot be built up satisfactorily around governmental units. This has been the policy of the Michigan Office of Civil Defense under Director C. F. Van Blankenstein, who recently resigned to work for Federal Civil Defense Administration, Region IV.

You certainly devoted a lot of time, thought and energy to this report, and it is our sincere hope that something will come from some of these suggestions. We know that Congressman HOLIFIELD has been most interested in civil defense, as well as Senators KEFAUVER, HUMPHREY, and others whom we do not recall at the moment.

We do not wholly agree with you on the Federal Government paying administrative costs at the local level, as we still believe we should have a fair degree of autonomy at the local level.

It would be appreciated if you could make arrangements to send us half a dozen more copies of your report for distribution locally. We understand that Colonel Gault is your deputy director and we remember him well from the Staff College at Olney, Md., in 1951, and we corresponded with him on a few occasions while he was civil defense director in Dayton, Ohio. It would be appreciated if you would convey our best wishes to Colonel Gault.

Most sincerely.

DANIEL R. WATERS,
Executive Secretary, Kent County Civil Defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE COUNCIL,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 12, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Director, Civil Defense Organization,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you very much for a copy of the very fine report which you submitted to your mayor. It was one of the best statements concerning civil-defense problems I have yet read.

The one which we prepared for Mayor Clark was nowhere nearly as detailed. A copy of Mayor Clark's reply is attached for your information.

May I say that I think you have done a great deal to help the civil-defense cause by your presentation and I hope that Mayor D'Alesandro, Jr., is aware of the good work which you have done in the preparation of the document.

Kindest regards.

Cordially,

PAUL B. HARTENSTEIN,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS,
January 11, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Civil Defense Director,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR FRANK: I have read and appreciated the copy of your letter to Mayor D'Alesandro concerning Congressman HOLIFIELD's request. We, too, were requested to answer this letter and as soon as I have some copies of my reply multilithed I will send you one. However, let me say that I was very happy to find that our thinking was very much the same and that the picture of the national civil defense is beginning to crystallize to a point that I believe that something can be done about it.

I believe that we disagree only in one instance, and that although I am in favor of the establishment of the FCDA on a higher basis in government, I do not agree that the Department of Defense is the proper place for it. Rather, it should hold a Cabinet position of its own and not get fouled up in the business of competing with the other three services. I indicated my reasoning on this manner in the letter which you will receive shortly.

Thank you for sending us your report and I am very happy to see such good substantial thinking being done in relation to civil de-

fense in your community. Hoping to see you again soon at some national meeting.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. HALSTEAD,
Executive Director, Minneapolis Office of Civil Defense.

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE,
OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE, COURTHOUSE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 5, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Director, Civil Defense Organization,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MILANI: Thank you very much for your letter of December 14, 1955, regarding your views on matters as expressed in Congressman HOLIFIELD's letter. I think they are very interesting and to the point and sincerely hope that Mr. HOLIFIELD will be able to incorporate some of them in any forthcoming civil-defense legislation.

I am especially interested in your appraisal of Public Law 920, and agree with you that the act is archaic and was not conceived to cover the type of emergency that will undoubtedly exist in the event of a hydrogen-bomb attack. Having been a member of the Air Force Board during World War II and having worked on the development of bombing planning, I thoroughly understand your statement that the hydrogen bomb does not respect "home rule."

I think that if enough of us get together and make our views known on the points that you have covered in your letter, that we may be able to accomplish something. I think that we should employ all media to this purpose and in particular the United States Civil Defense Council which, as you may recall, started out as a more or less legitimate group of civil-defense directors, but which has, to some degree at least, shown evidence of being dominated or absorbed by FCDA, and in so doing will lose, to a great degree, its independent status. I have always felt that there is a great need for an organization of this type as it is a voice outside of Government and if properly used, can be a potent instrument for civil defense.

I could make use of about six more copies of your letter if you have them available and would appreciate your sending them to me. In the meantime if there is anything that I can do for you on the Milwaukee front, or otherwise, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Very sincerely,

GEORGE W. CARNACHAN,
Civil Defense Coordinator.

CIVIL DEFENSE CORPS,
BIRMINGHAM-JEFFERSON COUNTY,
Birmingham, Ala., January 3, 1956.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Civil Defense Director,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MILANI: Thanks very much for copy of letter dated December 14 to your mayor in reply to communication received from Congressman HOLIFIELD requesting appraisal of our present civil-defense organization.

At the time of receipt of your letter I was preparing an answer to Mayor Morgan of our city to Congressman HOLIFIELD's letter. I have read over your letter very carefully several times and in my opinion you have covered the situation in a most outstanding manner and I agree with you 100 percent on every issue you have brought up and the solutions thereto. The idea of education of civil-defense personnel over TV might seem radical to many not familiar with the problems we face. After 4 years struggling with civil defense, I am convinced that we cannot enroll masses of people and give them the classroom training necessary for them to perform effectively in time of disaster.

I have taken the liberty of incorporating quite a bit of your letter into my reply to the mayor. It was so well written that it seemed impossible for me to take the same idea and change it. I sincerely hope you don't mind. As a matter of fact, I believe that every director that concurs with your thinking 100 percent could write an identical letter to his Congressman and Senator that would have very effective results, as most advertising managers tell us any idea repeated long enough and to enough people will produce results. Therefore, it might be smart for us to be pouring in more information to our Senators and Congressmen. If you have not already done so, permit me to suggest that you send a copy of the letter sent to me to the directors of the 70 critical target areas with the request that they write a similar letter to their Congressmen and Senators.

Wishing you a very happy and prosperous New Year, I am,

Sincerely,

U. N. JAMES, *Director.*

CITY OF KANSAS CITY,
CIVIL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT,
Kansas City, Mo., December 30, 1955.

Subject: Report of December 14, 1955, to the mayor of Baltimore on civil-defense status.

Mr. FRANK MILANI,
Civil Defense Director,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR FRANK: We have read your report with a great deal of interest several times over and I believe it is the best thing I have ever seen on the subject.

You are to be congratulated upon your keen analysis of the entire situation. However, having known you for so many years, I wouldn't expect less.

Particularly, I appreciate your comments on the use of surplus property which has been denied us. Your calling attention to the necessity of shortening the chain of command and cutting out the State office is very well stated. In fact, there is nothing I disagree with.

I should like to have a dozen copies if you could spare them as I want to give them to each of my deputies in order that I can use it as material for talks supporting our budget and other civil-defense projects.

Wishing you the best of everything including a happy 1956, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

C. O. THRASHER, *Director.*

The Upper Colorado River Storage Project Threatens California's Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement introduced in the Appendix of the RECORD Congressman ENGLE has alleged that the testimony of California witnesses proves that the Colorado River project will not threaten California's water rights. To reach this position, which is diametrically opposed to the conclusions reached by these witnesses, Congressman ENGLE on the one hand has relied upon quotations taken out of context, while on the other he has ignored those parts of the testimony which point out the serious danger in the upper basin project to the State's water rights.

Not only are Mr. ENGLE'S conclusions at odds with those of the legal and engineering experts upon whom he seeks to rely, but they are directly contrary to the official position of the Legislature of California, the State's attorney general, and the Colorado River Board.

Assembly Joint Resolution 37, enacted by the California State Legislature last May, is as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 37

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to pending legislation affecting the waters of the Colorado River

Whereas more than 6 million people of this State depend upon the Colorado River as an important source of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial needs; and

Whereas the metropolitan area of southern California, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and some 60 other cities depend on the Colorado River for water and hydroelectric power; and

Whereas the Colorado River is the sole source of water to irrigate over 1 million acres of land in this State; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of two major power and irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River at an estimated total cost approximating $1,750,000,000; and

Whereas one of these projects as contemplated by S. 500, H. R. 270, and companion bills, known as the Colorado River storage project, includes (1) the construction of 6 large dams creating reservoirs with an aggregate storage capacity of 44 million acre-feet, and (2) the construction of 14 or more irrigation projects known as participating projects; and

Whereas these storage dams are not required to serve the proposed irrigation projects but would store water for power purposes under interpretations of the Colorado River compact now being defended against by California in the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.;* and

Whereas the major irrigation participating projects are very costly transmountain diversion projects to take large amounts of the highest quality water out of the Colorado River Basin to other river basins; and

Whereas the other project, as contemplated by S. 300 and H. R. 412, and known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, is also a very costly transmountain diversion project to take the best quality water out of the Colorado River basin to the Arkansas River basin, and is the initial phase of a project to divert 900,000 acre-feet of water per annum out of the Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas both of these projects are based upon interpretations of the Colorado River compact which are now at issue before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Arizona* v. *California et al.;* and

Whereas these projects, if constructed under those interpretations, would be detrimental to both the quality and quantity of water to which California has rights long established by prior appropriation as well as by contracts with the Federal Government for projects now constructed; and

Whereas both proposed projects are based upon questionable standards of financial feasibility and if constructed would cost the taxpayers of our Nation several billion dollars in the form of a subsidy to the lands which would be irrigated; and

Whereas California is the second largest taxpaying State in the Nation, and would therefore be doubly injured if these projects were authorized both by the impairment of the quality and quantity of water to which existing California projects have established rights, and by the burden of a tremendous taxload: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the

Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of legislation authorizing the Colorado storage project and participating projects, and legislation authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project until the Supreme Court decides the case now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The State's attorney general, Hon. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, stated as follows on February 24, 1956:

In the interest of sound reclamation and sound national economy, the upper Colorado River project bill ought to be decisively defeated. I understand that it is scheduled to come up for a vote in the House of Representatives during the week of February 26.

I am convinced that the upper Colorado River project bill as it is being presented to Congress will adversely affect California's vitally important water rights on the Colorado River.

The office of the attorney general now is engaged in defending California's water rights on the Colorado River in a suit pending before the Supreme Court. With this suit in progress, certainly every other precaution also must be taken to protect California's rights on the Colorado River from harmful legislative measures. I believe the upper Colorado River project bill constitutes such a threat.

There are other basic reasons why the bill should not be adopted. Certainly it is inconsistent for our good neighbors in the upper Colorado River Basin to press for a bill that would bring hundreds of thousands of acres of land into crop production at a time when Congress is faced with the plan to pay farmers billions of dollars to withdraw some 40 million acres of farmland from crop production.

I am convinced that there is no justification for the passage of the upper Colorado River project bill at this session of Congress.

The argument advanced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] in rationalization of his own position is not a new one. He first advanced it in March 1955, during the House Interior Committee hearings upon the Colorado River storage project on cross-examination of the California witnesses. It was fully and effectively answered at that time—see House hearings on H. R. 3383, pages 977–992.

The following colloquies are illustrative. At page 982:

Mr. ENGLE. If I correctly interpret that statement, it means that this Congress could authorize, and the Bureau of Reclamation could build, all of these participating projects without the impairing by as much as one bucketful the water to which California is entitled under the Colorado River project.

Mr. ELY. Subject to two qualifications: First, if they were built without the construction of storage works which would intercept our water supply; second, to the degree that they do not involve transmountain diversions which would impair the quality of water.

* * * * * *

Mr. ELY. Bear in mind two things, Mr. ENGLE: First, quality of water, which we reserve at all times under article 8 of the Colorado River compact; and, second, in all of my answers to you, you and I are both dealing in complete ignorance of the claims of the United States for the use of Indians and as to whether they would be adjudicated to be ahead of the compact and outside of the compact. If they are, then no answer I give you can have any validity whatever because none of us know how much water the upper basin or lower basin would have coming to them after the satisfaction of those rights.

At page 989:

Mr. ENGLE. All I am asking is, Do I interpret that statement correctly, that the State of California and the Colorado River Board regard Glen Canyon, standing by itself, as a sound project?

Mr. ELY. Not as proposed; no, sir. May I explain?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, if you can explain that; go ahead.

Mr. ELY. In Glen Canyon, as proposed, the financial setup is based upon the assumption there may be withheld from the lower basin and accumulated in storage for power generation at Glen Canyon, water which may not lawfully be held there under the Colorado River compact. Such water must be released to the lower basin and is not available for power generation at Glen Canyon. That is point 1. Point 2: The 6-mill rate proposed here is not realistic. This project is not sound economically.

At page 991:

Mr. ELY. The storage project would be constructed, operated, and filled on the assumption that the upper basin may retain in storage during the filling period, which is about 20 years, some two to three million acre-feet per year that we say the lower basin is entitled to receive. It withholds that from us. That is the consequence during the filling period. There would be a consequent reduction in the quantity of water available for consumptive use in the lower basin in violation of the power contracts. I am still speaking of the filling period. After the reservoirs are filled, then the consequences depend upon the rate of development of the consumptive use in the upper basin.

The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation contained in House Document 364 are based upon the assumption that the ultimate consumptive use planned by section 2 of the bill will be at the rate of 9,500,000 acre-feet in extreme years and will average 7½ million and be calculated upon depletion instead of consumption at the site of use. That means a permanent deprivation of water from the lower basin of about 2 million acre-feet, taking into account the further consequences of the Mexican Treaty.

So my answer to you is, sir, that the effect of this project is immediate in withholding from the lower basin 2 million acre-feet or more per year to which we are entitled as soon as the gates are closed at Glen Canyon. That situation will prevail during the entire filling period. It will recur thereafter to the extent that the upper basin is developed in accordance with the plans presented in the project before you.

The burden of the reports of the State engineer and of the statements of California witnesses was that the reports on which the upper basin project were planned gave no proper or adequate consideration to the interest of the lower basin States, and that the project was planned on erroneous interpretations of the Colorado River compact, all of which cut California's rights seriously, and that the project should proceed only, first, if there were assurances that these rights were not impaired, and second, if the project could qualify under proper criteria of feasibility and repayment. The project fails in both respects.

In these circumstances it was the absolute responsibility of the representatives of the State and the agencies affected to point out these grave failures to the committee. This was done by Fred Simpson, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California; by board members Evan T. Hewes and Samuel B. Morris; by General Counsel James H. Howard for the Metropolitan Water District who also represented Joseph Jensen, member of the Colorado River Board; by Ben Griffith, president of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles and Gilmore Tillman as counsel for the city; as well as by Raymond Matthew and Northcutt Ely, engineer and counsel for the board respectively, the two persons whom Mr. Engle singles out in his attack.

To bear out the concern and objections voiced by these representatives, there is now at hand an independent engineering report on lower basin water supply entitled "Report on Water Supply for Probable Future Developments in the San Diego County Water Authority, September 1955." One of the engineers who made this report is Raymond A. Hill, who completed a report on Colorado River waters for the State of Colorado in 1953—see Senate Document No. 23, 84th Congress, first session. The San Diego report concludes that the upper Colorado River storage project will have a disastrous effect on the water supply of the densely populated coastal cities of southern California. It states that:

16. When the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and in operation, there will not be a sufficient flow in the river below Lee Ferry to supply the full right of the metropolitan water district, namely, 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum. It is quite probable that the flow will not take care of more than about one-half of the full right.

17. In order to obtain its full right in the Colorado of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum, it will be necessary to make other arrangements to replace the deficiency resulting from the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project.

18. Any reduction in the Colorado River aqueduct diversions will mean a proportionate decrease in the amount of water available to the San Diego County Water Authority through the existing aqueduct. Its effect on the authority would be disastrous.

See report, page 20.

How, in the face of this report, to say nothing of the testimony made in good faith by California representatives, can the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] support this project, and still say, as he does, "should authorization of the project prejudice California's legal rights to water of the Colorado River, my duty as well as the duty of every other person charged with the responsibility of representing California in or before Congress would be to oppose the legislation with all possible vigor"?

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I beg to ad-

vise the House that today I presented to the Congress a resolution on pending farm legislation that was sent me by the Associated Farmers of Richland County, Inc., of Mansfield, Ohio. It sets forth their opposition to any form of Federal control or subsidies.

I also have presented to the Congress a resolution on social security by the Associated Farmers of Richland County over the signature of its chairman, John G. Woods.

I respectfully ask the membership of this body to analyze carefully these resolutions.

Secretary Dulles and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans who have become uneasy of late about the unsteadiness of our leadership in the realm of foreign policy, I read with considerable curiosity the speech delivered February 26 in Philadelphia by the Secretary of State. It is stimulating to have Mr. Dulles with us from time to time to speak for the administration, because the dramatic changes in Communist strategy which have been building up in Moscow for the past year require a thoughtful response from our Government. Mr. Dulles' speech seems to qualify as thoughtful, although it is not always his prepared utterances which make the happiest impact on his public. One looks in vain, however, for new ideas to match the new departures of the Communist high command. We can only hope that this does not signify that Mr. Dulles really believes what he suggested to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 2 days earlier—that the Russians were only at that very moment revising their whole program because of cumulative failures. Any newspaper reader realizes that the revision of the Communist's approach to the world has been in effect most drastically for many months.

Yet even though the Secretary of State made no really new proposals in his address, I fear that the response of his party followers in Congress will be something new. Ordinarily an administration spokesman can expect the Members of his own party in Congress to applaud and support his recommendations.

This should be particularly true in matters which truly embrace the national interest, as do our relations with the underdeveloped nations of the world. If a Secretary of State, himself, cannot command such allegiance, surely his President should be able to find friendly voices among his own party in Congress to speak up in favor of his recommendations. Yet the one idea in Mr. Dulles' address which evidences any degree of freshness is one that has been met by silence within his own party—a silence made all the more humiliating by the fact that a band of Democratic Members of the House have publicly announced themselves in favor of the proposal.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the request made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address that he be given authority to commit this country to support a limited number of economic and technical assistance projects for a period of time sufficient to insure their completion. This authority is deemed necessary by the administration to strengthen our policy of positive contributions toward creating a better life among the newly enfranchised peoples of the world whose struggle for democracy is so vitally important to the free nations. Secretary Dulles reiterated this proposal, Sunday. The acceptance of this idea by myself and 16 of my Democratic colleagues was publicly announced on January 22. The President and Mr. Dulles must long for a similar profession of agreement from their own side of the aisle. The idea of advance commitment of aid funds is somewhat new, to be sure, although Congress has certainly indulged in implied commitments in undertaking previous large-scale aid programs even on a yearly appropriations basis. Yet, at a time that cries out for original responses to the changing situation which confronts us, it must be disheartening to the Secretary to find Members outside his own party taking the lead in seconding this modest new suggestion, while his own party colleagues remain eloquently silent.

As a signer of the letter of the 17 House Democrats on January 22, I am happy to renew my support of the Eisenhower-Dulles proposal for limited authority to commit this country to aid important foreign development projects until their completion. It is regretable, we feel, that Members of the President's own party have not given him and his sometimes harassed Secretary of State a similar expression of approval.

Edward H. Butler, Outstanding Editor and Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with all Buffalo in paying tribute to the late Edward H. Butler, editor and publisher of the Buffalo Evening News. While his death caused his physical departure from our midst, his memory and spirit shall long be a part of us in the great western New York area. Such was his contribution to his country and community.

I submit just and deserving remarks from his neighbor, the Buffalo Courier-Express:

E. H. BUTLER, OUTSTANDING EDITOR, CITIZEN

His community, his country, and the newspaper profession all could be justly proud of Edward H. Butler. He was a philanthropic and civic-minded citizen, a stanch patriot, and an outstanding editor and publisher.

In his long and distinguished career Mr. Butler played an important part in the historic transition of the American newspaper from a one-man organ of opinion to something approaching a public institution. The son of a noted "personal journalist" of the old school, he became an admirable exemplar of the new era—a newspaper owner who regarded his property as a sacred trust to be administered in the public interest.

His professional duties did not monopolize Mr. Butler's talents and time. He was a generous contributor to philanthropic causes and a remarkably active patron of education. Both the University of Buffalo and the Buffalo State Teachers College owe much in the way of development and progress in his interest and support.

It is not only for his faithful public service in these fields, however, that Mr. Butler will be remembered. He was a man of the highest principle, of strict and sensitive conscience, and of deep religious conviction. And he was a gentleman in the true and full sense of that fine old word.

The Courier-Express extends its heartfelt sympathy to Mr. Butler's family and to the Buffalo Evening News; and we mourn the loss of a man who deservedly held the respect and affection of countless friends and colleagues not only in Buffalo but throughout the Nation.

Rabaut Receives Highest DAR Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the honor bestowed by the Daughters of the American Revolution upon my colleague and fellow Michigander, Congressman LOUIS C. RABAUT. The Daughters presented Mr. RABAUT with their highest tribute—the award of merit—for his efforts in having the words "under God" inserted in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. This ceremony was most fitting, as Mr. RABAUT has worked long and hard to remind the American people that all we are or ever will be is a direct result of divine protection.

I am happy to append the presentation speech of Mrs. T. O. Timberlake, regent of the Continental Dames, District of Columbia DAR, and the acceptance statement of Congressman RABAUT:

ADDRESS BY MRS. T. O. TIMBERLAKE, REGENT, CONTINENTAL DAMES CHAPTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAR

This great Nation was born of an intense and burning desire for freedom—to live, to work, and to worship God. The ancestors of the Daughters of the American Revolution sacrificed their all for these ideals. They fought with every tangible odd against them, except their burning zeal and their supreme faith in God. Everything they did was done in faith and the knowledge that God was with them. In every deliberation and every meeting or battle—in their homes—they asked God's blessing and His guidance. They suffered hardship and privation, they fought and died in the bitter cold and snow with

prayers on their lips and they sat down to write the greatest documents ever written, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, only after invoking God's blessing and guidance. And America grew and prospered.

Somehow, we seem to have forgotten God—we have forgotten that He is still and will always be, our only hope and refuge and that it is we who have separated ourselves from Him, and not He from us.

You, Congressman RABAUT, have done a beautiful and a far-reaching service to your country and to the American people by introducing and engineering the passage of a bill in Congress to insert the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag—thereby bringing constantly to our thoughts the fact that this Nation is under God.

The Daughters of the American Revolution strive constantly to preserve the American way of life—to keep ever sacred the ideals of our Founding Fathers, and because what you have done is so definitely consistent with our purposes, Continental Dames Chapter of the District of Columbia, DAR, has empowered me, their regent, to present to you the Daughters of the American Revolution Award of Merit for 1956—the highest honor within our power to bestow.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN LOUIS C. RABAUT

It is a great pleasure to have an endeavor of mine honored by such a distinguished group as the Daughters of the American Revolution. Your organization long ago became synonymous with patriotism, devotion to duty, and moral strength.

I want to thank especially Mrs. Timberlake and the Continental Dames Chapter for the kind invitation to come here today and receive your coveted award of merit.

Perhaps you have wondered what set of circumstances combined to bring about this historic change in the wording of the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I certainly would never infer that I was the first to strive for a recognition of the Almighty in our national affairs. On the contrary, many organizations and individuals have sought to accomplish this worthy end. The Knights of Columbus and the American Legion had unofficially incorporated the meaningful words in their pledge recitation prior to my bill. The first suggestion for appropriate legislation came to me from a private citizen, a Mr. Mahoney of Brooklyn. Also, the Reverend Doctor George M. Docherty, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, in a sermon with the President in attendance, spoke on the subject of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and urged that the phrase "under God" be added to the pledge of allegiance. I am happy and proud that I was able to be the instrument of change.

In addition to my Under God bill, I introduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide a mail cancellation die bearing the words, "In God We Trust."

When the 3-cent and 8-cent stamps were issued bearing this motto, I did not press for further action on my bill, but later introduced a bill of similar importance, using instead the words "Pray for peace." This bill, H. R. 692, was passed in the House last year and it is now in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I would appreciate your contacting member friends throughout this country and urge them to write their Senators in support of my action. I feel that mail going throughout this country and the world bearing the words, "Pray for peace," cannot help but turn men's minds toward the only One who can really give us the peace so urgently sought in these troubled times.

How proper it is that we, as the first of the sister nations of the earth, proclaim to the whole world, as did our Founding Fathers, our praise and dependence upon Almighty God.

In closing, I would like to thank you again for inviting me here today. You are a most gracious group of ladies. I will always remember this day and cherish this high honor you have bestowed upon me.

Reds Gear Schools To Win Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a column appearing in the Washington Post, Tuesday, February 28, 1956, entitled "Reds Gear Schools To Win Cold War" by Marquis Childs.

The article follows:

REDS GEAR SCHOOLS TO WIN COLD WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

A report based on firsthand observation adds another note of warning that education in the Soviet Union is far outstripping education in the United States.

The massive educational program still expanding in Russia, under which today nearly twice as many students are enrolled above the high-school level as in this country, is one reason for the extraordinary confidence expressed by Soviet leaders at the recent 20th Congress of the Communist Party.

For as the latest warning, from former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, makes clear, the Soviet educational system is geared to win the cold war.

Benton, who made an intensive study of Soviet education and propaganda last year, says that system is producing a surplus of engineers and technicians who will be assigned to carry out technical assistance in every uncommitted country of the world. While getting their scientific training, they are thoroughly indoctrinated in the Marxist-Lenin line.

There are schools—and this seems to have escaped the attention of even specialists whose business is to know what is going on in Russia—in which all the training from the first grade on is in English, French, or German. Graduates of these schools have a fluent working knowledge of the language they will need when they are sent abroad to do a technical—and propaganda—job.

With a Russian-speaking interpreter and assistant, Benton took a tour of Soviet Russia's universities, technical institutions, laboratories, and libraries. In a 30,000-word article for the Britannica Yearbook, of which he is publisher, Benton writes:

"The Soviets are now challenging us frontally at what have historically been two of our strongest points, technology, and mass education. The present rate of Russian educational advance is faster than our own, just as their growth rate in industrial production surpasses ours. The gap in total performance is closing. It is closing rapidly.

"In less than 30 years the Soviets have created a primary school system rivaling our own in universality, with nearly 100 percent enrollment. Their secondary school system is mushrooming amazingly; by 1960 every Russian youngster is to be given an education at least comparable to a better high school diploma.

"They have already surpassed us in both the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level—with 4,300,000—to our 2,700,000."

In two speeches late last year, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, sounded an equally grave alarm. He said it was evident the United States was rapidly falling behind Soviet Russia in the training of scientists and technicians with the "certainty that we are turning out less than one-half the number of scientists and engineers we require—an alarming statistic by itself."

The deficiency begins, according to Strauss, in the high schools, where science training has long been inadequate and standards of science teaching dropping rapidly. He cited the fact more than half of all American high schools fail to teach physics or chemistry.

In contrast, Benton points out that in the last years of secondary school Soviet students must take 4 years of mathematics, including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry.

The objective, it is hardly necessary to add, is a Communist education—that is, first-rate technical training buttressed by complete indoctrination in Communist dogma. It is the combination of indoctrinated zeal with technical proficiency that is so ominous for the West.

In a recent speech Benton proposed the creation of technical-assistance academies similar to West Point and Annapolis, where young men of superior intelligence would be trained as engineers and technicians in every field.

The academies would be attached to and under the supervision of such outstanding institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Tech. In return for their free education, young men would agree to sign up for a certain number of years of service in America's technical-assistance program overseas.

Short of some positive, constructive step such as this, the drift will continue. And if estimates of Soviet progress are even approximately right, the gap will widen and America will fall increasingly behind.

To permit this to happen is hardly less than an admission of defeat. For if we have learned nothing else in the atomic-electronic age, it is that the engineers and scientists of today win the battles of tomorrow.

World Tension Increases as Reds Cast Wishful Eye Toward Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Clay County Free Press, February 2, 1956, by Mr. Ellis Friend, of Ivydale, W. Va., under the caption "World Tension Increases As Reds Cast Wishful Eye Toward Palestine."

The article follows:

WORLD TENSION INCREASES AS REDS CAST WISHFUL EYE TOWARD PALESTINE

(By Ellis Friend)

For many years Russia has been casting a wishful eye toward Palestine and the middle East, waiting for the time to come that she could begin her propaganda campaign toward Palestine, as she had done in many other instances.

Now Russia is sending arms and ammunition to the Arabian countries as well as other

Middle East countries. She is also trying to make trouble between Israel and the Arabian countries, also Jordan and all other middle eastern countries.

Since Israel has been an independent country for 8 or 9 years, I believe there has been skirmishes between Israel and her avowed enemy, the Arabian countries. Now Russia is trying to get all the other members of the United Nations to condemn Israel for one little armed skirmish in which the Arabs were to some extent the loser.

The United States and England have joined in condemning them, but Russia wants them to go ahead and exclude Israel from the United Nations. There is where we would make our biggest mistake in so doing. The heads of our Government claim that they do not want to start an arms race which no one wants, but we are already in one and there is no way on earth to get out of it.

Russia is taking the lead and the longer we refuse to send arms and ammunition to Israel, the farther we will drive them toward the Communist countries. We should know they are going to get arms and ammunition from somewhere and if we refuse to help them, the Communist countries will, and sooner than we thing, they may turn Communist, if they see that they are not going to get any help from the free countries.

War clouds are flying thick and fast around the Middle East and especially around the old, partly rebuilt city of Jerusalem. There is a major war shaping up in the Middle East, and let us hope and pray that it starts there instead of an atomic or hydrogen war against the United States by Russia. In the latter case here is what could happen:

Now that we know Russia is in possession of both the atomic and hydrogen bomb, this fact has added much worry to the already worried minds of the people of the United States. Now the big question is in everyone's mind, not only in the United States but in most of, if not every nation on earth, is when will these dreadful bombs be used and who will be the first to start using them.

We are no longer in doubt as to whether or not Russia has these dreadful weapons of war, as a good many of our Congressmen have already conceded that they have, and just to leave no doubt about this matter, the President of the United States has told us in no uncertain terms that Russia has hydrogen as well as the atomic bombs.

Now the question is being asked everywhere on street corners, in offices and stores and almost every place where people congregate, "Will Russia attack the United States with the dreaded bombs, and if so, just when?" It is known and is no secret that we have large and powerful bombers, capable of carrying bomb loads to any part of Russia and return. It is also believed that Russia now has bombers that could reach any point in the United States and return. It has been estimated by people who are in position to know that if the Reds should attack with 100 bombers, no less than 70 of them would reach our shores. They would, on their first raid destroy no less than 45 to 50 million lives, and possibly 60 to 75 million lives, which would be many more times the lives than have been lost in all the wars that the United States has ever been engaged in since this country was discovered.

Then what about the raid the following day, the next night, the next day and the next night and right on and on. This is something for us to all think seriously about. People are not giving this matter nearly enough thought and consideration and especially, this would apply to the heads of our Government.

If attacked, our airmen would take the air with great and powerful bombers and head straight for enemy countries in an effort to do as much or more damage than our enemy inflicted on us, provided, however, the enemy had not entirely destroyed our seat of Government.

There is a good chance that an all-out atomic war would not last more than 2 or 3 weeks at the most. Civilization would soon be wiped from the face of the earth. Let us hope and pray that it will never happen.

This reminds me of a story I once heard. A man was passing through the country when suddenly he came upon two large snakes which had met and were trying to swallow each other. The man looked upon the scene for a while. The snakes kept right on swallowing and swallowing, so the man passed on but soon became curious and returned to the scene to see just what had happened to the two snakes. As the story goes, the snakes just swallowed each other up so there were just no snakes left.

Let us hope and pray and do everything possible to keep this from happening to us. As we know, some of, or should we say, a great many of our top secrets regarding the atomic and hydrogen bombs have been allowed to slip through our hands and reach the Russians. This has come about no doubt by Communists and Communist sympathizers being allowed to slip into important places in our Government. Had this been prohibited in time, the Russians would still be without the atomic and hydrogen bomb secrets.

After all has been said and done, we must still realize that our very civilization and existence here on this earth are at stake, and are hanging in the balances. Our only real hope is for all of us in this country to turn to the Lord and invoke His divine power and guidance. This would especially apply to all the people at the head of our Government.

Let us all pray for peace and a better understanding among the peoples of the world.

It Makes Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a thoughtful editorial in the Cottonwood County Citizen, Windom, Minn., January 25, 1956, on the subject of Federal aid for schools.

The editorial follows:

IT MAKES DOUBLE TAXATION

Thus far no advocate of Federal aid for schools has come forth to explain just why those communities that have already taxed themselves to the limit to provide adequate schools should turn around and submit to being taxed to provide schools for some other district whose taxpayers have steadily refused to take care of their problem as we have.

Just for example, Windom not long ago spent over a million dollars in school construction and, as a result, local property owners have a heavy burden to bear for many years to come. They assumed that burden willingly because they recognized it as a responsibility of their own.

Now we would like to ask our two Senators to advise us as to whether the bill they favor will include help for us with our 1 million dollar burden, or will it just mean that the help will go only to those who, unlike us, have refused to assume their responsibility, even though they were as able as we.

Areas that will come in for greatest aid have found it possible to afford many things that we have thought we could not afford. We put the needs of our chidren first. They put other things first, in many cases. Are we to be penalized?

A Bard Speaks Up for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial which was reprinted in the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, on January 28, 1956, following its publication in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain-Dealer. The editorial, entitled "A Bard Speaks Up for Alaska," follows:

A BARD SPEAKS UP FOR ALASKA

The new Congress, according to Arthur Edson of the Associated Press, is in a poetical mood. At least some of the Members are, although it's difficult to understand what can cause the tender emotion at this raw season of the year. Perhaps it's the subject, calling to mind warmth and sunshine and leisurely and attractive living and breath-taking beauty, in short, Hawaii.

Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Republican of Indiana, was responsible for inserting the first poem of the year in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 5, 1956. 'Twas composed by one of his constituents, a lady who had visited Hawaii, and who, in 18 stanzas, sang the praises of the incomparable island, concluding:

"Let's use consideration!
Let's end the lengthy debate!
Extend heart and hand to Hawaii,
And make her our 49th State!"

Now we know the power of Hawaii over mortal men, one of our associates suffers violently from Hawaiilitis, a disease he contracted on a visit to the heavenly island several years ago. When the wind is howling and the snow is swirling it is downright pitiful to see him staring into space with a pathetc royal palm look in his eyes!

With all respect for Hawaii (we hope we get there some day) is it fair to stack the deck in her favor while poor, half-frozen Alaska is also pounding on the door for admission? Why not admit them both, letting them toss a coin to see which shall be the 49th and 50th State?

But what is needed immediately is a bard for Alaska who could jump into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with something like this:

Let us sing of the polar bear
And the sturdy Eskimo,
And thick red-flannel underwear
From Fairbanks to Juneau!
Where the snow's stacked high 'neath the Arctic sky,
And the radar net equates,
So an evening's sleep is calm and deep
In the present 48 States!

O, it's bleak enough, and cruel and tough,
And here no trade winds blow,
We might be rough but we have the stuff
As the Nation well should know.
When legislators pass us up—
Regretfully decline—
It makes us sore as a thawing pup—
We should be 49!

Will We Trade Freedom for Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the question of security and freedom is highly controversial today. It has been said that if we want security, we can find it in any jail house. This, however, is not the kind of security our people want nor is it what the free peoples of the world want. It appears, however, that in some parts of the world in those countries which have been plagued by war, political unrest, and economic disparity that they will accept security at the price of freedom.

As part of my remarks I am including a timely editorial by Mr. Constantine Brown which appeared in the Evening Star of February 22:

SECURITY AT PRICE OF FREEDOM—SOME IN WESTERN EUROPE WOULD PREFER SOVIETS' SLOW-SUFFOCATION FORMULA

Reports from Western Europe show that our allies were impressed by Comrade Khrushchev's frank 7-hour talk before the Moscow Communist rally. Except for the lack of operatic trappings it was not much different from Hitler's Nazi Party meetings at Nuremberg.

In the existing confusion, Khrushchev's blueprint for the world undoubtedly appeals to Europeans who live in the shadow of the Soviet might and are increasingly reluctant to offer militant resistance to communism.

The Kremlin spokesman gave little choice to his adversaries. He told them to choose between coexistence with the Communists or war. And the west Europeans who for years have lived in fear of another war seem to prefer slow suffocation to brutal strangulation.

Khrushchev spoke of the "various forms of transfer to socialism" and emphasized that this transfer could be achieved through parliamentary channels without civil wars. This pronouncement has already affected political thinking beyond the neutralist countries.

The Soviet leader's utterances have been particularly effective in France. The country is beseiged with serious domestic political troubles and even greater problems in North Africa. The administration of Premier Guy Mollet seems as much paralyzed as its predecessors. M. Mollet cannot legislate reforms because he does not have an actual working majority in the National Assembly. The balance of power is held by the Communists and Poujadists, who though at opposite polls politically, would join forces to overthrow the mdidle of the road government.

The Khrushchev pronouncement that a transfer to "socialism (in Soviet language it means communism) through parliamentary channels" has had an unquestionable appeal to the splinter parties which have hitherto supporter M. Mollet. The transition is, in the minds of the French as well as the Italians, very simple: Organize a popular-front government including representatives of the Communist parties, and then let nature take its course.

Had it not been for our intervention in Europe in 1947 when a popular-front coalition government existed in France and Italy, these two countries might already have Communist regimes in office. Our lavish expenditures for postwar economic reconstruction was predicated on expelling the Communists from the government and prevented our present allies from going the Moscow way. Conditions are no longer the same, however. The economies of these countries have been restored above the prewar capacity. Moreover, the USSR is now in the hands of a man who claims no longer to be sole dictator but a mere member of a directorship.

Stalin inspired fear not only among the peoples behind the Iron Curtain but throughout Europe. He acted too much like Hitler. Khrushchev plays the part of a well-meaning, happy-go-lucky, heavy-drinking, common man who wants everybody to be happy. His ultimate goals are no different from Stalin's but his methods are more palatable to the crowds. Stalin was anxious to rush things. Khrushchev who has set a new pace—at least for his intended victims in Europe—says that he can wait until communism is established by what he describes as "parliamentary channels."

Khrushchev remembers that Hitler achieved considerable success, until he plunged his country into war, by getting behind him the working masses and the moneyed classes and by eliminating the intellectual and middle classes. This recipe might now be adapted to the Western democracies where many intellectuals are already imbued by the Communist ideology while the middle classes seem helpless.

The full international significance of the 20th Communist rally will become more clear in the months to come. Our European friends who seem to be abandoning ship will wait to see what will happen to this country next November. They will wait to see the trends in the United States and will watch the extent of our reaction to the likely Red provocations in the Middle East and particularly the Far East. The Communist ideology has not an ideological appeal but one of obvious strength on the intended victims of Comrade Khrushchev.

Secretary of State Dulles spoke once of massive retaliation to Communist aggressiveness. He has been beaten over the head for his temerity ever since, both at home and in the NATO countries. When Khrushchev, at the opening of the Soviet Congress meeting, gave us no other alternative but coexistence or war, no such loud criticism was heard in America. In Europe his words were described not only by the Communist press as statesmanlike.

Coupled with this are the public admissions in America that we lag sadly behind the U. S. S. R. in a number of nonconventional weapons. Our allies, who throughout history have become accustomed to respect the parading of physical strength, look now toward the East. It is thence, they feel, that they can buy security at the price of freedom.

Visitors From Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the February 28, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Visitors From Italy":

VISITORS FROM ITALY

President Giovanni Gronchi and Foreign Minister Gaetano Martino of Italy are welcome guests this week in Washington. They are welcome first of all as representatives of an important nation of friendly people to whom Americans owe a continuing debt. This debt is found in the cultural heritage, the music and art, the millions of good citizens Italy has furnished to this country. President Gronchi and Dr. Martino also are welcome for reasons of state. That Italy succeed in her economic struggle to raise the standard of living and spread the benefits to low-income groups is of vital importance to the Western World. President Gronchi's feeling that the Christian Democratic coalition of Prime Minister Segni must move to the left and sponsor more comprehensive reforms if it is to win continued support is a feeling that has much sympathy among observers of the Italian scene. President Gronchi will have an opportunity to explain this in detail and to place in perspective his thoughts about the possibility of wooing the Nenni Socialists away from the Communists. He and Dr. Martino also will have a chance to discuss their views about the weaknesses in NATO and about Italy's new relationship in the United Nations. For their part the American representatives will have a chance to size up the new role of the Italian President as Signor Gronchi exemplifies it. Amicable discussion should be useful all the way around.

Statement by Dr. Wolfgang A. O. Pohle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a statement made recently in Chicago by a special guest of our State Department, Dr. Wolfgang A. O. Pohle. Dr. Pohle is a member of the Economic Policy Committee of the German Parliament and also a member of the Joint European Committee for Coal and Steel. His statement, as printed in the Chicago newspapers, holds interest for all of us:

Chicago is truly the steel capital of the world. We in the new postwar Germany who are endeavoring to fulfill our role in rebuilding the economy of the free world have much to learn and to admire here. American preeminence in heavy industry has aided us not only in building our own industrial progress but also, since we border directly on the Communist Empire, it has served to fortify our will to resist Soviet political and economic pressures with the knowledge that we have in the United States an ally strong both in the democratic spirit and the sinews of democracy as well.

To further strengthen these bonds and to provide a potent weapon against the encroachments of communism, a Magna Carta of the free nations of the world should be formulated. As proposed by Mr. Hermann Abs, president of Germany's largest bank and a leading statesman of his country, this Magna Carta would guarantee property owners of the world their inalienable right of possession and eliminate unwarranted and illegal confiscation or expropriation.

Action in this direction is urgent, as demonstrated by recent Soviet moves in the Middle East, where they offer war equipment linked with Russian capital investments.

Chicago, as the capital city of America's Midwest heartland, is a symbol of what a free people living in a free economy can accomplish.

In my country, under the leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, I am proud to say that the German people themselves feel a unity with the West based on a mutual adherence to the principles of free government, a free economy based upon individual initiative and the sanctity of private property, and opposition to the further extension of Communist imperialism. Facing the muzzles of Soviet guns as we do, the importunings of the Communist state are recognized by us for what they are. If the Soviets truly desire to live in peace in the world, it is their deeds and not their words which should convince the free world of their sincerity.

Statehood and the Alaska Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include here the closing address at the Alaska constitutional convention which met for 75 days at the University of Alaska to write a constitution for the future State of Alaska. That address was delivered on the day the constitution was signed, February 5, 1956, and was given by William A. Egan, of Valdez, who served so ably and so faithfully as the convention's president:

Governor Heintzleman, other distinguished guests, fellow Alaskans and delegates, in prefacing my remarks this afternoon, it would seem fitting and proper that the preamble to Alaska's State constitution be presented to all Alaskans. Ladies and gentlemen, the preamble:

"We the people of Alaska, grateful to God and to those who founded our Nation and pioneered this great land, in order to secure and transmit to succeeding generations our heritage of political, civil, and religious liberty within the Union of States, do ordain and establish this constitution for the State of Alaska."

There are those in Alaska who still say, "What great difference does it make that I, an American citizen, cannot cast my vote for the President and Vice President of the United States?

"What great difference does it make that we are represented by one, voteless Delegate in Congress—a Delegate who cannot vote even in committee, on any subject even though that subject might relate solely to the detriment or welfare of our great Territory. What great difference does it make that acts of our Territorial Legislature are governed mainly by 2 acts of Congress—1 dated July 30, 1886, and the other dated August 24, 1912?"

Well, to me, an I know to most of you, it makes a great deal of difference. We want to cast our ballot for our choice for President of the United States every 4 years. We want to cast our ballot at regular intervals for 2 United States Senators and for a voting Representative in the United States Congress from the great State of Alaska, in order that we have our proper representation as to the welfare of our Nation; and that in order that the tremendous natural resources available to our Nation in Alaska can be properly unfolded and utilized. Then, too, we want to vote for representatives to a State government that is not thwarted by a combination of 2 laws—one of which was enacted specifically for the Territory almost 70 years ago and the other one which was enacted by the Federal Congress almost 44 years ago.

Alaska's fight for the fullest measure of self-government did not have its inception in the time of most of us who are here this afternoon. Alaska was purchased by the United States from Russia on October 18, 1867, at a cost of less than 2 cents an acre. Alaska has served more than 88 years under the yoke of Federal domination. We are now in our 43d year of having been an organized Territory. No other State in the Union had to endure even half this period of time under Territorial status before admittance to the Union. During these years, despite Federal obstacles placed in the way of development of its natural resources, Alaska has produced more than 400 times the value of the original $7½ million purchase price from these natural resources.

In 1898, the Congress of the United States enacted legislation making it possible to file on a homestead in Alaska—but only on surveyed lands and there were no surveyed lands in Alaska in those days. This act set the people of Alaska afire with indignation and the cry for some sort of representation rose to one of cresendo proportions. Mass meetings were held in various populated areas of the Territory. Eastern papers picked up the story and Alaska's cause received some attention in Congress. In 1906, after 25 years of petition, Alaska was permitted to elect a voteless delegate to the national Congress. Persistent citizens kept hammering away and on August 24, 1912, the Congress granted incorporated Territorial status to Alaska, with the right to have its own legislative assembly, subject to the restrictions contained in the Acts of Congress of 1886 and 1912. The first Territorial legislature convened at the capital city of Juneau in 1913.

Ever since that time, Alaskans who were intimately familiar with the intensive handicaps placed upon industrial development of the Territory by antiquated Federal bureaucratic redtape, have continued the battle for a fuller measure of self-government with statehood as the ultimate goal. For more than a decade, dedicated Alaskans have carried a direct fight for the inherent right of our citizens to full citizenship as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. In 1946, at a referendum election, Alaskans voted by a majority of 3 to 2 for statehood for our great Territory. In these past few years, increasing numbers of Alaskans who had been lukewarm toward statehood, or who had been noncommittal, have joined forces in this greatest of common causes. Today, many opponents of statehood admit privately that another referendum on the question would reveal that a majority of from 4 to 1 to 6 to 1 now favor immediate statehood for Alaska.

The arguments against admission of Alaska into the Union are identical with those that were advanced against the admission of nearly all the 29 States that were territories prior to their admission into the Union. Alaska has more population than one-third of the States of the Union had at the time of their admission. There are those who will say that our population is relatively smaller in proportion to the total population of the United States than that of those earlier States at the time when they were admitted. The fact is that there were at least five States which had not only less population than Alaska has now, but even less population in relation to the national total.

Distance from the National Capital and noncontiguity to the mainland are often advanced in the course of congressional debate as reasons why Alaska should not become a State. Measured in the only true perspective, that of time required to journey between the proposed State and the National Capital, Alaska is much nearer Washington today than were most all the States at the time of their admission to the Union. Today one flies from Fairbanks to Washington, D. C., in approximately 20 hours, and even less time, depending on the type of aircraft one secures passage on. Instantaneous communication by telephone adds a factor not in existence when previous States were admitted. All of our principal cities are linked with the national telephone system.

To say that Alaska lacks the resources to support a State is fantastic. Many of the States now in the Union would be happy indeed, if they could be endowed with Alaska's natural resources. Even though our resources are in their present state of underdevelopment—mainly because of the Federal territorial-status yoke, our economy is amply able to support statehood. A prime example of Federal bungling in the handling of our great resources is our commercial fishery. It is my very firm conviction that, in the immediate years following the advent of statehood to Alaska, our fisheries conservation problem will be solved. With local control of our fisheries, the annual pack of salmon taken from territorial waters will quickly take an upturn because conservation policies would then be laid down by Alaskans intimately familiar with the problem. In a few years' time, with no additional increase in tax on the industry, our State treasury would be additionally benefitted with several millions of dollars each biennium. It is quite likely that with the rebuilding of our fisheries, which have become so depleted under the yoke of Federal stewardship, this increase in revenue to the State treasury could be accomplished and allow for a reasonable decrease in the tax now levied on the industry by the Territory. This question would take a considerable length of time for explanation, but it is one of such extreme importance when we are discussing the subject of statehood for Alaska that I do not believe any argument relative to the question could have much merit if it were not brought home to all our citizens that the solving of the problem of perpetuation of our great fisheries resource can only be accomplished with the right to fully govern ourselves. There are those who say that statehood would "open the door to the poorhouse." They cite such matters as the recent Mental Health Act, which carried a direct appropriation for construction of facilities by the Federal Government. To me, these people have missed the point altogether. The compelling reason for insisting upon the direct appropriation is just another example why we need statehood so desperately. The Federal Government has withheld care of our mentally ill from Alaska over the years. With no appreciable drain on its treasury, the Territory could have provided the facilities from the beginning, together with the sympathetic, expert care which means so much to the ultimate recovery of these patients. Other United States Territories cared for their mentally ill from the inception of Territorial status and were thus enabled to gradually build up their facilities.

To those who say, "This is not 1900—this is 1956," we repeat that no great industrial expansion came to any of our other 29 Territories until after their admittance to the Union of the United States. To this end, there is no difference between 1900 and 1956.

To those who say, "No one is holding us forcibly in Territorial status—we can move out if we choose," we say, "No, no one is forcibly holding us here. But, we have built our homes here; we are rearing our children here; a great many of us will die here. We never intend to live anywhere else. We love our great United States of America,

and our hearts belong too, to our great Territory of Alaska and we will never have a true peace of mind until we are taken in full membership as one of the great States of the Union."

In affixing our signatures to this document we did so with the knowledge that each word had been subject to free and lengthy debate in committee and on the floor of this constitutional convention.

I say to each and every Alaskan: If it had been your good fortune, as it has been mine, to have witnessed the abilities, the diligence, the devotion to duty, of these delegates who have drafted the proposed constitution for the State of Alaska in carrying out the task that had been cut out for them, you would say of their labors, "Well done."

We have just completed the task for which we were sent here. Your delegates to Alaska's Constitutional Convention have now given to you, the people of Alaska, the proposed constitution for the State of Alaska. We know that you will judge with great care the end result that has been accomplished here. We are exceedingly gratified that none other than the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, indicated in his message received here yesterday, that the eyes of the Congress of the United States and the eyes of the people of the United States will be upon you on Ratification Day, April 24, 1956.

Protecting the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a talk given by Mr. Otto Herres, vice president, Combined Metals Reduction Co., at the annual meeting of the Colorado Mining Association in Denver, Colo., February 3, 1956.

Mr. Herres is an outstanding leader in the mining field and few people in this country have a better grasp of the problems facing the mining industry. His remarks merit the careful consideration of all Members of Congress:

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

(By Otto Herres)

RECORDBREAKING PRODUCTION

In the year 1955 of otherwise booming prosperity, output of lead and zinc from the mines of the United States again, as was the case in 1954, remained at the lowest level since the years 1931–34 of the great depression. But this low state of mining was not caused by any falling off in use of the metals. Slab zinc production and consumption reached alltime peaks. Lead consumption was at a very high level. Demand for both lead and zinc was strong and supplies were tight. But in strange contrast to the record production and mounting sales, output of lead-zinc ores from the Nation's mines gained but little from the surging industrial activity.

The Government in reporting the mineral production of the United States for 1955 pointed out that the production level of the mines was far below average.

"Domestic mine output of lead and zinc topped 1954, but the production level remained well below the average of any of the past 4 decades for zinc and 5 for lead."

Below-average output

Mine output of lead was approximately 40,000 tons below the average of the last 10 years. Zinc mine output was some 84,000 tons below the 10-year average. And obviously the averages were pulled down measurably by the low tonnages of the last 2 years. But for all that, slab zinc production and use increased 20 percent during 1955 to set new records and consumption of lead was close to an alltime high.

In September the price of zinc moved up to 13 cents per pound to regain the price level of January 2, 1953. But during the 3-year cycle, marked by depression and rising costs for the mines, the price of zinc dropped to a low of 9¼ cents in February 1954, and lead to 12 cents per pound in April 1953, far below the cost of production at present-day wage scales.

The 1953–54 period of 9¼- to 11-cent zinc prices served to eliminate mine production of some 150,000 to 200,000 tons of zinc. Mine output dropped from 666,000 tons in 1952 to an estimated 508,000 tons in 1955. The new records for production and use of zinc in 1955 brought no corresponding improvement to the mines. They represent no gain for the mines but rather reflect near-record imports of foreign ores and metals amounting to 610,000 tons in 1954 and some 660,000 tons or more in 1955.

Liquidation of resources

And thus the contribution of United States miners to the cause of foreign aid and freer trade during the past few years has accomplished the liquidation of more than 150,000 tons a year of our zinc production. Communities dependent upon that production for support likewise have contributed their share in the injuries they have sustained.

And so, through this process of wiping out mines by means of imports priced below the cost of production in this country of high wages and living standards, the price of zinc once more has been returned to a level of 13½ cents. Measures toward price stabilization proposed 3 years ago by the mining industry would have avoided the closing of many mines whose production might have helped to supply the metal shortages of present and future years. But opposition by the State Department in the interest of foreign production blocked proposals designed to protect the domestic mines and permit their survival.

Higher prices

United States miners cannot become overly encouraged by the recent price rises in lead and zinc. It will be recognized that prices were raised to attract larger imports of foreign ores and not to aid the domestic mines. The announcement of the price advance in zinc said:

"The rise in the London price of zinc has been encouraging shipments to Europe by domestic smelters of foreign zinc ore and has discouraged imports of refined zinc.

"In order to preserve zinc supplies for our domestic customers we have increased the zinc price by a half cent to 13½ cents a pound."

It would appear from this that we have reached the stage where it is necessary to raise the price of lead and zinc in order to protect the American consumer. He now has to be protected from foreign competition for supplies by price increases, it seems, because sources of supply in his own land have been lost for want of the reasonable consideration that would have permitted their survival. Copper prices on the London Metal Exchange have reached 50 cents per pound in recent months, and during 1951 and 1952 when mining costs were much lower than they are today and United States prices were controlled, the official United Kingdom price for zinc was 23¾ cents per pound. Prices elsewhere in the world reached 32 cents and higher. Is it better to pay high foreign prices in order to obtain supplies when the need is great rather than have assurance of a reasonable degree of self-sufficiency in productive capacity at home?

As for the domestic mining industry, if there is no profit to be gained for the effort expended, there will be no production. Miners will move to other fields. Utah, for example, is one of the leading lead-zinc producing States. But already in 3 years' time there are more miners working at the uranium mines in Utah than in all of the lead, zinc, gold, and silver mines in the State put together.

Requirements for metals and minerals are mounting because of rapidly increasing world population, widespread mechanization of industry, vast expansion of transportation facilities and means of communication, and extensive development of power resources. Consider the strong demand and short supply which prevails for metals in common use, particularly steel, aluminum, nickel, copper, lead, and zinc. The problem in time threatens to be competition for supplies rather than overabundance of metals.

Policies of dependence

However that may be, national policies are encouraging a trend toward dependence on other countries for our metals and minerals. To be sure the lead-zinc mines have been helped temporarily by Government stockpile purchases of lead and zinc. But this offers no long-range assurance of a healthy domestic mining industry. During the time that it is effective, the Government purchasing can be expected to bring added imports to the extent that it serves to increase prices to a more adequate level. Witness the rise in zinc imports last year and recent efforts to attract more foreign ores by higher prices. And when stockpiling ends is the temporary prop by means of which Washington sustains us to be made into a more permanent crutch for a crippled industry? Is that the only plan we may hope for to cushion the reaction which normally may be expected when the current booming activity runs down and heavy demands for lead and zinc subside?

The United States holds whatever leadership it has in the world today because of its great wealth and productive capacity. But when the wealth is dissipated there will be no followers. Nor will the consumer prosper greatly if the productive capacity is impaired, particularly in case that impairment is caused by inflationary cost increases that far outrun corresponding gains in productivity. Support for reasonable measures to permit the survival of a healthy mining industry in the United States will afford protection against a costly dependence upon foreign sources for supplies.

Peace and prosperity

The political slogan of the day is peace and prosperity. But who can be confident that either the peace or prosperity is stable or long lasting? Possibly an uneasy peace may see growing competition in commercial fields play havoc with our high-cost prosperity.

The nations of the world have recovered from the devastation of war and their farms, factories, and mines are producing large quantities of goods for export. We face the problem of meeting the competition that we have reestablished and continue to aid and support.

But in any event, this world of ours in the foreseeable future promises to be a dangerous place for the credulous and unprepared. We can enjoy the blessings of peace and prosperity only through the strength that comes from our material resources and our self-reliance as a free people. If we heed the lessons of history we will keep our Nation strong, avoid inflationary expedients, and trust our security primarily to our own good resources.

Summary of the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the Colorado River storage project:

THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

WATER SUPPLY

The Colorado River is the last remaining major water resource available to the upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming).

WATER SOURCE

More than 90 percent of the water in the Colorado River system originates in the four upper basin States.

COMPACTS

The beneficial consumptive use of the waters of the Colorado River system was divided by compact between the seven basin States in 1922 and approved by the United States.

The beneficial consumptive use of the waters apportioned to the upper basin States by the 1922 compact was apportioned among the 4 upper basin States by compact approved by the 4 upper basin States and the United States in 1949.

DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOWER BASIN UNDER THE RECLAMATION LAW

In 1928, the Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed with the aid of the upper basin States and since that time, the Hoover Dam and powerplants, the Parker Dam and powerplants, the Davis Dam and powerplants, and the All-American and Coachella Canals and the Morelos Dam and canals in Mexico have been built. All the physical facilities necessary to the full utilization of the water uses apportioned to the lower basin and Mexico have been built. The needs of the upper basin and the continued orderly development of the river now demand and justify a project to provide for such development.

THE UPPER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

There has been little development in the upper basin since 1922 but now after 20 years of intensive investigations and the expenditure of $10 million a proposal for the development of the upper Colorado River under the terms of the Colorado and upper Colorado River compacts has been made by the United States Bureau of Reclamation. This project called the Colorado River storage project and participating projects is a basinwide proposal, which, when carried out, will provide the facilities necessary for the upper basin States to use their share of the Colorado River water resource. The proposal is both unique and complicated and must be carried out as a single basinwide project and constructed in two or more stages.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project must and will provide for:

(a) Complete regulation of the Colorado River above Lee Ferry by providing holdover storage reservoirs (water banks), so that water available during wet seasons or wet years may be made available during dry years or seasons. Such holdover storage will be large—more than 25 million acre-feet of silt storage. This water bank must be filled now while unused Colorado River water is wasting into the sea.

(b) Water for consumptive use by direct diversion or by exchange, both within and without the Colorado River Basin.

(c) Facilities for regulating, controlling, and conveying water from its river source to the points of use for municipal, industrial, and agricultural purposes.

(d) Generation of hydroelectric power the net revenues from which will help pay the costs of the project which are 99 percent reimbursable.

PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF THE PROJECT

The initial phase of the Colorado River storage project which will require 25 to 30 years to complete consists of 4 storage dams and reservoirs (at Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho) 3 powerplants (Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Curecanti) and 11 participating projects. The total storage capacity of the reservoirs is 32,080,000 acre-feet, the total generating capacity is 912,000 kilowatts and the participating projects will provide for 48,000 acre-feet of water for domestic and industrial purposes, deplete the flow of the river 433,300 acre-feet for irrigation purposes and will provide water for 143,020 acres of new land and supplemental water for 243,470 acres of land now being cropped.

COST OF THE PROJECT

Based on H. R. 3383 as amended the total estimated cost will be approximately $760 million. Of this total approximately $460 million will be for power and municipal features which will be repaid with interest and $300 million will be repaid without interest. This expenditure will be made over a 25-to-30-year period averaging less than 30 million per year.

PER-ACRE COSTS

The per-acre costs on the 11 participating projects vary from $210 on the LaBarge project in Wyoming to $794 on the central Utah project in Utah.

These costs are spread over a 50-year period. The annual costs per acre vary from $4.20 to $16.

These costs are reasonable and well within the limits of increased production per acre after water is made available. In fairness the cost per acre should be compared with the value of the land 50 years from now when the final payment will be made.

Fifty years experience on reclamation projects shows that the cost of supplying water to the land has averaged from 2 to 3 times the market value of the land and water at the beginning of the payout period. At the end of the payout period the market value of the land and water is from 3 to 4 times the cost of supplying the water.

No acre of land proposed to be irrigated under the participating projects will show an increased production after water is made available, less than the annual repayment plus the cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement.

The propaganda against the per-acre costs of this project have no basis in fact.

REPAYMENT

The cost of the power and municipal features will be repaid with interest and will place absolutely no burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation. The cost of the irrigation features allocated to the water users will be paid back by the water users in 50 years plus a 10-year development period without interest. The balance of the cost allocated to irrigation will be paid back from power revenues from project powerplants without interest.

JUSTIFICATION FOR INTEREST-FREE MONEY

The policy of providing interest-free money for irrigation features or reclamation projects is more than 50 years old. It is in harmony with national policy, more than 150 years old which provided for Federal aid to help build waterways and improve harbors, to build railroads, ships, airplanes, to provide for flood control and to aid the development of critical industries. For example, wagon roads were supported with land grants of 3,359,188 acres, canals and rivers with land grants of 6,842,921 acres and railroads with land grants of 37,807,688 acres. The Federal Government in recognition of general public benefits is still spending billions on rivers and harbors and flood control, little of which is reimbursed. Interest-free money for irrigation features is payment by the Federal Government for general public benefits resulting from the creation of new wealth, a broadened tax base, new jobs, new homes, new investment opportunities, and increased national stability.

There is still another reason why interest-free money should be provided for the construction of irrigation features of reclamation projects. The Reclamation Act of 1902 created a revolving fund called the reclamation fund out of which funds for the construction of reclamation projects would come. The sources of income to this fund is the natural resources in the reclamation States. None of this fund comes from direct appropriation except on a loan basis. The principal sources are sale of public land and timber, sale of oil, gas, and mineral leases, royalties, power revenues, repayments from projects and other miscellaneous sources. This income to the reclamation fund comes from the reclamation States and no other State puts in a dime. In 1954 the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming contributed more than $20 million to this fund. This annual contribution is increasing rapidly.

The total cost of the irrigation features of the Colorado River storage project will be approximately $300 million to be expended over a period of 30 years, an average of $10 million per year. This is the only money that is interest free. The upper basin States' contribution to the reclamation fund every year will be in excess of $20 million per year. The upper basin States should not be required to pay interest on money derived from the sale of their natural resources. Using money out of the reclamation fund contributed by these States will place absolutely no burden on the Federal Treasury and cannot possibly place any burden upon any taxpayer in any other State. The reclamation fund bank will always have sufficient funds to pay for the irrigation features of the reclamation projects. These features pay as they go. Federal funds out of the Treasury to a limited extent will be required to build the power and municipal features which constitute two-thirds of the cost of the project, but these costs must include interest charges so in this area there is no burden upon the general taxpayer. There can be no interest charge when you use money on deposit in your bank (reclamation fund) to pay the construction costs.

THE PROJECT IS A CONTINUING SOURCE OF REVENUE

Water is a renewable resource. Hydro power is a renewable resource. After the costs of this project are paid back the project power plants will continue to pour into the Federal Treasury more than $20 million a year.

NO PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE POWER CONTROVERSY

There is no power-policy issue in this project. Ten private power companies appeared in support of this project. The power will be sold under the provisions of the reclamation law which includes the preference clause. There is no Federal subsidy to power in this project. The power will be sold at competitive rates, expected to be about 6 mills at the bus bar or load center. Thus the users of power will contribute to the project costs.

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

This project will not add to the agricultural surpluses for the following reasons:

(a) The construction schedule will prevent any material farm production within 10 years of the date of authorization. The surplus may be resolved by that time.

(b) During the second 10 years of construction not more than one-half the 143,020 acres can possibly be brought into production.

(c) The principal crops to be grown on this acreage will be specialty crops, fruits and vegetables, alfalfa, and forage for cattle and sheep which feed on the ranges during the summer. The upper basin States are even now in a deficit-feed area, and Federal aid has had to be extended to them.

(d) Most of the wheat grown in the upper basin States is on dry land. As water is put on these areas the land goes out of wheat and into other crops. Wheat grown on irrigated land is not the most profitable crop.

(e) The population of the United States is growing at a very rapid rate and it is estimated that by 1975 every acre of tillable land will be required to provide the food and fiber needs of the United States. By the time this project comes into full production the crops grown will be urgently needed.

(f) The principle of the soil bank will not be violated. In the case of this project it is the water bank that is needed. This project must be started now so that the water now wasting into the sea may be put in the water bank (storage reservoirs) and made available to be drawn upon when the facilities are ready to put the water to beneficial consumptive uses. It will take at least 7 years to build the dams and 10 to 15 years to fill them. The water bank must be filled as soon as possible while water which is wasting into the sea is available for the filling.

NO INJURY TO LOWER BASIN RIGHTS

The Colorado River compact apportion 7½ million acre feel of beneficial consumptive use of the upper basin States. In addition, it provides that the upper basin States may not deplete the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to less than 75 million acre-feet in any consecutive 10-year period.

The total consumptive use by the upper basin States upon completion of this project will not exceed 4 million acre-feet out of their 7½ million. There cannot possibly be any interference with lower basin rights as a result of this project. In fact, H. R. 3383 specifically requires strict compliance with the applicable interstate compacts.

The Supreme Court recently held that there is no legal controversy between the upper and lower basin States.

How the Farmer Feels About Benson, Soil Bank, Prices, and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Farm Management magazine taken from an advance proof of the March 1956 issue:

HOW THE FARMER FEELS ABOUT BENSON, SOIL BANK, PRICES, AND POLITICS—POLL SHOWS MAJORITY OPPOSE SUBSIDY—FAVOR BENSON, GOP, AND SOIL BANK PLAN

Farm Management put its editorial finger on the pulse of the Nation's farmers in one of the largest opinion surveys ever attempted by a farm publication—and discovered the majority of Western farmers take a dim view of price supports, favor soil bank restrictions, and think Secretary of Agriculture Benson is doing a good job.

On the basis of first returns from the questioning of some 50,000 farmers and stockmen, it is apparent that opinion on soil bank policy is divided; but, significantly, only 5½ percent were outright opposed to the soil bank plan. More than half of those submitting early replies favored restricting payments to those who do not graze livestock on diverted land.

The vital election-year question, "Which do you think offers best deal for the farmers: Democrats or Republicans?" brought forth 65 percent in favor of the GOP. And 64.5 percent of the early returns were pro-Benson.

Those polled were so enthusiastic over Farm Management's plan to obtain a composite of the modern farmer's plight and his view on remedial proposals, that virtually all made additional comments on the questionnaire or sent along detailed views in accompanying letters.

"Farm supports should be reduced 10 percent each year until there are none," said W. C. Emery of Salinas, Calif., in a typical comment.

Another Californian, R. Merrit, of Santa Margarita, agreed. "It is not price supports, soil banks, controls or bureaus that has made this country's standard of living the highest in the world," he said. "It is free enterprise."

SUPPORTS

L. Lakin, of Tolleson, Ariz., feels that "free markets for all commodities, with no supports would, within a reasonable time, eliminate the necessity for soil banks and subsidies." His view is shared by reader M. Haines, of Quincy, Wash., who said he feels that "the only help Government should give farmers is fast tax writeoffs and liberal but realistic long-term operating money such as big business gets."

Of those replying to the four-part price-support query, 40 percent wanted no supports whatsoever; 26 percent favored flexible supports; 20 percent wanted 90-percent supports on all major farm products, and 14 percent favored the two-price plan.

"Eliminate all supports and you will soon eliminate all the farmers who have to have supports to live and who produce just enough to create the surpluses," said an Arizona reader.

SOIL BANKS

The survey, in order to present an accurate picture of the Nation's overall farm and livestock situation, encompassed a cross section of Farm Management readers, as well as nonsubscribers. The first large segment of replies, compiled for this initial presentation, was largely from western areas.

This group was 52 percent in favor of restricting soil-bank payments to those who do not graze livestock on diverted land. Thirty percent favored free choice by farmers as to what use is made of diverted acres. Only 5.5 percent opposed the soil-bank plan.

Views of the oppositionists were well summed by Californian John O'Neal, who commented: "I do not believe in any form of a soil bank. It will be detrimental to land. The large farmer will have too much advantage over the small farmer."

Waldon Branch, of Midvale, Idaho, believes the soil bank "would just help the big wheat man. In time it will hurt the corn man • • • and to enforce it right will cost a lot of money."

FEDERAL PAYMENTS

On the issue of restricting Federal payments, 35 percent of those submitting early replies favored making support or land diversion payments to all, with income restrictions. Thirty-four percent favored restricting payments to farmers with annual incomes of less than $15,000. Those favoring restricting payments to farmers with $25,000 a year income numbered 19.5 percent, and 11.5 percent said set the restriction at $50,000.

"Put a maximum amount on what an individual may receive, regardless of income," said one Californian, Carson Hubbard, of Tipton. Another, D. Eljah, of Brawley, thought supports "should be on a dollar basis, and when a farmer produces above the set amount—then no more money."

Anyone who ever doubted that America's farmer is still a rugged individualist should thumb through the thousands of replies this Farm Management survey prompted.

"Let the farmer run his own affairs," demanded P. J. Conrad, of Yakima, Wash. "The farmer without hope of easy money from the Government will raise what he can sell and sell what he raises—with less cost to the consumer and more satisfaction and profit for himself. He may have to do some of his own work, have a few less new cars, but he will be a better citizen."

Not quite so vociferous was O. W. Wagner, of Nampa, Idaho:

"I am not quite as rugged an individualist as I once was," he wrote. "All I need to do to determine that is to ask my banker. I have no quarrel with bigness as such • • • but it has been proven over and over again in foreign lands that a nation of a few getting a stranglehold on agriculture and industry eventually deteriorated. Therefore, I believe a limit on the amount any one individual can receive on a crop-support loan will arrest the present trend of bigness in agriculture."

"This restricting of payments, I feel, is un-American and undemocratic," counters S. V. Christierson, of Salinas. "A law of that sort should apply equally to everybody, providing no payment permit an actual profit."

POLITICS

Republicans were out ahead in political party preference by nearly 2 to 1 in the first block of returns, with 65 percent of those replying indicating they'll go for the GOP. Thirty-four percent were pro-Democratic, and 5 percent favored a third party.

Some, however, were pretty disappointed with the entire Washington scene.

"The Democrats have forgotten the cattleman just like the Republicans have," said L. Gienger, or Chilagum, Oreg. "Do half the cattlemen have to go broke before the other half will ask for help? I say if you support the farmer, wool growers, merchant marine, post office, airlines, big business, half the world, and all the armies—it's time you give the cattlemen a lift • • • at least get his costs in line."

Typical of the flood of pro-Republican comment from those polled was the analytical approach to farm problems offered by James T. Skinner, of Belfry, Mont.:

"I believe that if this soil-bank plan by President Eisenhower is given a fair chance to work by all farmers, that it will eventually eliminate our surplus crop trouble and slowly lead us out of these low crop prices. It seems to me that it is the most sensible plan offered to the American farmer yet, but it will take time to achieve these results. However, I don't think Secretary Benson is in touch with the farm problem at all. I believe he is well-intentioned but lacks the proper leadership to solve some of these difficulties. He seems to prefer a wait and see policy which, as every one of us knows, is getting us nowhere.

"I believe strongly in flexible price supports with a floor under which crops would have a fair limit," he continues, "but I believe the one thing that will help to solve our problems more quickly is better, more adequate marketing. I believe this to be our greatest weakness and one that is continually causing farmers and taxpayers alike no end to our surplus that continually accumulates."

SECRETARY BENSON

Does the average farmer think Secretary of Agriculture Benson is doing a good job?

Farm Management's poll shows that 64.5 percent favor Benson's efforts. And this controversial question prompted hundreds of footnotes and letters.

Many felt he was doing a good job "but * * *"

Said Jim F. Lewis, of Tubac Ranch, Tumacarori, Ariz.:

"I know there is a lot of opposition which he has to contend with which would make a man's job hard. But so far I think he has done a fair job. * * * I do know if hog prices don't come up soon I will be put out of business."

Lewis said he raises about 5,000 hogs a year, has spent nearly $100,000 equipping his 1,800-acre ranch and faces additional expenditures of $60,000, "and if something isn't done pretty soon not only I, but God knows how many other hog raisers, will go out of business and into the poorhouse."

"There is no doubt of the inteligence and sincerity of Secretary Benson," says P. B. Wand, of Pleasanton, Calif., "but hard-hearted realists are needed to meet our problems. The squeeze the farmer is caught in is apparent, and Benson has done a poor job of publicizing the plight of livestock men and farmers to the public. He would be more appreciated and have more stature if he would speak up rather than always say that everything will work out all right for the farmers."

Outright oppositon to Benson was sounded by U. F. Kluesner, of Leadlore, Idaho:

"He has foreseen the drop in livestock prices and the best thing he has come up with is, 'We shall study the problem.' Our agricultural secretary should be a man of action and always on the alert for the good of the farmer and rancher * * * and to act at once when a problem shows itself—not when it's too late."

Farm Management, anxious to obtain a complete picture of the Nation's agricultural problems and to mirror the farm and ranch scene for its readers, will continue compiling results of the survey, tabulating percentages and reporting results to its readers. Next issue a more comprehensive report will be presented. Meanwhile, readers and friends who have not participated in the poll are urged to study the accompanying list of questions and send in their answers.

Every questionnaire will be tabulated, all letters carefully read—and the results made known. However, the editors, understandably, cannot publish excerpts from every letter.

Final tabulation of the returns will provide what is probably the first accurate cross-section of opinion from the West's farmers on the vital issues of our domestic economy, farm problems and political reactions.

How they voted (top 2 places only)

	Percent
PRICE SUPPORT	
No	40
Flexible	26
SOIL BANK	
Restricting grazing on diverted land	52
Let farmers decide use of diverted land	30
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	
No income restriction	35
$15,000 income restriction	34
POLITICS	
Republican	65
Democrat	34
BENSON	
Favorable	64.5
Opposed	35.5

The Significance of United States Control of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address of Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, at The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., on February 25, 1956. Admiral Burke is one of the great men of the Navy. His all 'round experience beginning from the trying times of the lean Pacific days during World War II, coupled with his great knowledge of the makeup of our Navy of today qualifies him to speak with eminent authority on the need for America's control of the sea.

Fate places Admiral Burke at the helm of leading the American Navy into the Nuclear Age. This is a terrifying responsibility—a responsibility well known to Admiral Burke. In this mission he will need the help of both branches of the Congress and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Burke will fulfill his mission to his time and generation because he will get the aid of the Congress and the thanks of the democratic world for his contribution to our generation. He will place his knowledge in the perpetuation of our way of life as the leader of that important segment of our national defense and as the Navy's representative in the family of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The address follows:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF UNITED STATES CONTROL OF THE SEA

You, as the students of The Citadel, I know, realize how very fortunate you are to have General Clark as your president. General Clark is a great American, one we all admire. General Clark is one of our greatest wartime leaders. His record, leadership, and valor in peace and war are an inspiration to all of us. General Clark brings to The Citadel the wisdom and experience which can only be gained in battle. His record as leader of American Army forces in World War II and, later, as leader of allied forces in the war in Korea, speaks for itself. Our country is fortunate that General Clark has chosen to continue his career here in Charleston in the service of American youth.

Charleston has always been a city with profound interest in our Navy; Charleston has always been a great supporter of our Navy, and it is a pleasure to be able to represent the Navy in Charleston today. Charleston, for some 300 years, has been one of our country's most important maritime centers. The port of Charleston has good anchorages and it is easily approached from the sea. We are reminded of this by the flags of the nations of the world putting in at Charleston. The importance of the port of Charleston is growing. From a sailor's point of view, the possibilities for future growth are immense.

The Navy yard here at Charleston is one of the Navy's most important for making ship repair and conversion of the ships of our fleet. It is a busy and effective yard. Thanks to the assistance and wise counsel of your Representative, Mr. RIVERS, the Navy is now beginning extensive work in new construction of our facilities at the naval mine base here.

It is good to be in Charleston for another reason. Navy people have traditionally enjoyed duty here. We have enjoyed visiting the city of Charleston. We have always felt at home here.

My friends, General Taylor and General Twining, have already talked to you about how magnificent Army and Air Force function as elements of our unified defense team. I am the sailor member of the team. It is my pleasure to tell you about the Navy's role in maintaining the security of our Nation. I am going to talk to you about the seas and about ships. I am going to talk from the point of view of the sailor.

The Navy's main task in any kind of war is to control the seas. We must control the seas in order to protect United States striking power against the enemy, to establish the scene of combat as far away from our homeland and as close to the enemy homeland as possible. We must prevent the enemy from attacking our own country through the ocean areas. We must prevent him from using the seas to further his own campaigns against our allies.

Control of the seas is more important to the security of the United States today than ever before. It is increasing in importance as navies move ahead through the atomic age.

The Navy is hard at work on new developments. We are adapting nuclear power for ship propulsion. Carrier-based aircraft and seaplanes of the Navy are moving rapidly into the supersonic era. The most powerful, most destructive weapons of the age are being installed on board ships in increasing numbers.

The United States, as you know, does not have a monopoly on nuclear developments. Nor is the United States the only Nation in the race for sea supremacy. The Soviet Navy is and has been engaged in an unprecedented shipbuilding program. The Soviets have also made significant progress in the field of nuclear energy. Some of their progress has surprised us in the past. We could be surprised again.

A glance at a globe is all it takes to appreciate the meaning of control of the sea in the nuclear age. This planet of ours is actually covered by a world-circling sea. The continents are actually large islands surrounded by the great oceans. The oceans form a worldwide interconnected transportation network. They provide easy access to the population and economic power centers of the world. In time of war, the seas become a giant battlefield greater in scope than any other battlefield on earth. The victor on this great battlefield will have access to the resources of the world. The victor on this battlefield will be in a position to organize the resources and populations of the world and project this vast power into the homeland of his enemy.

The free world is an oceanic confederation. The free world confederation depends for its very existence upon the security of the sea communications which bind it together.

One of the cornerstones of United States national policy is collective security. The United States has cast its lot with other members of the free world community through a worldwide system of mutual defense agreements. The United States has, in addition, built up over the years a huge overseas investment in foreign-aid programs, in a worldwide system of airbases, in stockpiles, and in the thousands of men we have deployed overseas. Unless the United States Navy can remain supreme at sea against all

opposition, our system of collective security will collapse, and with it will go the position of the United States as a world power. A lot depends on the ability of the Navy to do its job.

Let us now take a closer look at the Navy's role in our national defense and at the threats which confront the Navy in carrying out its role.

As you know, the United States supports and maintains military forces for two general purposes. First, we want to deter aggression if it is at all possible. We want to deter little aggression as well as big aggression. Second, if we cannot deter aggression, we want to win the war, whether the war be a big war or a little war. Now, in order to do these two things, we must have naval power—we must have naval power to control and use the seas from the beginning to the end of any type of war, whether it be nuclear war or nonnuclear war, limited war or global war, short war or long war. Many kinds of war are possible. No man alive is a good enough fortune teller to be able to tell exactly what kind of a war will face us or where it will start or how it will start, or how long it will last. We must be ready to defeat the enemy in any kind of war he may start, regardless of what tricks he may have up his sleeve.

If the enemy decides to start a war with an all-out atomic surprise attack, naval forces at sea will play a major role in retaliating. Perhaps after both sides have made their initial strikes, United States ability to take further action will depend on the mobile striking power we have dispersed at sea. Naval forces are also very important in limited wars. Most of the danger spots in the world, as you know, border on the seas. Naval forces deployed in troubled waters serve as an on-the-spot deterrent to aggression. Our Navy is ready to strike immediately in case of any type of aggression. Naval forces deployed in international waters can be assembled and employed immediately by the United States if necessary because they do not operate from bases in foreign territory.

In some critical areas of the world, we do not have bases from which we can operate land-based military forces. In these areas, the air power of our mobile carrier task force is the only United States air power available to us for use in case of trouble.

In event of a major war, the Navy must insure the safe arrival of the vast amount of food, weapons, fuel, and reinforcements required by our hard-pressed forces and allies overseas.

Each combat soldier, sailor, marine or airman deployed overseas needs about 5 tons of shipping to begin with, and over 1 ton per month to keep him supplied. The men themselves may, and often do, move by air. But before the planes can fly, we must set up the overseas air terminals and supply and support and defend them with men, weapons, and material carried over in ships. The ships must have been there first.

Our own forces and allies overseas must be continuously supplied with war materiel if they are to continue fighting. This will be particularly important after the initial strikes, for in many areas our forces will have to be supplied and supported from the very beginning. If these supplies are destroyed at the overseas terminals, they must be resupplied by ship.

The United States has commitments with over 60 nations—all overseas. To back up these commitments we keep major Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force forces deployed on three continents across both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

If we are to live up to our worldwide collective security agreements, we must use the seas.

If we are to protect our huge overseas investment in deployed forces, bases, and stockpiles, we must use the seas.

If we and our allies are to survive, we must use the seas.

When you look at a chart, the sea areas look like a huge wasteland. Actually, this is not the case. Every sailor knows that the oceans and seas of the world are a beehive of activity. Sailors also know that regardless of how tough the opposition may be, ocean traffic during war is heavier than it is during peace.

Take the Atlantic Ocean area as an illustration. On an average day, today for example, there are from 2,000 to 2,500 ocean-going ships at sea. In time of war this traffic would be much heavier. No other form of transportation can replace the oceangoing ship as the prime carrier of this traffic.

To use the seas, we must be able to keep our ships afloat and keep them operating. Our Navy must be able to defeat enemy submarine attacks, enemy air attacks, attacks by enemy ships, missile attacks, and any other kind of attack he might try to throw against us.

Let us now turn our attention to the Soviet Union, which today is the second-ranking sea power of the world and moving up fast. The Soviets have two fundamental naval requirements.

First, they must protect their sea frontier from attack. This is to leave their armies and air forces free to act in Europe and Asia. Second, they must cut allied sea communications to isolate our own and allied forces in Europe and Asia. Thus isolated, our forces and overseas bases will be easy pickings for the Soviets. They will be able to gobble up the free world in bite-size chunks.

To succeed, the Soviets need naval forces designed for their particular needs. Their navy is different from our Navy, for our Navy must be designed to fight and win in European and Far Eastern waters. We know that the Soviet Navy is being well designed to meet their needs.

The Soviets have a large and growing Soviet submarine force—about 400 submarines—and they are building more of them. The Germans almost cut us off from Europe in World War II. They started the war with 57 submarines.

The Soviets have added over a hundred new and modern destroyers to their fleet. They have 24 cruisers—17 of them are new. They have expanded and modernized their naval aviation. Their naval air arm totals about 3,500 aircraft. Its mission is to support fleet operations from land bases.

The Soviet Navy is training hard in all kinds of weather. Their sailors have higher living standards, special privileges, careful indoctrination, special training schools to establish a fine esprit de corps in the Red Navy.

The United States Navy is now deployed worldwide. We are deployed to meet our cold-war commitments, and we are also ready for general war. Our naval forces range in size from a very small force in the Persian Gulf to the powerful 6th and 7th Fleets.

We have limited forces in northern Europe. We have fleets on our own east and west coasts to defend the sea approaches to North America. We have forces in the Hawaiian area. We also have ships providing support to our forces in the Arctic. Some of our ships are now operating with the Antarctic expedition.

Let us examine the operations of the United States 6th Fleet and the United States 7th Fleet more closely.

The Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean is the big punch of the collective NATO naval power of the western democracies. It is in a high state of immediate combat readiness. It has an extensive striking capability. It can be moved quickly to any danger area in the Mediterranean. It operates well dispersed to minimize danger in case of suprise attack. The influence of the 6th Fleet in support of United States policies has been tremendous.

United States ties with the countries of the Mediterranean and the confidence of these countries in United States ability to oppose aggression in this area have been strengthened. The 6th Fleet exercises a stabilizing influence on political matters in the Mediterranean.

The men who man the fleet have established a feeling of good will and friendliness toward the United States which cannot be measured in terms of dollars or military hardware.

The 7th Fleet has 4 attack carriers with 300 embarked aircraft. It also has an amphibious force of ships capable of carrying troops and equipment. The fleet also includes cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, and a logistic support force for sustained operations.

The 7th Fleet took part in the Korean war. Since Korea, our naval patrols have kept Communist activities limited. The 7th Fleet covered the Chinese evacuation of the Tachean Islands. It ferried large numbers of anti-Communist Vietnamese refugees from Haiphong to Saigon.

The 7th Fleet is ready for any assignment. It too is highly mobile and operates well dispersed.

Our overseas fleets serve as a deterrent to trouble, big trouble and little trouble, much like a strong and well-disciplined police force. Only when our fleets leave a particular area do the Communists there flex their muscles.

Our attack carriers are the central element of our naval striking forces. The aircraft embarked in these powerful ships will be among the first to retaliate in case of war.

The Soviet threat to our control of the seas is growing, but the power of our Navy is growing too. We are determined to stay ahead.

We are shifting to nuclear power as fast as technically possible, and as fast as funds become available.

We now have a good atomic delivery capability. It is rapidly becoming better.

We are shifting from guns to guided missiles so that we can knock down enemy aircraft at high altitudes and at long ranges.

We are developing surface-to-surface missiles that will increase our long-range offensive capabilities.

We are developing faster better attack aircraft. One of them now holds a world speed record never before held except by fighters.

We are developing high-performance fighter aircraft. We now have the fastest operational fighter in the world.

We have a high-performance jet seaplane in production that looks like a natural. It is fast. It has long range. It can carry a heavy load. It can operate from sea areas all over the world using submarines or surface ships for bases.

All of these planes will be able to use many types of guided missiles.

We are developing amphibious techniques which will enable our marines to land from the sea against all types of enemy coasts. The Marines are perfecting a vertical envelopment technique using helicopters that will be a big jump ahead in the science of assaults from the sea.

The nuclear-powered *Nautilus* has been in commission about a year. She is a wonderful underseas boat. She is fast. She is a true submersible. She will be difficult to defeat.

A sister ship, the *Seawolf*, will soon be commissioned.

There are, in addition, four new nuclear-powered submarines in previous programs.

We are asking for six more nuclear-powered attack submarines in this year's program. We are building a nuclear-powered cruiser and are designing a powerplant for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

Nuclear power in our aircraft will come some day too, but that is further off in the future. When that day comes, our seaplanes will have nuclear power.

We have many types of atomic bombs now. Naval attack planes can carry most of them. More important, they can deliver against strong enemy opposition with accuracy and speed. But these planes are not limited to atomic bombs, they are versatile and can use conventional weapons equally as well in case of nonnuclear war.

New technologies are advancing the science of naval warfare at an unprecedented rate. Navies of the future, other navies as well as our own, will have greater striking power, greater mobility, and a greater capability for dispersion under attack than anything we have seen up to now. As the scope and violence of naval warfare continues to increase, the importance of our control of the seas becomes greater than ever. Your Navy is dedicated to the task of keeping the United States supreme on the world's oceans.

Your Navy believes in the future, the future of which all of you here are a part. We are determined to do our job. We are confident that we can do it. We know that together with our wonderful Army, our Air Force, and our gallant Marine Corps, we are ready to maintain our country's honor, prestige, and security against all enemies.

The Supreme Court, the Broken Constitution, and the Shattered Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have in previous speeches tried to make clear to the Members of the House my alarm at the tendency of the United States Supreme Court to usurp the legislative functions of the Congress. I refer not only to the desegregation decision, but to the tendency of the Supreme Court to legislate. In this connection I introduced into the RECORD recently a criticism by the arch-conservative Wall Street Journal against what it termed "legislation" by the Supreme Court on the matter of the regulation by the Federal Power Commission of the gathering of gas at the wellheads of the States where it is produced. Lawyers everywhere are alarmed at the tendency—even those who believe in the integration of the races in our schools. This tendency is more fundamental and dangerous than even the controversial decision in the case recently decided by the Court declaring unconstitutional the segregation of the races in our schools.

In this whole connection I am, with leave of the House first obtained, introducing with my remarks, a dissertation by Mr. R. Carter Pittman, of Dalton, Ga., a brilliant lawyer and devoted student of the Constitution and our Bill of Rights. The dissertation is entitled "The Supreme Court, the Broken Constitution, and the Shattered Bill of Rights."

I do hope that a reading of this masterful statement of the case against legislative decisions by the Supreme Court will help awaken the people of our Nation to the danger that this trend poses to our democratic institutions and way of life:

I speak to you about the broken Constitution and the shattered Bill of Rights. They are the cherished relics of a proud people and mementos of a day that is dead. The universal ignorance with respect to them is appalling.

Schoolchildren are taught to recite from the Declaration of Independence. They think they know who wrote it. There is not one high school or college student out of each hundred in America who knows who wrote a single provision of the Bill of Rights. The percentage of college professors who can recite any provision of the Bill of Rights, except a part of the fifth amendment, is extremely low. About 90 percent of college graduates in America think that our Bill of Rights was written by Jefferson. If they have ever been told who wrote it, they were either misinformed or they have forgotten.

In 1951 the editors of Life magazine recorded in Life's Picture History of Western Man (p. 288), that John Adams was one of the most influential delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787. On the same page they named Jefferson as the author of our Bill of Rights. Adams was in England in 1787. Jefferson was in France when the Bill of Rights was written. Neither wrote nor influenced a single provision of either document. Life's editors found it more convenient to make up than to look up constitutional history. That has become an American trait.

Much of the Constitution and all of the Bill of Rights was originally written by history-minded laymen. They were written to be understood by laymen. They are therefore in simple language, easily understood.

Constitutions constitute. They constitute governments. They constitute the powers of attorney of public servants. Officers of governments must look to constitutions for the power they exercise. If the power is not conferred or authorized in the constitution then they don't have the power. The exercise of a power of government not authorized by the constitution is lawless usurpation.

The very first sentence of our Federal Constitution is as follows:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Is there anything about that sentence that an intelligent person able to read should not understand? Is there any reason why that sentence doesn't mean what it says? If it doesn't mean what it says, what does it mean? If it means what it says, doesn't it mean that only the Congress of the United States can make laws? It means that the President can't make laws. It means that the courts can't make laws. It means that you can't make laws for me and that I can't make laws for you, because all legislative powers authorized by the Constitution are vested in the Congress by the Constitution.

The first amendment and the very first sentence of the Bill of Rights is: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Notice particularly the first line: "Congress shall make no law respecting * * *" freedom of religion, of speech, of press, of petition and assembly. If the Supreme Court can make law, we have no Bill of Rights. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and the right of the people to assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances are predicted upon the proposition that only the Congress can make Federal laws. If the Supreme Court or the President or you or I can make laws there is no Bill of Rights, there is no Constitution and there is no Republic. If the Supreme Court can make that to be law today that was not law yesterday, we have a broken Constitution and shattered Bill of Rights.

As every lawyer and historian worthy of the name knows, there is no Federal common law distinct from that of the States. Federal courts follow the common law existing in the States prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution. State courts find, follow, and are bound by common law. In finding it a few have been known to attempt to make law but Federal courts don't have that excuse for claiming or asserting a power to make laws in the guise of construing it.

The purpose of all sincere investigations is the discovery of truth. Basic truth is discoverable in the midst of external realities. It may not be manufactured by the mind. It is a tangible reality and is never new. Once found, it may be seized and held fast. Now let us seek and follow the truth wherever it may lead on the most vital issue that has concerned America in this age.

In its celebrated integration decision of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court did not hold that the old "separate but equal" doctrine, laid down in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), was bad law. It held that it was bad sociology. It did not hold that the facts (or truths), disclosed by the records in the cases before the Court, justified a departure from the "separate but equal" doctrine. It held that "psychological knowledge," apart from those records, was of more validity than factual truths.

The first point resolved by the Court was that for want of sufficient information it could not be determined whether or not those who framed the 14th amendment intended to abolish segregation. The Court said it "cannot be determined with any degree of certainty." When the Court said that, it knew that the same Congress that promulgated the 14th amendment passed two bills dealing with segregated schools in the District of Columbia. There the Federal Government had plenary jurisdiction to establish integration if it intended or wished it. The Court knew also that at that time every American State except five had segregated schools. The Court also knew that as soon as the carpetbaggers were run out of the beaten and prostrate South 3 more went white leaving only 2 integrated States. Therefore the Court knew that the 14th amendment came into being and matured in a segregated America. Therefore the Court could not and did not base its decision on anything in the Constitution.

The Court conceded in the Brown et al. decision that the records in the cases before it demonstrated equality of white and colored schools in respect to all tangible factors, and for that reason its decision could not turn on such tangible factors, saying:

"We must look instead" (not also) "to the effect of segregation itself on public education."

The Court then asked: "Does segregation * * * (alone) * * * deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?"

The answer was: "We believe that it does."

Why? Because:

1. In the graduate-school case of *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U. S. 629), "* * * this Court relied in large part on those qualities which

are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness. * * *"

2. In the other graduate-school case of *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma Regents* (339 U. S. 637), "* * * the Court * * * again resorted to intangible considerations: * * * 'his ability to study, to engage in discussion and exchange views with other students * * *.' Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them * * * solely because of race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may effect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

3. In the Kansas case, then before the Court, the trial judge had found that "a sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. * * *"

Thereupon, the Court transplanted the nebulous "intangible" found in Kansas into the records of the South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware cases, to fill with void the vacuum left in those cases by failure of proof.

Next came the Russo-Marxist "intangibles" transplanted from northern Europe to end all tangibles in governments of law:

4. "Whatever may have been the psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy vs. Ferguson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in Plessy vs. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected."

Footnote 11 sets forth the "modern authority" the Court relied on. That "authority" appears to be in the field of sociology rather than "psychology," but that is of no moment, except to illustrate that when the court took its first step from "tangible factors" to "intangibles" and jumped from fundamental principles of law to pseudo-socio-science, it went in over its head. By the solemn confession of the Court, it abandoned the Constitution and the law and went to "intangibles."

Whatever they were, how did such "intangibles" find their way into the cases? They were not authenticated as "authority" by any method known to Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence or rules of evidence. If not in evidence, the universal rule is that it is harmful error, prejudicial to the adverse parties, for them to be considered by the Court.

We have scanned legal literature since May 1954 in an effort to find a respectable vindication of the Supreme Court's conduct but have found none. A few law-school professors have sought to defend the decision with that stupid sarcasm so popular now on a few college campuses, but no seasoned lawyer or judge has defended it.

The editors of the American Bar Association Journal voted not to print an article criticising the integration decision until they should be able to print a respectable article defending it. They are still waiting for a decent defense of the Court and the lawyers of America are kept in the dark by their own association and their own publication as to the extent of the crime committed against the Constitution by its own guardians.

The concept adopted by the Court to the effect that Negroes get an inferiority complex from associating with Negroes is an insult to the Negro race and to the intelligence of honest men of every race. We mention it to exclude it. Judicial notice of such a concept is unprecedented in judicial experience. To reach such a result the Court had to abandon law and facts and go to alien ideologies that are at variance with law and decency.

Under elementary and elemental law, a court may not use treatises in a field other than law, unless the treatises themselves are the very subject of inquiry. The doctrine of judicial notice extends only to those things of common knowledge that lie without the realm of science, or to that one science in which judges are presumed to be learned or experts themselves, the science of law.

Of frequent application is medical knowledge. Since that is a science without the realm of legal science and is not of common knowledge it must be proved under the oath of a member of the medical profession. He may not testify as to the knowledge of other physicians whether revealed by word of mouth, books, or treatises. Books themselves are not admissible, and may not be consulted by judges or juries. That is true, because hearsay evidence is no evidence. What a man, even though an expert, writes in a book or article on a nonlegal subject, is as much hearsay as if he wrote it in the Daily Worker. A party to a cause is entitled to have, and the law demands that evidence come to the bar of justice under the sanction of an oath; that a thorough and sifting cross-examination and an opportunity to impeach be afforded to shake and destroy it for any cause, including the intangible, or nebulous nature of it.

That law is neither new nor strange. It is as old as justice and as fresh as virtue. The Supreme Court is not a stranger to it. In *Pinkus* v. *Reilly* (338 U. S. 269), decided November 14, 1949, the Supreme Court, speaking through Justice Black, held that the use of nonlegal materials was illegal, illogical and unfair. If it was illegal, illogical, and unfair in 1949, what has happened since to conform such use to the sense of justice of the same judges?

In the Pinkus case the parties at least had an opportunity to rebut, to disprove and impeach by means other than cross-examination. In the integration cases no such opportunity was afforded to parties. The intangible considerations, discovered in Marxist publications, first appeared in the secrecy of the judge's chambers. Notice of it was first given to the defendants in the judgement itself. No precedent short of star chamber and high commission cases of the Stuart kings, 300 years ago, may be found for like judicial deportment. We thought the door closed forever on the precedents of those courts at the execution of the Earl of Strafford.

In *National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.*, v. *McGrath* (341 U. S. 123), the Supreme Court held that nonlegal materials could not be used by the Attorney General as a basis for listing an organization as communistic. Justice Black shamed the Attorney General, calling such conduct unfair. He said it was "abhorrent to free men." He should not complain that we agree with him. Three hundred years ago the English Parliament said it was treason. We agree with Parliament, too. If only an unfair person would do such a thing to a Communist organization, decency will not permit us to describe those who would do the same thing to the whole Caucasian white race—a people whose ancestors made the country free and great, whose loyalty has preserved it, and whose only crime is that its members want to keep their country free and their race white.

The Supreme Court has consistently held that the use of nonlegal materials for a purpose other than to aid the Court in taking judicial notice of a fact of common knowledge, violates the due process clause of the 14th amendment. An unanimous bench, graced by Brandeis and Cardoza, so held in *Ohio Bell Telephone Co.* v. *Public Utilities Commission of Ohio* (301 U. S. 292). There the Court said that the use of such material was a denial of "the rudiments of fair play"; that "to wander afield and fix" * * * the evidence * * * "upon proofs drawn from the clouds" * * * "is not the fair hearing essential to due process" * * * but is * * * "condemnation without trial." The Court held that "the fundamentals of a fair trial were denied to the appellant" when findings were grounded * * * "upon the strength of evidential facts not spread upon the record." What has the white race done to forfeit the benefit of the due process clause of the fifth amendment? The same words mean the same thing whether in the 5th or the 14th amendment.

Justice Brandeis said in *United States* v. *Abilene Southern Railway Co.* (265 U. S. 374): "Nothing can be treated as evidence which was not introduced as such." That rule was universal until the Supreme Court found it standing as a barrier to a decision that should defy the Constitution, the law, and the elementary facts of life. That rule became a casualty when the Court grounded its judgment on pseudo-socio-science, not a part of the record either as evidence or as law, and that could not be considered in the case without violating the Constitution.

In its integration decision of May 17, 1954, the Court was led into a vacuum by the semantics of sociological doctors, who found a judicial blindspot and practiced a fraud upon the untrained and unprofessional judges causing them to usurp the powers of Congress to make laws, and to victimize a helpless people. The most effective expert seemed to be Dr. Karl Gunnar Myrdal, who wrote the American Dilemma (1944). His 1,438 pages of psychological knowledge, and illegal and inadmissible claptrap, financed by Carnegie Foundation, overcame the Court. It was cited by the Court as the modern authority on which its decision was grounded. The American Dilemma is now Corpus Juris Tertius in American pseudo-socio-law.

Myrdal learned that the biggest blindspot in America is our pathetic ignorance as to the basic principles of American liberty. Marxists scream "academic freedom" and insist on the right to teach Marxism and Communism in our schools so we will know how to cope with it. No one insists on teaching the basic principles of American liberty. If one did he would be ridiculed as a reactionary. So Gunnar Myrdal found a vacuum or a vortex into which most anything could be thrown to pass for food. Thus he created an American Creed, that would have evoked universal laughter but for the fact that his creation was in a blindspot. Ignorace can't laugh for fear of being laughed at. On page 4 of his atrocity he defined his "creed" as "the fundamental equality of all men."

In the same breath he said its "tenets were written into the Declaration of Independence, the premable of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and into the constitutions of the several States. The ideals of the American creed have thus become the highest law of the land."

He knew that what he said was an untruth. He knew that the Constitution and Bill of Rights were written to preserve the blessings of liberty—and that neither says a word about human equality. But Myrdal thought he was in a blindspot, and had that same feeling of security that an ambush gives to a midnight assassin.

Nevertheless, for fear some unbeliever might cite the Constitution on him he put his shoes on backwards to make tracks both ways. On pages 12–13 he said:

"Conservatism, in fundamental principles, to a great extent, has been perverted into a nearly fetishistic cult of the Constitution. This is unfortunate since the 150-year-old Constitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions. * * * The worship of the Constitution also is a most flagrant violation of the American creed which is strongly opposed to stiff formulas."

In the same place he said that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was "nearly a plot against the common people."

On page 18, lawyers and judges became anathema to the American people and the "American creed," because, as he says, "the judicial order * * * is in many respects contrary to all their inclinations."

As his pages of Slavic philosophy are turned, the "American creed" became the

amalgamator of races. On page 614, "• • • the cumbersome racial etiquette is un-American."

He praised Thomas Jefferson to heaven on page 8 for the equality content of the specious "creed," which he claims to have found in the Declaration of Independence. But he again reversed his shoes on page 90 and damned him to another place for proposing emancipation and simultaneous segregation of Negroes to Africa, in his Notes on Virginia.

Myrdal is not the only one to try to make an equalitarian Marxist out of Jefferson. On one of the huge marble panels on the left as one enters the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D. C., is a fragment of one of Jefferson's sentences. As inscribed upon the panel the words are, "nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that these people are to be free."

As written by Jefferson there was no period, but there was a semicolon and the sentence continued: "nor is it less certain, that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government." (The Jefferson Cyclopedia, p. 816.)

That clause was deliberately left off that panel by some equalitarian who loves every other country and every other race except his own. Jefferson was made to say something he didn't say and that lie is told on Jefferson, with the sanction of our Government, every hour of every day in stone. It is a fitting specimen of the morality of those who maintain it. It is exhibit No. 1 in the museum of equalitarian depravity.

While reversing his shoes in rapid succession, Myrdal's socks slipped off. The aroma of Russia became distinct.

On page 9 he exposed the central theme of Marxism in the midst of half-truths. Here it is: "• • • in the last generation, the inherent conflict between equality and liberty flared up. Equality is slowly winning. The New Deal during the thirties was a landslide."

For once Dr. Myrdal revealed God's truth. American liberty and Marxist equality cannot coexist. The Supreme Court affirmed that truth in Brown, et al. and swapped American liberty for Marxist equality. Dr. Myrdal is the modern authority for the swap, but the swap is an old story.

In the Constitutional Convention on June 26, 1787, Alexander Hamilton said:

"Inequality will exist as long as liberty exists. It unavoidably results from that very liberty itself."

Madison not only recorded that in his Notes of Debates, but adopted it substantially as his own and described the doctrine of human equality fictitious in a letter to Jefferson October 24 of the same year. Equality at creation was the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, written to appeal to the simple-minded peasants and philosophers of France. The Declaration never became a rule of life in America. A lawyer who would plead it would be laughed out of court. It was assented to by John Adams who helped to write it. "But," said Adams to Taylor, April 15, 1814: "to teach that all men are • • • equal • • • is as great a fraud, as glaring an imposition on the credulity of the people as ever was practiced by • • • the self-styled philosophers of the French Revolution."

In Harvard's better days her Charles W. Eliot taught: "Inequality, not equality, • • • is the inevitable result of freedom." In Columbia's better days her Nicholas Murray Butler taught that equality is a "shibboleth." Henry James described the doctrine of equality as "slander" by "the paid scribes of old-fogyism which no man who is not an ass can believe." Lord Acton, Edmund Burke, John Morley and hundreds of others have exposed the specious thing.

Dr. Myrdal, the Supreme Court and Mr. James may labor the point, but it will never be imposed on the South. Nothing in our Constitution or Bill of Rights sustains the doctrine of human equality. The doctrine of freedom and the right to be unequal is in every line of them.

The doctrine of human equality never took root in America, North or South. At the end of the Civil War the carpetbaggers wrote it into the constitutions of six Southern States, at the points of bayonets. As soon as those carpetbaggers were driven out, all of those States except one went back to the doctrine of George Mason's Virginia Declaration of Rights of June 1776, "that all men are born equally free and independent."

George Mason's libertarian concept was copied into the French Declaration of Rights of 1789. In the bath of blood we know as the French Revolution, the phrase "All men are equal" was substituted in 1793. In 1940 the French Revolutionary motto: "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" was stricken from the tomb of her liberty. That cluster of inconsistencies no longer tarnishes the tricolor of France. In 1946 the doctrine of human equality was stricken from the French Declaration of Rights and the George Mason concept of 1789 went back in exactly as it was. But too late. The French are now a bloodless race that sends a feeble voice. Equality made them so.

Heaven and Hell are monuments of God's truth eternal that all men are not equal and that segregation is the pattern in the life everlasting.

It is inequality that gives enlargement to intellect, energy, virtue, love and wealth. Equality of intellect stabilizes mediocrity. Equality of wealth makes every man poor. Equality of energy renders all men sluggards. Equality of virtue suspends all men without the gates of Heaven. Equality of love stultifies every manly passion, destroys every family altar and mongrelizes the races of men.

Equality of freedom and independence is the American proposition. It cannot exist without inequality in the rewards and earned fruits of that freedom and independence. It is inequality that makes the pursuit of happiness something more than a dry run or a futile chase.

Equality may be imposed only in a despotism. Equality beyond the range of legal rights is despotic restraint. It is nowhere imposed except in the communistic sewers of slavic slavery. As Francis Lieber pointed out in his great work on Civil Liberty (p. 334), 100 years ago, "Equality absolutely carried out leads to communism."

Equality homogenizes so that cream no longer rises to the top. It puts the eagle in the henhouse that he may no longer soar. More than 2,000 years ago Aristotle proclaimed that equality may exist only among slaves. Russia has proved the postulate.

The October 10, 1955, issue of Life magazine carried an editorial entitled "In Memoriam, Emmett Till." That editorial was designed to appeal to the emotions of the ignorant and to stir up hatred against the white peoples of Mississippi and the South who had no part in the unfortunate occurrence and committed no crime except that of living happily in the South, minding their own business. The editors wrote of Emmett Till:

"He had only his life to lose, and many others have done that, including his soldier-father who was killed in France fighting for the American proposition that all men are equal. Those who condone a deed so foul as this are in danger of losing their souls."

The editors of Life magazine gave no details as to how Pvt. Louis Till met a hero's death. They passed over the facts in haste to get to the hero. The records of the Army show that Pvt. Louis Till, the fighting hero, was executed in Italy on July 2, 1945, at the age of 24, for the crime of rape and murder. He raped two Italian women and murdered another. As that buck Negro, was fighting, raping, and murdering those white women of Italy in the year 1945, he was doing exactly what Life magazine said he was doing. He was "fighting for the • • • proposition that all men are equal," but thank God, it was not an American proposition. Equality of freedom is Americanism. Equality of men is Marxism. The proposition that all men are equal in all respects and that it is not wrong to reduce the chastity of white womanhood of America to the level of black brutes is a cardinal tenet of communitsm. No, we don't condone a deed so foul as the killing of Emmett Till, nor do we condone the depravity of the editors of Life magazine. It is they who have lost their souls.

Shortly after the decision in Brown et al., Attorney General Brownell and Vice President NIXON were going about the country gloating over it. They confessed that the decision was dictated by a desire to counteract Russian propaganda. In other words, they bragged that it was done to please the Communists. That it did. Homer stated the real reason for Russia's interest better than Mr. NIXON or Mr. Brownell in his Illiad when he said:

"A bloodless race • • • sends a feeble voice."

In the December 13, 1955, issue of Look magazine, page 40, Justice Douglas marvels that in the summer of 1955 he found the white and yellow races segregated in Asiatic Russia. Russia plans a blooded race for herself and a bloodless race for America. All proceeds according to plan.

The South has no racial problem and has had none for near a half century. Its racial problems were solved by segregation. We don't intend to turn back to the horrors of a day that is dead to please alien sociologists.

We don't intend to go back to the kind of racial riots and the strife that now exist in some of the integrated cities of the North. Racial problems have become so serious in Chicago that the leading newspapers, radio stations, and television stations of that city recently entered into a conspiracy to suppress race-riot news and to deny freedom of the press. This un-American conspiracy was hatched up by the City News Bureau editor, Isaac Gershman. The agreement making up that conspiracy forbids the dissimination of factual news about race riots and gang fights. The New York Times of Sunday, July 24, 1955, page 35, tells about it:

"The need for a program such as Mr. Gershman's is emphasized by the 15 months of racial trouble at the Trumball Park low-rent housing project on the far South Side of the city.

"Since August 11, 1953, when the first of several Negro families moved into the Federal housing facility, the neighborhood has been marked by violence, rioting, beatings, vandalism, and racial clashes. To keep peace, as many as 1,353 policemen have occasionally been on duty at the 426-family development. An average of 300 policemen are always on duty. Nearly 250 arrests have been made."

For the last 2 years the city of Chicago has expended more police man-hours to keep down race riots and race clashes in one integrated Federal housing facility than has been expended for the same purpose in the entire South for 50 years. Segregated races don't clash in Russia or in America.

As late as 1952 the Supreme Court revealed its awareness of the internecine strife caused by forced integration in Chicago. In the case of *Beauharnais* v. *People of Illinois* (343 U. S. 250), Justice Frankfurter used the following language:

"From the murder of the abolitionist Lovejoy in 1837 to the Cicero riots of 1951, Illinois has been the scene of exacerbated tension

between races, often flaring into violence and destructions."

In the same opinion he described many of the race riots that have occurred in Chicago and vicinity in recent years. He continued:

"Violence between racial and religious groups must be traced to causes more deeply embedded in our society than the rantings of modern Know-Nothings. Only those lacking responsible humility will have a confident solution for problems as intractable as the frictions attributable to differences of race, color, or religion. * * * Certainly the due-process clause does not require the legislature to be in the vanguard of science—especially sciences as young as human ecology and cultural anthropology. * * * It is not within our competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists as to the dependence of the individual on the position of his racial or religious group in the community."

The Court hadn't read Myrdal's American Dilemma and didn't know enough about sociology, human ecology, and cultural anthropology to decide racial issues in 1952. But by 1954 the judges had become so expert in pseudo-socio-science a la Myrdal that it abandoned the Constitution, the law, reason, and commonsense to embrace a doctrine unknown to God and unknown to any government of law in the history of civilization.

Both before and after he became President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt knew, as every man of experience and character should know, that in order to promote good race relations the white and the black races must be kept separate. First in 1928 and again in 1933 after he became President he caused deeds relating to tracts of land at Warm Springs, Ga., to be made to himself personally by a corporation wholly owned by him. The fifth covenant in each of those deeds was:

"Fifth. Neither said land, nor any part thereof, shall be sold, rented, or otherwise disposed of to any Negro or other persons of African descent, or to a corporation or association owned or controlled by Negroes."

Those deeds may be examined in the office of the clerk of the Superior Court of Meriwether County, Ga., by any interested citizens. The first is in book 24, page 388, and the other in book 29, page 411.

When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt moved into the White House she found that the Hoovers had integrated the White House staff of servants. She immediately unscrambled the staff because, as she herself said:

"A staff solid in one color works in better understanding and maintains a smoother running establishment." (Henrietta Nesbit, White House Diary, p. 78.)

If she practiced one way and preached another that is a matter for her to square with her own conscience and her God.

On April 2, 1948, an American soldier, with long and varied experiences with all races in war and peace, testified in effect, before a congressional committee that the Negro makes a second-class soldier, saying in part: "* * * if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get into trouble" (Senate UMT hearing, Apr. 2, 1948, p. 996).

We turn over Dwight D. Eisenhower, the discriminating soldier, to be buffeted by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the equalitarian politician.

In the first edition of the Joe Louis Story (Life magazine, November 8, 1948, p. 129), Joe pointed out how the white people of the South excel those of the North in their harmonious relations with the Negro race. There he said: "* * * in all those years in Alabama I never knew anything about race or anything like that. No one talked about it, as I can remember. If there was lynch talk it never got to me or my folks. Not like now. I never got to know about such things until we got to Detroit."

Joe was forced to leave that statement out of his bound book because it was the truth and his northern publisher told him that the truth about the people of the South wouldn't sell, and that its publication in Life magazine was a mistake. Yankee ingenuity? Yes! No one will buy the truth about the South.

The sectional prejudices of the ignorant people of the North against the white people of the South is the most unreasoning prejudice known to history. It is a flame that never quenches. It feeds upon itself. The northern press can't afford to attempt to teach the masses of the North that there is no basis for sectional prejudices. To do so would mean bankruptcy.

The success of Life and Time magazines is due in large part to their policy of fanning sectional prejudices. That is the secret of the recent success of Communist infiltrations into northern hate groups. The South is an ideal whipping boy because no magazine with national circulation is published in the South and most of her leading newspapers are owned by residents of the North—some as far north as Moscow. The South has nothing with which to fight back except the ballot. Many of her Congressmen had rather see their pictures in Life or Time than to see their constituents treated fairly. The people of the South have learned slowly. Now a splash in Life or Time is rapidly becoming the kiss of Judas for southern politicians.

The good white people of the North are just like the good white people of the South. The blood that runs in their veins is our blood. The difference is that those in the South have had more experience with racial matters than those in the North. Of the thousands who move from the North to the South yearly, 75 percent embrace the southern point of view before living in the South 3 years and 95 percent have embraced it within 6 years. The South learned from experience to treat the good Negro white and treat his race black. The North treats the good Negro black and his race white. That just doesn't work. The blue birds, the black birds and the red birds get along beautifully in nature because they recognize the integrity of the other's breed. It is when they try to roost on the same limbs and use the same nests that the bird riots begin.

If you mix and closely confine 1,000 white chickens with 1,000 red chickens in the same house, a few days later the whites will be in one end and the reds in the other. Mix 10 whites with 1,000 reds and a few days later the whites will all be dead. Fools, sociological judges and perverts call that prejudice. If so, it is the prejudice of God.

The birds of the air, the beasts of the field and the fish of the sea practice segregation. God made it that way and a police force can no more stop it among birds and fish than it has among people. A newspaper conspiracy will not long keep mankind from knowing about the birds and the bees and the beasts and the fish.

The United Nations now distributes a booklet to our school children entitled "What Is Race?" On page 9 it says, in part:

"Is there a pure race? You can talk about pure bred races of dogs but you can't apply the same idea to human races."

The book then goes on to demonstrate by "scientific" data that purity and inequality may exist among all species of animals except the human species. This is a sample of the "fine work" the United Nations is doing with the money we work for, but which becomes the "take home pay" of traitors rather than our own. A Congress that hires parliamentarians, but no constitutionalists, to advise it, is likely to appropriate American money to establish or sustain any way of life except the American way.

The results of the decision of the Supreme Court has been to crystalize and solidify the determination of our people to live close to the Constitution and the law of the land. We don't intend to swap liberty for equality if we can help it. We don't intend to respect modern authority written by Karl Gunnar Myrdal or Karl Marx. We don't intend to respect any court decrees based upon such "modern authority."

The legislative powers granted by the Constitution are vested exclusively in the Congress. The first line of the Constitution says that, as we have pointed out. In order that there might not be any doubt as to where the new and dangerous powers conferred upon the Federal Government by the 14th amendment should be vested, the very last clause of the amendment was made to say:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

That clause is so plain a fool may understand it, but the Supreme Court held in effect that the word "Congress" means "Supreme Court."

The Constitution confers no power upon the Congress to legislate with respect to education. The power to legislate with respect to that subject remains in the States in accordance with the plain language of the 10th amendment and other provisions of the Constitution, fortified by honorable precedents and practice for 175 years.

It is true that the 14th amendment guarantees, as against State power "equal protection of the laws." It is equally true that "equal" doesn't mean "same." The word "equal" presupposes the existence of a plurality of objects for the protection afforded. Equal schools for Negroes cannot be the same schools as those for whites. If the same, they can't be equal.

Article 6 of the Constitution defines the "law of the land." It is the Constitution, and the laws and treaties made in pursuance thereof. The framers of the Constitution were careful to exclude executive and judicial decrees from their definition of the law of the land. If Federal officers knock on the door in the name of the Constitution, laws, and treatises, they are to be respected, but when they come knocking in the name of and under the authority of Karl Gunnar Myrdal, Karl Marx, or the lawless decrees of sociological judges, they must not be obeyed. A trust to keep we have. That trust is to resist tyrants and leave to our children a full measure of that freedom to which we were born and which is their birthright. The Constitution and Bill of Rights must be made to stand as a barrier against such a government of flesh. "The right to keep and bear arms" as protected by the second amendment is defined in the amendment as "necessary to the security of a free state."

A few years ago a Supreme Court Justice made the funny remark that "the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is." Everybody laughed. It made a good joke then, but depraved men soon began to say it without smiling. It is no longer a joke. The Constitution means exactly what it says. It is so plain that it yields little to construction but, like the Ten Commandments, it yields everything to depravity.

The framers of the Constitution knew their history. They knew that a tyranny may not exist without tribunals that can, in effect, make, judge, and execute laws without the interposition of the representatives of the people, acting in legislative assemblies. The lash of star chambers left their scars in the minds of the descendants of those who bore those scars in the flesh. The framers knew that the greatest work of God is a free, courageous, and virtuous judiciary, but they also knew that a pliant, servile, and time-serving judiciary is the greatest curse of God. While the framers

were careful to emancipate the judiciary and set it up as a coordinate and independent department of government, they were also careful to provide in the express language of the necessary and proper clause that "the Congress shall have power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the * * * powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof."

Under the constitutions of most States, and at common law, courts have the inherent powers to make such laws, in the form of rules and regulations, as may be necessary and proper to carry into execution the judicial powers of the courts. But the framers withheld from the Federal judiciary those common-law powers to make rules and regulations necessary and proper for the execution of the powers vested in the courts by the Constitution, and left the Federal judiciary powerless to implement its decisions. Such may be done constitutionally only in accordance with an act of Congress.

No act of Congress authorizes or can authorize the Federal judiciary to intermeddle with the operations of State schools or the segregation of races. No law grants Federal courts the power to nullify the decrees of God or the laws of States because they do not accord with the philosophy of Karl Marx or Karl Gunnar Myrdal.

On March 1, 1781, the Articles of Confederation were entered into by and between the 13 free States of America. The very first article of the Confederation, after the adoption of the name "The United States of America," was as follows:

"ARTICLE II. Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled."

Near the end of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia 6 years later, George Mason, of Virginia, proposed a Bill of Rights, to catalog some of the sacred rights that inhere in people, and to protect the people and the States from usurpation by Federal officials purporting to exercise the powers delegated to them by the new Constitution. That proposal was defeated by the unanimous votes of the States. Mason and Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, stood alone. Mason's motion was ridiculed. The Constitution was submitted to the people of the various States with no Bill of Rights shielding the liberties of the people and the rights reserved to the States. The people began to murmur. Their fears and apprehensions were aroused. The Massachusetts Convention, when ratifying the Constitution, reported back to the Congress: "* * * as it is the opinion of this convention that certain amendments and alterations in the said Constitution would remove the fears and quiet the apprehensions of many of the good people of this Commonwealth and more effectually guard against an undue administration of the Federal Government, the convention do therefore recommend that the following alterations and provisions be introduced into the said Constitution.

"First, that it be explicitly declared that all powers not expressly delegated by the aforesaid Constitution are reserved to the several States to be by them exercised."

A respectable minority had already made the recommendation in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

Next South Carolina ratified the Constitution under a resolution that contains substantially the same language.

Next New Hampshire ratified and echoed the same fears.

Next Virginia ratified after a bitter struggle. She proposed as the first amendment to the body of the Constitution "that each State in the Union shall respectively retain every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this Constitution delegated to the Congress of the United States or to the departments of the Federal Government."

New York came next demanding that nondelegated powers be reserved in the people or those to whom they may have granted them in State governments.

North Carolina and Rhode Island refused to ratify the Constitution until they were assured certain amendments would be adopted. The very first amendment proposed by them, as a condition precedent to ratification, to be inserted within the body of the Constitution, was the proposal that each State should retain every power, jurisdiction, and right which was not by the Constitution delegated to the Government of the United States. Thus it was that the last seven States that ratified the Constitution, demanded that the Constitution be so amended as to shield and protect the integrity of the States against the new and untried sovereignty.

The Constitution went into effect in 1788, but the Bill of Rights was not officially adopted by the necessary 10 States until December 15, 1791. The first Senate of the United States met behind closed doors and permitted no minutes to be kept of its proceedings, but William Maclay, a Senator from Pennsylvania, kept a secret journal. He recorded on pages 292 and 293, 2 years before the adoption of the Bill of Rights, that some of the Senators were gloating over the fact that the States and the people were at last in the clutches of Federal power.

Senator King was quoted as saying:

"The opponents of the Constitution would not see the ground on which to attack it. The business is now complete. We need not care for opposition. The Constitution of the United States implied everything. It was a most admirable system * * *. The claim of any of the States to any of the powers exercised by the General Government * * * will be treated with contempt. The Supreme Court is with the General Government to decide * * * in everything * * *, for the States have neglected to secure any umpire or mode of decision in case of difference between them. Nor is there any point in the Constitution for them to rally under. They may give an opinion, but the opinion of the General Government must prevail, etc. This open point, thus unguarded, has rendered the General Government completely uncontrollable * * *."

Senator King reckoned before people were through clamoring—clamoring for a Bill of Rights. The people knew not to trust a government except it be in shackles and chains. Montesquieu had told them that the bigger a government the more dangerous to liberty it becomes.

A few months later the people of the United States put the point in the Constitution for the people and for the States to rally under. That point is the 10th amendment.

The resolution of the First Congress submitting the amendments to the State legislatures recited that it was being done because "the conventions of a number of the States, * * * expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses be added * * *" (and in order to establish) "public confidence in the Government."

Thus it was in order to remove the fears and quiet the apprehensions of the people about the new Government and to inhibit the abuse of its powers the 10th amendment became the living law of the land, saying: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By virtue of that amendment the exercise of the nondelegated power by any agency or department of the Federal Government is subversion.

During recent years we have heard much about the fifth amendment and the privilege against self-incrimination. At times we have heard much about the first amendment, relating to freedom of the press, of speech, and of religion. However, we never hear that while only 4 States asked for those amendments, 7 States officially, and 2 more unofficially, demanded the 10th amendment. Massachusetts, South Carolina, and New Hampshire demanded the 10th amendment without a Bill of Rights in the belief that a Government so restrained would never be dangerous to human liberty and dignity.

The first nine amendments are an incomplete catalog of rights that inhere in people. Those rights inhered in the people before the revolution and before the Constitution. It was to shield those rights from kings and parliaments that the revolution was fought.

The first 9 amendments deal with rights. The 10th amendment deals with powers. It seizes the heavy hand of Federal power and holds it in a death grip, saying to the Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court, you may do what the Constitution says you may do, but you may do no more. Those powers that are not delegated to you are either reserved to the States, or they belong to the people.

The 1st amendment, as we have noticed, says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion", etc. The 2d amendment says in part: "* * * the rights of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." That amendment tells us what to do as a last resort—in case the independent judiciary fails the people. That amendment talks Anglo-Saxon. Cowardly people can't understand it. The 3d amendment likewise states something that government may not do. The 4th amendment reiterates that "the rights of the people * * * shall not be violated," etc.

The Bill of Rights, like the Constitution itself, proclaims repeatedly that only the Congress may make Federal laws. It was never dreamed by those who framed the Constitution or the Bill of Rights that a judiciary might attempt to usurp the powers of the Congress, the powers of the States, the powers of the people and the powers of God and overturn the Constitution, and make laws and brazenly cite Marxist writings as modern authority for so doing.

The Bill of Rights constitutes a cluster of little foxholes of liberty ground into the hard cold face of history by helpless men for a shield against the last of tyrants. They are a shield against arbitrary rulers, including star chamber judges, old and new. They are the result of distrust of power and distrust of men in power. They are a recognition of a truth eternal, expressed by Lord Acton: "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

If there is any provision in the Constitution of the United States forbidding the maintenance of segregation between races, where is it? If the Congress itself is given power to legislate with respect to education in the several States, where is that grant of power? If the Supreme Court of the United States is authorized by any clause of the Constitution to make laws and implement its laws by decrees, where is it? If there has ever, in the long history of civilization, been an example of the intermeddling of governments with the racial mores of a people, where and when was it?

In spite of the plain words of the Constitution, that any high-school child should understand, there are those who yet believe that the Supreme Court can make laws. In order for the Supreme Court to make laws let us see, summarize, and emphasize briefly what it must do:

1. It must nullify the very first line of article I of the Constitution that vests all of the legislative powers granted by the Constitution in the Congress.

2. It must nullify section 7 of article I which provides that Federal laws may not be made without the concurrence of the President or the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress.

3. It must nullify section 8 of article I which confers upon the Congress the power to make all laws for carrying into execution the powers conferred upon the judiciary.

4. It must nullify the limitations placed upon the judiciary by article III of the Constitution which restricts the judiciary to cases and controversies, and limits the appellate power of the Supreme Court "to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

5. It must nullify the definition of the law of the land contained in article VI which is "this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made * * *."

6. It must nullify that part of article VI of the Constitution that requires that all of those who make or enforce laws in America, State or Federal, shall take an oath to support this Constitution; in preference to and instead of Supreme Court decisions.

7. It must nullify all of our cherished guaranties of freedom, cataloged in the Bill of Rights, because our forefathers did not have the foresight to protect those rights against laws made by the Supreme Court as well as those made by the Congress.

8. It must nullify the very last clause of the 14th amendment that vests in the Congress the exclusive power "to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions" of that amendment.

On and on we could go listing the provisions of our fundamental law that must be nullified in order for a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to constitute the law of this land.

One who insists that the decision of the Supreme Court in Brown, et al. of May 17, 1954, is the "the law of the land" either knows better or he doesn't know better. If he know better he is depraved. If he doesn't know better he is ignorant. If he is ignorant he must be taught. If he is depraved he must be shunned.

For the full life of this Republic, the Supreme Court has consistently held that there is nothing in the Constitution that forbids the States from maintaining racial tranquility in segregated but equal schools. What has occurred to change the Constitution or the laws? Nothing except a campaign extending over a quarter of a century that has resulted in the systematic exclusion of trained lawyers and trained judges from the Supreme Court bench. That has been done in order to load the bench with weak men, and to prostitute the Court so as to make it embrace the philosophy of Karl Marx, the prophet, and his minor prophets, Andrei Vishinsky, and Karl Gunnar Myrdal.

When Jesus was looking for 12 good men he found Judas. He could have found a thousand like him without looking. So may a President.

The Supreme Court is to be commended for that spark of sportsmanship and integrity that caused it to cite "modern authority" for its decision in Brown, et al. With that lead, research has at last turned up an authority that the Court followed, without citing. It is the Course of Criminal Procedure, by Andrei Vishinsky, published in Moscow. In that book Vishinsky said:

"Soviet justice is an effective organ of Soviet policy."

Further on he described the functions of the Soviet judge, saying that he "should not aim merely at judicial logic; he should always be conscious that the law is nothing other than the expression of the policy of the party; in practice, this means that the Soviet judge, in case of contradiction between the law and the general line of the party, should not hesitate to set aside the application of the law, to obey absolutely the directions of the party, which represents for him the supreme law."

That is Brown, et al. There is your government of flesh. Karl Gunnar Myrdal was just a blind and a stalking horse for Andrei Vishinsky and his philosophy of government. Thanks to "modern authority" we are stuck with a Soviet constitution and a Russian bill of rights.

For 40 years now we have been planting the dead bodies of our sons in foreign soils on every continent of the world "to make the world safe for democracy." We have succeeded in making the world safe for communism. Democracy is dying. Here in America is the last hope of man on earth to hold liberty and dignity. The hold is slipping.

The American way of life, that so few now love and so many now hate, was won by a Revolution that could never get going until our forefathers organized and began to identify, ostracize, and boycott. They desocialized every traitor to his land and race. The freedom we enjoy was won by such means. If we keep our freedom we must rise to the level of our fathers and use their methods. The good negroes are on our side. There is no race problem involved. The only color involved is white—white trash. That white trash is organized under many names. Those organizations are composed of the dedicated gravediggers of American civilization.

The dilemma we find ourselves in today is not new. History repeats itself. Around 2,000 years ago, government by law had broken down in the Roman Republic. Judaism had lost touch with God. Mankind had cast itself loose from the traditions of the past and had lost its way. Wearied by excitement the world had gone mad. Form had replaced substance. Names had replaced things. Judges had forsaken the science of law for soothsayings. What we know now as social justice had replaced legal justice. The will of the people as interpreted by judges had replaced mandates of the laws of God and man. In that dark hour of history God sent His only Son to show the way to a world that was lost. He started with simple fundamentals. He taught the hopeless people to pray to God just one simple prayer that begged deliverance from their hunger, their trespasses, their temptations, and their evil, leaving to their own pitiful wits the phrasing of prayers of things less urgently needed.

As He was gently leading mankind back to tangible truth, He was also moving to His Garden of Gethsemane, Golgotha, and the Cross. Along the way He was trailed and shadowed by sociological judges, seeking to trap Him in His words. Seeing them in the multitude and among His disciples (one of whom was a friend of the court, and a traitor to his race and to his God) He began to speak of and to them. To the multitude He said:

"The * * * Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, but do not ye after their works. * * * For they bind heavy burdens * * * and lay them on men's shoulders * * * all their works they do * * * to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments * * *."

He then turned upon the sociological bloodhounds:

"But woe unto you * * * ye have taken away the key of knowledge * * * ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in * * * ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves * * * ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin and have omitted the weightier matters of the law * * * these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone * * * ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel * * * ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter but within they are full of extortion and excess * * *."

Thereupon He turned again to the helpless multitude: "Behold your house is left unto you desolate * * * ye shall not see Me henceforth. * * *"

He knew that the hour was at hand. He was in the clutches of sociological judges in a government of flesh. The judges who condemned Him trailed Him to the executive chambers of Pontius Pilate. Pilate, yielding softly to the will of the people, or to social justice, influenced by scientific thought control, asked the multitude whether it should be He to be executed. The judges, stirred up the will of the mob to cry: "Let Him be crucified."

Above the din of the mob were heard a few broken phrases as Pilate pressed the Saviour to declare whether He came to infringe the prerogatives of the tyrant Caesar, in his government of flesh "to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

Pilate was faintly heard to close the last colloquy: "What is truth?"

Even He paid a final tribute to truth that puts our Supreme Court to shame.

Thus the Son of God who branded the races of men with the marks of their kin and kind was, himself, history's honored victim of sociological judges in a government of flesh. It was their crown He wore, and their cross He bore.

That story may be found four times told in a book that may yet be found in most American homes. That book is a bur that mysteriously rides beneath the saddles of all modern authority in the field of sociological justice and scientific thought control. Our Supreme Court has virtually banished that book from the public schools of America in the specious names of religious freedom, and liberalism, and our children are not longer taught its lessons. That holy book contains no shifting creed and cannot rest on the same shelves with unholy ones that are now modern authority.

As we in the South once more pass into our Garden of Gethsemane thence to bear our socio-judicial cross, we plead with our brothers of the North not to let their sympathy and understanding be limited by latitude.

We in the South don't intend to obey men, however exalted their seats or black their robes or hearts. We do intend to obey laws made in accordance with our constitutions. We will live as free men or die as becomes the descendants of those who died that we might live in the freedom to be different with the liberty to be let alone.

Visit From the President of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial on President Gronchi's arrival in the United States is deserving of our colleagues' attention. It appears in the New York Times issue of February 27, 1956:

VISIT FROM A PRESIDENT

A visit from the President of Italy is diplomatically important in any circumstances and it is a pleasant opportunity to show our friendship for Italy. When the President is a dynamic and interesting character like Giovanni Gronchi, who arrives in the United States today, the visit becomes much more than a formality.

Constitutionally, the Italian President has little authority, but a forceful character like Giovanni Gronchi can give a weight and influence to the post that it does not normally have. At first, President Gronchi's espousal of the "opening to the left" frightened the uninitiated. The phrase was interpreted to mean that Signor Gronchi wanted to see a government formed that contained the left-wing Nenni Socialists who are closely linked to Italy's large Communist Party. However, Giovanni Gronchi is and always was anti-Communist. What he meant was that the Nenni Socialists must split with the Reds and then a government of the left could be formed with them.

The emphasis is always on the left, and this is what disturbs so many people. Yet, insofar as such trends can be pinned down, popular sentiment in Italy on the whole is weighted to the left. This is a genuine left, not a totalitarian Communist one. Over a period of a few years the Communists have been losing ground, although they remain the most powerful Communist Party in voting strength outside of the Iron Curtain.

The really important—and deeply satisfying—fact about postwar Italian history is that, in spite of the Communist strength, grave economic problems, high unemployment and a natural lack of experience in the ways of democracy after 22 years of fascism, Italy has become and remained a democracy. This is a great accomplishment and President Gronchi is one of the men who helped to keep Italy on the path of freedom. We do not need to agree with all his ideas or he with ours. What matters is that he believes in democratic institutions and is a friend of the United States. He will be welcomed here with true cordiality.

A Bill for the Protection of Ex-Korean Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which I hope will correct flagrant abuses by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in the administration of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which provides for the payment of compensation to ex-prisoners of war for treatment they received in violation of the Geneva Convention of 1929.

The law voting these benefits contained a provision defining a prisoner of war as one who did not "voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress" give aid to or collaborate with the enemy. It is also necessary to keep in mind that the law requires each claimant to satisfy the Commission as to the exact number of days he received insufficient food—for which he is entitled to compensation at the rate of $1 per day—or was subject to inhumane treatment—for which he is entitled to an additional $1.50 per day.

It has been the practice of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the case of all Korean prisoners of war against whom no allegations of collaboration have ben brought, to presume that the claimants were insufficiently fed and inhumanely treated during the entire period of their captivity. Generally speaking, these claims have been paid promptly and in full.

Unfortunately, a very different situation exists with respect to the processing of claims of prisoners of war against whom derogatory information has been received by the Commission. In these cases, the Department of the Army has furnished the Commission with secret and unsubstantiated allegations relating to the activity, treatment, and attitude of certain POW's during their captivity. Upon receipt of this secret and often hearsay information against a claimant, the presumption that he received substandard food and inhumane treatment has immediately been "suspended" and the claimant has thereupon been requested to establish his eligibility by affirmative proof. In other words, the claim has been disallowed by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and the claimant has then had the burden of proof of establishing either that he was not a collaborator or that he, in fact, actually received substandard food and inhumane treatment during each day of his imprisonment.

Claimants who have requested a hearing after having their claim disallowed on primary examination have been furnished a summary of information which, to my knowledge, has been identical for each claimant. In each case, it reads as follows:

A. Assisted the Communist propaganda by:

1. Writing and circulating peace petitions promoting Communist causes.

2. Writing and publishing articles containing information adverse and inimical to the interest of the United States.

3. Drawing cartoons which promoted communism and reflected adversely on the United States.

4. Participating in the preparation and dissemination of front line surrender leaflets.

5. Attempting to influence prisoners of war to accept communism.

6. Participating in the publication called New Life.

7. Actively participating in a group called Yen-So-Yen (workers) whose apparent mission was to interrogate and indoctrinate newly captured prisoners of war.

8. Serving as chairman of the camp peace committee.

B. Received the following preferential treatment from the hostile forces:

1. Better medical care than the other prisoners of war.

2. Better food and better clothing.

3. Easier jobs.

C. Cultivated the friendship of and were overly friendly with the hostile forces.

D. Frequently visited the Chinese officials of the prisoner of war camp by invitation and voluntarily both by day and night.

E. Were selected and approved by the hostile forces for special jobs such as squad leader and chairman of the peace appeal committees.

These are the general charges, Mr. Speaker, which each ex-Korean prisoner of war must rebut if secret and unsubstantiated allegations against him have been received by the Commission.

Actually, however, a claimant has no way of knowing whether he must affirmatively prove that he was badly treated or whether he must prove that he was not a collaborator with the enemy—or whether he must prove both. In dealing with the issue of collaboration, the policy of the Commission is to be found in a memorandum from the general counsel to the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission:

It is suggested that in the disallowance of claims under section 6 (e) of the act in which collaboration is an issue, the decision be based upon the finding that the evidence is insufficient to warrant the conclusion that the claimant, while imprisoned, was not fed or treated as provided in the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. No reference, expressed or implied, need be made therein to any official document or report which the Commission may have considered.

What the counsel's memorandum says is that the Commission may come to its conclusion on the basis of the issue of collaboration, and then write up its decision, in the same case, on the basis of another entirely different issue. This amazing document also contains the tacit admission that unevaluated, derogatory information, used by the Commission in reaching its decision, is then hidden from the claimant under the pretext that the information never entered the decision. In short, these hapless veterans find themselves deprived of their benefits and given a false reason, to boot.

I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, how closely this appalling procedure resembles the well known shell game. And I am sure you also see how far afield this procedure is from the accepted traditions of American justice.

The legislation which I have introduced today seeks to correct this deliberate and systematic injustice by requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to specifically inform a claimant of the reasons for disapproving his claim either in part or in full. It gives the claimant or his attorney the right to examine the evidence which is the basis of the Commission's determinations, and it prohibits the Commission from considering evidence which cannot be examined by the claimant.

Because many veterans have not been in a financial position to come to Washington to appear before the Commission, the resolution introduced today provides that hearings shall be held at a location not further from the claimant's residence than the capital city of the State in which he resides. The measure also gives each claimant the specific right to be represented by counsel, to have compulsory process to require witnesses to appear, and to cross-examine all witnesses on whose evidence the Commission has relied in denying his claim or in disapproving it in part. Evidence given by any witness on whose evidence the Commission has so relied, and who is not available for cross-examination by the claimant, must be disregarded by the Commission in reaching its decision.

In order that past abuses may be corrected, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have been discussing allows claimants to reapply to the Commisison for redetermination of their claims if, in the past, the claims were denied or approved

for less than the full allowable amount, on the direct or indirect ground that the claimant collaborated with any hostile force or enemy of the United States.

Finally, the measure establishes the right of claimants, against whom adverse decisions have been handed down by the Commission, to institute proceedings for the review of such decision by filing a written petition in our Federal district courts.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the careful and immediate attention of each Member of this House to the legislation which I have introduced today. The time has come to cut through the maze of fraud and hypocrisy which surrounds the proceedings of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In a letter to me dated January 10, 1956, Mr. Whitney Gillilland, Chairman of the Commission, piously declared that "in the administration of this type of legislation there is no adversary aspect. No one prefers charges or makes accusations. The legislation is of a beneficial nature and the determinations of the Commission are based solely on whether or not a claimant factually meets the eligibility requirements." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a claimant upon whom has been placed the burden of proof to establish that he did not collaborate with an enemy of the United States finds the proceedings to be adversary in every aspect. And I find it more than difficult to understand how Mr. Gillilland can say that "no one prefers charges or makes accusations" when he himself has signed hundreds upon hundreds of letters containing the summary of information against claimants relating directly to the issue of collaboration.

Fair Play Will Help Keep the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following statement issued on February 17, 1956, by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Rochester, N. Y., chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs:

The disclosure that our Government was on the verge of shipping tanks to Saudi Arabia, until halted by an exposé, is new and disheartening evidence of the inconsistency and unfairness of our Government's current practices in the Near East.

We have properly condemned the Communists for shipping deadly MIG fighter planes and IL bombers to Egypt. How then can our Government simultaneously supply arms to Egypt's major ally in the region, Saudi Arabia?

In recent months, Saudi Arabia has been a hornets' nest of Communist intrigue against both the United States and Great Britain, stirring up Jordan and other Arab States by bribe and threat to oppose western efforts to strengthen the region against Communist imperialism.

The Department of State cannot justify withholding arms from Israel on the ground that we are opposed to an arms race if we send arms to a despotic dictator who threatened on January 9, 1953, to sacrifice 10 million Arab lives in the attempt to destroy Israel.

Other Arab countries in the Near East are also getting arms from the West. During this last year the United States made available over $10 million worth of heavy tanks and other weapons to Iraq, whose present Prime Minister has stated: "Whoever would decide to make peace with the Israeli enemy would thereby sign the death warrant for the whole Arab nation."

British weapons continue to pour into Jordan which also refuses to make peace with Israel.

Thus while the hostile neighbors of Israel form an armed ring on her borders, the one democracy in the Near East is being isolated and denied arms by our own great democracy.

Have we ever before refused to sell arms to a democratic nation exposed to destruction by Communist weapons on her frontiers?

To strengthen the Egyptian-Saudi Arabian alliance at this time is to put teeth into Nasser's threat, uttered as recently as 1 month ago today, that the new Egyptian constitution was the beginning of an effort to establish Arab hegemony over Palestine.

Peace in the Near East must continue to be our major objective. But peace will not be attained, the threat of war in the Near East will mount and communism will grow stronger if we permit the Arab countries to achieve military superiority over the democratic country whose destruction they seek.

In America's own best interest and consistent with the American tradition of fair play, our Government should grant Israel's request for arms with which to deter aggression from her trigger-happy neighbors and to defend herself and the democratic way of life that she represents. Failure to take such action, accompanied by the disclosure of the planned shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia, indicts our professions of international morality, exposes democracy to new Communist attacks and impairs the high prestige of our country as the leader of the Free World.

The Case for Dental Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following resolution adopted by the council of the Cleveland Dental Society which concisely cites the case for an increased appropriation for dental research:

Whereas the physical, social, and economic toll taken by dental disease is constantly increasing and affecting most of the Nation's population, child and adult; and

Whereas great advances in preventing disease come as a result of research, and millions of people have already been benefited by dental research; and

Whereas the American dental bill which amounts to nearly a billion and a half dollars per year may be reduced by a few million dollars spent for research; and

Whereas the American dental bill is approximately 16 percent of the total medical bill while only 1.3 percent[1] of the funds allocated for research is devoted to dental disease; and

Whereas 40 percent of the men entering military service required immediate dental treatment, and today our troops are losing collectively over a million teeth a year with 5 percent requiring replacement to provide even the minimum for the chewing of food; the cost of this dental care to the taxpayer at the most conservative civilian rates would exceed $80 million a year and even a very modest progress would pay for the dental research many times over in the reduction of governmental dental costs; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his annual message this year complimented dentists as being a part of the Nation's health team and mentioned the need for more dental research; and

Whereas the dental profession has contributed over $220,000 annually for dental research: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress be urged to exert every effort to increase the appropriation for the United States Public Health Service dental activities for the 1957 fiscal year from $2,971,000 to $6,026,000, this increase to be used for the dental-research program of the National Institute of Dental Research; and be it further

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress be urged to request an appropriation of funds for the construction of the National Institute of Dental Research Building.

DWIGHT R. KINSLEY, D. D. S.,
President.

[1] Research grants to institutes for research (1.3 percent of total):

Institute for Cancer Research	$6,700,000
Institute for Heart Research	6,400,000
Institute for Mental Health	2,587,000
Institute for Arthritis Research	3,152,000
Institute for Dental Research	421,000

Fights To Stay on To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the Detroit Times by Mr. Art Hinkley, which announces the retirement of a great fighter for the common man. The name of that man is James H. Lee, better known as Jimmy Lee, who has consistently fought the avarice and attempts to secure more than a fair rate of return by the greedy people who sought to unfairly mulct the gas consumers, small and large, in our city of Detroit and in other consuming areas throughout the country, of a larger and larger percentage of their incomes.

Friend and foe alike respect and admire his courage and concern for the common man. It is to his eternal credit that it is rightfully said that it was he who established the principle that the Federal Government can regulate the cost of natural gas at the wellhead.

It is my hope that the city of Detroit will recognize his rare courage and ability and will be able to retain him, despite charter provisions to the contrary, that he may continue his unique contributions to the welfare of his fellow men.

The above-mentioned excerpt follows:

FIGHTS TO STAY ON TO FIGHT

(By Art Hinkley)

Jim Lee, the little, gray-haired city attorney who delights in taking on public utility giants, is facing an even tougher opponent—his next birthday.

When March 27 arrives Lee will be 69 years old, and the city charter sets that time as the mandatory retirement date.

For the last quarter century Lee has been fighting public utilities with the zeal of a dedicated missionary. He is in the midst of several battles and would like very much to stay on for the finish.

WOULD KEEP HIM ON

Council President Miriani and several other councilmen hope to make an arrangement whereby Lee would continue to serve the city on a contract basis. Miriani plans to enlist the aid of Mayor Cobo in the effort.

Paul T. Dwyer, corporation counsel and Lee's boss, anticipated his aid's retirement some time ago and named another staff member, Robert Reese, to take over the utilities assignment.

Reese, 41, has been in tte corporation counsel's office 7 years and has handled work for a wide variety of city departments.

Lee isn't as interested in his $15,175 salary as he is in winning his current battles. Among them are: distribution of a $36 million refund to customers of Panhandle Pipeline Co.; completion of the American Louisiana pipeline which will bring this area 200 million more cubic feet of gas, and a court action over a rate-fixing formula to be applied in the gas fields.

COVERS COUNTRY

Since about 1930 Lee has traveled throughout the country appearing at hearings and court actions in behalf of the public. He has argued repeatedly before the Federal Communications, Securities and Exchange, and Power Commission, Michigan's public service commission, and State and Federal courts. He commented:

"Usually Detroit was the only city represented in these battles. Occasionally another city would intervene, but usually Detroit was fighting the public battle alone."

Lee's efforts were successful in many cases and he was instrumental in obtaining refunds of more than $100 million for utility customers.

GETS THEIR RESPECT

The determined attorney won the respect of his opponents and he is quick to praise the utilities when he thinks they have done the right thing.

Lee is proud his opponents never have even tried to buy him off with job offers. He said:

"So help me, I've never had an offer from any of the utilities."

James H. Lee was a young Irish lawyer when he ran for the State senate in 1911 as a business promotion. He remembers:

"Teddy Roosevelt was in Africa. Taft was in the White House, and the Democrats were in the ashcan. I needed law business and decided to be a candidate for advertising purposes. It only cost $4 to file.

"No one was more surprised than I was when I got elected, 1 of 2 Democrats in the senate. Next year Mayor William B. Thompson appointed me to the city's legal staff."

In 1930 Lee handled the Woodward widening condemnation case—170 lawsuits in one—and he obtained a verdict of less than the citys' experts had estimated.

In 1910 Lee was one of the organizers of the Michigan Municipal League. He served as president in 1920 and a trustee since that time. Last year he was made the first life member of the group.

AN 8-YEAR JOB

For 8 years he has been chairman of the committee on telephone, gas, and electric rates of the National Institute of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. and Mrs. Lee, who live at 149 Webb, became acquainted when he was a senator and she a legislative committee clerk. They have a daughter and a son, James H. Lee, Jr., who is a successful radio and television actor.

The Past, the Present, the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently a political science instructor asserted that for 20 years your Representative had been carrying on a campaign against the 20th century, believing that time ended with the 19th century. He said the voters should "unite against the bad habit of Hoffmanism in the Fourth District." The gentleman speaks in riddles.

Everyone knows that time marches on. Sensible people learn from past experience, think of the future, not just of today. We need not build an ark on Mount Ararat. Sound thinking people, aware of today's realities, know that unless we use more common sense, return and adhere to certain age-old fundamental principles, our people will be drowned by the floodwaters of communism, public debt, or overwhelming taxation, or by all three.

When Adam and Eve were banished from the Garden of Eden because they associated with a snake, it became evident that if they were to live, it would be necessary for them to hustle for themselves.

Today, some folks—a few with their heads in the clouds—think we can get food, clothing, homes, and most things we want by legislation. In 304 a Roman emperor, evidently of the same mind as the instructor, sought to solve the people's ills by price-fixing laws and government control of the activities of the people. In the centuries gone by, several other nations have attempted through the enactment of laws, to create prosperity, contentment, and happiness. All failed—legislation does not satisfy hunger.

As long as the earth goes 'round, as long as we have day and night, as the seasons follow each other, there is no reason to believe that any individual or group of individuals, no matter how advanced their learning, how fine sounding their theories, will be able either to change or to overcome nature's laws which have been in existence not only in the 20th century, but since the dawn of civilization.

HOFFMANISM

Several years ago a publication, desiring to discredit me, sent an astute reporter into the district to write me down. She came up with the statement "the voice you hear in Washington is not the voice of CLARE HOFFMAN, but the voice of the people of the District." Making audible in Washington the voice of the people of the District is a worthwhile public service.

Unless I am completely mistaken, the people of the fourth district are thoroughly convinced that if they are to reap, they must sow; that if they are to harvest, they must plant, prune, and spray. That, if they are to live in comfort, they must work, be thrifty, conserve and wisely use their resources. That, if they are to live in peace, they must be tolerant of their neighbor's rights. That, if the welfare of the individual and of the Nation is to continue, recognition of physical facts, of nature's laws and moods, is necessary. That adherence to the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule, even though they be old—not a 20th century creation—is in the end the best policy for all.

The Government—without money, except as we furnish it—cannot itself take care of us. It can only write laws to protect us from injustice.

In formulating the policies which will insure our present and future welfare and security, it will be foolish to disregard the experiences and the lessons of the past.

If that be Hoffmanism, let those who think the principles of the Constitution, the policies which have given us so much, are shopworn, old fashioned, make the most of it.

The Integration Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following comment on the school-aid question which appears in the February 23, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American:

SCHOOL CHIEFS BAR AID RIDER—FEAR AMENDMENT MIGHT KILL BILL

ATLANTIC CITY, February 23.—The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) has gone on record against any desegregation amendment to Federal school aid on the grounds such a clause might lead to defeat of the legislation.

The association's annual convention, which winds up today, took its stand on the school-aid question in resolutions adopted without objection yesterday.

In another resolution dealing with integration, the 18,000 school officials urged "that all citizens approach this matter with the spirit of fair play and good will."

They expressed the conviction * * * that all problems of integration in our schools are capable of solution at the State and local levels.

Armory Construction in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present two exhaustive tables showing the status of National Guard construction in Louisiana. The construction program is is being handled under the terms of Public Law No. 783, which I sponsored and which I helped to engineer through Congress. Under the original bill, the Congress provided $250 million to be spent for Reserve construction within a 5-year period, and when this sum was exhausted an additional $250 million was authorized to be spent within 3 years.

The charts set forth herein cover only the National Guard projects located in Louisiana, but these projects provide for joint use with other Reserve requirements. The vastness of the program generally is indicated by the number of projects already handled in Louisiana, totaling some $3,369,818.39, since the enactment of Public Law 783.

The second chart covers the status of the National Guard armory-construction program for fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The exact costs of these programs, of course, are not yet known, as plans in many cases have not been completed, the purchase of the land has not been effected, and the engineering data has not been assembled. The 1956 program, together with the 1957 program, however, constitute an important phase of our total program of providing Reserve facilities for use in drills and assemblies.

When the second $250 million is expended within the 3-year period, we should then have completed one-half of our Reserve building program for the United States. I am satisfied that each State can present a very fine construction program such as I take pleasure in presenting herewith.

Armory construction program (Public Law 783)

Location	Cost of original building before Public Law 783	Cost of construction under Public Law 783		Estimated land values	Engineering fees	Other costs	Total values	Percentages	
		State funds	Federal funds					State	Federal
1. Donaldsonville		$35,026.52	$105,079.56	$11,000	$8,406.36	$5,600	$165,112.44	36.36	63.64
2. Jeanerette		35,345.13	96,142.51	3,000	5,916.94	6,350	146,754.58	34.49	65.51
3. Many		38,341.50	102,544.50	3,000	6,339.87	4,525	154,750.87	33.74	66.26
4. New Iberia		30,734.90	92,204.68	12,000	5,532.28	6,000	146,479.86	37.05	62.95
5. Lafayette	$71,385.55	34,373.71	91,580.00	10,000	9,951.05	9,150	226,440.31	59.56	40.44
6. New Roads		32,239.75	84,119.25	7,000	5,236.16	2,900	131,495.16	36.03	63.97
7. Marksville		31,422.75	83,819.25	7,000	5,185.89	2,900	130,327.89	35.69	64.31
8. Thibodaux	34,646.00	13,991.00	41,973.00	16,000	3,904.22	4,100	114,614.22	63.38	36.62
9. Ruston	32,962.00	3,758.75	10,901.25	10,000	2,198.08	7,000	66,820.08	83.69	16.31
10. Vivian		1,575.00	4,725.00	2,000	378.00	4,700	13,378.00	64.68	35.12
11. Breaux Bridge	59,056.00	25,425.50	70,957.50	10,000	7,880.60	2,900	176,219.60	59.73	40.27
12. St. Martinville		31,164.00	84,879.00	2,000	5,221.94	2,900	126,164.94	32.72	67.28
13. Abbeville		32,210.50	84,631.50	2,000	5,257.89	2,900	126,999.89	33.36	66.64
14. Jennings	52,395.83	26,259.25	71,502.75	12,000	7,575.44	2,900	173,173.27	58.71	41.29
15. Opelousas		34,173.75	86,021.25	1,500	5,408.78	4,280	131,383.78	34.53	65.47
16. Franklinton	10,007.00	7,757.25	22,221.75	3,000	11,356.00	1,800	56,142.00	60.42	39.58
17. Houma		34,851.00	94,278.00	4,000	5,810.81	4,400	143,339.81	34.23	65.77
18. Morgan City		30,896.75	88,565.25	10,000	5,375.79	4,400	139,237.79	36.39	63.61
19. Hammond		40,400.00	99,000.00	3,000	6,273.00	2,900	151,573.00	34.69	65.31
20. Camp Nichols		91,720.00	227,877.00	175,000	14,381.87	19,700	528,678.87	56.90	43.10
21. Winnfield	44,120.00	24,175.25	63,525.75	10,000	5,711.35	2,900	150,432.35	57.77	42.23
22. Crowley	63,367.00	24,614.75	63,644.25	8,000	7,773.68	2,900	170,299.68	62.63	37.37
Grand total	368,479.38	660,457.01	1,770,193.00	321,500	141,076.00	108,113	3,369,818.39	47.47	52.53

Status of armory construction program

FISCAL YEAR 1956

Location	Type	Status
Crowley	1-unit expansion	Contract let.
Winnfield	do	Do.
Jonesboro	1-unit armory	Bids in NGB.
Abbiers	do	Approved, site pending.
Minden	do	Approved, lease for site forwarded to city of Minden.
Plaquemine	do	Forms 34 approved by State Reserve Forces facilities board forwarded to NGB on June 11, 1954. Awaiting notification of approval and authorization to prepare plans and specifications.
Franklin	do	
Eunice	do	
Bastrop	do	
Homer	do	
Lake Charles	2-unit expansion	
Ville Platte	1-unit armory	
Leesville	do	
De Ridder	do	

FISCAL YEAR 1957

Ruston	1-unit expansion	Forms 34 approved by State Reserve Forces facilities board forwarded to NGB on Feb. 25, 1955. Awaiting notification of approval and authorization to prepare plans and specifications.
Covington	1-unit armory	
Natchitoches	2-unit armory	
Monroe	3-unit armory	
Bogalusa	2-unit armory	
Alexandria	5-unit armory	
Vivian	1-unit armory	
Sulphur	do	
Jackson Barracks	2-unit armory	

What's in the Mail Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following articles from the Watertown (N. Y.) Times and the Westerly (R. I.) Sun:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of January 31, 1956]

CONVINCING TEST

Congress is studying a $4 billion proposition known as the upper Colorado River project. A key unit of this program is the $421 million Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, designed to produce power revenues to pay off some 30 other units of the project that cannot pay for themselves. In other words, the dam-reservoir segment alone is considered the cash register of the entire operation.

But rough sledding is ahead for the program in Washington if Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, California, Republican, has his way. It's because he has made a fascinating and highly important discovery.

Independent geologists advised Congressman HOSMER that the water would swiftly disintegrate the immense cliffs which form more than 50 miles of the long, narrow walls of the reservoir because they are composed of a soft rock—known as Chinle shale.

The Congressman wanted to have absolute proof. In company with the geologists, he made a helicopter expedition to remote sections of the reservoir site in northern Arizona and southern Utah. Several hundred pounds of the Chinle shale were gathered and flown out for laboratory tests.

Using these samples, Congressman HOSMER demonstrated the rapidity with which it turns to pure mud when placed in an ash tray containing a small amount of water.

Congressman HOSMER was furious with this discovery. "If this is permitted to happen," he said, "the finances of the entire upper Colorado River project would collapse with it. The Nation's taxpayers would be left with a billion-dollar mud puddle. Congress should withhold any consideration of legislation pending a full and complete geological survey and report."

And to add weight to his argument, the California Congressman has sent out small boxes containing samples of the Chinle shale. They aren't sent under his frank privilege, either, but bear 9 cents in postage.

One such box arrived at the Times office Monday. We followed Congressman HOSMER'S instructions, placing the small handful of stones in an ash tray on the editor's desk. A notation, along with other literature and photographic evidence accompanying the box of shale, indicated the stones would be mere mud in just 5 minutes.

A stopwatch was plaecd on the experiment. In just 4 minutes—1 minute less than the documented claim—the ashtray was full of mud. The stones had disappeared. Maybe this new record of 4 minutes could be attributed to the fact Black River was used here.

Nevertheless, Congressman HOSMER has a very convincing argument. And he has employed a unique and impressive manner to demonstrate it.

[From the Westerly (R. I.) Sun of February 2, 1956]

WHAT'S IN THE MAIL TODAY?

The mailbag at the Westerly Sun yields its share of surprises every day. Possibly a newspaper gets more odd types of mail than any other establishment; since everyone wants a certain amount of publicity within the news columns.

This past weekend a small cardboard box arrived at the Sun from Representative CRAIG HOSMER, a Member of Congress from California. The box contained a handful of small stones called Chinle shale and certification from a geologist that the stones were taken from the Colorado and San Juan Rivers at the site of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam reservoir.

This project is a $421 million power dam and reservoir, a part of the Federal upper Colorado River project, now before Congress.

A photo that arrived in the same mail showed Representative HOSMER pouring water over a handful of similar rocks. In 5 minutes time they had disintegrated into mud.

The writer became curious and tried the same experiment, using an aspirin tablet in the same water for comparison. Strangely enough the stones, which were hard enough to scratch a fingernail, disintegrated faster than the aspirin tablet.

Representative HOSMER'S question is this: Will the taxpayers be building a good dam or a mud puddle costing $4 billion, the estimated overall cost of the project?

And quite a novel manner in which to get a point across to the reading public, too.

World Trade Unions a Potent Force To Resist the Spread of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, American organized labor has become a potent force in the effort of the democracies of the world to resist the spread of communism. Stories coming out of French North Africa indicate that American labor's activity may well be an important new factor not only in speeding the independence of those Arab-speaking lands but in preventing communism from gaining a foothold there.

In Algeria, the largest of France's three north African territories, there is being created a new Moslem trades union. It is patterned after similar unions in Morocco and Tunisia, which have played a major part in winning the greater independence recently granted those areas by the French Government.

American labor's connection with this effective effort in French North Africa, which is expected to bring about cohesion among the natives in their move toward independence, began with the strong campaign waged over the past 6 years by Irving Brown, head of the European office of the A. F. of L. It was followed by the all-out support of the anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions—ICFTU—with headquarters in Brussels, which originally encouraged the formation of the Tunisian and Moroccan trade unions in order to prevent those countries from falling under Communist influence. The new Algerian union will, as have the other two states, join the ICFTU.

Concerted effort is now being made toward the formation of an overall organization, comprising these three North African unions. This would mean that the political North African Federation, made up of Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco as independent states, had already been formed to all intents and purposes at the labor level.

Hence, France can no longer deal with isolated Algerian populations. These native unions, aided by their common membership in ICFTU and their common cause in seeking independence from France, are merging across the frontiers of the three states. Any effort that France should make now to seek to carry out a policy in Algeria, which would not meet with the approval of Tunisia and Morocco, would find resistance of the massed workers of all three states.

The new Union des Syndicats des Travailleurs Algerians (USTA) already is organizing port and dock workers, transport workers and hospital personnel. Plans are being made to wage a campaign to recruit agricultural workers.

USTA will make demands for improvement of the lowly lot of workers in Algeria and "equal pay with Europeans." It will, it is said, eventually move into the political field. Spokesman for the union, Ahmed Afri, said recently in Paris:

We shall not limit ourselves strictly to economic problems. We feel we must take our place in the fight for the defense of democratic liberties and the rights of the Algerian people to evolve their own status in accordance with both the charter of the U. N. and the statutes of the ICFTU in which we asked membership.

Mr. Speaker, this only serves to emphasize again the constructive, farseeing planning and effort that American organized labor is making, to do its full part as a group of responsible, intelligent persons, in helping to keep the world free of Communist domination.

The Federal Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Journal-American for February 23, 1956, on the President's highway program, is deserving of the attention of our colleagues:

BAD FOR ROADS

President Eisenhower's highway program in Washington is suffering today from foot-dragging and sabotage from members of his own Cabinet.

Whether accidentally or by design, the performance of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks as witnesses before the House Ways and Means Committee definitely lessened the chances of passage of a highway bill that will carry out the President's program.

The position taken by Humphrey perhaps can be rationalized to be that simply of a treasurer desiring to balance his books whether any roads get built or not.

The position of Secretary Weeks was just plain baffling.

The committee heard Weeks because he has supervision of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Weeks read a long, prepared statement praising those sections of the highway bill with which the committee has no responsibility and very little concern.

He was then questioned on the tax features of the bill, which are totally the concern of the committee and presumably the reason for Weeks' appearance.

The Secretary had no advice and no counsel.

He was unable to answer questions that almost everybody in the room, including the spectators, could have answered readily.

NEGATIVE ATTITUDES

Not only did he not know the answers, he refused to let two officials of the Bureau of Public Roads give the answers themselves.

It was more than sheer ignorance.

It was obvious to everyone present that Weeks was not going to help the Democrats write a tax bill to finance the Eisenhower highway program.

Is the Eisenhower program is voted down in the House because of lack of Republican support, the blame can be traced directly to the attitude shown by Humphrey and Weeks.

They were negative witnesses.

Apparently the President will have to state his position again.

He will have to state it bluntly and specifically so that no one will confuse his position with that taken by his two Cabinet members.

He has said already that he will support a highway bill financed by higher taxes, and in saying so he attempted to make the bill bipartisan.

At least that is the way everybody but Humphrey and Weeks saw it.

Their actions have served only to confuse those Republicans who will have to vote on the bill.

They are wondering which administration position is the official one.

The Weeks' performance looked particularly bad because he was preceded as a witness by a Republican who intelligently and enthusiastically supported the highway bill and its tax schedule.

He was Charles P. Taft, Mayor of Cincinnati and a brother of the late United States Senator Robert Taft.

Taft disagreed with previous testimony given by Humphrey and certainly will disagree with the position taken by Weeks.

The facts are that a Republican Ohio mayor did more to advance the Eisenhower highway program, for which he has no responsibility, than the two responsible Cabinet officers put together.

The New York Journal-American and the other Hearst newspapers regard it as of vital importance that the President again make his position clear and undo the damage done to a project in which he has a deep personal interest.

Milk for Health in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the State of New York and as a member of the important Committee on Agriculture of this House, I am very much interested in the problems facing the New York dairymen.

Consequently I have followed the progress of the National Dairy Council's program for greater New York with deep interest. The Dairy Council program is working through health and education leaders and through the press, radio, and television to increase the consumption of milk in the greater New York area. The program represents an important investment on the part of more than 37,000 farmers in the New York milkshed, most of whom are in New York State.

It is my understanding that as a result of the activities of the National Dairy Council the consumption of milk during the past year has increased in New York. This should have a salutary effect on both farmers and consumers. The extension of this program should in time help to reduce the price of milk, and for that reason I am greatly in favor of it.

The National Dairy Council was organized in 1915 to serve the dairy farmer and the dairy industry. Several Dairy Council units operate on a statewide basis. Among its activities are a broad public-relations program of nutrition education, the preparation of informational material, and the sponsorship of basic research on the relationship of dairy products to good nutrition. The council operates a special greater New York program whose activities are described in the annual report for 1955, which has just been published.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this report into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues and others throughout the country interested in this program. It reads as follows:

THE GREATER NEW YORK PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL DAIRY COUNCIL

The Greater New York program of the National Dairy Council conducts a program of nutrition education, and promotion publicity on behalf of the dairy farmers who supply milk to New York City. Program activities cover the five boroughs: Manhattan, Brooklyn, Bronx, Queens, and Richmond. The program receives its support through Milk for Health, Inc., from more than 37,000 dairy farmers in this milkshed.

It is a recognized fact that a knowledge of milk's importance to good health results in increased milk consumption.

Dairy council educational and research publications which meet the exacting requirements of local leaders in the fields of education and health carry the nutritional importance of milk as a food and beverage to mothers, preschool children, schoolchildren and adults of all ages. Dairy council materials are provided in quantity only on request, and care is taken to see that they are used effectively. Thus the facts about milk and good nutrition reach a very large percentage of New York City's 8 million people living in an area of 320 square miles.

Through newspapers, radio, and television, wide and effective use of this program's recipes, food photographs and other releases promoted milk as a beverage and as an ingredient in a variety of cooked foods. In addition to working for increased milk consumption, the Greater New York program's activities bring New Yorkers a better understanding of the dairy industry, of the local milkshed and of the importance of the dairy farmer.

Regular reports keep producers informed of Greater New York program activities and accomplishments. The Skyline Reporter, issued monthly, goes to all dairy cooperatives, milk plants, county agents and other agricultural leaders in the milkshed. Special reports are sent twice a month to all county agents in the area. Radio stations, farm papers and cooperative publications publicize the activities of this program. The quarterly report issued by Milk for Health, Inc., carries timely information to all supporting farmers.

Since March 1, 1955 the office of this program has been at 219 East 44th Street. The facilities are more adequate and make possible more efficient operation at lower cost.

THE THIRD YEAR

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five marked the program's third full year of operation. This report presents highlights of the year with some comparisons with 1954 and 1953. It was a year of progress and accomplishments.

NUTRITION EDUCATION

One of the basic tasks in the development of this dairy council program was that of establishing working relations with educational and health leaders. This was a twofold task of explaining the program and securing the acceptance and use of dairy council services and materials. Working within a geographical area of the city, each nutrition consultant served the schools and educational leaders, the health agencies, and professional leaders.

WORKING THROUGH EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

In Greater New York there are four types of schools: Public, Catholic parochial, Jewish parochial, and independent private. There is a total of over 1,500 schools with more than 1,200,000 students.

The dairy council program chain of influence stretches from key administrative officials to principals, teachers, children, and families. Members of the program's nutrition service visited the key officials and their staffs. Hundreds of conferences were held with other education specialists, including curriculum assistants and consultants in reading, health education, and visual education. These key people played an important part in explaining and encouraging the use of dairy council materials in the schools under their supervision. Through meetings held with their teachers, plans were formulated for the use of dairy council booklets, leaflets, and other materials in the school curricula. In addition, many counselors, staff coordinators, and specialists in teaching handicapped students and non-English-speaking children were informed periodically of the variety and availability of authentic dairy council materials. These conferences created many partners in the work to improve the food habits of the children, and, of course, increase their consumption of dairy products.

This program contributed to the success of the school lunch and special school milk programs. In addition to dairy council leaflets and posters, a special leaflet was provided which explained the special milk program to pupils and parents and encouraged children to participate. Approximately 1,150,000 copies of these were placed in the hands of schoolchildren through the cooperation of school officials and teachers.

This dairy council program has been accepted in practically all schools in the city. More than 90 percent of the schools in the five boroughs have requested a quantity of at least one dairy council booklet and nearly all have asked for enough copies to supply the students in many classes.

WORKING THROUGH HEALTH LEADERS

In Greater New York there are more than 17,000 physicians and surgeons, over 8,000 dentists and at least 21,000 other health leaders such as nurses, nutritionists, dietitions, and health educators.

The program served and worked through these professional health leaders who, in turn, reached families and individuals in all parts of the city and thus favorably influenced nutritional practices and the consumption of milk.

In each of New York City's 30 health districts, health department staff made effective use of dairy council leaflets, booklets, posters, exhibits and other educational materials. Staff members explained the program's services and educational materials to department of health nutritionists who were the focal point for reaching health leaders. Like

a pebble dropped in water, the beneficial effects of these conferences spread through each health district, with its doctors, nurses, dentists, dental hygienists and health educators to the entire community.

The program also worked through the welfare department and the many privately financed health organizations, including the Red Cross, Tuberculosis and Health Association, visiting nurse organizations and hospitals, and through physicians, dentists, nurses and dietitians.

Sample leaflets or booklets were mailed to professional leaders to inform them of the publications available upon request. More than 7,300 general practitioners were reached by direct mail. Doctors specializing in the various fields of medicine were served in keeping with their particular special practice. For example, child specialists were offered such publications as Feeding Little Folks, while those engaged in the field of obstetrics and gynecology were offered Before Baby Comes and After Baby Comes.

About 8,000 dentists were offered dairy council materials with over 2,000 requesting copies for use with their patients. The dentists provided a very important channel for getting information about milk and dairy products into the hands of parents and children. Special attention was given by working through dentists in connection with the annual Children's Dental Health Week in February.

Nutrition Week with its theme "mealtime is family time" served to reemphasize the importance of good nutrition to good health. It was truly a citywide undertaking with its beneficial effects spreading over many months. The programs' nutrition service director served as chairman for the second year and all staff members played an active part in the success of the week. The program provided more than 212,000 educational booklets and leaflets to meet the requests of health and educational leaders. National Dairy Council films were shown by many groups and dairy council exhibits were used in 17 places including hospitals, libraries, banks, and health centers.

This program has become recognized as a community resource for professional services and authentic materials. The dairy council's accomplished purpose was to increase health and well-being through understanding the importance of milk and other dairy foods in the diet.

NDC RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

Two research periodicals published by National Dairy Council were sent regularly to selected professional and educational people serving the greater New York area. About 20,650 received each issue of Dairy Council Digests and 5,750 received Nutrition News.

The Dairy Council Digests provided interpretative reviews of recent scientific research which related particularly to the importance of dairy products in good nutrition. Issued bimonthly, they reached general practitioners as well as professional groups associated with medical and health organizations. The publication was also sent to selected department heads and staffs at colleges and universities.

Nutrition News, issued four times a year, highlights nutrition research and presents timely articles on applied nutrition. It was provided to leaders in the field of education including school principals, educational consultants, home economics teachers and school-lunch managers. It also was sent to health educators, dental hygienists, and public-health nurses.

Direct evidence shows that these research publications were well received and met a great need.

MOTION PICTURES

Motion pictures were another tool which the program placed in the hands of health and educational leaders. In 1955 this program distributed four sound and color films which met the needs and interests of specific audiences and age groups.

Uncle Jim's Dairy Farm was used with primary and lower intermediate grades in the study of dairying and farm life and often supplemented its companion booklet. Whenever You Eat was used with teen-agers in junior and senior high schools in teaching better food habits. It's All in Knowing How was shown to senior high school students, young adults and parents with Weight Reduction Through Diet being used with groups of college age or older. The latter films were used in many areas, such as college nutrition and health education classes, hospital clinics, nursing schools, industrial health programs, and by nutritionists and other public health workers in varied community programs. For example, one nutritionist used these dairy council films as part of hers talks to service clubs, teen-age groups, women's clubs, weight control classes and many others.

Although prints of the films were made available through a film service, most of the films were scheduled and maintained by the health agencies and school systems. After receiving approval from the Board of Education, 52 prints of Uncle Jim's Dairy Farm were placed with its public schools, and district film libraries. Prints of the other three films have been placed after approval was secured, with such agencies as the health education service, New York Tuberculosis and Health community nutrition service, Queens Tuberculosis and Health and the film library of the New York City Department of Health. Special leaflets were prepared and distributed to schools, colleges, hospitals, and other health agencies to acquaint potential users with these educational films.

Greatest use of the motion pictures was made by professional workers as a part of planned programs for discussion-size groups. The use of films in this way intensified their effectiveness in furthering this dairy council program.

EXHIBITS

The major purpose of exhibits was to complement the program's services and publications and to further emphasize the place of milk in good diet.

The types and sizes of exhibits range from that of a model cow 14 inches high to those typical of conventions and expositions. The model cows, with their bells, green grass and messages of greeting were popular with the elementary school pupils and their teachers. Models represent Holstein, Jersey, and Guernsey breeds were accompanied by color pictures showing the 5 principal breeds of dairy cows. In schools they provided a focal point for teaching such subjects as nutrition, food production and dairying. Although the "herd" was increased from 15 to 45 cows in mid 1955, demand made advance scheduling essential. Each teacher was allowed to retain the model cow for not over 2 weeks.

This year, for the first time, the program maintained an exhibit at the Greater New York dental meeting held early in December. This was by far the most important dental meeting of the year in this part of the country. Hundreds of local dentists visited the dairy council booth, because better acquainted with the dairy council program and registered their requests for copies of educational materials displayed at the booth. Dentists were enthusiastic with their praise of dairy council cooperation and materials.

Several table-top exhibits and shadow boxes were used to illustrate the importance of milk as a food and to emphasize good nutrition.

In addition to the dental meeting, large exhibits were used in connection with Children's Dental Health Week and Nutrition Week.

Table-top exhibits were increased from 15 to 21 and were used at health center clinics, hospitals, libraries, bank windows, professional meetings and community programs.

A model dairy farm was featured on several television shows to promote milk consumption and create a better understanding of the important job of the dairy farmer.

For the second consecutive year, a large exhibit at the New York State Fair portrayed various activities of this program. In 1955, Milk for Health, American Dairy Association of New York, the Dairy Council units in New York State and this program jointly presented a large—40-foot long—exhibit directed to the dairy farmer.

PROMOTION AND PUBLICITY

In New York City there are 10 major newspapers, 7 television stations, and 17 radio stations. In addition there are more than 93 smaller daily papers which serve one or more sections of the city. Some are printed in Hebrew, Spanish, German, French, or other foreign languages. There are also several newspapers published by religious organizations. House organs and weeklies provide hundreds of additional outlets for promotion and publicity on milk.

Recognizing that food-page readers are second only in number to readers of front-page news and weather forecasts, the program continued to take advantage of food-page popularity to promote milk consumption. It provided seasonally appropriate editorial materials in checking recipes and attractive photographs to the newspapers in New York City.

During the year, nearly 100 new recipes for beverages and cooked foods were developed, tested, and distributed for use by newspapers. Each recipe called for 1 pint or more of milk, and in most instances was accompanied by an eye-appealing photograph.

At least 243 newspaper stories resulted from this program's milk-promoting publicity in 1955. Records show stories resulted in more than 33,000 lines of space. Frequently the articles were in Jewish, Spanish, Italian, and German newspapers. A specially prepared series of daily Lenten menus calling for a wide variety of dairy dishes and milk beverages were provided to and published by a large Catholic newspaper. In one instance a Jewish newspaper made liberal use of this program's milk-promoting recipes and photographs in their new cookbook.

As a result of this program's activities newspapers carried straight news items and editorials on milk, the dairy industry of the New York milkshed and the importance of the dairy farmer.

House organs which are publications prepared by business organizations for their own employees were provided with similar editorial materials. The publications have gone into thousands of homes of employees of an insurance company, clothing workers' union, the telephone company, and a parcel-delivery company.

Similarly a wide range of services to radio and television resulted in more than 50 broadcasts which urged increased milk consumption and brought facts about dairy farming in the New York milkshed to millions of city dwellers. Live cows were used on 4 TV shows, 1 of which originated at a nearby farm.

A model of a dairy farm was used on eight television programs. Many leading broadcasters used the program's publicity materials throughout the year.

Special promotional activities during Dairy Month included a dairy farmer who demonstrated milking to some 200 city children many of whom had never seen a cow, special radio and television programs, recipes and dairy stories in the newspapers, and a vending machine which dispensed free milk to pedestrians in the center of busy Times Square. Dairy product menus were developed by hotels and restaurants, nearly 1,500 United States mail trucks in Greater New York carried Dairy Month posters on 2 sides and food stores displayed more

than 2,000 posters as a result of the program's milk promotion activities.

KEEPING PRODUCERS INFORMED

It is essential that the 37,000 dairy farmers who support this program through Milk for Helath, Inc., be kept informed about its activities to increase milk consumption.

When a county agent is informed on matters of importance to the farmers he serves, then those farmers are better informed. For this reason, twice each month a short report was sent to all county agents in the milkshed. Practically all county agents found these reports helpful and many used them in radio broadcasts and in printed reports.

Each month 845 copies of the Skyline Reporter, a 2-page report on the work and activities of this dairy council program, went to all pool plants, cooperatives, dairy organizations, extension officials and other agricultural leaders in this milkshed.

Farm and dairy publications cooperated in explaining the work of this program and radio stations in New York City and in the milkshed cooperated in helping to keep producers informed.

Talks before farm groups, recordings for radio use, and the exhibit at the New York State fair reached many farmers with facts about the work this nutrition and milk promotion program does.

The report issued quarterly by Milk for Health, Inc., has proved important in informing all participating dairymen about this program.

The Metropolitan Milk Producers Cooperative Bargaining Agency, with a membership of 66 dairy cooperatives, unanimously passed a resolution at its annual meeting on December 6, 1955, which said in part:

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we believe the Greater New York program of the National Dairy Council as administered by the Greater New York Producers Dairy Council committee, which serves as board of directors, to be one of proven merit as indicated by increased milk sales, and worthy of continuous and ever-increasing support of every producer in the marketing area."

Fluid-milk sales each month in 1955 exceeded those for the corresponding month a year earlier.

Digest of Annual Report by George E. Stringfellow, President of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, and Senior Vice President of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., Delivered at the Silver Anniversary Meeting of the Association, November 14, 1955, at Newark, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, delivered a very informative report at the silver anniversary meeting of the association, which I think would be of interest to the people of America, and I am presenting it for the RECORD.

The report and newspaper articles follow:

DIGEST OF ANNUAL REPORT BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW JERSEY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THOMAS A. EDISON, INC., DELIVERED AT THE SILVER ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 14, 1955, AT NEWARK, N. J.

Tonight the New Jersey Taxpayers Association celebrates its silver anniversary. Twenty-five years ago—in the depths of the depression—a group of New Jersey taxpayers, alarmed by the mounting cost of Government and the impact of taxation on our economy, resolved to do something about it. As a result of their work and the work of those who followed them, the taxpayers of New Jersey are the beneficiaries of—

1. Better government, and
2. The saving of millions of dollars.

Our association is nonpartisan, nonpolitical, and nonprofit. It devotes its energy to the adoption of sound business principles in the operation of government. Our goal is to obtain essential governmental services at a cost we taxpayers can afford to pay.

New Jersey is a great and growing State. Its industry, commerce, and agriculture; its urban centers, its suburbs; its forests, mountains, and seashore resorts; its rail facilities; its seats of learning; combine to make it great. They explain its population growth of about one hundred thousand persons per year.

Mindful of these characteristics, our association seeks a revenue system which will protect and stimulate industry, production, and employment in the interest of all our citizens. Its purpose is to see that taxes are kept within bounds, public expenditures are kept under control, and public services are provided when necessary with maximum economy.

As we stand at the threshold of our second quarter of a century, may I call to your mind a few of our association's achievements of recent years, not to boast of past successes but to indicate a standard for even greater goals for the future:

1. The State government proposed two successive $25 million programs for expanding institutional facilities. After a study our association found the proposals sound and supported the bond issues to finance the needed facilities. The voters authorized the bond issues and our association recommended way of efficiently using the funds.

2. Our association opposed the $105 million veterans' bonus. The referendum was defeated.

3. We found the proposed $60 million State school aid program unsound. The proposal was reduced to $30 million. We supported it and the voters authorized the $30 million bond issue. By reducing the proposal from 60 to 30 million dollars, the people avoided a 5 percent corporated income tax.

4. Following the adoption of the optional municipal charter laws, our association helped local groups to establish a more representative system of local government.

5. When our State's inequitable assessment system needed to be revised, our association came forth with its "Practical Aids to Improved Property Assessing." This signaled the beginning of widespread constructive action in this field.

Demand for the association's publication "Financial Statistics of New Jersey Local Government," has grown with each annual edition. It is accepted today as a standard reference work—by taxpayers, newspapers, local and State officials, and others.

Our pamphlets embodying basic procedures for "Guiding Municipal Growth" and "Restoring Urban Values" enjoy wide acceptance and use by citizens and public officials alike.

These and other activities attest to the association's competence and effectiveness. They have contributed heavily to our State's record as 1 of 3 States in the Union with neither sales tax, nor personal or corporate income tax.

Our association's successful record results from a combination of staff and volunteer talents. A corps of experts devotes full time to research in governmental operation and finance. Their findings are studied by carefully selected committees, who in turn make their recommendations to the board of directors who make the association's policies.

By this means the best professional talent and the special abilities of association members are focused jointly on governmental problems in such fields as assessment, purchasing, institutional administration, budgeting, administrative planning, construction, water supply, etc. All of our taxpayers are beneficiaries of these efforts.

We are grateful to the many organizations who have labored with us in your behalf—to the press and radio, to the many public officials who have contributed generously of their governmental knowledge to help our association in its work, and to the many businesses, both small and large, who have made their specialized abilities available.

As we close the first quarter century of our association's activities, it is my privilege to express appreciation to our officers and directors, present and past, to our many loyal committeemen, and to the members of our staff.

And now a personal note: It has been my pleasure to serve our association for 12 years as a member of the board of directors, 11 years as a member of the executive committee, and 5 years as chairman of the executive committee. I am now finishing my fourth year as president.

At my request, I was not renominated to the board at our meeting today and it is my intention to retire as president at the annual meeting of the board of directors on December 12. Rest assured that in withdrawing from further official activities in our association, I do so with a heart that is filled with gratitude for your tolerance, for your patience, and especially for your cooperation, without which my efforts would have been stymied.

Our association never had a stronger board of directors or a stronger executive committee than today, and I am sure my successor will carry the association to a greater degree of public service than it has heretofore attained. To that end I pledge my best efforts.

[From the Trentonian, Trenton, N. J., of December 15, 1955]

ANOTHER QUARTER CENTURY

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association has started off on its second 25 years with high hopes that accomplishments will compare favorably with those of its first quarter century. Upon Francis J. Pinque, its new president, falls the twin burden of guiding the association along the paths of progress and of filling the shoes of his capable and distinguished predecessor, George E. Stringfellow.

Taxpayers of the State will wish Pinque all success. Trentonians in particular will extend the same felicitations to Clarence W. Snyder of this city, controller of John A. Roebling's Sons Co., who succeeds Pinque as treasurer of the organization.

Stringfellow, who served as a director since 1943 and as president from 1951, was suitably honored upon the occasion of his retirement. He has indeed earned the plaudits of his associates and the thanks of thousands of New Jersey citizens.

[From the News Letter of the New Jersey Manufacturers Association, December 1, 1955]

A QUARTER CENTURY OF SERVICE TO NEW JERSEY

A popular almanac lists only six memorable events in 1930, the year following the stock-

market crash. Unnoticed was the formation of a New Jersey organization in that year which was not only to save the State's taxpayers millions of dollars, but to help give them better government.

For 25 years the New Jersey Taxpayers Association has kept a vigilant eye on the operations and proposed operations of Federal, State, and local government bodies. Its vigilance has nothing in common with the miserly tendency to disapprove needed services merely because they require expenditures. Its support of two successive $25 million programs for expansion of institutional facilities is evidence that its scrutiny is to determine the facts that will give the citizen a dollar of service—if the service is needed—for a dollar of tax—if the tax is necessary.

[From the Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer of December 24, 1955]

AND THE NEXT 25 YEARS?

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association is starting its 26th year and after a quarter century there is more for it to do than ever. The association was started in the days of deepest depression when a group of New Jersey citizens decided to do something about the impact of taxation on the economy.

In those days the economy was so disrupted that even the lightest weight on taxation meant a sore spot. And, yet, great as the need for the taxpayers association was then, it is even greater now. In days of lush times there is less attention to the need for thrift and conservation.

During the last 5 years George Stringfellow, the East Orange industrialist, served as president. In that period the association acquired a fine reputation by working steadfastly for prudence and tolerance in government.

In its next quarter century, as it moves toward a golden anniversary from the silver, the association must foster both of these qualities in New Jersey government as it goes about its work.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of December 16, 1955]

MANY HAPPY RETURNS

Organized in 1930, the New Jersey Taxpayers Association has just celebrated its silver anniversary.

The association is privately financed and its chief mission in life is, as its title implies, safeguarding the interests of the taxpayer, protecting him against the encroachment of Government extravagance, and keeping him informed of whether his tax money is being spent wisely and well.

The association begins its second quarter century under the leadership of Francis J. Pinque of East Orange, an insurance company executive and former treasurer of the association, who has been elected president to succeed George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and longtime leader in the association.

Counterparts of the Taxpayers Association may exist in some other States but if there are any that have been more zealous in behalf of the man who foots the bills of government, or are more devoted to the public interest, the Courier-Post does not know of them. In fact, we are on safe ground in saying that there are none such. The association has been and is is powerful force for good in New Jersey and we are fortunate to have it. Its achievements under its retiring president have been notable and the best wish we can make for its new president is that under him they will be equally so.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of December 24, 1955]

TAXPAYERS' WATCHDOG

It's a pleasure to salute the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association on its silver anniversary.

Government economy—a rare commodity these days—is the watchword of the NJTA. The goal is not arbitrary penny-pinching but rather, as the association expresses it, "to obtain essential governmental services at a cost we taxpayers can afford to pay."

Jersey's favorable tax climate is surely due in part to the NJTA's relentless efforts to keep State spending within reason.

We wish the association many more productive years—and we regret that there are not more groups like it.

[From the Bergen Evening Record of March 7, 1955]

THE TAXPAYERS AT AGE 25

For 25 years the New Jersey Taxpayers Association has been a vital force for good government in New Jersey—economical, efficient, responsive government. It has evolved brilliant fact-finding methods, has made business and industry sensitive to their stake in sound government, and has genially resisted the doctrinaire—its support of spending for State institutions and for schools exemplifies its insistence on adopting what works best for most. The association has just celebrated its silver anniversary. One looks forward to hailing it and its good works a quarter-century hence, with confidence it will be as young, bright-eyed, loose-jointed, and unafraid as it was on the depression year Friday morning it was born.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger]

THE PUBLIC'S WATCHDOG

Once upon a time, the people who lived in a community ran it. They knew just how many nickels and dimes went into what community projects, and why. They were the government as well as the people.

It's still like that in some tiny little communities, nestled back from the main roads, but nowhere else. Our communities are so big that too often the people who live in them don't even know the names of their officials, let alone recognize them on the street. As for State capitals and Washington—well, they're just faraway places and the policies enacted in them are faraway things. This is the flaw in growing too big.

An institution has developed which fills in part of the gap. It isn't specified in the Constitution, but it is part of our democratic way of life. It is the pressure group. It preserves the liaison between the individual and his government by keeping him informed.

One such group in our State is the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, now marking its 25th anniversary. Its mission is sweet and simple. It wants to improve government and yet keep expenditures down so taxes will be no higher than absolutely necessary. It is hard to quarrel with this mission, and is equally hard to quarrel with the way the New Jersey Taxpayers Association has carried it out these past 25 years. It has been a force for much good in our State, on a nonpartisan, nonpolitical, and nonprofit basis. It has not limited itself solely to carping for economy. Instead, it has led such campaigns as more State aid to schools, expansion of State institutional facilities, and revision of local forms of government to make them more representative.

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association is, in the finest sense of the word, the public's watchdog.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times of December 30, 1955]

FOR NEW YEAR FISCAL CONTROL

In its 1956 platform, the New Jersey Taxpayers Association exhibits characteristic regard for prudent management of public affairs with a pointed appeal for "controlling tomorrow's taxes today."

A concise program is suggested: "Federal finances must be brought under control; States finances must be kept in control; local services must be adapted to changing conditions if control over local affairs is to be preserved."

Here, indeed, are the fundamentals of sound fiscal administration throughout the New Year. If financial restraints are effectively imposed at the national, State and local levels, the heavy tax burden will be eased with attendant benefits for every American citizen.

[From the Passaic and Clifton (N. J.) Herald News of October 24, 1955]

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF USEFUL SERVICE

For 25 years the New Jersey Taxpayers Association has been the public's loyal watchdog over the fiscal affairs of our State. In speeches, reports, and forums it has sought to cast a spotlight on matters that affect our pocketbooks as well as our general welfare.

It has succeeded in this task so well that it has become general practice for legislative groups to turn to the taxpayers' association for information and for advice on questions of finance, administration, and taxes. Yet this flattering recognition has in no way caused the association to lessen its vigilance. Even when its advice may not be wanted, the association never hesitates to speak up.

On its silver anniversary we salute the association and wish it well. New Jersey is one of the most economically administered States in the Union and also one of the most modern. The taxpayers' association has had much to do with bringing that about.

A Foreign Aid Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extracts from an article by Roscoe Drummond appearing in the Washington Post of February 28, entitled "Close Reexamination of Aid Plan Called For":

CLOSE REEXAMINATION OF AID PLAN CALLED FOR

It seems to me that the clue to our true relationship with all these new nations is imbedded in the most meaningful fact of recent history—the one fact which, perhaps above all others, clarifies and separates Soviet purpose and Western purpose. It is this:

Since 1939, the Soviet and Chinese Communists through force, threat and organized coup d'etat in neighboring States, have annexed outright or extended their military and political control over 740,216,000 people and more than 13,400,000 square kilometers of territory.

In this same period the Western non-Communist powers have granted freedom and/or self-rule to 692,969,000 peoples covering 15,294,640 square kilometers of territory.

In a word, during the past decade and a half, Soviet and Chinese Communists have imposed dominance and dependence on about 700 million people and the West have helped give freedom and independence to about the same number.

These newly freed peoples, these newly independent nations, have long looked to the ideas and ideals of the American Revolution as their inspiration. As the Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, remarked when he visited Independence Hall in Philadelphia last summer: "In our part of the world the ideas of

the American Revolution are today the most explosive of all forces, more explosive in their capacity to change the world than B–52's or even atomic bombs."

Our struggle for our freedom, our achievement of it and our upbuilding of an undeveloped continent have long fired the imaginations and incentives of Asians to go and do likewise.

Shouldn't our relationship with these freedom-cherishing, poverty-plagued nations be that of the most friendly, understanding senior democracy intent upon helping these new democracies to help themselves deepen their roots, guard their freedom, improve their economic lot and fashion their own free nation in their own image in their own way—as we did?

Such an objective would appeal to Americans as practical and realizable—and worth doing in a way which will serve our own security and that of the whole free world.

The Supreme Court Has No Power To Amend the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech to the Lions Club of Union, S. C., delivered by Hon. A. G. Kennedy, probate judge, Union County, S. C., wherein he discusses the legal methods of amending the Constitution of the United States and condemns the present Supreme Court for its integration decision of May 1954. He very properly excoriates the Court for ignoring stare decisis and basing its decision on sociological and psychological teachings and opinions.

The speech follows:

THE SUPREME COURT HAS NO POWER TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION

(By A. G. Kennedy)

ART. V. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

President Washington in his Farewell Adress to the American people, September 17, 196, among other things, warned us of the danger of one department of the Government encroaching upon and usurping the functions of other departments. He urged that the Constitution should not be amended or altered except in the ways provided therein, and that it should not be amended by usurpation, the weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The recent Supreme Court decision has effectually amended the Constitution by court decree (usurpation), the very thing the Father of Our Country warned us against.

The 18th amendment of the Constitution was repealed by the 21st amendment not by court decree. We who believe in States rights and constitutional government should fight all encroachments upon these institutions, with all our might and means.

Stare decisis: "To stand by things as decided."

Over 40 years ago the learned Justice Charles Evans Hughes, afterward Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, citing the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537 (1896)), affirmed, "That the question could no longer be considered an open one, that it was not an infraction of the 14th amendment for a State to require separate, but equal, accommodations for the two races." *McCabe* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry.* (235 U. S. 151, 160 (1914)). Twenty-five years ago the Supreme Court of the United States noted that segregation in public schools had been "many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution." In the case of *Gong* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78 (1927)), a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court held that segregation in the schools was not violative of constitutional rights. The court at the time of this decision included Chief Justice Taft and Justices Stone, Holmes, and Brandeis The Congress of the United States and 17 of the States for three-quarters of a century have required segregation of the races in the public schools, with the approval of the leading appellate courts of the country, and with the unanimous approval of the United States Supreme Court. Yet the present Supreme Court, by unanimous illegal decision, declared segregation of the races in public schools to be unlawful.

The 14th amendment to the United States Constitution which had been construed many times in cases before the high Court, according to accepted legal rules of court procedure. The Court was bound to accept former decisions of the same Court as the law of the case when the same question is involved. A juror is sworn to perform his duty in the case which he is called upon to hear and decide, but if he disregards his oath and sworn duty, ignores the evidence and law in the trial of the case he has done no more than the Supreme Court has done in the recent school segregation case.

I do not think Benedict Arnold betrayed the trust reposed in him more than the nine members of the Supreme Court of the United States have done in the Clarendon County school segregation case. I believe the Court made its decision upon political expediency knowing at the time that they were being unfaithful to their trust, and in violation of well established laws and customs. The Roman Governor Pontius Pilate made a decision to please the rabble and to gain the applause of those who would slay an innocent man. The Court has brought disgrace upon themselves and a contempt for the Court by all who know or hold the law in high regard.

The Court in this disgraceful decision has failed to follow the Courts precedents and has chosen to follow the example of the Roman Governor's decision who scourged the lonely Nazarene, and delivered him to his persecutors to be crucified. The justices have shown neither mental, judicial, nor moral fitness for the positions which they occupy. If all nine members of the Supreme Court were hanged upon the same scaffold for their wrong and their bodies buried in a common unholy grave, I should like the privilege of writing the epitaph for their unhallowed common tomb. I would use some paraphrased lines from Scott's, Lay of the Last Minstrel:

"Despite their titles, power and pelf
The wretches concentered all in self,
Living, have forfeited fair renown and
doubly dying, have gone down to the
vile dust from whence they sprung,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung."

Dulles Leads With His Chin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Press carried a most significant editorial on the subject of the latest Communist propaganda offensive. The title of that editorial is "Dulles Leads With His Chin." Many of us who have maintained an interest in Mr. Dulles' activities as Secretary of State, were astonished to hear attributed to him a belief that the Russian Communists had changed their fundamental doctrine, and even worse, that the Communists were shifting to a policy of tolerance and nonviolence in an effort to develop a government more like that of the governments of the free world. Mr. Dulles has been very poorly advised on what took place at the so-called 20th congress meeting of the Communist Party in Moscow. It would be well for him to look back of the briefing papers which caused him to make such unfounded statements as those attributed to him in order to examine the competence of those who are writing such misleading briefing papers.

Communist Party Boss Khrushchev made it crystal clear that the usual Communist methods of violence will be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong, and that the Communist takeover of the neutralist nations could be easily accomplished by what he called parliamentary methods and the deception of the popular-front type of governments. In effect, Party Boss Khrushchev stated the United States above all, was marked for violent treatment by the Communist conspiracy rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach which the Kremlin leaders have been proclaiming so loudly of late.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Dulles will find an appropriate occasion in the immediate future to correct the misleading statements attributed to him. Such a course of action is urgent in order to prevent confusion among the people of the free world and to repair the damage that will accrue to the hopes and aspirations of the enslaved people for a day of ultimate liberation.

Under leave granted, I insert the editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press of February 27, titled "Dulles Leads With His Chin":

The startling part of Secretary of State Dulles' interpretation of what the Bolsheviks are up to is that it disagrees with most others'.

He sees only Soviet failures; other observers see disturbing Soviet successes.

He sees fundamental changes in Communist doctrine, others see only clever tactical moves.

Dulles says the Kremlin's new diplomatic and economic offensive comes from Soviet weakness and failure of past policies—that the strength, unity and determination of the free world has forced the Soviets to "revise their creed from A to Z."

The Reds, he says, are shifting their basic doctrines to tolerance and nonviolence, trying to become more like the non-Communist world, and ultimately may produce a more normal Russia.

The handful of Bolshevik conspirators who seized power in 1917 have gone a long way in 38 years.

Then they had only a headful of Marx and a handful of bombs.

Today they rule the greatest and most evil empire in history—one-third of the earth's surface and 900 million people.

Much of it was acquired in the last 10 years and all of it through a policy of intolerance and violence.

There is nothing in the 50,000-word speech of Khrushchev to justify hope that any fundamental changes are occurring.

Unchanged is the Red doctrine that ends justify any means.

Khrushchev tried to hoodwink the rest of the world into believing he has scrapped the "inevitability of war" thesis. Yet in the same passage he concedes that in countries where resistance to the Red wave of the future is great, it still will be necessary to use force.

Dulles' claim that the strength, unity, and determination of the free world compelled the Bolsheviks to yell "uncle" and promise to be good, recalls Artemus Ward's description of a fight with a secessionist:

"By a sudden and adroit movement I placed my left eye agin the secesher's fist. Saw stars and other loominaries. Got down on the ground to see if he had dropt suthin' * * * I returned the compliment by placin' my stummick agin his right foot."

Stop Whispering: Proclaim United States Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, the Philadelphia Inquirer carried an editorial titled "Stop Whispering: Proclaim United States Story." I think this editorial has taken on a great deal of additional meaning from the events which have happened since January 20. In particular, I refer to the so-called 20th Congress meeting of the Communist Party which adjourned in Moscow yesterday. At their conclave, the Communist conspirators announced to the world that they were going to redouble their efforts by the use of programs of subversion and duplicity to conquer the world. The Philadelphia Inquirer makes a conservative estimate when it says in its editorial that the Russian Communists are redoubling their propaganda efforts. This editorial also points out another significant fact which is often lost sight of as we continue the battle of the cold war—that it is just as important for us to win the war for the minds of men as it would be to win a war waged with guns, bombs, and planes. We cannot win such a war on a "piggy bank budget."

Under leave obtained, I include the editorial, Stop Whispering: Proclaim United States Story.

America has a selling job to do. That job is to sell our country and all it means to the peoples of the world.

For many decades the United States of America was a beacon in the minds of men. Our country was held high as a friend of the oppressed, helper of the needy, champion of human liberty.

Today all that is changed. We seem to have fewer friends abroad with each succeeding year. What friends we have too often are in high places; the peoples seem to have lost touch. They appear ready to believe Communist lies that distort American ideals. Never in human history has a country done so much to assist others as ours—only to be misunderstood and maligned.

The Inquirer believes there is one basic reason for this grave state of affairs: Failure to get the real story of the real America directly to the peoples of other countries.

That failure is the more lamentable when we realize that salesmanship has long been one of our strong points. We can sell United States cars, United States films, United States music, United States goods almost anywhere. But we have slipped up badly on selling the great Nation which produced those goods—and so much more that is precious in the world today.

Because citizens of the United States have not been conditioned to regard propaganda as a major and normal function of government, our country's information agencies have been working in slow motion, with inadequate funds, insufficient personnel and indifferent public support. Even now the Voice of America is a whisper, not a shout.

Lacking, above all, has been that spirit of dedication to our cause which the Communists pour out in such measure in behalf of their campaign to enslave mankind.

Many United States Information Agency workers are doing a valiant job. But they struggle not only against their opposite numbers in Red agencies but against the work of Communists who have infiltrated schools, colleges, and other institutions, especially in Asia and the Middle East.

At a time when the cold war is being renewed by Moscow with redoubled vigor—even on our Latin American doorstep—it is time for Americans to face facts. It s just as important for us to win this war for the minds of men as it would be to win a war waged with guns, bombs, and planes. The stakes are just as high. Yet we would not expect to win a shooting war with a piggy-bank budget. How then can we expect to win the cold war with that same sort of small-change financing?

We have been spending, with hardly any question, for defense and foreign aid. The new budget includes over $40 billion for those two categories. Proportionately the job of selling the American story is almost ignored. Surely if we were to allocate for that purpose only one-half of 1 percent of that sum—or about $200 million—it would not be too much. General Motors alone spends an estimated $100 million a year to advertise and promote its products.

A drastically stepped-up expenditure to sell the American way would, in itself, be a valuable adjunct to the defense and foreign aid programs themselves. They are all part of the same struggle—to keep the free world free, and preserve our own freedom thereby.

The Inquirer believes that getting the truth about the United States to the peoples of other lands is one of the most urgent tasks we face. That is why a broadly expanded program should become part of our bipartisan foreign policy.

That is why we hope both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms for 1956 will include a pledge to that end.

We must stop whispering. We must proclaim the truth in words that will be heard, and understood clearly, throughout the world.

Belated Riddance: Now Deport the Rascal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Nashville Banner of February 27, 1956, titled "Now Deport the Rascal." The editorial says so eloquently what I have been trying to say the past week or so. I hope it is read by the Department of State with the hope that this article will prompt it to reveal how Peron got into the Washington Hotel in the first place.

The editorial follows:

BELATED RIDDANCE: NOW DEPORT THE RASCAL

Eviction of Juan Peron from the Washington Hotel in Colon, Panama, comes rather belatedly. This hotel is owned by an agency of the United States Government. The mere fact that Peron was a guest in that hotel gave strong credence that he was being given asylum in Panama with the sanction of Uncle Sam.

This outrageous affront to decency and to the sensibilities of those who detest dictators was likewise a stench in the nostrils of our Latin neighbors to the south. Few, if any, of them could understand why the United States was ostensibly offering protection to this lecherous libertine who despoiled a great country morally, politically, and economically, while grafting hundreds of millions of dollars for himself and his Peronist following.

The Republic of Panama could hardly move for his deportation while Peron lolled in the lap of Uncle Sam. Despite protestations to the contrary, his very presence on United States property was a sign to all that he was not to be molested. He had been driven from Argentina in disgrace. He had then been forced to leave Paraguay, to which he had fled. He was supposed to be headed for Switzerland, where one of his girl friends was awaiting him with power of attorney and reportedly with a couple of hundred million dollars which Peron had bilked from his beloved descamisados."

As a desperate, dangerous disturber wherever he may be, he was allowed to alight on United States property in Panama. From there he has breathed fire and brimstone, threatening revolution and bloodshed in Argentina. He has predicted that 1 million of his former countrymen who are glad that he is no longer practicing his perversions and thievery among them would die in the disturbance which would accompany his proposed return to Cosa Rosada and the buxom bosom of Nelly Rivas.

His stay in United States Government property had been vigorously protested by the Inter-American Press Association which has declared to the State Department that Peron's presence in the Washington Hotel, despite protocol or the so-called diplomatic niceties, was both indefensible and impossible of reasonable explanation on any grounds.

Peron is a menace to the peace and tranquility of the Western Hemisphere, so long as he is within its boundaries. Now that he is being removed after so long from his "privileged sanctuary" and the implied protection of the American flag, it is to be hoped that Panama will take immediate steps to deport him outside the hemisphere.

The coddling which he has too long received from representatives of the United

States Government, particularly the Latin division of our own State Department, is not only a disgrace in the eyes of those who abhor totalitarianism, but a disillusionment to Latin-Americans who cannot understand such shenanigans from a nation which shouts to high heaven about liberty and freedom while throwing its protecting arms and cloak of approval about the shoulders of the most ruthless dictator that ever subjugated a people in the Western Hemisphere.

Now let Panama get him out of its confines. Perhaps Argentina and the rest of the Latin-Americas may then be able to settle down to stable government and internal peace.

When he departs let no representative of the United States be there to bid him fond farewell. There's been enough of that for a while, so far as this lunatic and arrant rascal is concerned.

Phoenix, Ariz.: Seventy-five Years Old and Still Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD editorials from the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette commemorating the 75th anniversary of the founding of Phoenix, Ariz. Seventy-five years ago Phoenix was a very small village; now it is one of the great cities of the West. Every State in the Union has contributed to the growth of Phoenix, and the present city of Phoenix is a monument to the beneficial results which may be achieved from wise reclamation projects:

[From the Arizona Republic of February 25, 1956]

ONE TO GROW ON

The March 5, 1872, edition of a California newspaper carried the following comment: "This is a smart town which had its first house completed about a year ago. Now it contains many houses, also stores, workshops, hotels, butcher shop, bakery, courthouse, jail, and an excellent school, which has been in operation for months. * * * When it has become the capital city of the Territory, which it will, undoubtedly, at no very distant day, and when the 'iron horse' steams through our country on the Texas Pacific Road, Salt River Valley will be the garden of the Pacific slope, and Phoenix the most important inland town."

This enthusiastic report must have appeared overoptimistic to local citizens at the time. It wasn't until 9 years later that Phoenix even became incorporated * * * 75 years ago today.

But through the years Phoenix has moved steadily ahead. At times the progress must have seemed terribly slow to the local citizenry. But Phoenix did become the territorial capital in 1889. By that time the "iron horse" had come to Phoenix. In 1891 a devastating flood almost swept the city away, but the town recovered and in 1910 the population reached 11,134. In the next 10 years the population of Phoenix almost trebled. And Phoenix was on its way.

Today Phoenix has become one of the great resort centers of the country and of the world. It has spread across the Valley of the Sun and is bursting at its seams. Industry is flowing into the city in a steadily increasing stream. The early prophet's dreams have been realized to a far greater extent than he could have imagined. But the story of the little hay camp founded so many years ago beside the Salt River is far from told. Its greatest days and greatest triumphs still lie ahead for it is peopled with men of strength and vision who will see that it never drops into deadening somnolence, but moves on, ahead of the rest of the country.

We wish this great city of Phoenix a happy 75th birthday and many, many, happy returns of the day, each of them marking the end of a period of achievement and the beginning of a new era of prosperity and growth.

[From the Phoenix Gazette of February 24, 1956]

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OLD AND STILL GROWING

Phoenix is 75 years old tomorrow. The virile, growing city doesn't look its age. Perhaps that is the reason for such spectacular progress in recent years—Phoenix has been reborn a number of times, as its mythical name implies.

The handsome, modern city we know today is a far cry from the struggling young community incorporated on February 25, 1881. And even at that early date there had been an initial period of community expansion after the Salt River Valley Town Association was formed in 1870. From its very earliest beginnings, Phoenix has consistently and repeatedly outgrown the dreams and hopes of each generation. The city is still doing this on its 75th anniversary and there are many indications that it will continue to do so.

What accounts for this remarkable growth cycle? Many cities are 75 years old or older; many have long since passed their prime. What is it that keeps Phoenix ever young and ever growing?

Arizona's booming economy, in which Phoenix has long played a major role, accounts in part for the phenomenon, of course, but there is something more. A fine climate, varied community interests, visitors who return year after year—all of these have contributed. Sound municipal government, good schools, virtually unlimited recreational possibilities, all these and more are underlying factors in the Phoenix expansion story.

But perhaps the greatest influences for sustained growth are the residents Phoenix has attracted through the generations. People make a city. That is why Phoenix is the youngest, fastest growing, 75-year-old city in America.

Politics and Parity; Sanity and Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there is now under debate in the other body one of the most unsound, unrealistic, and wholly demagogic bills that has ever been presented to any Congress. I refer specifically to the pending farm bill which undertakes to combine the administration's soil bank plan with a restoration of 90 percent supports.

The proponents of this outlandish combination ignore completely the established fact that farm prices hit the toboggan while high rigid supports were in full force and effect, and it is without all logic and contrary to commonsense to now turn to a device under which the farmer has taken his worst licking as a means of restoring him to economic parity with the rest of industry.

The soil bank plan is designed primarily to eliminate the agricultural surpluses which have acted as a price-depressant, and we certainly meet ourselves coming back when we reinstitute high supports which can only serve to accelerate production and start the extra crops, for which there is no market, again rolling into Government storage bins.

The proponents of this legislative throwback, motivated solely by the concern for the farm vote, are charging the administration—and Secretary Benson—with dragging their heels in attempting to dispose of the enormous pile of food and fiber now in Government hands, whereas the record is quite clear that with 90 percent supports we have priced ourselves completely out of the foreign market. The Secretary is striving with might and main to dispose of this albatrosslike burden from around the Department's neck, but the best he has been able to do is to sell his goods at cutrate prices or for counterpart funds, either of which means a staggering loss to the American taxpayer.

Those who are now bleeding so profusely for the farmer—while all the while they are concerned only with his vote—should come forth honestly and advocate a straight cash subsidy to take care of the differential between farm income and farm costs. I would, of course, vote against such handouts just as I have always opposed high rigid supports, although I must concede that such a plan would be marked by an honesty which is wholly absent from the current legislative monstrosity now pending in the other body.

The following is an editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 25, wherein the finger is put directly on the inconsistencies embodied in this current hybrid—which in common with its kind can only prove to be sterile:

GET POLITICS OUT OF FARM SUPPORT BILL

Just about the most freakish—and most unsound—legislation ever attempted on America's farm problems is the hybrid bill now before Congress.

It is an election-year monstrosity in which Democrats, for perfectly obvious political reasons, are linked with some farm State Republicans to force a return to the high rigid farm price-support system. In this move the high, unalterable, and artificial support plan is jammed on top of the administration's "soil bank" proposal.

That would make the measure, by which the administration aimed to reduce excess acreage and thereby to hold down huge, unmanageable farm crop surpluses, worthless.

Is this politically motivated scheme headed toward greater prosperity for farmers? Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, declared in a speech yesterday, "High rigid price supports never have brought prosperity to the American farmer and never will."

But they have brought the dead weight of vast, unusable, unsalable accumulations of wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. We think Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson called the turn in his television appearance Thursday night when he declared,

"Surpluses are smothering farm prices and income."

They can't be sold to any worthwhile extent; can't even be given away. But they hang like a vast pall over the farmers of the United States: always a threat to existing prices; always a brake on better prices.

Senator AIKEN showed yesterday how the real upsurge of farm prosperity came from the Second World War; then from the Korean conflict. Farm prices, he said, skidded between those two outbreaks; then took another downward turn starting in 1952.

Congress gave President Eisenhower a mandatory directive to continue the high price supports—the 90 percent of parity system—for 2 years, the Senator said. And what happened? It filled the Government and other warehouses to overflowing again. It made farmers—to be paid with tax money—plough and sow acreage far above requirements to produce immense crops that had no place to go except those warehouses.

Mr. Benson has fought valiantly, and continues to fight, for a formula that will cut down unneeded crop acreage, and unusable crops. And in time reduce the need for all this storage of crops nobody wants. Senator AIKEN took a significant jab on the latter point in his speech when he referred to some champions of high-level supports as people "making fortunes out of storage of Government surpluses." Few, if any, of those engaged in crop storage are farmers.

The important thing Senator AIKEN did yesterday, as Mr. Benson has been doing all along, is to shed a clear light on the hard facts about high farm price supports: That they didn't solve farm problems and won't solve them if tried again.

The administration bill seeks, by reducing acreage—for which farmers would receive a subsidy, and a realistic application of flexible farm price supports—to create barriers against greater and greater surpluses.

But the farm-bloc amendments, for the 90-percent-of-parity supports, would wipe out the soil-bank plan. It's plain enough the soil bank would work to reduce farm crop surpluses; the high-level supports would make certain that more surpluses would occur. That shows how charged with politics the farm bloc's 90-percent-of-parity revival is.

For the farmers, and the Nation, it would be a backward step to continue the same faulty attempt to meet farm problems that have failed in the past. No sound, permanent solutions of those problems can be worked out by politicians for political reasons. The Eisenhower-Benson program seeks real and lasting solutions. Without the crippling partisan amendments that have been loaded on to it, that program should have the full support of farmers and all other citizens of the Nation.

Welcome to President Gronchi, of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues, the following editorial of welcome to President Gronchi, of Italy. The editorial appeared in the February 27, 1956, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

WELCOME TO PRESIDENT GRONCHI

When President Giovanni Gronchi, of Italy, arrives in the United States today, it will be as the representative of a nation which has risen from the ruins of war to take its place as one of the most important and valued members of the free world community. The significance of his trip may be judged from the fact that it marks the first visit by an Italian head of state, whether a president or a king, to these shores. And it will be a comprehensive visit, as such journeys go, for the Italian President is scheduled to remain in the United States and Canada until the middle of March. Evidently, Mr. Gronchi takes seriously the job of sounding out American opinion on a variety of problems which confront his country as well as ours.

This is all to the good. Full, frank, and free discussion is the best way for member nations of the great Western Alliance to approach their problems and aline their policies. It would be well if the talks between President Gronchi and American officials brought about an interchange of ideas on the best way to face the common peril of Soviet communism, and if they reaffirmed the historic ties which so long have united the Italian and American peoples.

During his stay, President Gronchi will observe at firsthand many manifestations of the friendship in which American attitudes toward Italy are deeply rooted. He is certain to be greeted enthusiastically wherever he goes as the chosen spokesman of one of the great peoples of the West. In a literal sense, his is a good will trip. In common with all Americans, we bid him welcome.

The Lake Mead National Recreation Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there are few people who would not agree that the Arizona Highways magazine, published monthly by the Arizona Highway Department is one of the finest publications of its type to be found anywhere.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the State of Arizona on the excellent work contained in the March 1956 issue of Arizona Highways, which is devoted to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, part of which is situated in the State of Nevada. This area comprises 2,655 square miles of federally owned land and joins Grand Canyon National Monument on the east and follows the course of the Colorado River for approximately 185 miles, extending as far south as Bullhead City, Ariz. Within this vast acreage are to be found two sizable and scenic man-made lakes. One of these is Lake Mead, which is formed by the water impounded by Hoover Dam, which is the largest man-made lake in the world, and which with 550 miles of shoreline offers countless panoramas of rugged, beautiful country.

Below Lake Mead and formed by the water impounded by Davis Dam is found Lake Mojave, some 67 miles of rugged canyons and attractive mountain scenery.

To this recreation area last year came nearly 2½ million visitors who were thrilled by the scenic and geologic sights and scientific developments to be seen there. One of the best known visitors last fall came from as far as England. He was Sir David Campbell, and on the placid waters of Lake Mead he set a new world's speed record for hydroplanes.

Mr. Speaker, like all of the 181 areas in the National Park Service, there is much additional work to be done here. Potentially the Lake Mead National Recreation Area is one of the largest playgrounds in the Nation, although up to the present but a small portion of its potential has been tapped.

Even without further development, I am sure that those who have been fortunate enough to visit this area will agree that their efforts were very worth while, and the Arizona Highways magazine has done a commendable job in portraying it. It is my hope that the March issue will further kindle interest in the development of our National Park Service, and I am sure that my colleagues from Arizona join me in extending a cordial invitation to all who might be interested in seeing some of the outstanding scenery of the West to visit the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

Nice Going, Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, amid the clamor for more funds and more power for civil defense authorities and the theorizing that America's answer to an enemy attack should be to run and hide, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star, of February 24, 1956, is indeed refreshing:

NICE GOING, ADMIRAL

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, underlined a truth yesterday that needs stating again and again. "The primary mission of our Armed Forces is to fight and defeat the enemy by offensive action anywhere, any time, and under any circumstances," he said. "This mission is so comprehensive and vitally important as to make highly undesirable the assignment of any additional diversionary functions and responsibilities." Amen.

The particular proposal Radford was objecting to was a law that would put civil defense into the Defense Department on a par with the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The best way to increase our present civil defense effectiveness, he declared, would be for the States to meet this challenge without, in effect, calling for standby martial law.

Of course the Army would administer martial law all over the country to the extent that governmental functions became disorganized following nuclear attack.

As before, we think the problem of civil defense needs to be simplified in the public mind—maybe then there will be more public cooperation with CD programs. The prob-

lem, essentially, is one of remaining at work under attack, preventing panic, and minimizing the aftereffects, locally, of any such attack. That is all anyone can do. There is no magic that can "empty" cities quickly enough to spare their populations, and if there were, the evacuations would give the enemy what he wanted anyway.

This much, certainly, is within the power of State organization to prepare for. It needs neither vastly greater Federal controls nor vast Federal expenditures.

Communism's New Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and that of my other colleagues, two timely editorials appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Appearing on Saturday, February 25, 1956, was the following editorial:

COMMUNISM'S NEW FACE

Speakers at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow took liberties with the name of Joseph Stalin which would have been unthinkable when that ironhanded dictator was alive. From Party Secretary Khrushchev on down they extolled collective leadership; and Deputy Premier Mikoyan, Foreign Minister Molotov, and former Premier Malenkov denounced the one-man rule of the autocrat whom they greeted a few years ago with fulsome eulogies.

It has long been so with dictators. Shakespeare's Mark Antony declaimed:

"But yesterday the word of Caesar might
Have stood against the world. Now lies he there,
And none so poor to do him reverence."

Antony had an adroit purpose in his oratory as the masters of the Soviet Union may have in their hours on hours of speeches.

They turn back 30 years to invoke memories of Lenin rather than Stalin, the Lenin who thought Stalin too rude to be party secretary and who had the resiliency to work with a group but who nevertheless was an intense, purposeful, and persistent revolutionary.

The facade they present of collective leadership may indeed embody a substantive change in the nature of the Soviet Government. At the very least it appears to signify that Mr. Khrushchev (or some other official) has not yet consolidated his power to where he can give orders that will be obeyed throughout the bureaucracy. At most it may mean that Bolshevist leaders of the second generation, plus some old Bolsheviks whom Stalin failed to kill off, have some faculty for reaching decisions by consultation and without fatal results to the losers.

If the latter assumption is true, it does not mean that communism is any less opposed to the success of free enterprise or representative government than before. The long-run objective still is to subvert governments and confiscate property, even though Communists in other countries are no longer under Soviet order to proclaim force and violence as their methods.

Outwardly the effect may be to seem to make the Soviet Government easier to live with if only because open talk of war is soft-pedaled. There doubtless will be efforts to form "popular fronts" with non-Communist parties if the latter will forget that the only purpose of a Communist in a parliamentary organization is to "bore from within" and destroy the structure.

Internally, the effect may be a little less rule by terror and a very slight gain of personal freedom by a few in the Soviet Union, particularly the technicians and managerial class whose skills are needed, and the example may spread to the satellites. But it should be remembered that Communist rule is essentially control by a zealous, hard-bitten minority, and that in history the rule of an oligarchy has often proved capable of as great cruelties as that of an autocrat.

The important consideration for the West in all this matter is that the existence of a new kind of government in the Kremlin, or even the appearance of a new kind of government there, will call for new policies and measures in the defense of free government elsewhere—particularly for unity in the face of blandishments and for greater emphasis on political and economic rather than solely military competition.

Appearing on Friday, February 24, 1956, was the timely article by Joseph C. Harsch:

STATE OF THE NATIONS—THE NEW SOVIET UNION—1

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—We of the western world are now, beyond serious doubt, facing a new government on the other side of the great power divide we call the Iron Curtain.

This new government, which controls the ancient Russian lands the world Communist movement inherited from the Russian Revolution and the power empire built by Joseph Stalin, did not come into being at, or because of, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is confirmed and its scope disclosed by the extraordinary events of this historic meeting.

This new government in Moscow is marked by a new attitude on the part of its members toward each other, toward the people they rule, toward Communist Parties beyond the Iron Curtain, and toward the outside world.

An assessment of this new government in Moscow, of its characteristics, its inclinations, and its policies, must be the basis for a new western approach to its greatest single external problem—the problem of its relationship with the Communist world.

The west has for a decade been operating against the Soviet Union of Joseph Stalin. Its present policies were formed in Stalin's days. They have not yet been changed substantially. There is no longer any serious doubt in the higher levels of policy thinking in Washington, London, Paris, and all the other western capitals of the world that there must be changes—and drastic changes.

The process of change begins, however, with a completed assessment of the new government in Moscow. This process has been underway for some time. It has not been completed. The massive texts produced at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow are raw material for the studies.

What the government officials of the West are doing it is proposed to attempt to do in this space also—of course, tentatively and imperfectly. These columns, and those who read them and apply their own thinking to the process, will be paralleling the study process of the western governments. We, outside of government, cannot reach sure conclusions. We can think independently toward the conclusions which the governments are trying to reach.

Two facts about the Communist Party Congress in Moscow—the first held since Stalin's demise—express the changes in Moscow more simply and graphically than do all the thousands of words of the speeches.

The first of these is the change of faces from the last Congress of Stalin's day. The men and women who came from all corners of Stalin's realm to their last meeting with the old dictator were of the generation which had come into local power after the great purges of the thirties, and were led by Georgi M. Malenkov, then secretary-general of the Soviet Communist Party. They were the Stalin generation—molded by Stalin, subservient to his every wish and whim, trained to regard him as the voice of ultimate authority and wisdom.

The men and women who came to this 20th Congress in Moscow were of an older generation. They were the provincial governors, the village leaders, the ward bosses of the pre and early Stalin days who had been pushed aside during the purges and supplanted by the young Stalinists. They are the dispossessed of the Stalin era, and also the survivors who share in common the fearsome memory of the purges when so many of their colleagues disappeared and they themselves might so easily have been counted among the missing.

These were the people who cheered as Stalin never was cheered during the week of the congress when man after man of the new leadership stood up and repudiated the cult of personality. These are the field officers of the new government in Moscow. These are the beneficiaries of the passing of the Stalin era.

The second graphic fact was the remark made by Leonid Ilyichev, Soviet press chief, about Stalin statues in the Soviet Union. After Stalin and his works had been repudiated, Mr. Ilyichev remarked: "As for the monuments—they stay."

The man Stalin, his form of government, his interpretation of communism, his attitude toward the world had been criticized, revised, denounced, and repudiated. His statutes are allowed to remain.

This gives us our first two points of departure for assessing the new government in Moscow. It is based upon the rank and file of bureaucrats and local party men who were dispossessed and put in danger of their lives by Stalin. It is urbane toward his statues; as urbane as, say, Democrats were toward Republican statues in 1933 or as Republicans were toward Democratic statues in 1953.

It Is Time We Woke Up and Recognized the Necessity of Having Trained Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the time is at hand when it is necessary for a change of policy in administering our Selective Service System. Today it would seem that at least local draft boards and some State boards are oblivious of the need of trained scientists to maintain our national security, by providing advanced types of weapons that will exceed in effectiveness those that are the result of advanced scientific development in nations that are unfriendly to our way of life.

Today there is pending before Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey a case that I have brought to his attention where local and appeal boards, in New Jersey, have

turned a deaf ear to a request that would permit a student in advanced science to complete his course at a State university. The young man is a graduate of college and has now almost completed his advanced scientific course in pursuit of a doctor's degree. His studies up to this time have followed a course that is most necessary if we are to meet the challenge of other nations in such matters. I have purposely withheld details of his name, the name of the college at which he received his original degree, and the university he is now attending to attain his higher degree of doctor in his chosen scientific course. This boy is no slacker. He stands ready and willing to serve his time in the Army. He and his father, a distinguished Legionnaire of New Jersey, only ask that he be permitted to finish his final course that will take only a comparatively few more months of time, June 1957.

It is more important to our future security that this young man be permitted to finish his course of advanced scientific study, or, be sent into the Army at this time for the usual training process, that can include some duties not too important. That is the question that must be decided in this particular case.

During a visit to Soviet Russia and several of its satellite countries last fall I was astounded to learn of the extent to which Russia is preparing its students for scientific usefulness. Today, it is far ahead of us in this respect. Tomorrow, it will be so far ahead that it will create a situation that can be serious. This is a fast-moving world in the study of pure science as well as applied science. We cannot afford to lag behind.

In confirmation of this thought which I have expressed, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and all who are part and parcel of our Selective Service System, to an article that appears in the February 27, 1956, issue of the Des Moines Register by Marquis Childs in the form of an interview with former United States Senator William Benton, entitled "Soviets Train Scientists To Win Cold War." I commend it to the serious consideration of all who think in terms of the welfare of our Nation and its people. It reads as follows:

FORMER SENATOR WARNS—SOVIETS TRAIN SCIENTISTS TO WIN COLD WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—A report based on firsthand observation adds another note of warning that education in the Soviet Union is far outstripping education in the United States.

The massive educational program still expanding in Russia, under which today nearly twice as many students are enrolled above the high-school level as in this country, is one reason for the extraordinary confidence expressed by Soviet leaders at the recent 20th congress of the Communist Party.

For as the latest warning, from former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, makes clear, the Soviet educational system is geared to win the cold war.

SURPLUS OF ENGINEERS

Benton, who made an intensive study of Soviet education and propaganda last year, says that system is producing a surplus of engineers and technicians who will be assigned to carry out technical assistance in every uncommitted country of the world. While getting their scientific training, they are thoroughly indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist line.

There are schools—and this seems to have escaped the attention of even specialists whose business is to know what is going on in Russia—in which all the training from the first grade on is in English, French, or German. Graduates of these schools have a fluent working knowledge of the language they will need when they are sent abroad to do a technical—and propaganda—job.

RAPID EXPANSION

In a lengthy article for the Britannica Yearbook, of which he is publisher, Benton writes:

"The Soviets are now challenging us frontally at what have historically been two of our strongest points, technology and mass education.

"In less than 30 years the Soviets have created a primary school system rivaling our own in universality, with nearly 100 percent enrollment. Their secondary school system is mushrooming amazingly. By 1960 every Russian youngster is to be given an education at least comparable to a better high school diploma."

WARNING BY STRAUSS

Late last year, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said it was evident the United States was rapidly falling behind Soviet Russia in the training of scientists and technicians with the "certainty that we are turning out less than one-half the number of scientists and engineers we require."

The deficiency begins, according to Strauss, in the high schools where science training has long been inadequate and standards of science teaching dropping rapidly.

He cited the fact more than half of all American high schools fail to teach physics or chemistry.

In contrast, Benton points out that in the last years of secondary school, Soviet students must take 4 years of mathematics, including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry.

FEW ELECTIVES

Since the Soviet Union is a totalitarian state, the student has little choice once he has selected a specialty. Electives are few and far between. So-called cultural courses are held to a minimum.

The objective, it is hardly necessary to add, is a Communist education—that is, first-rate technical training buttressed by complete indoctrination in Communist dogma.

It is the combination of indoctrinated zeal with technical proficiency that is so ominous for the West.

Others say that while the threat of massive technical training is a real one, the very fact of advanced education in the scientific spirit will raise troubling doubts that will in turn, lead to a weakening of the support for the state. If this could happen, then an evolution away from totalitarianism and toward a genuine acceptance of peaceful coexistence might be possible.

SPECIAL ACADEMIES

In a recent speech, Benton proposed the creation of technical assistance academies similar to West Point and Annapolis where young men of superior intelligence would be trained as engineers and technicians in every field. In return for their free education, young men would agree to sign up for a certain number of years of service in America's technical assistance program overseas.

Short of some positive, constructive step such as this, the drift will continue. And if estimates of Soviet progress are even approximately right, the gap will widen and America will fall increasingly behind.

To permit this to happen is hardly less than an admission of defeat. For if we have learned nothing else in the atomic-electronic age, it is that the enginers and scientists of today win the battles of tomorrow.

The "Billy" Connery Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the very interesting story concerning the life of the late William Patrick Connery, Jr., who served as a Member of Congress from the Seventh Massachusetts District for many, many years.

He was highly respected, honored, and revered by everyone. In Congress he served on several important committees, and as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, he was instrumental into bringing to final passage the liberal labor legislation that is still on the statute books.

Since this story of our "Billy" Connery is most interesting, for the reason that it renews and refreshes our memory of the very high qualifications together with the outstanding prominence of our dear, beloved, genuine friend, and the excellent reputation that he attained as a public servant, I include it in the RECORD.

The story follows:

WILLIAM PATRICK CONNERY, JR.

A raw cold wind was blowing over the hill of the World War I veterans' lot in Pine Grove Cemetery on the day it was dedicated. It was November 11, 1922. It chilled the large group of veterans gathered there. Dressed in well-worn Army overcoats and overseas caps, or faded pea jackets and round sailor hats, they huddled together listening attentively to the speaker of the day. He was one of them, their buddy, whom they had elected to Congress 7 days before.

Standing at attention, roused by his stirring, short but dramatic speech, they thrilled to his closing words. With eyes turned toward the heavens he said, "To you who have given all for your country, I solemnly promise that I will never stop working for the care of physically or mentally disabled veterans, their widows and orphans, and for equitable, compensating rights due all veterans, who have honorably served their country, so help me God."

For over 15 years he was the greatest friend the veteran had in Congress. Death ceased his untiring work for them on June 15, 1937. It was fitting and commendable that only a few short hours after his death, his comrades of Post 6, American Legion, paid him the signal honor of giving the post his name, William Patrick Connery, Jr.

"Billy," as he was affectionately called by all who knew him, was born in Lynn, Mass., on August 24, 1888. He was the son of William P. Connery, Sr., and Mary Haven Connery, whose outstanding lives in the community were an example to their children. His father was mayor of Lynn from 1911 to 1913, and his excellent administration of city affairs is a matter of record.

Billy was educated in St. Mary's School, Lynn; Montreal College, Canada; and Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass. From the latter institution of learning, he reveived an honorary master of arts degree while he was a Member of the Congress of the United States. He studied law at Georgetown University and passed the bar in Washington, D. C.

While at college he developed a flair for acting, no doubt inherited from his father, and while there chose acting as his profession. From 1909 to 1916 he toured the

country with George M. Cohan shows. He left the stage in 1916 to accept a position with the GE plant in East Boston.

Billy enlisted in the 101st Infantry at Camp McGuinness, Framingham, in August 1917 to be with his brother Larry. Larry had served with the famous 9th Regiment in 1916 on the Mexican border. The 9th known as the Fighting Irish, had been consolidated with the 5th Regiment into the 101st United States Infantry, and was preparing for overseas duty. It was a unit of the now famed Yankee Division.

Repeatedly refusing commissions, he served 19 months as a private in France, because he wished to be close to the common soldier. He took part in all the major operations, engagements, and battles of his regiment. Shortly before his return home, he was promoted to regimental color sergeant for meritorious service. He considered this the greatest honor he ever received, and he had many bestowed upon him. He was known throughout the Yankee Division as Cheerup Billy, fatherly adviser to all, comforter of the wounded and dying, courageous and brave under fire. General Edwards called him his Apostle of Cheer. Col. Edward L. Logan, his commanding officer, publicly referred to him as the most valuable man in the 101st Infantry.

A whole book could be written about his experiences during and immediately after World War I, when he spent so much time organizing veterans to form legion posts and speaking at their installations. His message was always the same, "Organize. Be united. Avoid pettiness and you will have strength."

He was a charter member of the Lynn Y. D. Club and was a principal speaker at the dedications of most parks and squares named for Lynn boys who died in the service. Always a guard or escort when the bodies of deceased veterans were returned to Lynn, he brought consolation to many Gold Star mothers who grew to love him.

Lack of space prevents a recounting of the work done by his buddies and Post 6 Drum Corps in electing him to Congress after a thrilling campaign. He never forgot them. A picture of the corps was on the wall behind his General Edwards.

Though huge in scope, he presented a simply worded program when he campaigned for Congress in 1922. It never changed over the years. It was "100 percent veteran, 100 percent labor, 100 percent justice for all the people all the time." No man ever lived up to campaign promises better than he.

It is important for our younger members to know that at that time the veterans' program was not as popular as it is today. In fact, in many areas it was decidedly unpopular. Many times Billy had to stand alone in his fights, deserted even by his comrades. Political expediency forced some to brush away care for the disabled, to forget the dollar per day paid to privates who came home to no jobs, but not Billy. It was simple to jump on the bandwagon during and after World War II because step by step most of the benefits in the GI bill of rights had been fought for by a game little fellow who made a promise on a cold day in 1922.

Criticized by newspapers, he was sarcastically referred to as the "Veterans' Santa Claus" and "Veterans' Robin Hood." He made one of his greatest speeches in Congress when the veterans were accused of selling their patriotism because they wanted a bonus.

Billy won the election by 7,000 votes. It was really a remarkable victory. In an interview the day after election, he gave credit to the veterans, their mothers, sisters, wives, and sweethearts who worked so hard for him. He was reelected seven times to Congress increasing his majority every election until the last one was over 20,000.

With Larry as his secretary, he arrived in Washington in March 1923, and was sworn in as a member of the 68th Congress. Harding was the President at that time. He was appointed to three committees. They were World War Veterans' Legislation, Labor, and Expenditures in the War Department. He was a member of the first two for his entire membership.

On March 23, 1923, Billy spent a whole day at the United States Veterans' Bureau discussing with Generals O'Ryan and Hines what could be done to improve and facilitate veterans' claims. Asking for helpful suggestions by mail from the Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Y. D. Clubs, he incorporated their suggestions and criticisms into a report which he personally presented to the Bureau head to work on.

On November 22, 1923, he appeared before the Senate Investigating Committee and flayed the treatment disabled veterans were receiving. Shortly after, the reorganization of the Veterans' Bureau became an order, and regional offices were established throughout the country. His battles in committee and on the floor of the House for the care of the disabled is a long glorious saga in the records of Congress. Unannounced visits to veterans hospitals was a frequent must on his list of duties. One day a week he set apart time to visit the wards at Walter Reed Hospital where he was greeted warmly by the boys.

His battle for a soldier's bonus, which he preferred to call adjusted compensation, was long and discouraging. Banging away in the Veterans' Committee hearings, he had to give and take to get different bills to the floor of the House. None of them ever completely satisfied him, but they were better than none.

Outlined in brief, the history of the bonus paid to World War I veterans runs as follows:

1. Bonus bill: Provided 20-year endowment policies. Vetoed by Coolidge, May 15, 1924. Reconsidered May 19, 1924.

2. Bonus loan bill: Increased amount veterans might borrow and reduced interest rate. Vetoed by Hoover, February 26, 1931. Reconsidered February 27, 1931.

3. Soldiers' bonus bill: Would have paid off veterans' compensation certificates: Vetoed by Roosevelt, May 22, 1935. Defeated May 23, 1935.

4. Soldiers' bonus bill: Made 9 year, 3 percent bonds redeemable on demand. Vetoed by Roosevelt, 1936. Reconsidered January 27, 1936.

Those 12 years brought him success on many bills in which he was vitally interested. Among them were the following:

Increased pensions to Civil and Spanish American War Vets.

Increased aid to widows and children.

Emergency Officers Relief Act.

Incorporation of Yeoman F into Naval Reserves.

Amendment to Johnson bill providing compensation for every disability up to January 1, 1930.

Increased appropriations for National Guard.

Pilgrimage bill provided trip to France for Gold Star mothers to visit graves of their sons.

When Roosevelt was elected President in 1932, Billy was the ranking Democrat on both the Veteran and Labor Committees. Realizing the veteran program was in full swing and could be left in the very capable hands of Rankin, of Mississippi, and Wright Patman, of Texas, he chose the chairmanship of the Labor Committee and put that committee on the map. More labor legislation was enacted during the 5 years he served as chairman than had been enacted for the preceding 150 years.

Long before the term "social justice" was used politically, Billy was working for constructive legislation to improve conditions for the masses of the people. Some of the quotations found in his earliest speeches in Congress were based on the famous encyclicals of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI on labor. He knew both of them by heart and knew they embodied all that was right for all classes.

Before the NRA was written, the Connery 30-hour-week bill had been reported to Congress with provisions outlawing child labor, the yellow-dog contract, protecting right of labor to organize, and guaranteeing the right of collective bargaining to labor, by representatives of their own choosing. These provisions were all included in the NIRA as a result of his efforts.

He refused to introduce the CCC bill on the grounds it was like a wartime draft bill, and the $1-a-day pay was inadequate. His fight changed the bill and obtained concessions which protected the man under the United States Employees Compensation Act and made it voluntary enrollment. Had he been wholly successful the pay would have been $80 instead of $30 a month.

The Metcalf-Connery bill aimed to prevent all racketeering in building projects of the Government. It passed the House and Senat but was vetoed by President Hoover. It was designed to prevent kickbacks of pay and profiteering.

Billy led the fight providing every second ship be built in a Navy Yard.

He was credited with the success of the passage of the Railway Labor Pension bill which put 100,000 men to work within a year, and eliminated company unions on the railroad. He led the fight and won the restoration of pay to Government workers by having returned to them 10 percent of their 15-percent cut.

He secured an unanimous report on the Wagner Peyser bill from the Labor Committee which established United States Employment Service.

Three vital pieces of legislation were Billy's handiwork. The Wagner-Connery National Labor Relations Act was written and rewritten 14 times before it was presented and passed by Congress on July 5, 1935. It created a National Labor Relations Board with power to determine an appropriate collective bargaining unit, subject to elections they supervised at request of workers; to certify the duly chosen trade union; to take testimony about unfair employer practices and issue cease and desist orders.

His pet bill was the Connery 30-hour week bill. He presented it to Congress on January 9, 1935 as a relief for unemployment. It provided for a 6-hour day and a 5-day week. It extended to all forms of employment, including agricultural workers, domestics and employees subject to the Railway Labor Act. It empowered the President to impose an embargo, tax or quota system on imports of any foreign country, which by laboring long hours for low wages could undersell the goods produced by the United States. This bill was backed by John L. Lewis and the A. F. of L.

He was to realize his greatest ambition the day he died, his wage and hour bill for which he had been working for years would have been passed. It prohibited the use of child labor; created a labor standards board; banned use of professional strike breakers; required the payment of 50 percent more wages for overtime; established the procedure for collective bargaining in the industries and a plan for differentials that would equalize the wages in the South with those in the North. The present wage and hour bill was passed on June 25, 1938. It retained many of the original points, but eliminated the differential clause which would have been a boon to New England industries.

The first bill Billy presented to Congress was an old-age pension bill, which he coauthored with Senator Dill. It was vetoed by Coolidge. He continued to fight for old-age pensions, inserting his demands by amendments any place he could, hoping a bill would be passed. The social-security bill was written in his office and was passed

almost unanimously on August 14, 1935. It created a board to administer old-age benefits based on earnings before the age of 65; unemployment insurance, and grants to States to aid the needy, aged, blind, widows, etc.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from 1923 to 1937 will attest to the courage and fidelity with which he kept his campaign promises of 1922. In reviewing the memorial addresses by his many friends in Congress, for whom he held the greatest respect, it is remarkable to read so many times, allusions to him as lovable, a fair competitor, honest and above all a gentleman. The kind of person he was is best summed up in the words of his brother Larry who succeeded him in Congress. He wrote:

"Combine the simplicity of the really great, the wit and humor of the cultured Celt, a warm sympathy for the underprivileged, a huge capacity for making friends and keeping them, every quality necessary for leadership, with honesty, integrity, personality, and decency and you have a composite picture of Billy Connery. His greatest characteristic was his integrity. His word was his bond. He never hedged, evaded or ducked an issue in his life. He was scrupulously honest and completely sincere. Deeply religious, he lived religion instead of talking it. All kinds of honors were heaped upon him while he lived. He knew popularity as few men know it. With success mounting yearly, he never lost the underlying philosophy of his life. To quote Kipling, he 'could walk with kings yet keep the common touch.' He was 'Billy' to everyone who knew him."

He died suddenly on June 15, 1937, of coronary thrombosis, leaving his wife, Antoinette, and a little daughter Marie Therese, with his brother and sisters to mourn him. His funeral was the largest and most inspiring ever held in New England. Thousands filed into the State armory and at his home and lined the streets to view the funeral procession which was strictly military. The 101st Infantry marched as a unit and was followed by veteran groups from miles around. The Y. D. Club of Lynn formed an honor guard at his bier, from the time his body arrived at the South Station, where they took over from the Irish-American Veterans of Washington, D. C., until his burial on Saturday, June 19, 1937.

Hundreds of floral tributes, thousands of spiritual bouquets, telegrams, letters, and resolutions were sent to Mrs. Connery from Government officials, veterans, and friends.

From President Roosevelt came the following tribute: "In the untimely passing of Congressman Connery the Nation loses an able man and conscientious legislator whose service can ill be spared. An earnest champion of the rights of the underprivileged as chairman of the House Labor Committee, he literally wore himself out in his efforts to find in national legislation, a solution for an age-old problem which would be just and equitable to the rights of capital and labor."

Post 6 can rightly boast of a great name. It can be found also on the William P. Connery Junior Memorial School in West Lynn; Disabled American Veterans Post in Boston; a room at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C.; main avenue and auditorium at Camp Edwards; and has been recommended as the name for the West Roxbury Veterans Hospital, in a bill presented to Congress by our present Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, who has done such a splendid job in representing us in Washington.

In bringing to a close this very incomplete story of Billy's life, which was a happy, useful, active, and dynamic one, let us pause one minute in silent prayer, and meditate on the thought that, "To live in the hearts you left behind, is not to die."

How Some Countries Get Dollars—the U. S. A.: A Soft Touch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article which appeared in the National Review of January 25, 1956. It indicates how Tito and other countries have been able to work the United States for soft-touch gifts and loans:

Back in 1954, Marshal Tito had an inspiration.

The Yugoslav farmers were in revolt against his variety of communism and, to provide them with consumer goods, he had borrowed $30 million from the World Bank.

The World Bank officials told him the next step was to refund Yugoslavias' prewar debt and to borrow money in New York and London. So in March 1954, he opened negotiations with Yugoslavia's private foreign creditors, who told him to cut down the Yugoslav budget; which meant firing the jobholders who were the core of his political support.

Tito didn't dare fire them. Instead, he appealed to the United States Government for a handout. The State Department, in one of its periodical drives to save Italy from the Italian Communists, told Tito to help out by being handsome in the Trieste dispute—which he couldn't do without turning all Yugoslavs against himself. This was Tito's fix when his inspiration came.

Because Italy had a Communist problem, Italy had got American money. All countries with Communist problems got American money. So Tito—this was his inspiration—decided to be a problem himself.

Tito needed to flirt with Moscow; but if he tried flirting at a moment when he had been so clearly rejected by the United States, Moscow would demand his white uniform and medals. So he needed—as former Secretary Acheson used to put it—to deal from a situation of strength. Observe the ensuing sequence of events:

1954

December: Nehru agrees to a state visit from Tito. He and Nehru jointly announce they adhere to neither the Western Allies nor the Communists.

1955

February: En route from India, Tito stops in Egypt. He and Colonel Nasser have a secret conference.

May: On Tito's invitation, Bulganin and Khrushchev visit Belgrade. The United States Ambassador is hastily recalled to Washington.

July: The United States offers Tito increased military aid. Tito says the United States should just hand over the money and weapons.

September: Colonel Nasser invites Bulganin and Khrushchev to visit Egypt. The United States Ambassadors to all Near Eastern countries are summoned to a meeting.

December: The World Bank offers to finance the first stages of the $500 million Aswan Dam. Colonel Nasser says it ought to just hand the money over.

December: On Nehru's invitation, Bulganin and Khrushchev visit India.

1956

January: In his state of the Union message, Eisenhower asks Congress to increase the civilian foreign aid appropriation by $2.2 million and make the foreign-aid program permanent. Yugoslavia, India, and Egypt are unofficially mentioned as beneficiaries.

Tito is possibly driven by more than an honest greed for American dollars. To some students of communism his break with Moscow in 1948 was fraudulent; they believe that he is today Moscow's underground ally. Moscow itself takes the maneuvers of Tito, Nehru, and Nasser with deadly earnestness. Moscow is clearly out to strengthen the Communist position in India; to establish it in Egypt; and reestablish it in Yugoslavia. In this week's Third World War, Mr. Burnham touches on the inexplicable willingness of Washington to submit to Tito's gang blackmail. Here we merely want to pay tribute to Tito's wits and to one of the most elaborate and far-flung parlor charades ever enacted.

What the Middle East Means to the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Digest for March 1956 contains the following article on the meaning of the Middle East to the free world. The article, authored by Ralph McGill, has been condensed from the Atlanta Constitution. It is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

TROUBLE IS ITS HISTORY: WHAT THE MIDDLE EAST MEANS TO THE FREE WORLD

(By Ralph McGill)

(Exodus 3: 8: "And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, a land flowing with milk and honey.")

Every day about 3 million barrels of crude oil flows from the deep-drilled wells beneath the desert sands of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iran alone * * * and there are many wells in other countries in the hot, historic, and ancient Arabian Peninsula.

Today it is the Russians who press it toward war. Their ultimate objective stands out sharply in the glare of the world's spotlight now held on the Middle East.

That objective is—control of the oil and a Soviet hold on the Mediterranean. The former is a relatively new target. The latter is as old as the tsars. They maintained, for centuries, an imperialistic drive for a port on the Mediterranean.

As we read early in Exodus * * * there had been a war. The Hebrews, one of many Semitic tribes, had been captured in war, and taken prisoner into Egypt where they had been put at forced labor. Obviously, from "The Book," this war had taken place many years before.

The point is that as the curtain lifts on the first misty scenes in recorded history there was fighting in the Middle East.

It was then, as now, a land bridge between Asia, Africa, and Europe.

The German kaisers, dreaming of conquest, covered it with a phrase, "Drang Nacht

Osten"—drive to the east. They went in for aiding in the construction of railroads. They almost pulled it off, too, when the first great World War flamed. Out of it came the legends of "Lawrence of Arabia," the great Englishman whose diplomacy and organization managed to thwart the Turks and the Germans in their drive for conquest.

General Allenby marched British troops into Jerusalem, his head bare out of respect to the Christian significance of the city. He ended Turkish rule. It had endured for centuries, sapping the vitality and character of the people, and reducing the land to more of a desert than when they came.

Hitler made a determined drive for the "land bridge," knowing that he who controlled it would own Africa. Rommel, the Desert Fox, and his battle-tough Afrika Corps came perilously near to plucking the plum. Destiny, in the form of an angular, egotistical, able general called Montgomery and his Desert Rats frustrated Hitler.

Now, come the Russians. They do not march. Instead, they provide arms to a restless Egypt, held by a second-generation dictatorship which long ago ate the first of its litter—General Naguib. They agitate Syria, where another uneasy military dictatorship holds on. Transjordan, too, has a small, good army, bored with nothing to do.

France comes into the picture. She can claim existence as a power only because of her African holdings. Already, the best of these, in North Africa, is in danger of being lost.

So, Russia, without saying "forward march" to a single soldier, drives toward the great basin of oil, upsets the never very stable balance in the Arab world, and moves toward possible control of a great strategic area. It is vital to the free world. We will be drawn in—unless Egypt, Syria, Transjordan—and Israel—come to their senses.

Israel has brought long-needed Western democracy to the area. Arabia's once-rich culture, frozen at about the 13th century, has gone steadily down. Arab leaders since have debased and pitilessly exploited their own people.

But never for a moment think of this as merely a democratic David, with his slingshot out to face the Goliath of the Arab world. It is a great and terrible crisis. With North Africa gone, no beachhead could be held in Europe. If the ancient, historic "bridge" is lost to Russia, then indeed does the balance of power shift heavily to her side.

This is some of the meaning of "the Middle East."

The Leech Called Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a composition by Mr. B. M. Gibson, one of my constituents. Mr. Gibson is a farmer, school teacher, and former member of the South Carolina Legislature and the South Carolina Employment Security Commission. In rhythmic form, he scathingly denounces Congress for illegally scattering the American dollar to the four corners of the world, including the lands of the Hindoos, Hottentots, and Eskimos.

He emphasizes the fact that we are spending ourselves into bankruptcy while the Kremlin laughs. Lenin said we would do just that. I agree with Mr. Gibson that we should use our brains more and our dollars less:

THE LEECH CALLED ECONOMIC AID
(By M. B. Gibson)

This thing called Economic Aid
Is a bald-faced illegal raid
Upon the people's pocketbooks—
Or that's the way, to me, it looks.

We John Does pay our taxes here,
Pay Uncle Samuel ev'ry year,
But where's the Frenchmen or Hindoo
Who pays the U. S. A. a sou?

Should Congress, then, tax you and me
And give away the "take" for free
To ev'ry country 'neath the stars,
Whose flag is not our stars and bars?

Congress, each poor taxpayer thinks
Such taxing puzzling as the Sphinx:
While sly Bulganin chuckles low
Each time you vote away our "dough."

Congress, eternally some say
You'll have to give our means away:
But don't usurp old Santa Claus—
Let him fill foreign maw and craws!

We have a quarter-trillion debt,
And yearly it's a-growing yet:
Why borrow, then, to give the world
Greenbacks like snowflakes random hurled?

The billions we give away each year,
What might they not accomplish here?
Yet Congress can't cut taxes now—
The voters, though, could tell them how!

They're planning now—I swear, by swan—
To build a dam they call "Aswan,"
A Nile job like a Pharaoh's dream—
Two billion bucks to dam one stream!

What mandate can our Congress boast
To treat our money like burnt toast?
I'm telling them, for me and you,
"Let Nehru oar his own canoe"!

No nation yet that e'er drew breath
Has taxed its people close to death,
Or thrown its bounty far away
In lands o'er which it owned no sway.

Sure as we ever conquer space,
The first space ship that makes the race
Will take some "Marshall Plan" to Mars
To gift wrap all the peopled stars!

Let Congress other nations treat
As does my banker down the street:
"I'll loan you, yes, but pay when due,
Or our old friendship, sir, is through."

Let Congress give no more away,
But hoard it for a sterner day.
Then Congressmen, when looking roun,'
Need fear no more Ben Franklin's frown.

Congress as soon could make hell heaven
As with our wealth uplift and leaven
The teeming East with moneyed yeast—
Taxpayers know that much, at least.

Congress, the noise outside your doors
Is not the ocean's cadenced roars—
It is the Nation's voice of wrath,
Bidding you choose a better path:

A path of oldtime commonsense,
Indexed with "billions for defense,
But not a dime to give away,
To friend or foe, till judgment day."

If such path's treason in this age,
Reread hist'ry's earlier page.
Then ask what our forbears would say
If they filled seats of State to-day.

Let queasy lands hold hands with Russia;
In time will fall their "House of Usher".
Why should we play Sir Galahad
And send good money after bad?

Congress, make our land strong and great—
That is your only high mandate.
Money no lands nor friends can buy.
So let your giveaway craze die.

Edward A. Dickson—Great Californian Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a news item appearing in the Sacramento Bee under date of February 22, 1956, relating to the passing of Mr. Edward A. Dickson, one of the outstanding citizens of California during the last half century. Mr. Dickson was a newspaperman, teacher, and public official vitally interested in the growth and welfare of California. At the time of his passing he was president of the board of regents of the University of California, and was known affectionately among his host of friends as the "father" of the University of California at Los Angeles. His departure is a real loss to the State of California and his leadership in local and statewide affairs will be sorely missed. The news item follows:

E. A. DICKSON, 76, LOS ANGELES CIVIC LEADER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REGENT DIES

Edward A. Dickson, whose career for more than half a century was interwoven with California's growth, died today in Los Angeles at the age of 76.

Dickson was a newspaperman, teacher, public official, political party worker, businessman, and leader of constructive activities of many civic and governmental groups.

He was active until his death as chairman of the board of regents of the University of California and president of the Western Federal Savings and Loan Association of Los Angeles.

He is survived by his wife, Wilhelmenia; nephew, Edward H. Dickson, Washington, D. C., correspondent for the McClatchy newspapers, and a great nephew, Samuel Edward Dickson.

WISCONSIN NATIVE

The elder Dickson was born in Sheboygan, Wis., and moved to California as a boy. He was graduated from the Sacramento High School and after graduation from the University of California at Berkeley in 1901 he went to Japan to teach school.

REPORTER TO OWNER

He began his newspaper career in San Francisco in 1903 and later was a Washington correspondent. He joined the Los Angeles Express as political and editorial writer and became editor and owner of the Express in 1919.

He left newspaper work in 1931 to become president of the savings and loan association.

FATHER OF UCLA

Dickson was known as the "father" of the University of California at Los Angeles.

When he was appointed to the UC board of regents in 1913 he was then the youngest man ever named and he was the first regent from southern California.

It was largely through his efforts that Los Angeles proper became the southern branch of the University of California in 1919. Dickson selected the Westwood campus site for the vast development into the modern UCLA. The school had an enrollment of 1,231 when it came into existence. Its current enrollment is 15,000.

Dickson told the story of the UCLA campus in his book, The University of California at Los Angeles, published last May.

The campus site Dickson selected was a 383-acre tract known as the John Wolfskill ranch. It was presented to the university as a gift from the cities of Los Angeles, Beverley Hills, Santa Monica, and Venice.

GIVES $230,000

Dickson gave the university $30,000 for graduate journalism fellowships and $200,000 for special professorships for distinguished scholars and scientists who have reached retirement age.

The latter fund was turned over to the University of California last month.

He also founded the Edward A. Dickson achievement award, an annual UCLA alumnus-of-the-year honor.

POLITICAL FIGURE

Dickson and Chester Rowell, then editor of the Fresno Republican, founded the Lincoln-Roosevelt League which played a prominent part in the Young Turks rebellion among California Republicans which led to the election of Hiram Johnson as Governor in 1911.

He managed or advised on successful reform campaigns for mayor against Southern Pacific Co. interests which resulted in Lincoln-Roosevelt League victories in Berkeley, Los Angeles and Sacramento.

Dickson was a confidant of Hiram Johnson until 1918 when Johnson was elected to the United States Senate and William D. Stephens, lieutenant governor became governor.

RIFT IS HEALED

A rift developed between Johnson and Dickson which was not healed until many years later at a chance meeting in the Nation's Capitol.

Dickson was with Johnson at the Pasadena Hotel when the so-called snub by Charles Evans Hughes of Johnson occurred during the 1916 presidential campaign.

In 1920 Dickson was one of the original backers of Herbert Hoover for president.

BROAD SERVICE

He served on the Los Angeles Water and Power Commission, the Los Angeles Centennial Commission, the Olympic Games Association, the Art Institute and Library Board and was president of the Historical Society of Southern California.

In 1017 and 1918 he was a member of the California State Council of Defense. He also was a California delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1932.

From 1918 to 1922 he was a member of the Republican State Central Committee.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Free Enterprise and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Can Free Enterprise Survive Without Small Business?" The address was delivered last evening by Harold B. Wess, professor of business administration and marketing, School of Business Administration, American University, at the second Institute of Profitable Management for Small Business.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN FREE ENTERPRISE SURVIVE WITHOUT SMALL BUSINESS?

(By Harold B. Wess)

If and when small business disappears from our midst, then our free-enterprise society will be no more. I use "when" because I fear that unless appropriate action is taken, it is possible that small business will no longer be present, keeping our economic system healthy and dynamic.

How many big businesses that began as small businesses would have been able to grow and expand under our present tax structure? If Henry Ford had started his pioneering venture under the current tax system, would the Ford Motor Co. have reached its present size—would it be able to make its present contribution to a prosperous economy and to the economic well-being of our Nation?

Our present tax structure makes it difficult, if not impossible, for small and struggling business concerns to accumulate sufficient working capital to expand, purchase up-to-date fixtures and machinery, improve plants and stores, and hire additional labor.

Let us face it squarely. Small business, now as in the past, must depend on plowed-back earnings for working capital. Access to the capital markets and to the savings of investors by issuance of stocks and bonds is not available to small business. Small business must turn to commercial or bank credit and, more important, to previous earnings plowed back in the business, to meet financial requirements. Our taxing system makes it difficult for the small-business man to accumulate adequate profits to plow back into his business, credit is often not available when needed and, when available, the cost is high, and the open market for securities is largely closed to the small-business man. The usual result is undercapitalization. This means that with a slight economic squall, many a small-business man capsizes and then sinks.

There are more than three million small businesses in our economy. In discussing the place and problems of small business in our society and in paying tribute to the contribution of small business to our economy, let us not forget that big business is equally essential to our prosperity and high standard of living. We need both for a well balanced and soundly integrated free economy and free social climate. In this connection I quote Prof. J. D. Glover of the Harvard School of Business Administration from his book, the Attack on Big Business:

"Facts, it seems to me—teem about us on every side to attest the great contribution that big business has made to American life. Big business deserves much of the credit—not all by any means—for our unequaled technological advance and standard of living."

As to the claim of certain rabble rousers that big business is running the country, he has this to say:

"It seems to me that no reasonable man, looking objectively at the facts, can believe that big business runs the country, nor that it is pushing us, willy-nilly, into totalitarianism. In fact, it ought to be perfectly obvious that if there is any real threat of this sort, it comes from those who desire, by authoritarian political action—by the power, and ultimately by the force of the State—to remake the country to correspond to some fixed ideal of their own, or to push us back into some never-never Golden Age."

Much emphasis has been given to the high mortality rate of small business. Let us remember that bigness itself is no guaranty of survival. A study by the Brookings Institution showed that of the hundred largest corporations that existed in 1909 only 31 remained on the list in 1948. The rest either slid down the scale or went out of existence entirely. No company large or small has a permanent guaranty of survival. That is as it should be in a free society. In the last analysis a business, large or small, must serve the public or go under.

Why is maintaining the health, growth and survival of small enterprise vital to a better social and economic performance? The answer is implicit in our conception of free enterprise. Free enterprise makes available to individuals the opportunity to try their talents and abilities in new ventures. Private enterprise must provide these opportunities in order to retain its dynamism.

There must be opportunities for the rugged individual to attempt the new and untried. We must have a climate which make it possible for the newcomer to make a better start and with guidance and education, enable him to prosper and survive and become, perhaps, a medium and important middle-sized businessman. In order to make all this possible, we must provide a flexible business system where such attempts on the part of the individual will have a reasonable chance for success.

With over 3 million centers of business entrepreneurships and initiative we can have, and in fact must have, a dynamic society with millions of opportunities for new ideas, for trial and error, for daring ventures into the future. Newcomers force established businesses into alertness and efficiency. In this way they serve to keep the advantage of a competitive market open to the consumer.

It is to the best interest of big business to foster the success of small business, and to the best interest of us all. In recent years an attempt was made by the Federal Government to take over the steel industry. Let us hope that government ownership zealots do not come into power. Healthy small business makes this difficult. It is reassuring to contemplate that it is not simple for a government to take over several million small enterprises.

I am not suggesting that the Federal Government has no part to play in our private enterprise economy. What makes our society dynamic and vigorous instead of static and inflexible is the decentralization of authority and decision making, in contrast to a society under centralized direction and control. We have many governments and centers of activity and decision making. Labor unions, business associations, fraternal orders, clubs, churches, universities, professional organizations, the family unit, and many groups of farmers, adult study groups, town councils, etc., are all participating directly and indirectly in the government of our Nation.

We may best sum up the case for small business by quoting Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University:

"In an age of bigness there is need to preserve islands for the cultivation of the resources of smallness."

We know that many people by temperament and makeup will be happier and more effective in a business of their own. There are also many who should try their own wings before becoming part of a large organization.

Let us take a look at small businesses; how many are there, how do they perform, and what happens to them? There are 4,200,000 firms now in operation. Of this number, 75 percent have fewer than 4 paid employees. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent employ 1,000 or more people. More than three-fifths of the 4.2 million firms now active have been in operation by their present owners since the end of World War II. The median age of all operating business is nearly 7 years—that is half of the businesses are older than 7 years and half younger. Taking the business population as a whole (4.2 million), only 19 percent remained in operation under the same ownership for more than 10½ years, 54 percent survived 1½ years, and 25 percent survived 6 years. The chances are that about 1 out of 5 small businesses will attain the age of 10 years.

Not all businesses are liquidated because they are unprofitable, but a study made in 1946 disclosed that half of all liquidations and about one-fourth of all transfers were made either to avoid or minimize a loss.

Why do we have this high mortality rate among small businesses? Need this always be so? Such high mortality is sheer economic and social waste.

We know there are functions the small business can perform more economically than big business can. There is a need and a market for goods and services which a small enterprise is more flexible and qualified to achieve. The small-business man can give better personal service; he can meet the needs of his customer because he is closer to them; he can move faster than the big business. Small business can compete and capture a market in manufacturing, retailing, wholesaling, and services because of this personalized service—high in convenience, quality, specialization, and accommodation. Yet the small-business man usually gets into trouble because—

1. He tries to make limited capital stretch too far.
2. He handles his credits poorly.
3. He lets his inventories get out of hand, carrying too much slow-moving and dead stock instead of concentrating on fast-moving items.
4. He lacks training and preparation for his job.
5. He has little understanding of his market and the personal and physical equipment needed for success.
6. He lacks financial understanding, does not know how to determine the availability of funds and how to use them to the best advantage.
7. He has little or no recordkeeping and does not understand the accounting function.
8. He is so involved in the pressure of day-to-day details that he has no time to analyze his situation.
9. He fails to seek help from the outside.
10. He is frustrated by changing competitive conditions because of his inability to evaluate them and does not know how to cope with them.
11. He does not understand nor has he been trained in the art and science of management.

In addition to these handicaps, small businesses characteristically have insufficient working capital and therefore cannot afford to tie up this capital for any long time on improvement in plant and equipment.

The small owner must meet the same problems in the management of his business as his large competitor with this difference—he is the buyer, the seller, the financier, controller, recordkeeper, etc., all in one. Yet he must learn to appraise all of these functions himself as though he had delegated them to others. For these reasons he frequently needs outside qualified counsel to help with an objective examination of his operation and suggestions for improvements in areas where he is weak.

It is the duty of big business, of Government, and of educational institutions to encourage and help the rugged pioneering individuals who are ready and willing to take the risks of blazing new trails. Today, alas, there are too few young people willing to take the risks of going into a small business of their own. Witness how few are the young people who will go into selling as a career, and note that those who do, generally prefer the security of a straight salary rather than the hazard of a straight commission.

What can schools of business administration do to help small business? They can, in setting up their programs, bear in mind that the small-business man must have versatility. He cannot delegate to specialists jobs of finance, control, personnel, advertising, marketing, production, etc. He must be the specialist in all or many of these functions. Schools of business must therefore develop courses of instruction that will fill his needs for an overall expertness and skill peculiar to the requirements for a small enterprise.

Uppermost in everyone's mind is what will happen to small business under automation. It is encouraging to find Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, reporting to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on November 25, 1955, that:

"Relatively small business may be in a position to turn its disadvantages into an element of strength by capitalizing upon its comparative adaptability and flexibility. While big business fights for mass markets, smaller business may capture the business left behind. While big business concentrates on mass assembly, the manufacture of components and parts—even the mass production of components—becomes the opportunity for small new enterprises. There is no doubt that the smaller plants will need to give especial study to product design and standardization problems in order to achieve longer product runs and secure the maximum benefits from automatic machinery.

"Small business unquestionably has its problems in the contest for survival. These include the terms of competition, the difficulty of securing sufficient capital, adequate management, and the problems of research and development. The trend toward automatic machinery may result in making these difficulties even greater, but it is far from clear that automation itself is going to add a wholly new and overwhelming set of survival problems of its own."

Small business is indispensable in a free enterprise economy. However, wholesale subsidizing of economic inefficiency and wasteful use of resources as a method of promoting the growth of small business will do only more harm to our economy, and, in the long run, will be a disservice to small business itself.

President Eisenhower in his economic message to Congress on January 24, 1956, said, "The lasting prosperity of our Nation depends far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does or can do for them." Let us, therefore, turn our thoughts away from subsidies and artificial props to thoughts of how to help small business help itself.

Forced Repatriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the arguments for and against a committee to investigate forced repatriation of anti-Communists to Soviet Russia following World War II, House Resolution 137, continue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two letters published in the New York Times on this subject which I commend to my colleagues for their attention.

The letters follow:

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1956]

INQUIRY ON WAR PRISONERS—CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION INTO FORCED REPATRIATION OPPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Having served for 8 years at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials and subsequently with the United States Army Historical Division, I was greatly interested in a letter from William F. Buckley, Jr., James Burnham and others, published on January 26, which advocates a congressional investigation of the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war between 1945 and 1947.

It is highly questionable if this action involved millions of prisoners. One would like to know the writers' source for this quite incredible figure. Moreover, contrary to what is alleged, this repatriation was clearly agreed upon between top-level Russian and Allied authorities at Yalta, Potsdam, and elsewhere.

At that time the prisoners in question were regarded quite unequivocally by both sides, Russian and Allied, as traitors and war criminals. It is a manifest distortion of history to invest them in retrospect with the status of political refugees.

Logically, an investigation of the kind sponsored by Congressman BOSCH would also have to inquire into the case of William Joyce ("Lord Haw Haw"), who was executed (on the basis of a technicality which was palpably a legal fiction) by the British as a traitor although he was a native-born American citizen who never became a British subject and subsequently, I believe, acquired German citizenship while serving as a Nazi broadcaster. Joyce's claim to the status of political refugee (which in all fairness should be allowed to work both ways) is certainly much better founded than that, for example, of the Soviet General Vlassov, who defected to the German side after his capture.

In my opinion, inquiries of the sort proposed by Congressman BOSCH, which quite unjustifiably seek to judge past events in the light of present political situations which were not anticipated at the time when they occurred, can serve no useful purpose. In effect, they constitute merely a modern version of the medieval bills of attainder.

I fully agree that there is much that is doubtful about our actions and policy in postwar Germany, but venture to recommend, as a more legitimate subject for investigation, the truly fantastic black market conditions which were allowed to prevail in Germany between 1945 and 1948. Anyone who personally experienced the "cigarette economy" of those days can only conclude that it was deliberately aided and abetted by United States occupation authorities on the highest level.

JOHN BARNARD ROBINSON.
NEW YORK, *February 2, 1956.*

[From the New York Times of February 25, 1956]

FORCED REPATRIATION—NO KNOWN AGREEMENTS MENTION USE OF FORCE, IT IS SAID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The letter by John Barnard Robinson, published in The Times of February 18, adheres to the very popular misconception that forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war and liberated civilians was agreed upon by the Allies in Yalta, Potsdam and elsewhere.

This simply is not so. Neither the Yalta Agreement nor the Potsdam Declaration nor any other known diplomatic document contains even the slightest reference to the use of force in repatriating prisoners of war and civilians.

The chief historian of the American Army, in a special study of forced repatriation, has stated that it was purely the result of an unwarranted arbitrary interpretation of the Yalta Agreement by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The truth is that our own Department of State had informed the Soviet Government through the diplomatic note of February 1, 1945, that we could never forcibly repatriate those Soviet nationals captured in German uniforms—as for instance the Vlasov troops—because that would be a gross violation of the Geneva Convention. The Acting Secretary of State, Joseph C. Grew, wired our Secretary of State, then at Yalta, warning him against the conclusion of any agreement with the Soviets which could result in unlawful forced repatriation.

When Mr. Robinson asserts that Congressman BOSCH's proposal quite unjustifiably seeks "to judge past events in the light of present political situations which were not anticipated at the time when they occurred, he is wrong again. The task of statesmanship is to anticipate. As Mr. Truman's memoirs clearly show, he rather correctly anticipated Soviet attitudes in the postwar era. As far as forced repatriation to the Soviets was concerned, many prominent people had repeatedly and vigorously protested against this inhuman practice.

May I further remind Mr. Robinson that we forcibly repatriated many Soviet nationals who had heroically fought with our own troops against the Nazis in Italy? These Soviet nationals were by no stretch of the imagination prisoners of war and therefore not covered by the Yalta Agreement, no matter how wrongly our military authorities might have interpreted it. Their extradition was a crime, pure and simple. It should, of course, be included in any forthcoming congressional investigation.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, *February 20, 1956.*

New Jersey American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an annual custom, Don Hart, of Bridgeton, N. J., as department commander of the American Legion of New Jersey, and his associated officers, held the 12th annual breakfast of the department at the Congressional Hotel. The purpose of this breakfast is to enable the department officials to present to the New Jersey Members of Congress the views of the department with reference to the matters affecting ex-servicemen in which the Legion is interested.

These meetings have been of great benefit to the congressional delegation. We look forward to the meeting each year. We hope they will continue.

In accordance with the consent granted, I am including as part of my remarks the following summary of remarks made by William G. McKinley, national executive committeeman, and Edmund G. Lyons, vice chairman of National Americanism Commission:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY, TO NEW JERSEY CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION BREAKFAST, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1956, BY WILLIAM G. MCKINLEY, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMAN, AND EDMUND G. LYONS, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION

Gentlemen, for sake of brevity this statement is reduced to a minimum, so that "he who runs may read."

1. The problem of the consolidation of the Veterans' Administration outpatient clinic at Newark regional office with the facilities at East Orange Hospital is undergoing further study seeking to resolve the objective without loss of bed capacity at the hospital.

You will recall our suggestion last spring in this connection that consideration be given to providing an additional building on the East Orange Hospital grounds for the entire operations of the regional office.

Without detailed and specific recommendation, at this time, we would ask you to continue your interest in this problem to the end that proper appropriations be provided to secure a regional office building in East Orange and to finally dispose of the Newark property known as the Old Globe Indemnity Building.

The effect of this would be to realize a substantial money return to offset the cost of new construction, return the Newark property to the tax ratables of the city of Newark, and materially improve the services of the Veterans' Administration to New Jersey veterans.

2. Attention is invited to the reduction in requested appropriations for the overall operations of the Veterans' Administration by some $600 million for a total request of something less than $5 billion.

This reflects decreases due to termination of programs for certain veteran benefits and a leveling off of others.

Our comment on this fact is to point up a contradiction between reduced budget and continued propaganda of scare proportions that veterans' benefits are rising to threaten bankruptcy of the Federal Government.

We invite your attention to this error which could adversely influence congressional approach to veteran legislation by overemphasis of money values.

We believe that money for veteran programs although in large amount should be considered in ratio to overall budget. This is not a very great factor.

We believe that projection of future costs of veterans programs based upon veteran population is grossly distorted and is misleading. Any projection of veteran costs based upon veteran population needs to be in ratio to the overall of the population and therefore in ratio to the overall of national economy.

Unless war again visits us in the next 25 years, mortality, especially among older veterans, will tend to reduce the veteran population, while on the other hand, the Bureau of the Census foresees a population in excess of 228 million within 25 years. There would be normally a consequent increase in national wealth as the population increases.

Therefore, the ratio of veterans to population will decline and the ratio of veteran program costs to overall wealth will lessen.

We ask you to keep these facts in mind as you approach consideration of issues involving costs of veteran programs both now and in the future.

3. For your information and guide to consideration of Veterans' Administration appropriations as these effect New Jersey, you will be interested in the following:

Lyons Hospital has a capacity of 2,009 beds. As of now, 1,932 are occupied with 32 patients on leave for whom beds must be reserved. This is nearly total occupancy. There are some 676 applications awaiting admission, many of whom are in State and county institutions which, as you know are overcrowded.

These are neuropsychiatric cases. This condition is not only continuing but the case trend is rising.

East Orange Hospital has a total capacity of 950 beds, of which 850 are authorized for use and 740 beds have been budgeted.

As of now there are 788 patients in the hospital, an overload of budgeted beds.

There are 132 applications for admission. These are general medical and neurological cases.

The caseload is rising and is closely following our projections of caseload as given to you in previous reports.

We believe that there is a need to bring all the facilities of East Orange into full operation.

We repeat our previous statements to you that some expansion of neurological treatment is necessary and as a relief to Lyons Hospital.

We concede that this is a management and budgeting problem, technical in nature, but you should be informed of this problem and we ask your sympathetic concern and influence when considering appropriations in the field of hospital care.

H. R. 7886

4. The major legislation to be offered by the American Legion this year in the area of veterans benefits is embodied in H. R. 7886.

This legislation would liberalize existing pension entitlements to elderly veterans, predominantly of World War I.

It must be recognized that World War I veterans, now at average age 63 years, are being retired from the labor force of the Nation. This means substantial reductions in income to a very large proportion of these older men.

The problem is many sided and complex in detail. We do not have time for an involved discussion of it.

Let us say, however, this proposal is a carefully studied attempt to provide for older veterans in justice to them, in justice to our country, and in accord with long-established national tradition and custom. It seeks to avoid an overpensionizing of eligible veterans where there is no economic need but to lend aid and comfort to those veterans who actually need assistance in their declining years.

We ask your support of this bill.

5. You will be considering various bills prompted by the report of the Hoover Commission dealing with veterans' affairs.

We are opposed to many of these suggestions for adequate reasons. To save time, we will provide to you an exhaustive study by our national organization which we hope will be helpful to you.

We ask you to sustain us in our position concerning these matters.

May I yield at this time to Edmund G. Lyons, of Clifton, past department commander and vice chairman of our National Americanism Commission, who will discuss our views concerning matters in the field of Americanism.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The American Legion continues its firm support of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act and is opposed to weakening amendments or any attempt to repeal this act. As a result of this legislation enforcement procedures have been strengthened in order to cope more adequately with the threat of subversive penetration. Loopholes and inconsistencies in the old immigration laws have been eliminated. We now have for the first time in our history a sound immigration and nationality system.

Some of the proposed changes recently made would result in a 2½ times increase in our existing immigration figures. We doubt if the economy of our country could stand this influx.

We would oppose any attempt to eliminate the fingerprinting of immigrants. Representative of over 20 million men who served in the Armed Forces, who were not only fingerprinted upon entry into service but also fingerprinted every time we drew our pay, I'm sure you can see our position on this matter.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATION

We believe that a continuing study should be made of tax-exempt foundations. The American Legion is not opposed to the creation of such organizations, but is deeply concerned with the activities engaged in by some foundations and the purposes and causes promoted by grants from organizations receiving special consideration under our tax laws.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The education of the youth of the United States has been a matter of deep interest and continuous study to the American Legion since its organization in 1919. In 1921 the American Legion, together with the National Educational Association, initiated American

Educational Week. We are still actively associated with this project. At the present time we are sponsoring and promoting some 18 programs in the primary and secondary schools of this country. These programs in no way substitute for the existing programs being carried on by school authorities, but, where we are invited, we supplement their programs.

With the exception of certain programs now in existence, such as ROTC, land-grant assistance, donation of surplus Federal commodities for school-lunch programs, and grants in aid in critical national defense areas, the American Legion is opposed to any form of Federal aid that would reach down into our communities for the purpose of school construction or other form of school aid.

Two recent studies by intergovernmental committees have declared that the State and local communities have the capacity to meet the financial requirements for education.

UNESCO

At our recent convention in Miami the American Legion requested Congress to make a complete current investigation into the operations of UNESCO to determine whether that agency is complying with the terms and conditions of House Resolution 215 and Senate Resolution 122, 79th Congress, said resolution being the basis of United States participation in UNESCO, particularly the final portion of said resolution, which states, "*Provided, however,* That such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several States or their administration."

Since UNESCO is prohibited from operating within the United States by law, the American Legion requests that Congress repeal the laws creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO and its secretariat.

The following is a list of some of the persons attending the breakfast:

TWELFTH ANNUAL BREAKFAST, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY, FOR NEW JERSEY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, PRESIDENTIAL ROOM, HOTEL CONGRESSIONAL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 29, 1956

GUEST LIST

United States Senators

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, Princeton.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, Rahway.

United States Congressman

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, First District, Republican, Merchantville.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND, Second District, Republican, Camp May City.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Third District, Republican, Rumson.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Fourth District, Democrat, Trenton.

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., Fifth District, Republican, Morristown.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Sixth District, Democrat, Plainfield.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Seventh District, Republican, Saddle River.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD, Eighth District, Republican, Paterson.

Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, Ninth District, Republican, Haworth.

Hon. PETER R. RODINO, JR., 10th District, Democrat, Newark.

Hon. HUGH ADDONIZIO, 11th District, Democrat, Newark.

Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN, 12th District, Republican, Livingston.

Hon. ALFRED W. SIEMINSKI, 13th District, Democrat, Jersey City.

Hon. T. JAMES TUMULTY, 14th District, Democrat, Jersey City.

Albert B. Hermann, Administrative Assistant to Senator SMITH.

Albert E. Abrahams, Executive Secretary to Senator CASE.

Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey.

Mr. Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Joseph F. O'Hern, manager, VA Regional Office, Newark, N. J.

Col. Salvatore A. Bontempo, director, State Division of Veterans' Services.

Mr. Albert H. Acken, secretary, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan, Chief, Army Division, National Guard Bureau.

Mr. Wallace S. Moreland, director of public relations, Rutgers University.

The American Legion—National

J. Addington Wagner, national commander, the American Legion.

James F. O'Neill, publisher, the American Legion magazine.

T. O. Kraabel, director, national rehabilitation commission.

Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission.

George J. Kelly, director, national public relations division.

Newspaper representatives

James Munn, Associated Press.

Edward K. Inman, editor, the National Tribune—Stars and Stripes.

Harold G. Stagg, senior editor, Army Times News Letter.

Arthur Sylvester, Newark Evening News.

Thomas Buchanan, Newark Star Ledger.

J. Newman Wright, Passaic Herald News.

Cyril J. O'Brien, the Trentonian.

Dean Dittmer, United Press.

American Legion Auxiliary—Department of New Jersey

Mrs. Howard Shuster, Nutley, department president.

Mrs. Harry Gleckner, Carteret, national executive committeewoman.

Mrs. Harry Kellerman, Weehawken, department secretary.

The American Legion—Department of New New Jersey

Don Hart, Bridgeton, department commander.

William G. McKinley, Jersey City, national executive committeeman.

Albert E. McCormick, Mountain Lakes, national alternate committeeman.

William F. Grund, Union City, director of service activities.

Morris W. Kuzbyt, Trenton, department adjutant.

C. Harold Saidt, Trenton, director of public relations.

Arthur W. Mazowiecki, Clifton, past department commander.

Raymond G. Clyons, Hoboken, past department commander.

William C. Doyle, Burlington, past department commander.

Edmund G. Lyons, Clifton, past department commander.

Halsey W. Stickel, Maplewood, past department commander.

Joseph G. Carty, Plainfield, past department commander.

W. Rex McCrosson, Palmyra, past department commander.

Edward Wysocki, Frenchtown, chairman, rehabilitation-hospital committee.

Harry N. Weeks, Jr., Belleville, chairman, department membership committee.

Vincent A. Maher, Ridgefield Park, national legislative advisory committee.

Russell M. Pike, Maywood, department rehabilitation-hospital committee.

Ralph A. D'Olivo, Morristown, chairman, department policy committee.

Bernard W. Maxwell, Wildwood, president, New Jersey American Legion Convention Corporation.

The Construction Job Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Lt. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the Associated General Contractors, New York, N. Y., February 14, 1956:

THE CONSTRUCTION JOB AHEAD

Standing before you gentlemen, who represent the greatest industry of the greatest Nation in world history, one cannot help marveling at the vitality of America. Each nation at one period or another seems to have some outstanding characteristic, some national genius—as the Germans, for example, have been preeminent in music, and the English in seamanship. I think there can be little doubt that the genius of America is for technology and notably the technology of construction. The magical growth of our Nation has been a triumph of construction—construction of transportation systems, of industries, of cities, and of other facilities of indescribable variety, at a rate and on a scale that can be recorded in statistics but scarcely comprehended. Through our construction as through nothing else, we have manifested the tremendous vitality released by our system of free enterprise and our democratic institutions.

The very zest of life for all members of the Corps of Engineers is the part we have been able to play in the vast drama of American construction. As planners and engineers for envisioning requirements and designing economical public works of great magnitude to meet those plans, we have been partners with the contractors of America in providing facilities basic to national growth. Some $7 billion worth of civil-works projects have already been put in place by this Army engineer-construction industry team. These projects help protect the Nation's teeming river valleys from floods, provide water-transportation facilities that carry a substantial portion of the Nation's commerce, give us a growing measure of control over the flow and stability of our rivers in all seasons, and make important contributions to the national supply of electric energy. We are continuing to build such projects at the rate of about half a billion dollars every year.

At the same time, the corps is the agency through which you contractors are building mighty defenses to help guard the Nation against the unprecedented threats and dangers of this age. Since the outbreak of the Korean campaign alone some $7½ billion worth of military construction has been placed by the corps, some of it here in the United States, much of it scattered about the globe from near the Equator to near the North Pole.

The momentum and magnitude of this worldwide construction program doubtless will continue well into the future as far as we can discern and estimate. The military-construction program launched in 1950 is still more than a billion dollars away from completion and there is a constant net increase in total requirements each year. In fact, I do not believe that our defenses will be permanently completed when this particular program is finished; in these fast-changing times, construction for defense is likely to be a continuing task. And the

civil-works construction job is growing, to our concern, faster than we are building under budgetary limits. For example, in 1927 our active backlog of work on authorized but uninitiated or uncompleted civil-works projects totaled less than half a billion dollars. But today it has doubled and even trebled decade after decade over 30 years, has reached the staggering current total of $9 billion, and is still growing. Thus our close team relationship is a historic, necessary element in national life—a basic manifestation of national vitality.

Statistics help us measure, but cannot describe, the importance of that relationship. Our joint responsibility to the Nation is big because it is vital. Every one of the projects in our $9 billion active civil-works backlog represents a need by some American community or region for basic resource development to protect or support its continued growth. More than that, each project included in this huge backlog represents the survival of the fittest—that is projects carefully screened by the Corps for economic and engineering soundness from an even greater total of $12.5 billion authorized program. And national defense continually confronts us with demands for not only more construction, but new and different construction.

Ever since Korea we of the Armed Forces have been associated with you in the task of building, big and fast—to outrace all actual and potential rivals. And 1 by 1 you have mastered increasingly difficult tasks, and have brought new dimensions to our previous conceptions of size and speed and economy in construction. Now together we must open still another range of dimension in construction skill—we must revise our previous conceptions of construction precision. And that involves unprecedented problems for contractors in building the base facilities for our preparedness needs.

Our technology seems to call for constantly increasing precision in almost every field of workmanship. Our instruments must be more and more refined; our tooling and gages must measure to finer fractions of a millimeter; our control over technical processes, whether it be the aiming of a long-range missile or the guiding of a cutting edge, must be far closer than human senses alone can govern. Vital processes absolutely depend upon our obtaining this precision. Now in military construction too, we have reached the point where unprecedented precision is becoming necessary to the utilization of advanced equipment and arms. Operations vital to the national security and possibly to national existence depend upon obtaining this precision.

The reason, of course, lies in the increasing complexity of military equipment. Many of our aircraft, for example, are so constructed that the crew sit far forward of the landing gear. On a "hot" landing, every dip and dump in the runway surface is magnified into a rocking motion of the plane at the very instant the pilot needs maximum control. Furthermore, to cut down weight, modern planes make heavy structural use of relatively flexible hollow aluminum tubing, so that the rocking motion is augmented by a whip-action effect. A pilot taxiing a plane at 100 miles an hour—and many of them land much faster than that—must endure plus or minus 2½ "G's" of pressure from the vibrations of his plane alone. It is no wonder that the Air Force wants to do everything possible to cut down causes of motion and vibration. Unevenness in runways can mean the repeated loss of valuable equipment and priceless lives of highly trained air crews.

The establishment of longitudinal and transverse gradients for finished airfield pavements are not alone sufficient to insure a profile satisfactory for safe operations of modern high speed aircraft. It has become necessary to exercise closer control during construction of these pavements. Ordinary commercial standards and practices will not do. It is not sufficient to require airfield finished surfaces to be constructed to the normal smoothness requirements of one-eighth inch when tested with 10-foot straight edge within the deviations from established grades permitted in superhighway construction. It has been found necessary to limit the rate and frequency of the small irregularities in pavement surfaces. We will be requiring paving contractors to construct the finished pavement surfaces at airfields paved with portland cement concrete and bituminous concrete to within one-fourth and one-half inch respectively of the established gradeline at any one point with the further restriction that the algebraic difference from the established gradeline at 2 successive points 100 feet apart do not exceed the deviation specified above. Smoothness requirements will be controlled to one-eighth inch of 10 feet straight edge. A super deluxe job of design and construction must be done on these projects in order to meet the increasing demands of modern aircraft. These stipulations are established based on actual requirements and vital need.

The requirement for supersmoothness in runway construction is something that has come to the fore within the past 2 years as new aircraft began to come under test. It was, therefore, almost impossible to anticipate from any construction viewpoint in the past. Hence, our Government must now bear extra expense, our pilots must run extra risks, and our airpower operate under extra handicaps, until we can improve our facilities to meet newly arisen requirements. as we build for the future, we must try to provide work that will hold up not only against present requirements but against possible developments to come. Hence, I believe that we are seeing the beginning of a trend toward greater precision which will extend to much of our military construction.

When we hear and read about the arms race and the competition for superiority in armament, virtually all the attention seems directed to the planes and weapons themselves; too often little or no early consideration has been given to the base requirements of these implements. But it is beginning to appear that we may soon reach, if we have not already reached, the point where our ability to put new types of aircraft and missiles into the air will be determined in large part by the ability of the American construction industry and your colleagues in related engineering fields to provide the necessary construction support. Rockets as well as aircraft are going to impose unprecedented problems upon you. To the extent that this trend develops, our race for supremacy in military technology is going to focus squarely upon the relative ability of you men to outbuild your counterparts in other lands in all ways.

While we continue to hear of Russian gains in the technology of production, I doubt very much that the Russians or anyone else can begin to match us in the field of construction. Personally, I think there is a very important lesson to be gained in this respect from how we procure defense construction in America. Recently the House Armed Services Committee complimented the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks because, dollarwise, 83.5 percent of the Corps' contracts and 72.9 percent of the Bureau's contracts were entered into as a result of advertised open competitive bidding as compared with 5.81 percent of all other Department of Defense procurement.

Now I have heard justification for procurement by negotiation on the grounds that that is the only way you can get the right article and right price. This may well be so in the procurement of military hardware—but you can't get away from the fact that while the world, including our principal enemies, may be catching up with us on production, no one comes even close to touching us in speed and efficiency of construction. And, no one can convince me that the terrific competition in the construction industry isn't the real basis for our outstanding superiority internationally in the construction field.

I have heard some production men say that we should use more negotiated contracts in the field of construction. Admittedly it is not an easy task to write specifications that are sufficiently clear, comprehensive, and concise to permit competitive bidding. Moreover, it takes consummate skill and judgment to insure fairness to both the Government and to the industry as well as a willingness on the part of the Governmental construction agencies to accept increased vulnerability to public expression of criticism. But it can, and is, being done for construction and with transcendent results in our international competition situation.

It is not my business to advocate to you gentlemen that the Defense hardware program should or should not take a leaf out of construction's book in this respect, but I would like to say at this point that the construction industry could well take a great big wide leaf from the hardware manufacturer's books and bring about a better balance in the top level Defense management through the sponsorship of highly qualified construction men for high Defense Department positions. There are bankers, lawyers, engineers, and production men galore—the best America affords—among the high echelon of the Defense establishment, but there is a conspicuous scarcity of men whose backgrounds are primarily in the field of major construction. When you consider the big and vital part construction plays in defense these days, you must, inevitably ask yourself the question: What is the construction industry doing to carry its share of responsibility for giving this country the best guidance it can possibly muster for our defense?

Without discounting in the least the outstanding contributions made by veteran construction men, such as Mr. Roger W. Fulling, previously with DuPont, and now Director of Construction in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, and perhaps a few others, let me emphatically say to you that from where I sit, it is obvious that we need more men with long construction experience in top positions of the Defense establishment. We need you to prevent fragmentation of engineering and construction agencies; we need you to introduce practical construction considerations into foreign treaties which impose an imbalance on construction economies and time as compared to alleviation of other tensions; we need you to devise means whereby a fair share of the better engineers and construction men serve with the Armed Forces both in military and civil status; we need you to synchronize priorities of construction materials needed to permit the construction of facilities to keep abreast of weapons being produced, because hardware is given high priority inconsistent with priorities given the construction which must support such weapons. I could enumerate many other important and allied reasons why, in my opinion, the Defense establishment needs the help of outstanding construction men in the several secretariats. I strongly suggest that the AGC look into this matter, verify what I have said, and raise volunteers as an act of patriotism in time of need.

Well, at any rate, we are going to keep the competition high in defense construction and so we are going to ask you to play a part that may well be decisive to the air and arms supremacy of America by giving us means

that no one else can surpass for putting new types of craft and missiles into operation.

Related to the requirement for precision is a trend toward greater quality in many types of construction besides pavements. When our country launched its vast military construction program immediately after the outbreak of the Korean campaign, the major emphasis was on getting the most construction possible at minimum cost. As we review our experience with that program, we find that in many cases this has resulted in high eventual charges for such items as maintenance, repair and replacement of facilities that are proving increasingly unsatisfactory. Today all of us concerned with military construction must, in my opinion, think of better facilities, rather than cheaper construction. We want to save money, but not at the expense of quality. When we build living quarters, for example, that are not of a quality conducive to encouraging men to remain in service, we save construction money but risk loss of what is far scarcer and more valuable—trained, experienced men. In short, we can now document from experience something that I think all of us knew in a general way all the time—that when carried beyond a certain point, few things are as costly as a cheap construction.

In saying this, I do not mean that we are not as eager for economy as we have ever been. The longer the present period of uncertainty, tension, and change lasts in the world, the greater will be the burdens piled upon our government and our people, and the more necessary will the strictest economy be. But I believe that economy is now being more realistically related to higher standards of quality and workmanship.

Military construction is not the only field in which developments of significance to the Corps' construction program have occurred during the past year.

The effects of this year's floods in New England and California are going to reverberate through the Corps of Engineers for a long time. The New England flood was one of the most destructive natural disasters in American history, involving damages estimated conservatively as between 600 and 700 millions of dollars. The California floods, though tragically costly in both life and property, proved less destructive—thanks in part to the Federal flood control structures and related structures, including those of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Corps of Engineers' flood control structures, alone, prevented damage to the amount of $116 million. I am not going to dwell either upon the economic effects of the floods or upon the tragic loss of life and destruction they brought in their wake. But I would like to mention some of the preventive and remedial activities they evoked in the Federal Government.

In September 1950, the Congress passed Public Law 875 to provide "an orderly and continuous means of assistance by the Federal Government to the States and local governments in carrying out their responsibilities to alleviate suffering and damage resulting from major disasters * * *." In January 1953, President Eisenhower by Executive order delegated the administration of this law to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, Mr. Val Peterson. The relief operation after the New England floods—which we called Operation Noah—provided the first large-scale test of this law in action and the first major test of the coordination of Army engineer operations under the civil-defense framework, which until then had been a subject of much discussion and paper planning but virtually no field demonstration. Under Operation Noah, the Corps of Engineers within a matter of hours was able to mobilize a staff of civilian and military experts drawn from all over the eastern half of the country and as far west as Omaha, Nebr. Within a very few days, the construction resources of the region had been put to work restoring communications and other basic services. At peak strength, 3,365 mechanics and 1,423 items of heavy equipment were working on the reconstruction mission of the Corps. By the beginning of last December contract obligations had reached about $15 million, more than a thousand contracts had been completed, restoration work had been completed in 202 localities and was in progress in 178 more, 72 bridges had been removed and 223 bridges had been replaced, 35 dams had been repaired, 99 water and sewer systems had been put back in operation, channel work had been done at 237 locations, and the Corps of Engineers' part of the flood-relief job was about 67 percent complete. These figures attest the tremendous job done by the contractors and constructors of the flood area, who tackled their relief tasks with a speed and energy and skill of which your whole profession may be extremely proud.

Now, as the clean-up continues, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and the other Federal agencies upon which Civil Defense will call in case of emergency under Public Law 875, have been evaluating their Operation Noah experience with the view of working out more precise assignments and even better coordination of effort in case of future catastrophes in which the Corps might be called upon for assistance. These discussions are dealing with such matters as the setting up of operational plans in which the roles of local, State, and Federal bodies will be predetermined as far as possible, and the surveying of the construction and other resources that may be available to each. They should help to provide the people of the United States with something they have never had before—a nationwide rescue plan for application in case of emergency by governmental guidance and leadership of the construction industry.

Another significant development of the past year has been the increasing public concern over water resources, and particularly over the growing problem of municipal and industrial water supply. This concern was reflected in Congress, which authorized the starting or resumption of 102 new projects by the Corps of Engineers alone. These new projects, once launched, will continue in construction for a number of years. Furthermore, I feel that the launching of these projects may indicate the beginning of a trend which may continue into a period of acceleration in water-resources development. The need for such development has become impressive, as shown by our backlog of unbuilt civil-works projects, which I have previously mentioned, and there is every reason to believe that the people are becoming more and more alive to the need.

Although for 20 years—since 1936—we have been working under the flood control legislation enacted that year, there is no river basin in the Nation where the flood-control program is more than two-thirds complete. The terrible floods in the North Atlantic States, New England, and California have spurred the demand for protection not only in those regions but in every American river valley.

With the new starts provided this year, we are beginning work on projects needed to fill the main remaining gaps in our midcontinental trunk-line waterway system, constituted by the Mississippi system, but the development of many tributary and feeder lines into a true waterway network is hardly more than begun.

And the public is now becoming aware of a new facet to water-resources work—the fact that an assured, adequate supply of water for domestic and industrial use in our communities is absolutely necessary if our economy is to be sustained and further expanded. In fact, I believe that the constantly growing, inexorable nationwide demand for more and more water in the face of a constantly diminishing natural underground supply has now reached such proportions that the most critical single future water-resources problem facing the Nation is that of providing an assured adequate supply of water for domestic, industrial and other needs. The construction industry, though not as directly dependent on water supplies as many other industries, is nevertheless vitally affected by the problem, because water supply is becoming one of the main limiting factors which will impose ceilings on continued growth and building in many areas unless farsighted water supply programs are promptly undertaken. We have the estimate of the Paley Commission that no other single factor will be more important in determining the future locations of new industrial plants—and hence the centers of construction activity—than water supply.

It seems to me self-evident that an adequate water supply for the future will have to depend more and more upon the conservation of available surface water through the use of reservoirs constructed by the Federal Government, other governmental agencies, and private concerns. Primary responsibility for providing municipal and industrial water supply lies, and I believe should continue to lie, with the States and localities. But I also believe that the time has come for the consideration of legislation for Federal cooperation with State and local agencies in the solution of this problem—cooperation which can afford mutual economies and other advantages to both Federal and non-Federal interests. Whether or not such legislation is provided, I believe that water-supply projects will form an increasingly significant portion of the Nation's construction endeavors from now on.

Thus the teamwork and cooperation between the Corps of Engineers and the construction industry continues to play a most significant part in national life, whether in the support of national economy by basic civil-works developments, or in the protection of national existence by worldwide military construction. The preservation and perfection of our teamwork is a concern of utmost importance not only to ourselves, but, because of our vast joint responsibilities, to all the people of America.

And hence I am personally and officially gratified at the success of the task force meetings that have been held between representatives of your association and of the corps ever since 1949. The worth and success of these meetings is proven by the fact that they have continued and are increasingly productive. The suggestion of the AGC that they be held at the different divisional headquarters of the corps in rotation has proved a most happy one, and divisions that have not yet been visited are looking forward to their turns to become hosts. Although I have not been able to attend any of these divisional meetings personally, I attended the first meeting in Washintgon at your headquarters in June 1953, and I have followed their progress with interest and appreciation. Moreover, the corps was represented by the Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, Maj. Gen. Charles Holle, at the meeting in Washington last November at which the AGC group was headed by Mr. William DeButts.

We appreciate your continued support of the affiliated reserve units, including the support given by your magazine, the Constructor. We appreciate the fact you have given us that support not only during the exciting times of national emergency, but steadfastly through the ensuing years of cold war in which there is a natural tendency to let enthusiasm lapse and effort lag.

During this spring, some thousands of engineer troops that have been serving and training with the Air Force will be returned to Army control. A good many of them now are going to be trained here in the United States. These troops must be taught to con-

struct facilities and lay pavements adequate to support operations under combat conditions. That means that they cannot receive mere token training, but must obtain skill and practice by the actual construction of operation-worthy facilities.

I want to assure you, however, that our general policy will be, as always, to turn programed construction over to skilled and experienced constructors entitled to the work and able to perform it capably and economically—and I might add that the preponderance of it, dollarwise, will continue to be procured by competitive bidding. Of course, the Department of Defense directive and the Army regulations restricting the use of military construction units to projects that "clearly contribute to the training of the unit for the performance of its wartime mission" will be scrupulously observed, as they always have been. But these former Aviation Engineers were doing heavy construction in remote overseas islands or bases and they will be known as "heavy construtions battalions" under special technical supervision of the Chief of Engineers. They are D-Day units to be trained to a "T" for critically important defense missions for the Air Force and Army on the outbreak of an emergency. You gentlemen know that you can't train such a "storm unit" as I had in the Southwest Pacific by peeling potatoes or pouring sidewalks for the Service Club. There will be give of these units stationed across the southern part of the country, and I need and am fully counting on your support and cooperation in our assignment of proper training tasks to these ultra-important units.

In summary, it is apparent that the Army engineers and you American constructors are going to be working together for many years to come on jobs of increasing significance and difficulty, calling for the highest degree of mutual cooperation. We of the Army realize the problems involved in the tasks which confront us and the usual demands they impose upon you. If some of the demands of the Armed Forces seem extraordinary, it is only because the need is vital. We are counting on you to meet those demands. We on our part, in full understanding of the vital importance of your industry, will do everything in our power to help make our joint cooperation a mutually satisfactory, effective, smooth-working relationship.

For I believe that if we adhere to the tested and proven principles of competition and leadership—leadership to which you can contribute more and more as you play an increasing role in the actual guidance of Government and defense efforts—we can meet the Nation's need for greater precision, quality, economy, and fast-driving progress in all forms of construction enterprise. We can provide the Nation with the construction base it needs for meeting any kind of emergency and any kind of challenge, whether it be a challenge of nature or of international rivalry. I believe this, because I know the toughness, virility, and survival characteristics of American constructors, individually and collectively. You have never been beaten, and I know you will never allow yourselves to be beaten, in our field of national preeminence—construction technology.

Strength: The American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent statement of Syngman Rhee brings impressively before us the anomalous and ridiculous situation now obtaining in Korea.

As President Rhee points out, the Korean truce was no sooner made than it was broken. Americans will ponder a long time, I am sure, before they can agree about many aspects of the Korean truce but they certainly are alarmed by what has transpired since —in flagrant, cynical, ruthless disregard for the peace agreement. The evidence before us shows that the Chinese Reds and the Communists generally have conspired, and are still conspiring in violation of the terms of the truce to strengthen their air installations and armed forces in North Korea.

That they are also conducting a widespread campaign of espionage and infiltration in South Korea, sheltered and protected by the so-called truce team comprised of nations that are identified with the Communist bloc and hostile to the free world, appears to be established by available reports and statements from responsible sources.

President Rhee has spoken with force, propriety, and obvious justification, and the facts he set forth in his speech are undeniable. Whoever thinks that it will be possible to placate and appease the vicious Communist conspiracy is suffering a palpable delusion since placation serves only to embolden the overt acts of the conspirators, and appeasement, like surrender to blackmail, only leads to further brazen and impossible demands.

Strength of attitude, backed up by strength of arms and spirit, and strength of purpose to face all necessary risks, must be a firm cornerstone of American policy toward the Communist world.

Statement of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, on the Announcement of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

My guess for the past few months has been that the President would be a candidate. If he is a candidate, there is a deep obligation to our country that the people must consider. Even under conditions of peace, the work of the President is most trying. In these days of emergency, his responsibilities are magnified many times. One of the obligations of the people is to recognize that ours is a constitutional form of government, not a parliamentary or managerial one; that there is no substitute for the leadership of the President, particularly in the field of foreign affairs; that it is a 24-hour job and not a part time or limited or semirecreational one. While my guess has been that he would be a candidate, my individual opinion is that any man in his position, without regard to party, would exercise wise judgment in not being a candidate. For over and above the benefits to some members of his party in their campaigns for reelection, or even the Republican Party remaining in control of our Government, is a question of the national interest of our country. I doubt very much that if the President runs and is elected, that the responsible authorities of other free government will enter into any agreements in the field of international affairs that would be other than of a temporary nature from day to day or week to week. I doubt if they would enter into any long-term agreement. I realize he had a hard decision to make with the political and business pressures upon him, and while I respect his decision, nevertheless, from the angle of the country, I think his wise decision would have been not to be a candidate. Even as a candidate, and under the most favorable conditions to the Republican Party, I think he will not have more than a 50–50 chance of winning.

John Bond Trevor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country have sustained an immeasurable loss in the death last week of Mr. John Bond Trevor.

Throughout his life Mr. Trevor's capacity for leadership of the highest order was demonstrated in many fields, and his profession, his community, and his country were enriched by it. He was a great patriot and zealously supported his country's authority and interests. To that end he played a leading role in developing the immigration quota system which was established in 1924. For many years Mr. Trevor figured prominently in various patriotic groups and was the prime mover in the formation of the American Coalition, an organization of patriotic groups which investigated what it believed to be Fascist and communistic activities in the United States.

His advice and counsel was sought after not only by Members of Congress and Government officials but by men in high positions throughout our great country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of February 21 concerning this great American, which is as follows:

John Bond Trevor, a frequent adviser to congressional committees and a long-time advocate of immigration restrictions, died yesterday afternoon after a long illness at his home, 11 East 91st Street. His age was 77.

Mr. Trevor, a lawyer and industrialist who took an active part in public affairs, helped to devise the national origins quota system of regulating immigration. This system was incorporated into the immigration law in 1924. Thereafter, Mr. Trevor was active in defending the law against frequent criticism.

Mr. Trevor was the son of the late John B. Trevor and his second wife, the former Emily Norwood. He was born in Yonkers on November 19, 1878, and traced his ancestry to Thomas Willett, a mayor of New York; William Floyd, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and Col. Benjamin Tallmadge, a member of Washington's staff.

A 1902 graduate of Harvard College, Mr. Trevor received an M. A. degree from the university a year later. He entered Columbia Law School in 1903, was admitted to the New York bar in 1904 and received an LL. B. degree in 1906. In 1932 the University of Rochester conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

GOT LEGION OF HONOR

Mr. Trevor was a veteran of World War I and was decorated by France with the Order of the Legion of Honor. After the armistice in 1918, he was put in charge of military intelligence here.

Upon his discharge from the Army in 1919 with the rank of captain, Mr. Trevor was appointed special deputy State attorney general to assist the joint legislative committee. The agency, the so-called Lusk committee, was set up to investigate subversive activity.

In 1920, Mr. Trevor was named associate counsel of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to investigate Russian propaganda. The committee achieved the deportation of Luwig A. C. K. Martens, Soviet agent who tried to function as Ambassador without recognition.

Subsequently Mr. Trevor was influential in obtaining the adoption of the first immigration quota law and, in 1924, the permanent quota system. In 1927 he founded a citizens committee to defend the system.

HEADED AMERICAN COALITION

The committee developed into the American Coalition, an organization of patriotic societies. This group broadened its activities to include opposition to nazism, fascism, and communism. Mr. Trevor served many terms as its president until 1950. He actively opposed the recognition of the Soviet Union and sought alien registration, which was adopted during World War II.

Mr. Trevor was an active critic of the New Deal and an opponent of plans for world government or world federation. He made his views known by speeches at the New York Chamber of Commerce and through congressional testimony, newspaper articles, and books, and other activities.

The Sons of the American Revolution awarded to him its gold medal for Americanism in 1951.

Mr. Trevor served at various times as vice president of Paul Smith College of Arts and Sciences, as a trustee of the American Museum of Natural History and of New York University, and as commdoore of the St. Regis Yacht Club.

He is survived by his widow, the former Caroline Murray Wilmerding; 2 sons, John B. Trevor, Jr., and Bronson Trevor; and 5 grandchildren.

Power of Congress To Regulate Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent State Department pamphlet on OTC tends, I think, to minimize the power proposed to be lodged in this organization designed to control international commerce.

The question, however, this Congress must decide is whether it proposes to surrender its control over the regulation of foreign commerce and place it in the hands of an international body. Under present articles of the OTC agreement, it appears that this organization is set up to exercise definite control and regulation over the flow of international trade and would give the State Department rather than Congress the power to agree to any new obligations sought to be imposed upon us restricting the constitutional power of Congress to regulate our trade.

Under the proposed plan upon approval by Congress the OTC would thus be empowered to exercise regulatory powers over our tariffs and foreign commerce, and Congress in that event will have surrendered one of its fundamental constitutional prerogatives and obligations.

The State Department has already agreed in the GATT convention to eliminate certain import quotas and not to establish others.

It has also made agreements concerning tariff rates at specified levels and to maintain certain items on the free list.

By this action the State Department is in effect exercising specific constitutional powers and duties of the Congress. If congressional powers are exercised by Congress in the future in the face of agreements already entered into by this Government, it will lay the Congress open to charges of breaking international agreements. It is my conviction that the Congress should carefully scan our entire foreign-trade relations with a view to retaining its historic control of foreign trade and commerce. Congress, not the State Department or any other agency, should continue to exercise its constitutional power and duty to regulate foreign commerce of the United States.

Hon. Abe Stark, President of the Council of the City of New York, Receives Awards of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the formal presentation speech of Mr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, given on Monday, July 18, 1955, at which time the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and citation were bestowed on the Honorable Abe Stark, president of the council of the city of New York, in his office at city hall; and I also insert the acceptance speech of President Stark:

Mr. BAYERN. I have the privilege, pleasure, and honor, President Stark, of conferring upon you the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and citation, by direction of the board of dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. You are in very good company, in view of the fact that both former President Harry S. Truman and President Dwight D. Eisenhower have likewise been so honored by this famous foundation.

The foundation was established to further the political and moral values of the Americas by Gen. Eloy Alfaro, the Abraham Lincoln of Latin America, for whom the organization was named, and who, from 1895 to 1901 and from 1904 to 1911, was the President of the Republic of Ecuador.

Gen. Eloy Alfaro was known for his efforts to liberalize all countries of Latin America, and to improve educational standards and opportunities, both for the children and adults. On the political side, General Alfaro fought for liberty and American unity. He played a leading part in achieving the liberalization of oppressed Latin American nations and further cooperation among the countries of this hemisphere.

Furthermore, General Alfaro welded the factions of the Cuban Freedom Party together in December, 1895—3 years before the Spanish American War, when he publicly petitioned the Queen of Spain in a document demanding Cuban independence. In 1906, General Alfaro convened the International Congress in Mexico City, attended by representatives of Latin-American Nations, to discuss questions relating to progress and well being of the American states, based upon justice and fraternity under the public laws of the Americas.

Were General Alfaro alive today, he would be in the forefront of the fight to preserve for the Western Hemisphere the Pan American unity of freedom-loving people. He woud be a zealous supporter of the work and program of the United Nations, and he would leave no stone unturned to assure, for all the peoples of the world, that home and peace and good will to all men that is our common heritage from our common creator.

We are very fortunate, therefore, that we have a man of the stature of President Abe Stark, who is here to continue such ideals of democracy and in the belief that it was not from human hands but from the Great Creator that every man, woman and child inherits the inherent right of life, to human liberty, to happiness and equal opportunity. It is fortunate that the outstanding achievements and accomplishments of President Abe Stark are recorded for all the world to observe in a lifetime of service as a private and public spirited citizen, and as a public official in New York and throughout the Nation. We know of no one, who, by his public and private services, to mankind, has more fully and brilliantly earned this great honor.

A famous author, Mr. Ben Burroughs, must have had a vision of President Abe Stark when he wrote a sketch on The Richest Man. He said: "That the richest man in the world is He * * * Who has some one to love * * * A man who worships as he likes * * * and works for all he earns * * * a man who'll practice tolerance * * * and whose love of freedom burns * * * A man who is respected for * * * The goodness of his name * * * The one who lives an average life * * * without the quest for fame." Abe Stark is the personification of these attributes, which were so dear to General Eloy Alfaro during his lifetime.

In view of the foregoing, and in recognition as a leader of men and as a builder of boys, President Stark has demonstrated that success in private enterprise or in public affairs requires personal devotion, active intelligence and bold constructive vision, in our democratic society there will always be recognition afforded to men whose service is humanity and whose mission is mankind. President Abe Stark is New York City's outstanding example of a successful business executive in the field of public administration. Therefore, in recognition of his ex-

traordinary distinguished patriotic, philanthropic, religious and humanitarian services, it now gives me honor, happiness and personal pleasure to now carry the determination of the board of dignitaries into effect. I hereby present the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and citation of this famous foundation to President Abe Stark.

Mr. STARK. I am deeply grateful and greatly honored to receive the Grand Cross and citation of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama.

My appreciation is enhanced by the fact that while this beautiful presentation is being made, a conference of far-reaching magnitude is being held in Geneva by our leaders in their sincere endeavor to achieve a lasting peace.

General Alfaro, during his lifetime, and the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation have always striven to bring about better understanding among the people of the world, and to solidify the Americas.

I sincerely hope and pray that our leaders at Geneva will succeed in promoting the lasting peace, for which General Eloy Alfaro fought and died for in his efforts to bring about international accord. While liberty and freedom constitute the heritage of every American, nevertheless, we must ever be vigilant to preserve it and to protect it.

Please accept my sincere and grateful appreciation for this great honor bestowed upon me by the Board of Dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. I shall always cherish it as a coveted memento and an inspiration to accelerate my efforts in behalf of the people of the city of New York, and our country. Thank you very much, and may God bring in our time peace on earth and good will to all men.

Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo Recipient of World Brotherhood Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1956, under the auspices of World Brotherhood, Inc., Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States and chairman of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations, was presented the first annual World Brotherhood Award for service to the human community. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the address of General Romulo on that occasion:

My talk tonight has to do with various letters of the alphabet and the connection between those letters and the cause of human peace and freedom. Some of these letters are familiar, such as U. N., U. S. A., and U. S. S. R. Some are not so familiar but are rapidly becoming so. I refer in particular to IRBM, ICBM, and NW. What we do about these various letters, how we arrange them or rearrange them, will have more to do with the kind of lives we will live in the next decade or so than anything we may be doing as businessmen, or educators, or community leaders. Indeed, our decisions concerning the disposition of those letters may have a bearing on the question of human destiny.

IRBM stands for the intermediate range ballistic missile. ICBM stands for the intercontinental ballistic missile. NW stands for nuclear warfare. Put them all together and you have the triumph of hell on earth—made by man, directed by man, aimed at man.

The intermediate range ballistic missile is what the name implies—a device for carrying the hell bombs over fairly short areas—let us say, from any part of Europe to any other part of Europe. The intercontinental ballistic missile can carry the hell bombs from one continent to another. The ICBM has a range of 5,000 miles or more. If the polar route is used, there is no country in North America, Europe, or Asia that is not accessible to any other country on those three continents.

What speeds do the ballistic missiles attain? It is no military secret that they are faster by far than the speed of bullets. Faster, at least seven times faster, than the speed of sound. Faster, at least four times faster, than the revolution of the earth itself. The ICBM brings the United States and the U. S. S. R. within 20 minutes of each other. It also brings the human race within minutes of the kind of destiny that makes a man-fashioned farce of the gift of sacred life.

For neither is it any military secret that there is no real defense against the kind of war now impending. The interceptor system has yet to be devised that can adequately meet the threat of large numbers of these sleek engines streaking through space and carrying nuclear cargoes.

According to the best intelligence available, the ballistic missiles are now getting out of the experimental stage. According to the same intelligence, within 1 year sufficient numbers of these carriers will have been tested and ready for quantity production.

I have no way of knowing whether, as some reports have claimed, the United States is behind the U. S. S. R. in the development of these missiles. For the sake of the American people and of history itself, I hope and pray that it is not.

But let me make one thing clear. Even if, within a very short time, the free world were to catch up with and even pass the U. S. S. R. in its ICBM program, that by itself would not provide an adequate basis for world peace. For I believe that nothing is more dangerous or more insulting to the intelligence than the theory, which one often hears these days, that the peace we seek can be created out of mutual terror.

I believe in military preparedness. Make no mistake about that. I don't want the free world to fall behind in any single respect in terms of military strength. But it is a serious weakness to believe that military preparedness by itself can safeguard the cause of peace and civilization.

The only justification for armaments in a free society is to serve as the shield behind which we can press forward with the great ideas that can in time dispose of force itself.

Let me repeat: The world is perhaps 1 year away from a point of no return. At the end of that time, we will either have in being a fully functioning system of workable and enforceable control over the alphabet of the apocalypse, or we shall be locked into a period of sleepless waiting as the tensions and apprehensions mount toward their climax.

That is why I say that nothing is more irresponsible or more dangerous to the cause of human life on this planet than the notion that a system of mutual terror can give us peace. The very existence on either side of ultimate weapons places such a premium on surprise attack as to create trigger thoughts and trigger fingers. Terror makes for fear. Mutual terror makes for mutual fear.

Human life requires and deserves something more substantial than mutual fear and terror for its foundations.

I am sure I do not have to remind anyone that the ICBM and nuclear weapons do not exist in the best of all possible worlds. They exist in the context of national rivalries, in the context of basic national insecurity, in the context of a period of world revolution, in the context of aggression that has already taken place, in the context of powerful upheavals involving more than 1,300,000,000 human beings—more than half the human race—who are coming up out of more than a century of indignity but who are not quite certain where they should now go or what the light is that will guide them.

All these things are happening today. The notion that the main challenges and upheavals of our age can be kept free of explosions through a system of mutual terror is, again I say, not merely a thoughtless concept but an evil one. It is evil because it is morally repugnant. It is evil because it says in effect that man's destiny can only be shaped by and is dependent upon force. It represents, this incredible theory does, the ultimate attack on the affirmative nature of man—his ability to mobilize his intelligence, his spirituality, his imagination, and his courage for the attainment of great ends.

Ten years ago, when the United Nations Charter was being considered at San Francisco, my Government came to the conference with both hopes and apprehensions.

Our hopes were for a world in which the imagination and intelligence of man could be turned to the making of the finest age yet known in history. We felt that the same energies that had been demonstrated in war could be used in the conquest of scarcity and human misery. There was nothing beyond man's reach. He could reclaim the wastelands. He could tap the basic energy of the sun. He could turn to the seas for new sources of raw materials. He could liberate himself from drudgery. He could educate his children. He could embark on the vast adventure of self-fulfillment.

Our apprehensions were that very little of this promise might be realized because the nations at San Francisco would be so preoccupied with purely national problems that they wouldn't have time to lift their heads high enough in order to sniff the cool, brisk air of a new age. We were afraid that the nations were so locked in the past, so tied to outworn concepts of how best to achieve security, that they would repeat errors instead of learning from them.

And of all the obsolete concepts, none was greater or more damaging than the notion that we could avert another world war without world law. This was the idea that the United Nations could exist side by side with the kind of unfettered national sovereignty that made aggression possible and indeed inevitable.

I believed at San Francisco and still believe today that our best chance for peace—indeed, our only chance for peace—is by making of the United Nations an organization with powers adequate to prevent aggression, adequate to control civilization-smashing weapons, adequate to deal with the basic causes of war, adequate to raise the standard of world justice, adequate, finally, in terms of the human individual himself.

Please don't let me give you the impression that mine was the only government at San Francisco that expressed its hopes for a creative peace. Not for a second would I withhold credit from many of my colleagues whose hopes were no less real than my own, or whose apprehension were no less severe.

The inability of San Francisco to create a United Nations which could replace the world anarchy left by the Second World War can be traced, I believe, to the following reasons:

1. There was a strong conviction at San Francisco that the world's peoples were not yet sufficiently advanced in their thinking to support a world organization with adequate authority to make and enforce world law. My conviction then and now is that

the world's peoples will respond to inspired leadership precisely on questions of world law.

2. The United Nations created at San Francisco represented a solidification of the status quo existing at the end of the war. Peace was never really created at the end of the war; all the uncertainties, unresolved issues, and hanging questions were left as they were. The United Nations was superimposed on the existing complexities and tensions without any real authority to deal with them. The best the U. N. could do was to try to keep a very bad situation from becoming worse. But bad situations tend to get worse in the absence of proper plans or means to deal with them. The range of the U. N.'s effectiveness was thus limited to the juggling of explosive situations.

3. The implications of a two-power world were never fully appreciated at San Francisco. It was mistakenly assumed that the only thing required for peaceful relations between the United States and the U. S. S. R. was for both countries to live and let live. But the live-and-let-live theory had never worked in history whenever two powerful nations faced each other across a power vacuum. In 1945, the world between the United States and Soviet Russia represented such a vacuum. It was inevitable that each state would consider this vacuum in the light of its own ultimate security. The vacuum would be especially tempting to a country such as the U. S. S. R. with its powerful ideological drive and its historic ideological claims concerning world revolution. But even without respect to ideology, competition was inevitable in terms of the long-range security interests of both nations.

San Francisco never really faced up to this issue. The failure to do so took the form of easy rationalizations. It was said that if the United States and U. S. S. R. couldn't agree, then a stronger U. N. was impossible. And if they could agree, a stronger U. N. wasn't necessary.

If we are to accept this logic, then it would be equally logical to dispose of the United Nations altogether For if the peace is to be dependent on agreement between the giants, then why a U. N. in the first place? The only real justification for a U. N. is to define the rules of the game binding on all and transcending the interests of the individual nations. If each nation is to be allowed to define for itself its place in the international traffic pattern, anarchy results. Moreover, the very absence of workable world organization makes it necessary for each State to look after its own security. This means not only an armaments race but a competition for military bases, with jockeying for position and everything that goes with it. Therefore, a world organization has the job of eliminating this competition for security, by guaranteeing the territorial integrity of all nations, by defining a code for the proper behavior of those nations, and then making sure the code is enforced.

In short, it is precisely because there were competing ideologies in the world—precisely because there could be no fundamental agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union—that it became necessary for the world organization to interpose itself between the two, and substitute enforceable law for international drift and accident.

These, then, were the three principal reasons why the organization fashioned at San Francisco lacked the muscle and the mandate to fulfill the hopes of the world's peoples for an enforceable peace.

The obvious question, of course, to be asked is whether the U. S. S. R. would ever have agreed to binding commitments at San Francisco.

It is most probable that the Soviet would have promptly and vigorously objected. But I believe the goal should have been defined nevertheless. I believe, too, that the Soviet could not have afforded to have alientated itself from world public opinion on an issue clearly involving the welfare and safety of the world's peoples. I believe that a timetable for true world security, with a step-by-step long-range strengthening of the United Nations to achieve the necessary powers—I believe that this approach was at least worth the effort. This is what I mean when I say that the affirmative definition of necessary goals is where genuine security begins.

But all this is now behind us. Whatever went wrong at San Francisco or in the years that followed, we are confronted with the need to deal with the present.

Complex though the present situation may be, it is not beyond human comprehension or control. Certain facts cannot be disputed. Within a year—2 years at the most—the armaments race will reach its climax.

The time, therefore, to attempt to meet the problem is now.

I believe that the full General Assembly of the United Nations should consider this matter at its next general session. It should undertake the most thorough examination of all the implications of the ICBM in the context of developing world tensions. This issue should have right-of-way over all others.

The General Assembly can consider the fundamental problems concerned with the control of the planet-shattering weapons. When we do that, we will automatically be considering the control of war itself, for what is required to take care of the first will also take care of the second.

The U. N. must consider, in short, the big questions that will ultimately have to lead to a charter review conference—how to win the support of the overwhelming majority of the world's peoples for a United Nations with responsible authority; how to prevent aggression; how to deal with conspiracy on the world level; how to insure world justice; how to safeguard human existence.

The agenda is survival. And even as the debate begins, there is one measure that can be taken that can give point to the debate and conceivably win the world a little time. We can put knowlegde to work. The U. N. can take the initiative in bringing about a public accounting of armaments.

Knowledge about arms, universally held, could reduce unwarranted fears. It could warn of attack. It could provide a basis for control agreements among nations as the essential prelude to world arms laws. It could disclose violations of control agreements and laws. Knowledge about arms, universally held—this is what can be done now.

This is no substitute for the mutual inspection and control that must come. But as an essential step toward this goal, information becomes important. The pace of modern warfare is so swift that collection of warning information must be under U. N. control. for results must be fed directly to defensive and retaliatory forces.

Specifically, the U. N. should be able to undertake its own program to collect, evaluate, and disseminate to all member nations fullest information on world armaments. And national intelligence and inspection efforts must be fitted into a U. N. context.

First, a United Nations Arms Information Agency could immediately evaluate all publicly available data on the forces of each country and issue estimates of each nation's armaments. It is not generally recognized what reliable estimates can be made from published information. The work of private organizations which publish detailed data on the world's military forces can be cited as examples of what can be done with so-called open sources of information. Agencies of the U. N. already publish voluminous estimates of national economic resources. Should not the U. N. begin studies of national armaments with similar vigor?

In addition to open sources, arms information could be collected by the U. N. in other ways:

Any mutual inspection agreements between nations should provide that the U. N. receive copies of information gathered by participating nations. U. N. ground-inspection teams could supplement national inspectors at agreed control points, just as the U. N. is now doing in Korea and may soon do in Palestine.

Nations having aerial reconnaissance forces should be requested to place small units under the operational control of the U. N. agency, and arrangements could be made for the U. N. to take responsibility for aerial inspection of those areas of the world not covered by reciprocal national surveys.

The U. N. could participate in the earth-satellite program and other scientific efforts associated with the international geophysical year where such activities might develop opportunities to collect data on world military forces as well as scientific information. The U. N. should itself operate the reconnaissance satellites soon to encircle the earth.

The U. N. should call on individuals and private organizations throughout the world to cooperate directly in reporting arms information of all kinds. This focus for the loyalty of the world's peoples is a necessary part of any system to enforce subsequent arms agreements.

This proposal, therefore, calls for the U. N. to begin now to report regularly to the world on the development, testing, production, and possession of arms. Accurate, complete, and universally available arms data can soon become the basis for U. N.-sponsored effort to achieve world arms controls and reduction.

I am certain that no one will regard this proposal as an end in itself. The end, of course, can only be a United Nations wise enough and strong enough to bring to our planet a rule of law and justice. And justice involves not merely the careful and precise operation of legal machinery. It involves the passionate concern for the human individual, making life as meaningful and purposeful as the human potential will permit. For safety and security are not enough. The fulfillment of the human potential remains today, as it has always been, the main business of the human race.

Prayer for Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the prayer-for-peace movement inaugurated several years ago by Hon. Herve J. L'Heureux, outstanding member of the United States Foreign Service and veteran of World War II, continues to grow and to spread throughout the world.

It is based on the efficacy of prayer in solving current international problems and would establish an international custom whereby all men, women, and children who believe in God "would pause for 1 minute in the midst of their daily tasks, at 12 o'clock noon each day and, raising their hearts and minds toward God, ask him to help us adjust our international differences to enable the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace.

Since it was established in 1948 this movement has made very impressive progress in many nations. Unique in the fact that it does not embrace any organizational form but merely promotes

and urges universal prayer, it is fully understandable that it should compel the interest and acceptance of very large numbers of people of all denominations who have basic faith in the Prince of Peace. The movement is all-embracing as to believers in the Almighty and is not confined to any sect, denomination, nation, or race.

Having served loyally and faithfully in our armed services, and so ably and efficiently in our Foreign Service, Mr. L'Heureux possesses a wealth of ability, knowledge, and experience to conduct this movement. All lovers of peace, and all believers in God, applaud him for his unselfish devotion to the best ideals of religion and democracy. That he, above all others, should have had the inspiration, the zeal, the idealism, and selflessness to join with his service comrades to initiate Prayers for Peace, compels our admiration and our own prayerful associations.

The lines are drawn in the fearful struggle between East and West, between atheism and faith in God, between despotism and freedom, between Red imperialism and democracy. For reasons that are inherent in the philosophy and strategy of Marxist communism the world is racing madly toward another welter of blood and destruction that threatens civilization. Up to this time, the instruments of enlightened mankind, argument, persuasion, diplomacy have failed to check this ghastly race. It may well be, as has often been the case in history, that prayer, faith, brotherhood, and good works may accomplish what statesmanship has failed to achieve.

If people everywhere, individually and collectively, could be persuaded to turn away from materialistic concepts and practices which have taken hold of much of the world and return to their basic belief in the omnipotence, goodness, and mercy of the Lord, the great problems which now confuse and enthrall most of mankind might be solved.

There is more than a ray of hope in the current world situation. Despite the ruthless Communist conspiracy, many good, sincere, devout people throughout this Nation and the world, still are possessed of religious faith and belief, still worship the Almighty and repose confidence in Him. Even in the great Soviet Empire, notwithstanding the antireligion and persecution practiced by Marxism, millions and millions of people still hold firm to their religious beliefs and challenge the infamous doctrine that religion is merely an opiate.

If prayers for peace could be spread throughout the world to reach into the hearts and minds of believers, a great chorus of prayers for peace would echo through the world and, in time, would soften and chasten those now engaged in spreading international hatred, promoting the fires of revolution and war.

Mr. L'Heureux and his group are making a noteworthy contribution to the cause of peace. They are entitled to the respect, the gratitude, the encouragement, and support of all who earnestly seek peace, believe in the power of the living God, and hold fast to the ideal of human freedom. If this movement continues, it could well bring mankind together in a great unity of faith, and open the door to universal peace, prosperity, and happiness for the world.

But the Law Requires It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 27, 1956:

BUT THE LAW REQUIRES IT

Two notable visitors to Hawaii recently have expressed amazement that the sugar and pineapple industries are negotiating for contracts with a union whose regional representative and spokesman has been convicted under the Smith Anti-Communist Act.

The union is the ILWU and the chief negotiator for it is Jack W. Hall, one of the "Hawaii Seven" convicted on June 19, 1953, in a Federal court trial here; convicted on the first ballot.

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, Democrat, was the first to draw attention to this situation. He said he will seek Federal action under a 1954 law to deny the union the services of the National Labor Relations Board so long as it continues to accept Communist leadership.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell likewise was critical of the situation. He points out that action to correct is the responsibility of the Justice Department, and not his department.

Meanwhile some Democratic spokesmen here, conveniently ignoring the fact that it was Representative WALTER, a Democrat, who first raised the issue, are accusing Secretary Mitchell and Governor King of waving the Red flag because of their references to the local situation.

Industry representatives don't like it. But they are powerless to do other than they have been doing until the Federal Government moves in, as it has against the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers (independent) and the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, both ousted from the CIO at the same time the ILWU was because of alleged Communist domination.

In the preliminary legal skirmishing in the case of the miners' union, the Government has won every round. The next step is a hearing by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Legal decisions in the case of the electricians also have gone against the union to date.

With the precedent of these two unions to guide it, the Federal Government could move against the ILWU.

Federal action to challenge the ILWU leadership has been too long delayed. Congressman WALTER, a Democrat, doesn't like it. Secretary Mitchell, a Republican, doesn't like it. We of Hawaii don't like it, either. But so long as the Federal law requires industry to bargain with union representatives who are chosen by union members, employers must accept such representatives. Sometimes that is fine; sometimes it isn't.

Why the Farmer Isn't Flourishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article, by Russell Lord, entitled "Why the Farmer Isn't Flourishing," brings to mind some of the terrible things that happened to our agriculture before and during the depression years.

The Democratic administration succeeded after long years of struggle and fighting to get adequate and good legislation through both Houses. The present administration would like to have you forget all these trials and tribulations and sink down to a position of complacency and accept the program of Secretary of Agriculture Benson which cannot work, and would weaken and destroy the work so far accomplished by the preceding administration.

The article follows:

[From the Saturday Review of February 25, 1956]

WHY THE FARMER ISN'T FLOURISHING

"If a man were porter of hellgate," says the clown in Macbeth, "He should have old turning of the key. * * * Here's a farmer that hanged himself on the expectation of plenty; come in time; have napkins enough about you; here you'll sweat for't."

The jibe was probably an old one even then, as old as commercial agriculture. A big crop brought a low price. From lean yields the farmers were the first to eat and the first to profit. Historically, and for the long pull, the primary producers of food and fabric appear to thrive best in years of short supply, war, deprivation, and calamity. So it seems at least to the urban eye; and if in generally sunnier times of peace and plenty farmers are the first to go through the wringer of deflation, there is still a considerable tendency to let them sweat for it.

They sweated for it here in the 1920's. In the 12 long years from 1920 to 1932, farm foreclosures, normally 3 or 4 to the 1,000, went up to 30 foreclosures for every 1,000 farms; and more than a million farm families were dispossessed. Then everything went to smash, or just about. Between 1929 and 1935 employment in industry went down 37.5 percent; payrolls went down 58 percent. Prices paid farmers, already low, sank further. By 1932 farm buying power was down to only about 60 percent of what it was before the First World War.

This is remembered; and now that the some 22 million people who still depend directly upon farming for most of their living are again the first great occupational group to feel, quite sharply, the pinch of a postwar or interwar deflation, the enlarged and reassembled proposals of both moderates and liberals in both major parties are of a scope that would have seemed incredible in 1925.

The new books and pamphlet before me, I think it fair to designate as timed, entirely properly, to the approach of an election year. Murray R. Benedict's Can We Solve the Farm Problem? is subtitled "An Analysis of Federal Aid to Agriculture." It is a work of permanent value, historical in method, conservative in tone. The product of a group study

undertaken in 1951, the analysis is balanced in the final chapter by a critical composition of the whole Committee on Agricultural Policy, and some individual notes of protest. Examples of the latter:

"What about the 'surplus' of farm people? * * * What [other] jobs are available? What training will be needed? What help in moving and job hunting will be required?

"What is plainly needed is a program to improve diets and stimulate consumption both at home and abroad. We should be experimenting boldly with food stamps, with expanded school lunches, with better marketing devices, and with other methods to keep abundance from becoming a curse."

A like line of protest is more aggressively developed by Leon H. Keyserling and a study staff of the Conference on Economic Development. Their pamphlet, Full Prosperity for Agriculture, is an able and eloquent presentation of the liberal or leftward of moderate approach to full production and full employment. As more or less unreconstructed New Dealers, Mr. Keyserling and his associates regard present administration farm policies as negative, timid, and inhumane:

"Current farm policies stem from the thesis that the surpluses of farm commodities reflect surplus farm production plant; that the contrived deflation of farm income will reduce the farm plant and population; that less farm output will automatically raise farm prices and income; and that those forced out by the process will either land on their feet or have only their own inefficiency to blame if they land on their heads. * * * This is a sad throwback to the method by which other surpluses—including a labor surplus—were cured a generation ago. * * * The great progress of our general economy during the past quarter-century from boom and bust to improved stability, and from inhumanity to conscience, has rejected this mythology."

If there be campaign material in this for the year ahead it will center, I imagine, on the designation of farm deflation as contrived and in part effected by present elaborations of the governmental apparatus set up in the 1930's for farm relief. Can it be true that now, instead of simply plowing down every third row of cotton, we are contriving to plow every third little-farm family off the land and into the streets? I think not. I think that the initial Agricultural Adjustment Administration, for which I worked, was not contrived to strengthen the position of the "haves" among farmers and crowd out those of lesser means; but it probably did so unwittingly, by and large, and to that extent hastened accelerating forces of displacement. About one-fourth of our people were farming in 1930, as compared to one-third in 1915. Now only about one-sixth are farmers, and soon it will be one-tenth. Mechanization and high capital costs make this inevitable. It costs about as much now to buy and equip an adequate farm plant—$50,000 or more—in most parts of this country as it did to start a country bank a generation ago.

The years of our farm pioneering have not ended, but our initial and too brutal concept of soil-mining for insatiable markets has changed. American farmers take far better care of the land now than they did when the first farm programs started; and that is one clear gain. Another gain, not always as clearly discernible, lies in a growing recognition that surplus problems, both as to goods and jobs, are not simply economic problems; they are moral problems. And throughout the past third of a century, particularly, we have sought more strenuously, boldly, and ardently than any other people in history to modify and conduct the profit system so that a balanced abundance of farm products may be more decently maintained and shared.

Confusion on Middle East Is Blamed on Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune carries an article by David Lawrence concerning the confused situation in the Middle East. I have asked permission to include this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, because I believe it places in true perspective the recent testimony of Secretary of State Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The article follows:

CONFUSION ON MIDDLE EAST IS BLAMED ON DEMOCRATS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—The United States and her allies are determined to preserve the territorial integrity of Israel and to use physical force if necessary to do it.

This is the big news of the Middle Eastern situation. It was made plain enough to the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but, instead of recognizing its significance, some of the Democrats played a disgraceful game of politics and attempted to badger the Secretary of State. They preferred to give the Communist world the impression that American councils are divided, wavering, and without resoluteness.

There is a good chance of achieving peace in the Middle East if all Americans, irrespective of party, will get behind the policy laid down by the United States and her allies. This was first given public emphasis in a statement issued just after Prime Minister Eden visited President Eisenhower in Washington a few weeks ago. But the other day Secretary of State Dulles amplified it significantly to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he said:

"By our pledges, of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, we have undertaken to stand ready to put our power behind a United Nations action to save Israel. After all, Israel is a creature of the United Nations. The armistices were negotiated by the United Nations. There is no country in the world which has as strong a call upon the United Nations as the State of Israel has, and we believe that if the members of the United Nations will put their strength behind the United Nations' action to save Israel, that is a far better assurance for Israel than if we get into an arms race, because any amount of arms which Israel can buy from the United States can be topped, like that, by more arms which the Soviet Union will plow into the situation, and you get into an arms race which Israel cannot possibly win, because Israel, with a population of about 1,700,000 and a very small area, cannot absorb arms comparable to what can be absorbed by the surrounding Arabs, with their capacity to absorb arms, now that they have access to the arsenals of the Soviet Union."

MORE IMPORTANT NEWS

This text should have been widely disseminated by all the press services. It was more important news than the picayunish and captious questions of Democrats seeking political publicity at the expense of their nation's interest.

For the American policy in the Middle East is firm and unequivocal. It proclaims that action will be taken either within or without the United Nations.

This could mean military force as a last resort and a blockade of the Middle East area by allied naval forces. But before such a contingency is ever reached, Mr. Dulles pointed out to the Senators, the lead would be taken by the United Nations, adding this important comment:

"Now, if that lead were balked by Soviet veto, then we would face another problem, either of going to the General Assembly and seeking action there, because you may recall that in 1950 there was adopted a so-called uniting-for-peace resolution, which provided that if there was a veto in the Security Council which prevented giving aid and assistance in the event of aggression, then a special meeting of the General Assembly could be called on 24-hours' notice to deal with the problem.

"So that there are various alternatives that we have in mind that might be availed of if there were aggression, and if there was a veto in the Security Council so it could not invoke assistance to the victim of aggression."

DISPUTE WITH DULLES

Notwithstanding this forthright expression of American policy—which should be a warning to Soviet Russia, too—certain Democratic Senators chose to belittle the efforts of the Secretary of State and argue with him on the intangible question of whether the Soviets are or are not changing their global policies and propaganda. It was an excursion into the realm of abstraction.

These tactics are the usual story of selfish partisanship taking hold, in a political year, above patriotism and the national interest. The opposition parties in the British and French Parliaments are afflicted with the same disease. Millions of American voters are to some extent to blame because they elected a Democratic Congress in 1954 and served notice that for 2 years at least there would be a divided Government.

It's a sad state of affairs to find so many of the Democrats playing politics with human tragedy. In the end they will succeed in encouraging the Communists to take chances in the Middle East, and the result might be war or a crisis that could easily bring on war. This is a time for forbearance and the avoidance of partisanship.

The Soil-Bank Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is presently engaged in an extended debate on the farm bill, S. 3183. This bill was recently reported to the floor by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of whom Senator ELLENDER is chairman. Many amendments will be offered to this bill on the floor, and no one can say definitely at this time just what the bill will look like when the Senate has finished its deliberations.

The bill as reported out by the Senate committee is a great improvement over the bill which contained nothing but the soil-bank provisions, because S. 3183 provides for price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities during 1956 and 1957. And in addition, it gives a little much-needed relief to the hard-

pressed dairy farmer of this country by raising the support level of dairy products from the present 75 percent computed under the new formula to 80 percent computed under the old formula. Even these improvements leave much to be desired because the bill provides no relief whatsoever to the producers of beef, pork, poultry, fruit, and vegetables. Any sound legislation which will result in lifting agriculture out of the present depression and give farmers an income permitting them to pay their interest, taxes, operating costs, and still have anything approaching an American standard of living, must include an equalization payment direct to the producer, covering the difference between the price for which nonstorable commodities sell on the open market and 90 percent of parity. Anything less than the above is not approaching the problem in a realistic manner and will only result in failure to cure agriculture's greatest illness. There is no way to avoid the problem. Prices of farm products are too low. The farmer's share of the national income is too little. His share of the consumer's dollar is now less than 40 cents. Nothing but price supports will cure this situation.

The so-called soil bank has some merit as a conservation measure, but it will prove absolutely inadequate as a measure for restoring income and purchasing power to agriculture. The soil-bank measure, without adequate price supports, is much like a house without a foundation or a tractor without a motor.

The soil-bank plan is in two sections. The first section provides for the establishment of the soil bank which must be taken out of allotments; this is the acreage that will be retired for pay. The farmer will be required to enter into a contract with the Secretary covering, not less than a 3-year period and he will be required to establish the fact that he will be in control of this land for the duration of this contract. Most tenants operate under a year to year tenure, so this provision would make ineligible a tenant with only a 1-year lease, and might easily lead to the landlord pushing his tenants off the land and leasing to the Government whatever allotments he had. The ceiling on payments, as established in this bill, is $750 million per year, with 5 million farms in the United States, this would give an average payment of $150 per farm. It is true many farmers would get more than the $150 average—but that would also mean that many farmers would get much less than $150.

The soil bank would not release farmers from complying with their allotments because it is stated on page 7, beginning with line 15:

To be eligible for such compensation, the producer shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotments within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe.

Again on page 21, beginning with line 14:

No person shall be eligible for payments of compensation under this act with respect to any farm for any year, in which the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity exceeds the farm acreage allotment for that commodity under title 3, of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended.

So it is evident that the soil bank must be established out of allotments that are already so tight that it pinches. This provision is the same as the Holland amendment which Congress repealed last year; which simply means, if this bill is enacted as written, no farmer will be eligible for a payment under its provisions in any way—if he happens to overplant the acreage allotment on any crop.

The No. 2 soil bank provided for in this bill and referred to on page 16, as "Conservation reserve goal" is an acreage to be set aside and taken out of production by the farmer in addition to the soil bank which comes out of the farm allotments. The acreage taken out of his allotments, as well as the general acreage retired under the conservation goal, cannot be used during the life of the contract for any productive use whatsoever. The legislation provides that unless put under water—that means under dams, or set out in forest trees; it must have a cover of grass, and/or legumes established and maintained on this reserved acreage. Weeds must be kept mowed and brush controlled. No use can be made of the forage crop. It can neither be grazed, mowed for hay, nor can grass or legume seed be harvested from it. In most cases, it will need to be fenced to prevent grazing and the term of the contract proposed in the bill cannot be less—but may be more—than 3 years. The payment for this conservation acreage is limited to an average of $70 per farm per year, and must include the acreage assistance the Secretary would provide toward establishing and maintaining the cover on this land—the expense of fencing it, and so forth.

How long would a family-type farm survive on a little soil-bank payment if its operator must continue to sell the products of that farm at from 50 to 70 percent of parity, as he is doing in many cases today It should not be forgotten that the first year in which this administration and Secretary Benson began to administer agricultural programs, namely 1953, was the first time in 11 years that the average price paid to the producer for all food and fiber produced on American farms was less than 100 percent of parity. Our old farm programs, properly administered, held the price of farm products at or above parity for 11 years—but the sliding scale farm program adopted by this administration and its Secretary of Agriculture, reduced the American farmer to his present plight in a 3-year period. The Secretary is still fighting every proposal which would raise the farmer's income and restore his purchasing power.

What diversified farmer has any considerable acreage he can financially afford to take out of his present allotment for rent to the Federal Government? I am appending to these remarks an article appearing in the current issue of the Ozarks Mountaineer. This article was written by Fred V. Hinkle, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, stating his views on the agricultural situation. I commend the article to my colleagues for their reading and study. It follows:

FARM PROGRAM NO HELP TO REGION

(By Fred V. Heinkel, president of Missouri Farmers Association)

It is a far more simple matter to put ships in mothballs than it is farms.

The President has recommended a two-point soil-bank program. The first part is designed to take cropland out of production with the idea that our grain surpluses might disappear. The second part is aimed at taking marginal land out of production, and is a long-haul proposition. It would plant these marginal acres in trees or subject them to other conservation practices.

The President's message is encouraging in that he shows he realizes there is a farm depression and that the farmer's problems can be best solved by Government action. He stressed that Government should accept the responsibility.

The primary fault of the President's proposal is its failure to recognize the real farm problem. That problem is low income—not surpluses. By law the surpluses are insulated from the market and cannot be sold in this country for less than 105 percent of the support price plus storage charges.

The idea that if support prices are abandoned, the surplus will vanish, has found its way into the thinking of persons who have not checked the records.

During the twenties when general prosperity was at a high level, farm products brought less than a living wage to their producers. There were no support prices then, yet the ruinous prices were attributed to overproduction.

Sliding supports have aggravated the situation. In a desperate effort to meet increased expenses, farmers have worked harder and produced more. You never did hear of a farmer not planting his full quota of wheat just because support prices had dropped and his wheat was worth less than before.

The Salina (Kans.) Journal in an editorial stated: "In proposing the soil-bank program, the administration in effect has scuttled the flexible-support scheme—although it may not want to admit it. If the flexible scheme is not to be relied upon to reduce production, then the reason for lowering the loan price has ceased to exist. The immediate question is a subsidy for ailing agriculture. Considering the need, the subsidy might as well be adequate."

THE PRESIDENT'S SOIL-BANK PLAN DOESN'T HELP THE OZARKS

Is the soil-bank proposal adequate to help Ozark farmers? A reduction in grain acres certainly will not help milk prices.

Our Ozark farms are not much of a factor in creating the grain surpluses. About all the grain that is grown in this area is fed to livestock—in fact, it is necessary to ship in additional grain each year for feed purposes.

Instead of selling cash grain, most Ozark farmers market their row crops when they sell their hogs, milk, butterfat, beef cattle, poultry, eggs, lambs, and wool. The livestock farmer is "left out" so far as the soil-bank proposal is concerned. In Missouri between 70 and 75 percent of income from farm marketing is from livestock.

Most Ozark farms are family-size operations. If these small farmers are compelled to reduce present crop acres, they will not be able fully to utilize their time or their equipment. Both the farmer and his equipment will become partially unemployed.

Many young men get started in farming by the renter route. They purchase machinery and rent additional land until they can save enough money to purchase more acres. It is likely that 100 percent of the Government soil-bank payment would be more attractive to the landlord than 50 percent of the crop he would receive as rent. What will happen to our young people? We don't want them all to move to the cities.

Most of our surplus grain in Missouri is grown in the river and creek bottoms. If

this land is allowed to go unattended, the willows and cottonwoods will soon take over. In the Ozarks brush would be a problem. The land would have to be reclaimed before it could ever again be planted in crops. You cannot put farmland in mothballs, like you do tanks and battleships.

We agree with the President that the problems of our farmers are "of the utmost urgency." Drought conditions of the last few years have left few Ozark farmers in financial shape to face the decline in farm prices. This winter has been drier than 1930, 1934, and 1936—the years we associate with the Dust Bowl. It is time to get some cash in the hands of these people.

It has been proposed that the farmer be paid in certificates good for grain now in storage to compensate him for keeping acres out of production. This would not cut down on the amount of grain on the market. It would not help the price of wheat. The Government would dump some grain, but it would not help farm income.

I am convinced that the long-term conservation feature of the proposal has merit. But the marginal acres proposed to be taken out of production under this section are not much of a factor in creating our surpluses. Most farmers do have some land that would be suited for trees. Unfortunately, however, due to the advanced age of most of our farmers, they will never see trees they plant converted to timber. It might be better for the Government to purchase some of these marginal acres and place them under the management of the United States Forest Service. I believe, however, that in the not too distant future pulp mills will be built in the Ozarks, which will utilize the lower grades of timber in this area.

The main point is that the program does not meet the basic problem of Ozarks farmers—low income. If the farmer received parity prices for his milk, beef, hogs, wool, and grain crops, there would be little need for any of these nine proposals advocated by the President.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

On February 16, 38 years ago, the liberty-loving people of Lithuania joyously proclaimed themselves a free and independent republic.

For more than two decades, Lithuania stood as a bulwark of democracy until, in the name of liberation, it was overrun and forcibly incorporated under the totalitarian tyranny of Soviet communism. But the Lithuanians' love of liberty and democracy could not be extinguished—they burn as brightly as ever.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will celebrate again this year the anniversary of their nation's independence. They will again voice their sympathy for their enslaved countrymen and once more protest vehemently against the alien forces of darkness that have seized their homeland.

Sympathizing with the plight of Lithuania and other countries now suffering under foreign totalitarian rule, the people of New York welcome the opportunity to honor a freedom-loving people by joining in the observance of this anniversary.

Now, therefore, I, Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1956, as Lithuanian Independence Day in the State of New York, and call upon all our people to join with fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in hope and prayer that the liberty and independence of a brave people will soon be restored.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 15th day of February in the year of our Lord 1956.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

By the Governor:

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Secretary to the Governor.

Tell the Senator To Look Homeward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a column by Victor Riesel that appeared in many newspapers last Saturday. In view of the current interest in campaign contributions, this will throw a little more light on the subject.

The article follows:

TELL THE SENATOR TO LOOK HOMEWARD

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—Junior Senator DICK NEUBERGER, of Oregon, is a courageous man. He wants the Government to give the Democrats and Republicans some $11 million each to fight one another in this presidential election. And he would pass a law banning large political contributions from unions and businesses.

I don't mean that it takes courage to ask the Government for $22 million. That could come out of the bird-watching division of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Where this ex-newspaperman may find himself in trouble is in his reference to a $23,000 contribution to his campaign by labor. NEUBERGER called this and all other political gifts "evil."

He may yet get himself known as the man with the gray flannel tongue among the unions which support him.

NEUBERGER'S law would prohibit contributions of anything more than $100. It is presumed that this means direct or indirect contributions. For example, DICK NEUBERGER got $23,000 from unions in cash, but many times that in services.

Oregon unions mailed 98,000 letters supporting him in the critical senatorial campaign there in 1954.

They made 160,000 telephone calls getting voters to come out. They supplied and gassed up 100 cars.

They fed scores of volunteer workers. This comes to a neat bit of currency and a considerable political contribution, not to mention the size of the printing bills.

Now, if this friend of labor leaders across the land really means to push a law banning sizable contributions, he would have to try to include these indirect outlays.

If this were possible, it could cripple much of labor's political action. Most of it is based on indirect gifts of manpower, publicity, and air waves time—not on financial gifts.

These make for a powerful machine, which can never be outlawed. Its opponents can only build one to compete with it.

There is, for example, the most effective of all labor political action operations—run by Walter Reuther and his United Automobile Workers.

This union now is the landlord of a building occupied by Chrysler officials, and the structure gets into this piece by way of being one of the indirect contributions to labor's political action.

The UAW recently purchased the offices from Chrysler, which gets out in June. Then the building will be turned into an air-conditioned labor college, which will be compulsory for all union staff members.

It will graduate a brilliant corps of regional officials, for they will be especially trained in every bit of union activity.

Every staffer will get a rounded education in everything from automation to legal action. But at least one expert in each subject from each region will be developed so that every section of the land will have a squad of men who are tops in their lines.

This will make quite a team. And, most certainly, there will be a political expert among them, which won't, of course, preclude any of the others from being politically trained too.

In each campaign, this team of experts will find itself lending its talents to the local union's candidates. This is legal. There is no way to stop it. Nor is there any way to count its cost.

But it certainly is a political contribution to the candidates, indirect as it is.

This will be just part of the UAW's political activity. The entire union is geared to such action, especially for the presidential campaign. Every congressional district will have a special congressional chairman, running a special congressional campaign organization. All directed quite brightly by union people.

If this is the kind of large campaign contributions the Oregon Senator wants to outlaw, he'll lose his friends inside labor. If these aren't what he has in mind, he's really finessing the Senate.

Colorado River Storage Project Would Help, Not Harm, United States Uranium Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that the reservoir to be created by impounding water behind Glen Canyon Dam would flood out rich deposits of uranium and make them inaccessible.

This is just another of the series of fantastic statements that have been circulated by southern California opponents of the Colorado River storage project in their frantic attempt to discredit this great development. This has been clear from the fact that new, and increasingly ridiculous, charges have been raised each time a previous one is disproved. This talk of flooding important

uranium deposits is the latest of this series of trumped-up issues.

To set the record entirely straight on this matter, the question was put to the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission's reply was sent to the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, United States Senator from New Mexico, and chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1956.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This is in reference to a recent telephone request from your office for information concerning the possible effect upon uranium mining and milling operations of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam, a unit of the Colorado River storage project.

Our replies to your specific questions in this regard are set forth below:

1. A geologic study of the reservoir area, including both air and ground reconnaissance, is progressing and it is anticipated that this work will be completed by late summer. Based upon present knowledge, no appreciable amount of commercial grade uranium or other radioactive ore would be inundated by the reservoir to be formed by the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

2. With the possible exception of a small inactive pilot plant located at Hite, Utah, no presently constructed uranium ore processing plant or pilot plant would be impaired by the reservoir behind the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. The pilot plant at Hite, designed to treat 30 to 40 tons of ore per day was built by Vanadium Corporation of America in 1949. This plant has not operated for several years and it is our understanding that it is partially dismantled.

3. An additional supply of power in the area, if tied into existing transmission lines, would be helpful to the uranium mining and milling industry. It would protect against power shortages and also would provide for the requirements of expanded operations. The question of bringing power to individual mining operations is dependent largely upon cost of transmission. Installation cost of feeder lines to individual mines is often prohibitive because of the small power load. Many areas of concentrated operations already are supplied by private and cooperative public utility organizations.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE C. JOHNSON,
Director, Division of Raw Materials.

Economic Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address entitled "Economic Justice" delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] at a meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association held at Philadelphia on February 28, 1956.

There being no objection, address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC JUSTICE

(Address by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association at Philadelphia, February 28, 1956)

"Justice," said Disraeli, "is truth in action." Justice—rendering to a person that which is rightfully his—is mankind's noblest ideal. As the preamble to the Constitution and the pledge of allegiance to the flag make clear, justice is the core of our political creed.

Tonight I want to talk to you about a particular kind of justice—economic justice. What is it? How is it endangered? How can businessmen help to preserve it?

Of all the facets of justice, the economic side of it has suffered the greatest distortion. Concepts of legal and social justice seem to be more widely and better understood.

Four or five years ago a top economic planner in the Truman administration proudly announced that the Government was giving the people $19 billion more, after taxes, than the year before. That was a most revealing statement. It reflected a belief, perhaps subconscious, that the Government has some paramount right to 100 percent of the national income. The producers of that income were expected to thank the Government for its generosity in distributing the fruits of their labor. A greater inversion of economic justice is hard to imagine.

In a similar vein, President Truman said in campaign speeches in 1952 that farmers and wage earners would be ungrateful if they did not vote to keep the Democrat Party in power. A majority of voters refused to swallow this theory. They were swayed by nonmaterial considerations: A bloody, stalemated war in Korea; softness toward communism in the top echelons of Government; bungling in foreign affairs; and corruption spreading like cancer throughout the executive branch. The majority of voters were influenced, too, by the administration's perverted sense of economic justice, the most dramatic revelation of which was the seizure of the steel industry.

Today the political situation is reversed. We have a changed administration. We must stand on our record. I hope that no Republican, by exaggerating the economic achievements of this administration, will subvert the ideal of economic justice.

Even labor bosses concede, albeit grudgingly, that America is enjoying an era of unparalleled prosperity. These are the incontestable facts supporting that conclusion:

Gross national product approaching $400 billion.

Personal income of $306 billion.

New construction at the annual rate of $41.8 billion.

Sixty-five million Americans gainfully employed.

These are all-time economic records. For this economic progress the Republican administration may claim some credit. However, I hope that Republicans will not try to claim sole credit for these economic gains. I hope that no Republican candidate will claim that his party created 65 million jobs; or that it is giving the people personal income, after taxes, in the amount of $272 billion. What better way to promote Communist and socialist ends than by asserting that our jobs and our earnings spring from the wisdom and benevolence of Government?

Economic justice is merely the policy of recognizing that every man is entitled to the things that are his own—freedom to do the work for which he is best suited; compensation commensurate with his talents and contributions to society; and unmolested enjoyment of the fruits of his industry, provided, of course, that he does not trespass upon the economic rights of others. Since men are not equal in energy, intelligence, and frugality, it necessarily follows that identical economic rewards to all would be unjust. Shakespeare knew the tragic consequences of obliterating rational distinctions among men:

"O, when degree is shak'd,
Which is the ladder to all high designs,
Then enterprise is sick!
* * * * *
"Take but degree away, untune that string,
And hark what discord follows!
* * * * *
"Force should be right; or rather, right and wrong
(Between whose endless jar justice resides)
Should lose their names, and so should justice too.
Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself."

—*Troilus and Cressida, act I, scene 3.*

Although this administration cannot honestly file a political patent on our current prosperity, it can point with pride to fostering economic justice. By promoting economic justice, this administration created the favorable climate in which the energies and ingenuity of millions of American farmers, businessmen, and workers in industry were released. They, not the public officials in Washington, rewrote the economic record books. However, a Republican administration, with the aid of conservative Democrats in Congress, helped materially by eliminating or alleviating economic injustice. These were the major examples of economic injustice existing just prior to the election of President Eisenhower:

Federal taxes at confiscatory levels.

Deficit spending at the rate of $10 billion a year.

Stifling wage and price controls on the economy.

Galloping inflation at the rate of 6 percent a year.

Growing Government competition with private business.

In just 3 short years this is what the administration and a cooperative Congress have achieved:

Taxes have been cut. A comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code has encouraged risk-taking in job-creating ventures. I hope that it may soon be possible, and without impairing the national defense effort, to make a further reduction in taxes.

We have a balanced budget. The President has submitted a balanced budget for the next fiscal year as well. Only once during 20 years of Democratic rule was a balanced budget achieved.

Inflation has been halted. A dollar saved in January 1953 is worth a dollar today. A dollar saved in 1942 was worth only 61 cents 10 years later.

Nothing, however, is more unjust than Government interference with the free market economy. Such interference may take the form of direct economic controls or Government competition with private business enterprises. Even after direct controls were ended, 12 of the 15 Senators on the Banking and Currency Committee, myself not included, were anxious to give the President standby price and wage control authority. President Eisenhower threw cold water on this idea. For the first time in many years a President spurned a proposed grant of power. By way of eliminating unfair Government competition with private business, 24 synthetic rubber plants have been sold; the Inland Waterways Corporation has been sold; and the Defense Department has withdrawn from such commercial activities as coffee roasting, ice-cream making, tree growing, and rope manufacturing.

On the question of a free and competitive market economy, no compromise is possible.

Of course, there must be some degree of Government regulation, as for example, to prevent fraud. In addition, the Federal Government's purchasing programs and its monetary, credit, and fiscal policies must necessarily exert considerable influence on the market. The crucial question, however, is who makes the major economic decisions: all the people in their capacity as consumers or a bureaucratic clique? In my judgment, Max Eastman did not exaggerate when he wrote in his book, Reflections on the Failure of Socialism:

"Mankind is confronted with a choice between 2 and only 2 business systems—a choice which involves the fate of democratic civilization. We can choose a system in which the amount and kind of goods produced is determined by the impersonal mechanism of the market, issuing its decrees in the form of fluctuating prices. Or we can choose a system in which this is determined by commands issuing from a personal authority backed by armed force."

"We have to choose," Eastman says, "and the choice is between freedom and tyranny."

Such a choice will be presented to the American people in the next election. In two of his most recent speeches, Vice President NIXON said:

"The choice is not between the Eisenhower program and something more conservative, but between the Eisenhower program and something far more radical."

The Vice President is right.

How radical is the alternative program referred to by Mr. NIXON? Let us call as a witness Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. The Senator's liberal credentials, at least in the modern sense of that much-abused word, are unimpeachable. He is a charter member of the ADA; an ardent supporter of Mr. Stevenson; and an able and articulate spokesman for the groups which dominate the Democrat Party. Here is what Senator HUMPHREY wrote in an article published in the autumn 1955 issue of the American Scholar:

"The one distinctive aim (of liberalism) was the liberation of man from traditional restraints."

Let me say at this point that the Constitution of the United States is a traditional restraint. The Constitution is, in fact, the most powerful temporal restraint on tyrannical action by government that the world has ever seen. If men in power are ever "liberated" from the restraining influence of the fifth amendment, economic justice will cease to exist.

Senator HUMPHREY also said in his revealing article on Liberalism:

"Liberalism may one day challenge and another day cherish the church; in one age it may seek less Government intervention in economic affairs, and in another age, more; it may at one time be hospitable to the specific interests of the business community and at another time be hostile.

Let me interject here that modern liberals are not usually so frank in stating their demands for absolute freedom of action. Personally, I have no desire to live under an administration which might be hostile to the church, economic freedom, and the business community.

Continuing the quotation from the Senator's article:

"The liberal approach must be experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic. Believing that no particular manifestation of our basic social institutions is sacrosanct or immutable, there should be willingness to reexamine and reconstruct institutions in the light of new needs."

Just compare that philosophy of government with the "dynamic co: servatism" of President Eisenhower. The different is one of first principles. How absurd to say that the American people are limited to a choice next November between tweedledee and tweedledum.

Other forces are hacking away at the concept of economic justice. First, there are the spiritual descendants of Karl Marx, only a small fraction of whom are enrolled in the Communist Party. Marx, you will recall, wrote: "In order to create equality, we must first create inequality." Men of superior ability were deliberately penalized under the rule: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." If we have learned anything from history, it should be that communism and socialism create vast inequalities, but that the only equality produced is in misery and death. Still, there are many people who naively believe that the price of pork chops can be permanently controlled without the Government moving in the direction of hanging the butcher.

The ideal of economic justice comes under heavy attack from the economic agencies of the United Nations. A score of spending programs are based on the false assumption that a global redistribution of wealth would be just. The basic tenet of Marxism is given an international twist: "From each nation according to its ability, to each nation according to its needs."

On the international scene as on the domestic, men afflicted with planners' itch seek to control the production, distribution, and price of basic commodities. Their goal is total regimentation of international trade. Friends of the free market economy drew first blood when the U. N.'s International Trade Organizations collapsed for want of United States support. But when this master plan aborted, the global planners formulated international agreements for particular commodities—wheat, oil, tin, sugar, rubber, etc. The U. N. has even called a conference to draft plans for an international agency to support the price of olive oil. The proposed agency would be officially known as the Olive Oil Fund; unofficially as OOF. OOF would need to start with a fund of $20 million. You know who would foot the bill.

Then we have the U. N.'s International Labor Organization and Human Rights Commission which are attempting, by treaty law, to regulate the economic rights and duties of people all over the world. I do not have time to discuss these socialistic proposals in detail. In this connection, however, three facts deserve attention:

First, the extravagant economic promises set forth in U. N. and ILO treaties cannot be fulfilled without the imposition of unjust economic duties.

Second, a former Chairman of the U. N. Human Rights Commission, Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, commented as follows on the U. N. draft Covenant on Economic and Social Rights:

"I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to Western promptings."

Third, the U. N. Human Rights Commission has voted overwhelmingly on several occasions against recognizing the right to own property as a fundamental human right.

What can businessmen do to defend the traditional concepts of economic justice? For one thing, they can stop supporting those U. N. agencies and commissions which devote their energies in the main to the promotion of socialistic causes. It is incomprehensible to me why some American businessmen fight even the mildest forms of economic intervention at home, while at the same time they finance organizations which spread the U. N.'s brand of socialism.

Next, businessmen can stop financing publications, organizations, and educational institutions which are hostile toward the ideal of economic justice. Many worthy conservative causes have folded for lack of adequate financial support. A whole book could be written on the subject of business contributions to those who would destroy private business enterprise.

And finally, businessmen can stop being smug—smug in the sense of regarding technological and economic achievements as the end-all and be-all of life. The time in which we live forbids hysterical optimism. The fact that responsible men, in the age of thermonuclear weapons and the Communist menace, can assert that this is the best of all possible worlds indicates a severe loss of perspective. Even without the overhanging threat of communism, our unprecedented material prosperity would not necessarily prove that every day in every way life is getting better and better. Unless a veritable orgy of consumption is the object of life, a high level of prosperity offers merely a better chance for men to achieve the higher ends of life. The purpose of life is to live it with the greatest possible fidelity to such nonmaterial values as truth, justice, fraternity, and loyalty. These are the values which most Americans recognize as a reflection of God's will.

The future of America depends today, as as it always has, on the indispensable supports of morality and religion.

Scudder No Opponent of Dam Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that neither you, nor any other Member of this House, expects accuracy from the writer whose daily column is placed quite properly by the Washington Post and Times Herald on the page with the comic strips. However it seems to me that it was going a little too far, even for him, when he laid the responsibility for the disastrous floods in California last fall at the door of the Representative from the first district of my State.

Having served in the California Legislature, as well as in the Congress, with HUBERT SCUDDER, and knowing therefore the regard and respect in which he is held both in Washington and California, I was inclined to laugh off the accusation, but these canards, deliberately thrown out to injure an individual or to influence a campaign, can be more serious than we sometimes think.

I was delighted therefore to receive in the mail a few days ago a copy of the editorial from the Santa Rosa Press-Democrat of January 24, 1956, a leading daily in the first district. The charge that the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] in any way opposed necessary dam construction in his part of the State, or any other part, for that matter, is completely exploded. To those who know him, the editorial is hardly necessary, but we are pleased that the editor took the time and space to refute the charges, and I have asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include the editorial here, for the benefit of anyone who may have seen the

original, unjustified attack upon an able Member of this House:

[From the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat of January 24, 1956]

SCUDDER NO OPPONENT OF DAM CONSTRUCTION

You probably were just as startled as we were to read in Drew Pearson's column awhile back that the northern California floods would not have been so serious if Congressman SCUDDER hadn't blocked the construction of dams.

Since Mr. SCUDDER is the man we can all thank for the legislation which made Coyote Valley Dam financially possible, and since he's performed legislative miracles in getting construction speeded, we thought this accusation could stand checking. We wondered what other dams, if any, the columnist had in mind since it sure wasn't Coyote.

Checking up took a little time and work, but you might be interested in knowing what we found.

One of the major northern California projects is the Feather River dam. Far from blocking it, Mr. SCUDDER is the man who in 1950 introduced the bill which would have constructed it, along with an irrigation canal system and hydroelectric facilities to generate 300,000 kilowatts of power. Since then, reapportionment has taken that area out of Mr. SCUDDER's district and placed it in that of Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of Red Bluff, and a movement has started to have the dam built by the State of California instead of the Federal Government. But Mr. SCUDDER was extremely active to get a dam built which would control floods such as the one that hit Yuba City this year.

That leaves the Trinity River project. Congressman ENGLE introduced a bill last year to authorize it. Mr. SCUDDER promptly announced he would oppose it until such time as the rights of the downstream users on the Trinity were protected.

He wasn't opposing the dam as such, but he did oppose an allocation of water that would ship the stream to other parts of California and take water away from people on the lower Trinity who had always used it.

He and Mr. ENGLE had no difficulty in reaching a fair settlement. Mr. SCUDDER then advised the House that he had no further objection to the matter. He supported Trinity Dam when Mr. ENGLE's bill came up for passage last year.

Mr. SCUDDER's record shows consistent leadership in legislation to stop the damage of floods and the waste of water through construction of dams.

More Power to Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared February 23 in the Oak Harbor News, a weekly newspaper published in my district, points up the advantages being realized under the Eisenhower administration's partnership-power program. It outlines the advantages the power consumer is getting today compared with those under past power policies.

The State of Washington has several projects in which Federal, State, county, municipal, and private power operations are combining their facilities to provide more kilowatts of power in the immediate future.

I believe this editorial characterizes the endorsement of this enlightened power program that the people of my district have indicated to me.

The editorial follows:

THINGS ARE LOOKING UP

The consumer is getting the breaks these days with the compromise offered by both public and private power companies. In the 50 years that the Pacific Northwest has been torn by fighting over public verses private power, each issue has been fought on a knock-out basis, the winner taking all, and the consumer paying for it while costly legal delay ran into years.

The new philosophy on generation of power accepts compromise that in effect says: "Why wear ourselves out fighting? Let's share the power and get on with the job." Presenting for the first time a middle ground where both public and private utilities can live without trying to destroy the other.

This is a switch for the consumer, who is always the little guy looking on, while big corporations fight over his right to power. He is usually only concerned when his television refuses to function properly, when his electric bill is too high or his voltage inadequate but he is still the consumer. He is the one who uses the electricity and who is glad to pay for it, and he is the one who will be mighty glad that the power companies have decided to give him a break. He deserves it.

Resolution Favoring the Construction of Pelton Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD the following resolution which I have received from the Jefferson County Jaycees, of Madras, Oreg. The junior chamber of commerce has sent me a well thought-out resolution which I am herewith submitting for your reading.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas that portion of the Deschutes River which would be inundated by Pelton Dam is now as always inaccessible to all but a handful of the hardiest fishermen; and

Whereas that same area would be open to thousands who do not have the time or the strength to make the arduous trip now necessary; and

Whereas the lower Deschutes River historically has been reserved for power; and

Whereas commercial fishing interests have not until now protested it being thus reserved; and

Whereas salmon observed in numerous careful counts have been pitifully few; and

Whereas the Deschutes River for years has relied on planting for its fish population; and

Whereas Pelton Dam, when constructed, will assist in the growth of Oregon by paying taxes; and

Whereas the value of the power to the State of Oregon will outweigh the value of the fish; and

Whereas the construction of Pelton Dam will include adequate provision for fish propagation; and

Whereas the construction of Pelton Dam will include adequate provision for recreation facilities; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled favorably on the Pelton Dam project: Be it

Resolved, That the Jefferson County Junior Chamber of Commerce go on record as favoring the construction of Pelton Dam without delay and opposing all actions tending to delay it.

Raids on Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Philip Hampson, and published in the Chicago Tribune of February 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO MAIN TOOLS USED IN RAIDS ON COMPANIES—WAYS ARE SECRECY AND INFLUENCE

(By Philip Hampson)

We take up again this morning the subject of financial raiders, who usually are Johnny Come Latelies seeking to grab control of long-established companies.

Many raids have resulted in bitter proxy fights such as took place in Chicago last year for the control of Montgomery Ward & Co., and Libby, McNeill & Libby, whose managements successfully repelled them.

Currently, Fairbanks, Morse & Co., 126-year-old Chicago enterprise, appears headed for a proxy fight staged by Leopold D. Silberstein, president of the Penn-Texas Corp., New York City, who wants control or effective representation on the company's board.

Silberstein arrived in this country in 1948 and has been a citizen here since 1953. He was born in Germany.

SECRET STOCK PURCHASES

Raids often are opened through stock purchases carried on in great secrecy. The raiders' agents buy their stock under names hidden in brokerage accounts or in foreign banks.

A busy management obviously may be unaware that its position is menaced until active trading indicates something is up. And then the management finds itself somewhat in the position of the man walking alone in a dark street who suddenly gets a knife in the back.

The American spirit of fair play looks askance at raider tactics. Years ago the country had its share of ruthless financial raiders, but you will go a long way to find a kind word spoken about them.

Col. Henry Crown, one of Chicago's most respected businessmen, well expressed the American feeling to this writer recently. Crown, asked to join a financial transaction—it was not a raid, though bickering was involved—declined, saying: "I am a builder."

TWO "TOOLS" LISTED

We have observed that in a number of raids two "tools" have been used to a greater or lesser degree. One is the secrecy provided in a financial operation carried on through

the medium of "street accounts" in brokerage offices or Swiss banks.

The other is "influence," which usually means the help provided by politicians or by former Government officials who know their way around in their respective fields.

Regarding the Swiss banks one Chicago stock broker told this writer recently that the way stock manipulations are carried on through them in connection with American companies is a national scandal.

He was astonished that the State Department has done nothing about it. Stock purchases can be made through accounts in Swiss banks which are identified only by number—the identities of the individuals concerned are kept secret.

The Swiss banks for years have been bankers for the world. They may act as agents for deposed kings or runaway dictators in hiding money in the United States through the purchase of securities in American companies. Or they may act for American bankers.

SOVIET PURCHASE POSSIBLE

One banker observed that it would be relatively easy for a Soviet agent engaging in a number of interbank transactions in Europe to wind up, by transferring funds through a Swiss bank, purchasing stock in an American company engaged in secret defense work.

Taking up the second tool, influence: Political influence has always been of the greatest aid in getting a wide variety of things done.

These may range from getting approval to build an entry across a sidewalk into one's yard to getting a juicy Government insurance contract. The record of how things are done in Washington is too widely known to be belabored here.

In Silberstein's activities there appear to be a few "happy" coincidences. One of his New York lawyers is Benjamin Javits, the brother of Jacob Javits, attorney general for New York State.

As the only winner of a major post in the last election in New York State the attorney general is not without influence when he raises his voice in Republican councils.

In Chicago one of Silberstein's lawyers is W. McNeil Kennedy, who was Chicago regional manager for the securities and exchange commission when the Roosevelt administration was in power.

ALSO SERVES SILBERSTEIN

Serving Silberstein in Washington is Oscar L. Chapman, who was Secretary of the Interior under President Truman. Chapman currently is described as a "Washington lawyer." He is also a director of Penn-Texas.

Harry A. McDonald explained in a court case in Chicago involving Fairbanks, Morse that he was here at the request of Chapman to testify on behalf of the Siberstein interests.

McDonald, a former Detroit, Mich., investment banker who now is a Washington investment adviser, under Truman was chairman of the SEC and later administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

We are not sure of Silberstein's status in the present expected Fairbanks, Morse proxy fight. As we previously stated Silberstein on January 5 informed the New York correspondent for The Tribune that neither he nor his company was buying stock in Fairbanks, Morse.

He also emphasized that "under no circumstance will Penn-Texas engage in a proxy fight for control of Fairbanks, Morse." On January 26 he informed The Tribune in Chicago that he owned 100,000 shares and indicated he would engage in a proxy fight.

Meantime, the situation is complicated as regards the Chicago company because of differences of opinion that exist between 77 year old Col. Robert H. Morse, Sr., chairman of the board, and his 82 year old brother Charles H. Morse, Sr., who once was president.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Get Politics Out of Farm Support Bill," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET POLITICS OUT OF FARM SUPPORT BILL

Just about the most freakish—and most unsound—legislation ever attempted on America's farm problems is the hybrid bill now before Congress.

It is an election year monstrosity in which Democrats, for perfectly obvious political reasons, are linked with some farm State Republicans to force a return to the high rigid farm-price support system. In this move the high, unalterable and artificial support plan is jammed on top of the administration's soil-bank proposal.

That would make the measure, by which the administration aimed to reduce excess acreage and thereby to hold down huge, unmanageable farm-crop surpluses, worthless.

Is this politically motivated scheme headed toward greater prosperity for farmers? Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, declared in a speech yesterday, "High rigid price supports never have brought prosperity to the American farmer and never will."

But they have brought the deadweight of vast, unusable, unsalable accumulations of wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. We think Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson called the turn in his television appearance Thursday night when he declared, "Surpluses are smothering farm prices and income."

They can't be sold to any worthwhile extent; can't even be given away. But they hang like a vast pall over the farmers of the United States; always a threat to existing prices; always a brake on better prices.

Senator AIKEN showed yesterday how the real upsurge of farm prosperity came from the Second World War; then from the Korean conflict. Farm prices, he said, skidded between those two outbreaks; then took another downward turn starting in 1952.

Congress gave President Eisenhower a mandatory directive to continue the high price supports—the 90 percent of parity system—for 2 years, the Senator said. And what happened? It filled the Government and other warehouses to overflowing again. It made farmers—to be paid with tax money—plough and sow acreage far above requirements to produce immense crops that had no place to go except those warehouses.

Mr. Benson has fought valiantly, and continues to fight, for a formula that will cut down unneeded crop acreage, and unusable crops. And in time reduce the need for all this storage of crops nobody wants. Senator AIKEN took a significant jab on the latter point in his speech when he referred to some champions of high-level supports as people "making fortunes out of storage of Government surpluses." Few, if any, of those engaged in crop storage are farmers.

The important thing Senator AIKEN did yesterday, as Mr. Benson has been doing all along, is to shed a clear light on the hard facts about high farm price supports: That they didn't solve farm problems and won't solve them if tried again.

The administration bill seeks, by reducing acreage—for which farmers would receive a subsidy, and a realistic application of flexible farm price supports—to create barriers against greater and greater surpluses.

But the farm-bloc amendments, for the 90-percent-of-parity supports, would wipe out the soil-bank plan. It's plain enough: The soil bank would work to reduce farm crop surpluses; the high level supports would make certain that more surpluses would occur. That shows how charged with politics the farm bloc's 90-percent-of-parity revival is.

For the farmers, and the Nation, it would be a backward step to continue the same faulty attempt to meet farm problems that have failed in the past. No sound, permanent solutions of those problems can be worked out by politicians for political reasons. The Eisenhower-Benson program seeks real and lasting solutions. Without the crippling partisan amendments that have been loaded on to it, that program should have the full support of farmers and all other citizens of the Nation.

Need for Election Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carried an excellent editorial on the elections bill, which has been prepared by the Senate leadership. This editorial sums up well the reasons for the country's need of a new election structure. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITED CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The emphasis on full reporting of political contributions in the Johnson-Knowland "honest elections" bill, introduced yesterday, is unquestionably a major step forward. Truthful accounting for campaign receipts and expenditures is the largest single need in exposing and eliminating unsavory influence. This salutary effort, and the provisions covering broadcast time for major candidates and permitting income-tax deduction of political contributions up to $100, far outweigh the minor defects in the bill.

Among the questions of detail likely to be raised is whether the proposed limitations on campaign spending are themselves realistic. By camparison with the obsolete limits in the present law, the new figures are undoubtedly generous. To some they may seem excessive. But it must be remembered that the present law has never been effective. It has restricted the spending of each candidate and political committee without any control whatever over the number of such committees that may be set up in behalf of a single candidate. The new bill is an attempt to close this loophole, to require the reporting of all contributions for each candidate by a single agency. If it works out that way, some of the limits it would impose may prove to be too low rather than too high.

The present limit on spending by senatorial candidates ranges from $10,000 to $25,000, the basic measuring stick being 3 cents per vote. Under the Johnson-Knowland bill, the minimum limit imposed on candidates in the smaller States is $75,000, with a 20-cents-

per-vote escalator, which, in the case of New York, would permit the spending of about $1,300,000. For candidates for the House the limit would be boosted from $2,500 ,or 3 cents a vote, to $15,000, or 20 cents a vote. While these changes appear to allow drastic loosening of controls, the new figures must be compared to what candidates have actually spent in recent years, and not to the fiction recorded in the statute books.

At first it appeared that the 20-cents-per-vote formula would impose a crippling limitation upon the Republican and Democratic National Committees. This formula would allow each to spend about $12 million in a presidential campaign. But State and local committees could also spend up to $12 million, which means that no effective limit would be imposed on the national parties so long as they operated in large part through State and local committees.

One especially significant provision would require all donors of more than a total of $5,000 to make consolidated returns showing who got their gifts. That should provide a ready index to any major effort to influence votes through the lavish distribution of campaign contributions. Yesterday's evidence before the George committee to the effect that lobbyist Neff attempted to reach the Senators of 5 States in connection with the natural gas bill emphasizes the wisdom of this provision. By contrast, contributions of $100 or less would not need to be reported. Some provisions of the new bill are admittedly experimental, but with its stress on accurate and comprehensive reporting it offers enormous advantages over the present law.

Arms for the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit Times of February 25, 1956.

Entitled "Let's Suspend Confusion," the editorial points up the bumbling, confusing role of the State Department in regard to the shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. For the record, I should like to say that I agree with the sentiments expressed in this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S SUSPEND CONFUSION

The off-again on-again mixup over the shipment of 18 Walker Bulldog M-41 tanks to Saudi Arabia is a disturbing indication that we may not have a clear Middle East policy at a time when war threatens that economically and strategically vital area.

Even the announcement of the State Department about the embargo on shipment, imposed one day and then lifted the next night, is confusing.

Details of the original sale were reviewed and it was stated that it was "subjected to the usual careful scrutiny to determine if it would meet" conditions of law and policy.

The sale obviously met those conditions or the shipment would not have gone ahead.

Then, says the State Department:

"On the evening of February 16, inquiries were made concerning the tank shipment about to leave New York harbor. It was decided to suspend all outstanding export licenses for the area in question pending an examination to insure that such exports were being made in compliance with pertinent laws and regulations and were in conformity with the policies of the United States with respect to the maintenance of peace and stability in the area."

The licenses were suspended the following day and reinstituted the next day.

Thus a deal made in secret and approved in secret had to be suspended and then reapproved when it became public.

Everyone is aware, we feel sure, of the complex difficulties in the Middle East.

Those difficulties are emphasized in the State Department announcement to which we are referring.

It speaks of the "massive shipment of arms by the Soviet bloc to the Near East," meaning the supplying to Egypt of jet planes, tanks, artillery, and submarines.

It calls this a clear signal for the starting of an arms race that would increase the danger of war in the area.

The United States, Britain, and France are opposed to the development of an arms race and said so in the tripartite statement of May 25, 1950.

But questions arise:

"Is this an arms race or is it becoming no contest?

"It has been the policy of our Government to maintain if possible a balance of defensive arms between the Arab states and Israel, but has not this been upset by Egypt's possession of modern jet planes while Israel has no comparable craft?"

It is one thing to abhor an arms race, and quite another to know how to prevent it.

The State Department says this dangerous situation is under continuing review, and we presume that study includes the Israeli bid to purchase $50 million of arms in this country.

A balance of arms has prevented war so far. If it is determined the balance has been dangerously upset, there is less peril in restoring it than in permitting the gap to widen.

Also as part of the continuing review, and in the face of the embarrassing turnabout on the tank deal, we suggest it would be healthful for Secretary of State Dulles to make a full-dress report to the American people.

There is clear danger of Mideast conflict. What are we doing to stop it?

What, frankly and bluntly, are the risks and the remedies?

Let us put an embargo on confusion.

Silberstein Is Both Broker and President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article written by J. A. Livingston, and published in the February 29, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

(By J. A. Livingston)

SILBERSTEIN IS BOTH BROKER AND PRESIDENT

Leopold D. Silberstein, president of Penn-Texas Corp., one of America's sudden tycoons, is a corporate leapfrog. He takes over a company, then, with the help of its treasury, leaps on some other company.

He leapfrogged himself into control of Industrial Brownhoist Corp., Niles-Bement-Pond, and others. Now he is leaping on the 98-year-old Fairbanks, Morse & Co., of Chicago, whose $99 million in assets nearly matches Penn-Texas's $104 million.

On January 27, Silberstein, flanked by attorneys, presented himself to Robert M. Morse, Jr., Fairbanks, Morse president, and volunteered to be chairman of the executive committee or chairman of the finance committee. His Penn-Texas Corp. had become the mysterious possessor of 115,000 shares, or 9.4 percent of the outstanding stock.

One hundred thousand of these shares were acquired from the Union Bank of Switzerland for $4,300,000, on which $2,300,000 is still owing. Question: How did a foreign bank, 3,900 miles from the New York Stock Exchange, acquire 100,000 shares? Was the stock accumulated in expectation of a sale to Penn-Texas at $43 a share? Was a profit made? If so, by whom?

The other 15,000 shares were bought by Penn-Texas at $47 a share from Charles H. Morse, who has had a falling out with his brother, Robert H. Morse, Sr., Fairbanks, Morse chairman, and his nephew, Robert H. Morse, Jr. The Charles Morse-Silberstein contract raises a question of prudence. Silberstein commits Penn-Texas Corp., to purchase within 3 years an additional 27,220 shares, the price to be determined by quotations the day before on the New York Stock Exchange. Fairbanks-Morse stock could skyrocket and Penn-Texas would be stillbound. It's an almost unlimited liability.

At the moment, Silberstein is a white knight fighting the Robert Morses for self-dealing. He's seeking an injunction to prevent the company from swapping Treasury stock on a share-for-share basis for Canadian Locomotive Co., Ltd., already controlled by Fairbanks, Morse. Silberstein has a point. Robert Morse, Jr., as president of Fairbanks, Morse, bargains for Fairbanks, Morse shareholders, then slips over to the other side of the table and, as president of Canadian Locomotive, bargains with himself for Canadian Locomotive shareholders.

Harry A. McDonald, former Securities and Exchange Commission Chairman, called as an expert witness for Penn-Texas, characterized the proposal as unfair to Fairbanks, Morse stockholders. Fairbanks, Morse has been a consistent moneymaker, whereas Canadian Locomotive, after 4 years of losses, has just emerged into the black. Fairbanks book value is about $46 a share versus about $16 for Canadian Locomotive.

If the exchange goes through, it would put additional Fairbanks, Morse stock in friendly hands and dilute Silberstein's equity. Yet in this proxy-battle tactic to defeat Silberstein, the Morses may be too casual in discharging their responsibility as trustees for Fairbanks, Morse shareholders. In a proxy contest, this will help Silberstein's side of the argument.

Silberstein, in turn, may be too casual in his relations with Penn-Texas shareholders. He is president and principal shareholder of Uno Equities, Inc., a brokerage firm whose address is 111 Broadway, New York, the same as Penn-Texas. The telephone numbers also are the same.

I have seen photostats indicating that Uno Equities has acted as broker for Penn-Texas in purchasing 5,000 shares of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange. The commissions charged were double the standard minimum New York Stock Exchange rates. A public relations adviser, speaking for Silberstein, who was too busy to talk, said: "You can say for Mr. Silberstein that none of the stock acquired before February by Penn-Texas was purchased through Uno Equities."

When I said I was referring to stock purchased in February, I was told that I was

engaged in cross-examination, that the question was not material.

I can only conclude that Silberstein has been siphoning off Penn-Texas petty cash—the commissions came to $3,845.74, of which $1,922.87 was the Uno Equities add-on to minimum stock exchange rates—through his own brokerage firm.

As a stockholder in Fairbanks, Morse, Silberstein is properly apprehensive about the Morses' self-dealing. Yet Penn-Texas stockholders have cause for apprehension if Silberstein, as their trustee, charges them, as their broker, more than standard commissions. It suggests looseness with other people's money.

Progress in Artificial Heart-Lung Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two items, both published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune. The first is an article from the January 11, 1956, issue, the second an editorial from the issue of January 12 of the same newspaper. Both the article and editorial deal with the subject of progress in artificial heart-lung research.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 11, 1956]

TWO-DOLLAR DEVICE USED IN KEEPING DOG ALIVE FOR 27 MINUTES—ARTIFICIAL HEART-LUNG RESEARCH PROGRESS CITED

(By Pen Wilson)

Five New Orleans doctors performed a heart operation on a dog Tuesday and for 27 minutes kept the dog alive with a $2 device that performed the functions of the dog's heart and lungs until the pup's own organs took over again.

The dog was still alive late Tuesday and there was every reason to think it would fully recover from the surgery, the doctors said.

The $2 apparatus, a device consisting of little more than a plastic bag and several tubes, is an artificial combined heart and lung.

In a cautious and carefully worded announcement, the doctors emphasized that their research with the artificial heart-lung is "in no way complete," noting that it has not yet been used on human beings.

BACKED BY DEMONSTRATION

Other devices, somewhat similar, have been in use elsewhere in the country but this team of doctors believes theirs is the only one in existence that is so ultrasimple it can be mass produced, sterilized and discarded, all for only $2.

The doctors, who released their preliminary report Tuesday, and who backed it up with a surgical demonstration in an eighth-floor laboratory of Tulane University's Hutchinson Memorial, are:

Dr. Reichard Kahle, 45-year-old native New Orleanian, an associate professor of surgery at Tulane.

Dr. Dennis Rosenberg, 34-year-old graduate of the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Dr. Salem Sayegh, 33, an instructor of surgery at Tulane and a graduate of the Royal College of Medicine in Bahdad, Iraq.

Dr. Edward S. Hyman, 30, a graduate of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore and now a clinical instructor in medicine at Louisiana State University, and his brother, Dr. Albert L. Hyman, 32, also of the LSU staff. Both are native New Orleanians.

RESEARCH UNDER GRANT

Their research is being conducted at Tulane under a grant from the Louisiana Heart Association to Dr. Kahle.

In brief, their device, which was designed and built by Dr. Edward Hyman, bypasses all the blood from the heart and in their experiments has taken over the functions of the heart and lungs for 30-minute periods, enough time to perform most corrective heart surgery.

The bypassing of the blood from the heart enables the surgeon to work with a "dry heart" and insofar as the team's dogs are concerned has ended the system of groping into the heart and trying to work in a mass of blood.

The present device has been used successfully on four dogs, not counting Tuesday's, and in each case the heart was opened while the device labored away for heart and lungs for half an hour, the doctors said.

The dogs' recoveries have been apparently so complete, said Dr. Albert Hyman, that in one instance he went to feed the dog a few hours after the operation only to have it jump from its cage and scamper playfully about the room.

MORE TESTS REQUIRED

But Dr. Kahle estimated it will take many more dog operations before the lung-heart will be tried on a human patient.

This, much simplified, is the way the team operated on a 23-pound mongrel Tuesday:

The dog was given a general anesthetic and prepared for surgery.

Swathed in surgical sheets and dressings, and with only its shaven chest exposed looking for all the world like a small child, the dog's jugular vein was exposed.

An incision was made under the fourth rib.

Meanwhile artificial respiration took over for the breathing mechanism.

ELECTRICAL PUMP STARTS

Two of the main veins entering the heart were then isolated and a plastic tube was passed into them to aspirate all the blood coming from the heart.

A second tube was passed into the artery and an electrical pump was started to circulate blood through the apparatus.

The artificial respirator was turned off. By this time the artificial heart-lung was doing the dog's breathing.

The surgeons then opened a sac which holds the heart, then opened the heart itself.

The plastic bag and pump drew out all the coronary blood—but the heart continued to beat "dry."

Without the device, the entire cavity would have filled at once with blood, Dr. Kahle explained.

A drug was injected to keep the blood from clotting.

All the while Dr. Albert Hyman checked the dog's blood pressure.

DOCTORS REVERSE PROCEDURE

The dog's heart proved to be in good shape, said Dr. Kahle. He noted: "Now you get a sick baby, and it wouldn't be this easy."

After letting the artificial heart-lung work for 27 minutes, the doctors "backed out," that is, reversed the procedure. In all it took about an hour and a half as compared, Dr. Kahle said, with possibly 5 hours under other systems.

"The dog looks as though it did quite well," said Dr. Edward Hyman.

How many dogs are they away from trying it out on a human? "Perhaps a couple of dozen," they said. Humans "within a few months," said their formal announcement.

How could such a plastic device be made? "It can be stamped out commercially like a beach ball or any plastic toy," Dr. Edward Hyman said. "It's got about $1 worth of tubing and 50 cents worth of plastic."

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 12, 1956]

PLASTICS HEART-LUNG

As its designer says, the artificial heart-lung apparatus now being successfully experimented with at Tulane University for animal heart surgery owes its chief distinction to its relative simplicity; the plastics of which most of it—excepting, we suppose, some mechanical units—is composed; and its capacity for cheap, mass production. It includes an oxygenator to refresh the blood in its short-cut passage. Plastics have already been found valuable for storing blood; for containing and pumping it in transfusions; and in tubing for artificial heart-lungs.

The main principles of such devices have, in the past decade, exerted great fascination. As we understand it, their use is limited to extreme emergencies where humans are concerned, one of the calculated risks being uncertainties with respect to proper blood circulation over any extensive operating period. As far as practicality in preliminary experiments is concerned, the New Orleans device seems to offer great promise.

It is interesting also that in this Louisiana Heart Association grant project, there are associated with Dr. Kahle, of Tulane, graduates from Iraq and South Africa, and instructors (including Dr. Edward S. Hyman, the inventor) from Louisiana State University.

Investigation of Political Contributions by Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Whose Ox Is Galled?" by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, in which the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is very clearly and adequately discussed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 29, 1956]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WHOSE OX IS GALLED?

WASHINGTON.—The grand senatorial investigation of political contributions by big business looks very like turning into an investigation of political contributions by big labor. Not to put too fine a point on it, the grandees of the AFL-CIO are scared pink.

What scares them is the composition of the select committee that the Senate has now named to look into the whole problem

of campaign financing. Sticking out like a sore thumb among the four Republican committee members is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of New Mexico, who has been raising the roof about the political activities of labor organizations for some time now.

The committee chairmanship will be allotted, in defiance of the seniority rules, to the young, evangelical Democrat, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee. If Senator GORE wants to let the chips fall where they may, it is unlikely that anyone will stop him, since there is deep fear in the Senate of any suspicion of a coverup.

But Senator GORE is clearly going to be made to understand that the chips will be very large indeed, and that some of them will fall, in a rather hard and wounding manner, on members of his own faction of the Democratic Party.

Besides Senator GOLDWATER, the other three Republicans on the select committee, BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, THYE, of Minnesota, and PURTELL, of Connecticut, will certainly go along with a move to look into the political money that comes from big labor as well as the money that comes from big business. Equally certainly, at least one of the Democratic committee members, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, will favor such a move.

Some labor leaders have already warned the Senate Democratic leadership of danger ahead. And well they might. Labor contributions take the form of under-the-table money almost as often as business contributions. And it is a reasonable bet that almost every Democratic Senator who is even moderately pro-labor has received some campaign help of this kind.

Every practical politician knows, of course, that there is no truth whatever in the extreme right-wing view that labor money in politics equals or exceeds business money. The total political outlays of the labor organizations certainly do not amount to one-fifth, and probably do not amount to one-tenth of the political outlays of big business. Furthermore, except in congressional elections in the South, at least three-quarters of the money from business sources goes to the Republicans.

Yet the fact has to be faced that a really full and complete inquiry will deeply embarrass everyone, on both sides of the political fence. And this fact in turn suggests that everyone, on both sides of the fence, has been pretty mealymouthed about this business of campaign contributions, which has meanwhile been getting out of hand in all directions.

The behavior of an arrogant minority of the oil industry during the recent natural gas bill fight, which brought on the present inquiry suggests how far out of hand the whole business has got. But there are plenty of other indications.

In the Ohio election that returned the impeccably honest Robert A. Taft to the Senate in 1950, for example, at least $3 million must have been spent, overall, on the Republican side. Yet Truman Newberry was driven from the Senate in 1922, because it was proved that he had spent $195,000 to defeat the elder Henry Ford in the Michigan elections of 1918.

What is urgent, therefore, is not to plow through all the seas of mud that are certainly there to be plowed through by the investigators of campaign contributions. What is really urgent is to subject this business of campaign contributions to reasonable controls, and to establish sensible, workable, nonutopian standards for the future. With his usual good sense, Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas has seen exactly this point.

JOHNSON has therefore caused to be prepared a revision of the existing statutes, which does three things of cardinal importance, as well as many useful but minor things. First, it brings under control the phony committees that candidates habitually create, often by the score, to conceal the amount of money spent in their campaigns. Second, it sets a realistic ceiling—30 cents per voter in each State—on the amount of money a candidate can spend in a congressional or senatorial fight.

And third, and most important of all, the Johnson bill requires full and complete disclosure of every campaign contribution of whatever kind, so that everyone will know who's influencing whom. With the political campaigns growing more astronomically costly every year, the need for something like Senator JOHNSON'S bill has become more and more acute. And if the present ruckus causes the bill to pass, the net result will be excellent.

Compulsory Licensing—The Path to Creative Atrophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article regarding compulsory licensing of patents provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, published in the February 27, 1956, issue of Washington Atomic Energy Report:

COMPULSORY LICENSING—THE PATH TO CREATIVE ATROPHY

(By W. Sterling Cole)

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides advanced legislative principles and standards to guide a rapidly expanding industrial, scientific, international, and military program. It contains progressive principles and is a sound law, except for the so-called compulsory licensing provisions.

A compulsory license to a patent is a governmental order which authorizes persons other than the patent holder to use and benefit from his discovery. I consider such a provision in any law unconstitutional, unreasonable, and an invasion of personal and property rights for no good purpose.

Proponents of compulsory licensing of atomic energy patents argued that the Federal Government had spent some $13 billion developing the atomic energy art; and that the corporations who were contractors of the Atomic Energy Commission would capture important patents, conceived while a contractor, to the exclusion of companies with no prior AEC relationship. I sympathized with this concern. However, compulsory licensing is not necessary to prevent this happening. I believe in a different approach, one which looks to the problem itself. I would deny a patent in any case where the invention or idea rightfully belonged to the Government.

The framers of the Constitution provided in article 1, section 8, clause 8 that Congress would have the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." The Constitution does not refer to patents as such but rather to the exclusive right of authors and inventors. I examined the available historical records of the Constitutional Convention and found that the word "patent" was considered by the framers but the words "exclusive right" were chosen instead. I believe this was purposeful—to protect the integrity of the grant—to prevent such things as the compulsory license.

The First Congress created a patent system, using the words "sole and exclusive right" in the first patent statute to describe a patent. With this the concept of exclusiveness was fortified. The patent statutes provided the base upon which industrial America grew. The patent gave a temporary monopoly to one individual or company; yet the system was such that the concepts embodied in the discovery were published for the world to see. The competitor or patentee then set to work to improve upon the invention to insure that once again he could compete in the national market place. This guaranteed a pyramid of development and gave birth to an industrial giant.

Congress, in acting later to curb combinations in restraint of trade, passed the antitrust laws—but these laws left intact the patent monopoly. In recent years there have been proposals calling for a compulsory licensing system because of alleged monopolistic practices involving patents. Such proposals have failed when faced with the contention that the patent monopoly was a fleeting one—one that passed with the next significant improvement.

The compulsory licensing features of the Atomic Energy Act are the first of their kind. They defy the Constitution because the power of Congress is limited to granting the "exclusive right." This patent with a cloudy title is not exclusive—it is public and open to invasion. Thus, section 153 of the Atomic Energy Act does violence to the patent system and established a dangerous precedent.

The greater reason for having a normal patent system in the atomic energy field exists in the express desire of our Government to quickly bring the benefits of atomic energy development to our people. Compulsory licensing will only lead to the creative atrophy of the Socialist state. Why should one improve upon the patent of his competitor if the Government will give him ready access to the existing invention?

During the debate on the 1954 act, the House at first rejected compulsory licensing and substituted an amendment which I proposed. This is now section 152 of the act. This section provides that any invention or discovery in the nonmilitary atomic field conceived during a relationship with the AEC would be deemed to have been made by the Commission but the Commission can waive this right. The House rejected compulsory licensing, but it was adopted by the Senate, as section 153 of the act. As enacted, the law retained both sections.

In this Congress, I have introduced H. R. 5167 which would abolish compulsory licensing and also modify section 152. The amendment would continue to preclude special patent advantages to contractors—but where section 152 now refers to most any relationship with the AEC, my proposed amendment refers only to those relationships with the Commission which were for the benefit of the Commission. (The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold hearings on the Cole bill in March.) It has been the practice of the AEC of late to enter into various contractual relations which are not specifically for the benefit of the Government or of the Commission. An example of such a contract is the so-called access agreement. In such an agreement the Commission contracts to make available to an industrial corporation certain classified information to assist that company in the development of the peacetime applications of atomic energy. The company agrees in return to protect this information. A later idea or discovery produced by this company would not rightfully belong to the Government. H. R. 5167 would therefore amend section 152 so that it would only relate to those contracts which were ex-

pressly for the benefit of the Government or the Commission.

Progress in the United States is based upon incentive. This incentive is not only material but has its roots in the satisfactions of accomplishment. I am striving to preserve this.

Post Office Red Ink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article and tabulation regarding the operating deficit of the Post Office Department which appears in the March 2 issue of the U. S. News and World Report.

This excellent article not only points up the need for a postal rate increase but also highlights measures being taken by the Department to provide increased efficiencies and economies through mechanization and other improved facilities:

ONE BIG BUSINESS IN TROUBLE—SOME COSTS CUT AT POST OFFICE, BUT RED INK FLOWS

Post Office, like other businesses, is booming. But it can't make ends meet. Mail volume is way up. More money is coming in. But costs are up, too.

A solution is not in sight. Congress balks at boost in postal rates asked by White House.

One of the largest business concerns in the world, the Post Office Department, is in trouble.

The post office has more customers, takes in more money, all the time. Yet it is losing approximately $500 million a year. Its costs are rising faster than its receipts.

The managers of the business, backed by President Eisenhower, are now asking Congress for permission to raise prices. Similar proposals have been turned down in the past, and chances of adoption look doubtful this time. The higher postal rates now asked would not enable the post office to make a profit, or even pay its way; but they would permit construction and modernization.

Postal service will suffer post office officials warn, unless new buildings and equipment are provided. The mail load gets heavier and heavier. Old-fashioned methods of handling mail must be replaced, they say, with modern techniques, including automation.

PRICE OF A STAMP

These are the postage rates that are proposed:

Four cents for ordinary letters, instead of the present 3 cents.

Seven cents for airmail, which now costs 6 cents.

Thirty percent increase in the rates for books, magazines, newspapers, and other second-class mail—the raise to be by 15 percent raises in 2 successive years.

Twenty-nine percent raise in postage for advertising matter and other third-class mail.

If Congress allows these increases, they would bring in an additional $406.5 million a year.

With this extra money, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield proposes to launch a 5-year building program. He would spend $125 million for new labor-saving equipment.

The Post Office Department could not do these things, he says, by simply squeezing costs, effecting more economies. It has drastically cut some costs in the last few years. But the payroll expense constantly rises. That's 80 percent of Post Office costs. Congress has granted 6 pay raises since 1932, with few increases in postage rates.

NEW DEVICES

The only way now to cut costs further, Mr. Summerfield believes, is to provide more floor space and better facilities. For lack of space, some mail now is handled on the sidewalks, even in the rain. The movement of trucks often is held up for lack of loading platforms. More conveyor belts, more new-type carts are needed.

Some of the equipment that is needed is just coming out of the inventors' laboratories: Machines with electronic eyes that flip letters and arrange them in front of the stamp-canceling machines in just the right position; machines that, in effect, "read" typed addresses, sorting letters by cities.

With such devices, costs eventually may be cut enough to wipe out the deficit, postal officials believe. But, even if the price of stamps is raised, they see little hope that the Post Office business will operate in the black—during the next 5 years, at least.

Why higher postal rates are being sought

	Year ended June 30, 1953	Year ended June 30, 1955	Change, up (+), down (−)
Pieces of mail carried, billion	50.9	55.2	+4.3
Families served, million	46.3	43.5	+3.2
Letter-carrier routes	123,241	[1] 130,000	+6,759
Post offices	40,609	38,316	−2,293
Total outlays	$2,779,426,000	$2,732,777,000	−$46,649,000
Total revenues	$2,120,498,000	$2,376,478,000	+$255,980,000
Deficit, to be paid by taxpayers	$658,928,000	$356,299,000	−$302,629,000
Deficit of $483,478,000, expected in the year ending June 30, 1956			+$127,179,000

[1] Estimate.

Thus need for service has grown, offsetting most economies in operations. Postal service still runs in the red.

Address by President Gronchi of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, all of us were privileged to hear the very fine address by the President of Italy, His Excellency Giovanni Gronchi, this afternoon. It was a message of sincere friendship from the people of Italy to the people of America. It was also an expression of deep gratitude from the Italian people for the aid given them in the rehabilitation of their country after World War II.

President Gronchi gave us an honest and forthright account of one of our stanchest allies in Europe, Italy. He acquainted us with its accomplishments in the past decade since the end of the war, its present conditions and major problems, and its current international position and outlook. It was an encouraging picture coming at a time when many nations of the free world are beset with all sorts of difficult problems. It is particularly encouraging because the leader of a great European country appeals to us "for closer and uninterrupted cooperation, carried on in a spirit of mutual trust and faith."

Of particular interest also is President Gronchi's view that a "better integrated functioning of NATO" is needed.

His views and comments will surely arouse much interest in Washington and abroad and will stimulate some fruitful thinking and planning for the future. His visit has already borne results for the good in the relationship between our two countries and for the benefit of world peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I urge Congress to take immediate action in approving the resolution which I introduced on February 9, 1956, House Concurrent Resolution 213, expressing the friendship of the American people for the people of Italy and voicing our hope that Italy will remain one of the leading democratic nations of the free world. Similar resolutions have been introduced by my colleagues HUGH J. ADDONIZIO and PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey; PAUL A. FINO, of New York; DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida; and ALBERT W. CRETELLA, of Connecticut. I urge the House Foreign Affairs Committee to report out the resolution in the very near future.

Colorado River Storage Project

SPEECH
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado for his fine speech, and for the outstanding job he has done as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation. I do not believe I have ever witnessed a finer demonstration of patience, fairness, and legislative generalship, than has been displayed by Colorado's distinguished representative, WAYNE ASPINALL, during the long and tiring course of committee hearings and consideration of this bill. It has been a pleasure to serve on a subcommittee with such a chairman, and the House may

rest assured that the legislation before it today has received committee consideration in the highest and most careful sense of the term.

Murder in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Roger Goebel which appeared in the Manhattan College Quadrangle shortly after the Till slaying in Mississippi last fall. Since that time, it has been reprinted in numerous publications, including several national periodicals. It was last reprinted in Town and Village, a local publication of lower Manhattan. It was reprinted for its timeliness in connection with Brotherhood Week. Its content seems to me to be sufficiently important to be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress:

MURDER IN MISSISSIPPI
(By Roger Goebel)

My brother is dead. He was just a boy, but he's dead now. Perhaps you knew him—he was your brother, too.

Why are you so startled? Have you forgotten him so soon? His name? His name doesn't matter. He's buried now, just as all news of him has been buried in the back columns of the newspapers. He wasn't really very important, and a murder in Mississippi certainly can't compare with the latest, raciest scandals in New York.

Well, he's dead now. And he was just a boy. He was only 14, just beginning to grow up. He was full of the wonderful feeling that comes when a boy becomes a man. He was on his first holiday, a thousand miles from his Chicago home. He must have been very proud of his years and of his self-reliance; he must have loved to be alive.

And now he's dead. They killed him. They killed him because of a boastful voice and a cocky whistle; they killed him because he was "fresh"—they killed him because he was black. They took him out in the dark of night and led him away; they beat him, and then they shot him with cold steel bullets whose chill could not match the ice in their hearts. They were fools; they murdered him because of the blackness of his skin, but what blackness could ever match the blackness of their hearts?

And now the boy is dead, and soon he'll be forgotten. You feel uncomfortable already, and wonder why I mentioned him. What's done is done, and who's dead is dead; it happened long ago, and you were not to blame. There are more important things now—wars, and tensions, and world crises. You can't remember a murder—even the murder of a boy—forever.

But he was just a boy and he is dead now, and he was my brother and your brother too. And you didn't kill him—but you let him die. You let him die, and now you're forgetting him, just as you'll forget others like him. You let him die when you didn't fight to save him, not from death but in life; when you didn't save him from his slums and when you didn't give him an education like your own, when you made him take the poorest seats on your buses and wouldn't let him live in your neighborhood, when you made him a second-class citizen and a second-class man. Now you're willing to give him justice, but you were never willing to give him love.

He was just a boy, and he happened to be a Negro. He might as well have been a Slav, or a Jew, or a Puerto Rican, or any other whom the breath of prejudice touches. He's dead, but he might as well have lived in the shadow of your indifference for three score years and 10.

My brother is dead. He was just a boy, but he's dead now. Perhaps you knew him—he was your brother too.

The Truth About the Upper Colorado River Project—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the American Enterprise Association recently published a booklet on the controversy over the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS wrote in support of the project, and the distinguished columnist and writer, Raymond Moley, presented an analysis which illustrated the inconceivable cost and infeasibility of the project.

These pro and con statements were published under one cover. However, Senator WATKINS chose to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only his own statements.

Therefore, in the interest of presenting both sides of this matter and providing my colleagues with a fair appraisal of the project, I submit herewith the statement made by Mr. Moley:

THE CASE AGAINST COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS
(By Raymond Moley)

FOREWORD

A year ago the American Enterprise Association published a booklet written by me and entitled "What Price Federal Reclamation?" It presented facts and conclusions which were the result of several years of observation and study of the various Federal enterprises in western reclamation States. Included therein was a brief analysis of the Colorado River storage project, which, in various forms, was then before Congress, and which is now pending in still other forms. My analysis a year ago indicated that under the terms of a bill then pending, which embodied the plans of the administration, the costs would be so excessive as to be wholly indefensible, despite the trick bookkeeping incorporated in the bill and habitually practiced by the Government in reporting such projects.

It was clear that the farmers who would become the unfortunate beneficiaries of the measure could repay only on an average 12 percent of the costs of the original construction, even though under the Government's interpretation of the law they are relieved of any interest charges on the unpaid portion for an indefinite number of years. Figuring not only the burden assumed by the Federal Government in the original construction costs and the interest charges, each 160-acre farm would be subsidized to the extent of $212,000. This, I contended, was an excessive burden to saddle upon the taxpayers of the 44 States who would derive no benefit from the project.

In addition, I noted that this is a strange time indeed to propose the addition of some hundred thousands of acres of productive land, when the Government is seeking means of relieving the burden of surpluses through retiring land from use. The facts which I presented in that study have not been refuted except in a general derogatory manner by some sponsors of the project, blinded to facts by the power of regional interest.

This year Congress and the taxpayers of the Nation are faced by the same general project, but in two proposals which are different not only from those before Congress a year ago, but different from each other. It is my purpose herewith to analyze those two proposals. I feel it proper to state, since my contribution to this booklet follows that of Senator WATKINS, that I am not replying specifically to his arguments. I am going to analyze specific legislative proposals, one of which passed the Senate last year and the other of which emerged from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

My position as an opponent of both of these bills is exactly what it was a year ago, when I opposed the measures pending at that time. I am concerned with the solvency of the Nation and with the interests of those millions who are called upon to bear, through their taxes, the costs of Government.

I am not directly concerned with the differences which extist among the States that share in the waters of the Colorado River. Moreover, I am only incidentally concerned with the issue of conservation raised by a proposal to build a great power dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. The essential problem of conservation is to conserve the solvency of the Nation and the taxpayers who dwell therein. I may add that it has been food for bitter reflection that so many commentators and others have interpreted this controversy only as a battle to preserve the sanctity of a beautiful national monument and that so few have comprehended the enormity of the engineering folly and financial waste involved. In any event, the Echo Park Dam will probably be eliminated as a means of escaping the protests of the conservationists. That will leave the issue as it should be, a question of the wisdom of the proposal in its entirety.

I shall show in the text that follows that the project, despite the length of time during which it has been discussed, is ill planned in part, and in other parts not planned at all, that it is not self-liquidating, that it would involve an excessive, not to say an incredible cost per acre benefited, that the power aspects are with the possible exception of the Glen Canyon Dam financially infeasible, that in order to manufacture a case for feasibility the bills embody dubious exercises in bookkeeping, and that the national interest demands that the entire proposal should be reviewed by a genuinely independent and competent board.

MAINLY HISTORICAL

Under the famous Colorado River Compact, created to some extent through the expert and energetic efforts of Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, 30 years ago, it was agreed that the water of the Colorado should be allocated between two groups of States, with a remainder to be at the disposal of the Mexican Republic. The lower group of States include Arizona, California, and Nevada. The upper group are Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, Colorado. I believe that it is fair to say that it was assumed at the time that the Federal Government would materially assist each group of States to regulate and store the water of the river thus allotted, in order to stabilize and conserve the water involved and for consumptive use.

The first report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation on the upper basin of the river was transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior in 1947 (H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess.). This plan presented an inventory of more than 100 projects for development in the upper Colorado Basin. It was assumed that all of these could not be built, because they would require at least 25 percent more water than was allocated to the upper basin States. Their enumeration was merely an exercise in imagination by the Bureau Engineers and a showcase of selection for the use of congressional representatives from the States concerned.

Later, in 1950, the Bureau of Reclamation presented a more refined plan (the so-called project planning report, H. Doc. 364, 83d Cong.). This plan includes 10 major dams and reservoirs, the hydroelectric capacity of which was estimated at 1,500,000 kilowatts. The reservoirs named would, it was estimated, store 48 million acre-feet of water. There would be an indefinite number of water-use projects, some irrigation, some industrial, and others for municipal purposes.

It is important to note that in these various plans and in the subsequent legislative proposals based upon them with only 1 or 2 exceptions the storage units would not directly serve irrigation or other water-use projects with water directly. For the most part the dams proposed—especially the major ones—are exclusively power projects, and the reservoirs which they would create would be used to regulate the flow of the rivers involved. These dams would be dedicated to raising the revenue necessary to build the irrigation and other water-use projects. In short, the connection between such dams as Glen Canyon and irrigation would be exclusively financial.

One of the bookkeeping devices embodied in this plan would be a basin account, a fund into which all revenues would be poured for use in financing additional projects whenever possible. It is important to note that this basin-account scheme has never been specifically approved by Congress in an authorizing statute. The cost of the 1950 plan was estimated in 1949 prices at $1,408,189,000. In recent prices (1954) the cost would be $1,620,000,000.

This plan was held up during the remaining years of the Truman administration. It was halted by lack of approval of the Budget Bureau.

THE 1953–54 EISENHOWER-M'KAY PLAN

Secretary McKay in December 1953 submitted a supplemental report recommending the authorization and construction of 2 dams and storage units, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Utah; Florida, Colorado; Hammond, N. Mex.; LaBarge, Wyo., Pine River extension, Colorado, and New Mexico; Seedskadee, Wyo.; Silt, Colo.; Smith Fork, Colo.; Paonia, Colo.; and Lyman, Wyo. In addition, Eden, Wyo., previously authorized, was included for participation. The Secretary also recommended the Shiprock division of the Navaho project, New Mexico, subject, however, to a further feasibility report.

In March the Budget Bureau generally recommended the Secretary's program, but threw out the Shiprock-Navaho item. The Budget Bureau asked that the economic justification of the irrigation projects be reexamined before authorization. Bills were introduced embodying the recommended plan, but no final action was taken on them by the 83d Congress.

With the advent of the 84th Congress in 1955, two new bills were introduced, S. 500 and H. R. 3383. The present concern of Congress is with these. They differ in certain respects. I shall analyze and criticize each of these proposals in order.

S. 500—PASSED BY SENATE IN 1955

The bill passed by the Senate in 1955 by a vote of 58 to 23 is an omnibus measure. The Senate committee, as the result of logrolling on a massive scale, added a considerable number of projects to the plan recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in 1954. Instead of 2, it names 6 storage units—Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, and Navaho. It adds no less than 21 participating irrigation projects to the 12 originally proposed by McKay and the 11 approved by the President in 1954. However, the bill states that the 21 additional projects are authorized subject to the submission of feasibility reports by the Secretary of the Interior and further action by Congress.

This sort of legislation, while it has been done before, is plainly a perversion. If a project is only vaguely justified and needs study and report by the Interior Department, why should it be named at all in a bill? In this case, the naming of the 21 additional irrigation projects and the 6 storage units establishes a moral commitment to the States and communities which would be benefited by these projects and would make further and final action by the Department and Congress more or less a formality. The total estimated cost of the various units named in S. 500 would be $1,658,460,000, of which $782,883,000 would be spent on the storage units. However, in arguing for the bill Senator WATKINS and others claim that the money represented in the bill would be only $1,092,999,800.

In a letter to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS on June 28, 1955, I said of this sort of legislation:

"Clearly this bill was designed by its architects to mean whatever the interested sponsor happened to want it to mean at a given moment. Specifically, it was intended to tell the people in the beneficiary States that they were to have practically every 'participating project' their hearts desired, while it was to tell anxious taxpayers in Pennsylvania, South Carolina, or Michigan that it was to cost only a billion dollars. To attempt a serious discussion of such a bill would be like trying to anticipate the humors of a coquette. You only know that she will be expensive and that she will never be satisfied."

The essential reason for this characterization was that the bill is and is not an authorization. It contains several different kinds of qualified authorizations. Four storage units seem to be conditionally authorized. Two others must have further study of various sorts and certifications.

THE HOUSE BILL, H. R. 3383

On July 8, 1955, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported out H. R. 3383, which differs materially from S. 500. Instead of 6, it would authorize 4 storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. It also contains 11 "participating projects"—the ones originally approved by the Secretary and the President. Most notable is the omission of Echo Park as a concession to the conservationists and to eliminate their strong opposition to the entire project.

However, the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to complete and submit planning reports on the 22 "participating projects" which were added in the Senate bill to those approved by the Secretary. (See p. 76 for full list of participating projects involved in both bills, with pertinent cost data.)

The House bill is only a bit more covert in its purpose than S. 500. The intent is clearly to open the way to the authorization of all the irrigation projects named in the bill. The provisions of H. R. 3383, as those of S. 500, would set in motion the machinery which ultimately would involve something like a billion and a half dollars in construction costs alone.

H. R. 3383, moreover, provides an across-the-board, arbitrary reduction of the Bureau of Reclamation's estimate by 10 percent. This has no engineering or financial justification, because in all estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation, history shows that the figures are on the low side, often by as much as 50 percent or more. The action of the committee in presenting this phony estimate is purely political. It is intended to misinform and mislead the Congress and the public.

Thus, at this writing the two bills, S. 500 and H. R. 3383, are before the House for action.

WHO PAYS AND HOW

Since the taxpayers in the 44 States which are not beneficiaries of this project are vitally concerned with the problem of how the vast expenditures from the Treasury for these projects are proposed to be repaid, and since proponents of the project assure us that it is 100 percent self-liquidating, I shall give major attention to this problem. The subject of engineering is also involved, but that is of less concern to the taxpayer remote from the scene, and I shall only briefly mention it in what follows.

This project, like practically all reclamation projects during the past 25 years, provides that the revenues from the hydroelectric projects be used to subsidize in part, and usually in large part, the irrigation projects. Moreover, in the cases where there water for industrial and municipal use, those aspects pay for themselves. The flood control, navigation, and wildlife preservation aspects are nonreimbursable. They are a Federal expense. But in the Colorado River storage project these latter purposes and allocations are negligible.

As I shall show, the main cash box from which the alleged restoration to the Treasury of the money expended is to come, is the revenue from the power aspects of the project.

The plans for repayment from power revenues in the two bills, S. 500 and H. R. 3383, differ somewhat in detail, but are alike in the patent fact that they absurdly overestimate the capacity of the power units to bear the financial load assigned to them.

Repayment in S. 500 is through a financial gadget known as the Collbran formula. It provides that the net from the power revenues is to be devoted to paying off the costs of the power aspects of the project, the dams, reservoirs, and other essential installations. This, it is estimated, will take about 50 years. After that, the net from the power revenues will be used to pay the 85 percent or so of the irrigation costs without interest, which have not been paid by the water users. The term during which that would be paid cannot accurately be estimated. It is clear from all reasonable assumptions, including the highly doubtful one that there would be any revenues at all, that the time would be 50 years or more in addition, thus bringing the period of repayment far into the 21st century.

The financial plan in H. R. 3383 would use the net power revenues first to pay the irrigation costs, without interest, of course, that the water users cannot pay. It is estimated, quite optimistically to say the least, that this repayment of the 85 percent of the irrigation costs would take about 50 years. Then, and not until then, would the power installations be repaid, with interest. H. R. 3383 provides that the power investment should be repaid within the useful life of the project, not to exceed 100 years.

The Bureau of Reclamation testified in connection with the initial (1954) plan of Glen Canyon, Echo Park, and 11 participating irrigation projects that under this plan the repayment would take a little less than 100 years. But at the same time it was stated by the Bureau's witnesses that if more projects were added the period would extend beyond

100 years. With the long list of 21 new projects envisioned in both bills, this would assume that power projects would have to be running at top efficiency for more than a century and a half. This may well be the most absurd implication ever contained in a legislative enactment.

THE CAPACITY OF POWER PROJECTS TO PAY

Among the primary and incorrect assumptions, there is the assertion that the assorted power projects, even those contained in S. 500, can pay for themselves. On this point I wish to offer the testimony of a man who first appeared in print on this subject within the month. On January 31, 1956, Robert LeRoy Cochran retired from the Bureau of the Budget. For 11 years he had been a major expert on water and other civil works projects in that Bureau. He was never called upon to testify, and it can be assumed that his wise advice was not observed by the two Budget Directors who have been concerned with this Colorado storage project. Mr. Cochran served in the State engineer's office in Nebraska for 20 years, during which he was State engineer for 12. He was elected Governor of his State in 1934, 1936, and 1938. He was raised in a reclamation country and has owned a reclamation farm for 40 years. On the basis of this unparalleled experience and his 11-year study in the Budget Bureau, he stated for publication in Newsweek (issue of February 20):

"According to the claims of the Bureau of Reclamation and the congressional sponsors of the project, the cashboxes from which most of the repayment must come are the power installations, the largest of which is Glen Canyon near the Utah-Arizona border. On the basis of the figures submitted, only Glen Canyon could be justified as financially feasible. Even if the revenues from that one dam were as good as anticipated, they would be entirely consumed in paying the deficits on the other power dams. That would leave nothing at all for the repayment of the irrigation costs during the first 50-year period.

"The analysis presented by the Department was based upon a 50-year period, generally considered to be the useful life of a project. Such a period may be too long in the light of the future potentials of power production from atomic energy and other sources."

The upper Colorado Basin has a boundless supply of energy potential in coal, natural gas, oil shale, and uranium. The steadily increasing efficiency of coal-burning plants, the availability of cheap and abundant supplies of fuel, the increasing cost of building hydroelectric installations, and the remoteness of the remaining good hydro sites from the centers of population are rapidly making hydroelectric power uneconomical. Moreover, not far in the future and well within the 50-year period which seems to be basic in the calculations of the planners of the Colorado storage project, great atomic energy plants will overtake other methods of producing electricity.

At this very moment, the immense aluminum industry which hitherto has been drawn to the Northwest because of its supply of cheap hydroelectric power is moving to the Ohio Valley because of the presence of large coal deposits and proximity of its market for finished goods.

The fallacy embodied in a plan which must depend not only upon the useful life of hydroelectric installations for 50 years but upon prices for power based upon present conditions must be obvious to all minds not benumbed by self-interest. For the revenues—highly speculative at best—from installations whose life estimate is altogether overoptimistic—must depend upon getting the same price for power far into the remote future.

It is true that in the hearings on the Colorado storage project in 1954 and 1955 representatives of the area's 10 private power companies were heard and they subscribed to the need for water storage. They also said that the companies represented would buy power generated at the projected power installations. But they qualified their promise by saying that they would take the power at a price comparable to the cost of power from other sources. The sponsors of the bill misrepresent this position of the companies by failing to mention the latter qualification, which is vital. Indeed, with the supplies of coal which are available in the very heart of the region, it is doubtful if the companies can afford even now to pay the price embodied in the estimates.

Moreover, it is not true that the market for the bulk of the power that might be generated would be the very people who would be the beneficiaries of the irrigation subsidy. The economic market for the big producer, Glen Canyon, would be in the lower basin, in Arizona and California. A representative from Arizona has already objected to the proposed power rate assigned to Glen Canyon.

The Truth About the Upper Colorado River Project—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of a booklet recently published by the American Enterprise Association on the controversy over the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project:

IMMENSE CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF IRRIGATION

Not one single irrigation project in all of the 34 "participating projects" is financially sound. I show in the tabulation on page 76 the construction costs, the area served, the irrigation allocation per acre, and the percentage to be repaid by the irrigators for every one of the 34. If we consider the original 11 approved by the President and Secretary McKay, the cost for area served on the individual projects ranges from $200 to $800 per acre for construction alone. The water users can repay a weighted average of 17.5 percent. This average is that low because the largest of all, Central Utah, is the least feasible.

But these figures of cost per-acre fail to represent a true measure of cost, because nearly two-thirds of the acres to be served are already in production and would receive only a supplemental water supply. In most cases this additional supply would be only a few inches in depth per annum, and thus only a small fraction of the amount of water necessary to put arid land into full production. The real cost of putting enough water on an acre of land in this arid to semi-arid region would on the Central Utah project be over $2,600 an acre.

And it must be remembered that in these figures which I present in this section of my discussion, I am considering only construction costs. I am not considering interest charges on the Government's investment. I shall consider that presently.

Nor do the figures I have presented include another legitimate charge for irrigation. This is the proportion of the cost of building the storage reservoirs, which should be borne by the irrigation projects.

WHAT IS THE LAND WORTH?

As many an unlucky farmer has learned by bitter experience, the real value of his land is not what he has put into it in money and labor. It is what he can get for what he produces. The lands proposed to be irrigated in the Colorado River storage project lie at altitudes of from 5,000 to 7,000 feet above sea level. They are not in tropical or semitropical latitudes. They have a short growing season and are generally capable of producing only forage crops and grains. Land in the region, fully irrigated and improved brings in the market an average of only about $150 an acre.

THE FANTASTIC NAVAHO PROJECT

In the great propaganda campaign of the sponsors of this Colorado storage project, a colorful feature was certain ceremonial dances by Indians. It must be presumed that these shows were not wholly generated in the minds of the dancers. But considering what is planned in the project for the Navaho Indians in New Mexico, it might be added that there was indeed cause for rejoicing. In this case, however, those who did the dancing would not be required to pay for the music. The taxpayers of 44 States would account for that.

The Navaho project was, as we have seen, rejected by the Budget Bureau in its review of the 1954 version of the plan. It was reinstated in the Senate committee, according to press reports in Utah, at the insistence of a Senator from New Mexico.

As we have seen, the irrigation construction cost per acre of the Navaho project would be $1,530, the highest of all 34 projects. Of this, the Indians could repay at most less than 15 percent. It was testified at the hearings by officials of the Indian Bureau that the project would provide for 1,100 Navaho Indian family farms and that the cost per family farm would be $200,000. The same witnesses testified that the gross—not net—income per family farm would be about $5,000 a year. Since the interest charges alone on this investment per farm would, at 2½ percent, equal the gross farm income, this project would seem to be fair neither to the taxpayers nor the Indians. Certainly there might be a less expensive way to provide for these families. Certainly, according to Secretary McKay, it is not in the true interest of the Indians to keep them in subjection as second-class citizens. And there is no better way to destroy them than to support them in this costly manner. The testimony at the hearings also brought out the fact that there is among informed people grave doubt whether the Indians themselves want to farm irrigated land or whether they could succeed as irrigation farmers.

THE SUBSIDY IN TERMS OF COMPOUNDED INTEREST

Under the original plans for reclamation created more than half a century ago under Theodore Roosevelt, it was thought wise to give farmers on irrigated land a bit of a lift by relieving them of interest charges on the unpaid portion of the Federal investment. Considering the brighter promise of some of the projects initiated at that time, such as the Salt River development in Arizona, and the fact that the law contemplated repayment in 10 years, this subsidy seemed justified. However, even the projects initiated then failed to pay out, and Salt River only got itself out of debt on the original project in 1955. The cost of large additions to the Salt River project are still unpaid.

When the time for repayment was extended to 20 and then to 40 and finally to 50 years, the interest factor took on formidable proportions. But in the plans for the Colorado River storage project, even that 50-year repayment period now in the law is extended. Under the repayment provisions of the ori-

ginal 1954 plan—Glen Canyon and Echo Park and 11 participating projects—the Bureau of Reclamation estimated the interest subsidy alone to be $1,153,000,000, which was more than the estimated construction cost of the whole project. This would amount to $3,150 an acre on the 366,000 acres to be served. If there were to be added the four additional storage projects specified for authorization in the Senate bill in addition to the Navaho San Juan-Chama and Gooseberry irrigation projects, the corresponding Federal subsidy, using the same method of calculation as that used by the Bureau of Reclamation in the original project, would total $4 billion—more than $5,000 an acre on the 745,000 acres served. So much for the interest subsidy under S. 500.

Under the repayment provisions of H. R. 3383, the interest subsidy on the minimum projects authorized (4 storage units and 11 participating projects) would amount tof nearly $2 billion at the end of the overall repayment period of 99 years. However, with the inclusion of the additional projects contemplated for later authorization, the interest subsidy would be at least as much as under S. 500, but probably a much greater amount.

However one looks at the financial status of the Colorado storage project, the absurdity of the claim of "self-liquidation" stands out. If we consider the version of 1954, which was approved by the administration for an initial construction cost of about $1 billion, the interest charges at 2½ percent would be $25 million annually. For the larger plan in S. 500, the annual charges would be $40 million. The total annual net revenues estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation would be less than these amounts on the average.

These revenues, assuming that they can be realized, could be used only once. If they are used to pay construction costs, the interest charge would have to be paid by the taxpayers of the Nation. If they should be used to pay interest, the construction costs would have to be paid by the taxpayers.

At this point I wish to present the view of former Governor Cochran as set forth in the interview cited on page 52:

"Question. How then could the costs of the irrigation aspects of the project be paid back to the Federal Government?

"Answer. A small proportion (about 15 percent) of the construction costs alone would be repaid by the farmers during the first interest-free 50 years. While it is proposed that the balance (85 percent) be paid back out of the revenues of the power aspects of the plan, we have already seen that there is no validity in that claim. Payment from that source would not begin anyhow until after about 50 years. By that time, the power features might well be obsolete. It should be emphasized that there appears to be a very serious doubt as to whether any power revenues would ever be applied to the payment of irrigation costs in the upper Colorado Basin. I submit that a proposal to start payment after 50 years on a debt for any purpose is not worth the paper it is written on.

"Meanwhile, because of the high construction costs per acre of the irrigation works and the accumulating unpaid interest, the Federal subsidy would be enormous. Under the ultraliberal construction of the reclamation law by the Department, freedom from interest extends not only through the 40 or 50 years beyond a 'development' period, but indefinitely into the future.

"Something like 90 percent of the irrigation costs (including interest) would be Federal subsidy."

Reclamation Bureau officials and congressional sponsors of this project have a good deal to say about the so-called reclamation fund. This fund is supposed to provide money for this and other projects of the same nature. The inference is that there would thus be little or no charge on the taxpayer.

The fact is that the reclamation fund is largely a matter of bookkeeping. If the money in that fund were not used for unnecessary and uneconomic projects, it could be used to reduce the Federal debt or to reduce taxes.

In the beginning the fund benefited only from the sale of public land. More recently, however, the fund has been kept going largely because there have poured into it revenues from large Federal power projects. However, this money from Federal power projects includes the so-called interest component from those revenues which should properly go into the general fund of the Treasury to repay the interest charges on the Federal investment in power projects.

THE BURDEN ON THE STATES

The concern which each of the 48 States should have in this vast subsidy can be calculated by determining the percent of the Nation's tax burden which each State must normally pay, then by applying that percentage to the sums stated above. The States directly benefited, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming, pay only 2 percent total Federal taxes. Thus the 44 other States must carry approximately 98 percent of the costs. Assuming a total subsidy of $4 billion, the percentages borne by the States and the amounts involved appear on the accompanying table. I have used in this calculation a list of percentages compiled by the Tax Foundation, a nonprofit research agency.[1]

Colorado River storage project—Federal cost to be borne by Nation's taxpayers, by States

State	Percent of Federal taxes by States	Federal cost to be borne by taxpayers of each State
Alabama	1.15	$46,000,000
Arizona	.51	20,400,000
Arkansas	.68	27,200,000
California	9.32	372,800,000
Colorado	.91	36,400,000
Connecticut	1.74	69,600,000
Delaware	.37	14,800,000
Florida	1.69	67,600,000
Georgia	1.53	61,200,000
Idaho	.34	13,600,000
Illinois	6.90	276,000,000
Indiana	2.56	102,400,000
Iowa	1.55	62,000,000
Kansas	1.31	52,400,000
Kentucky	1.27	50,800,000
Louisiana	1.34	53,600,000
Maine	.47	18,800,000
Maryland [1]	2.56	102,400,000
Massachusetts	3.19	127,600,000
Michigan	4.91	196,400,000
Minnesota	1.74	69,600,000
Mississippi	.65	26,000,000
Missouri	2.50	100,000,000
Montana	.40	16,000,000
Nebraska	.85	34,000,000
Nevada	.17	6,800,000
New Hampshire	.30	12,000,000
New Jersey	3.60	144,000,000
New Mexico	.38	15,200,000
New York	12.34	493,600,000
North Carolina	1.67	66,800,000
North Dakota	.30	12,000,000
Ohio	5.90	236,000,000
Oklahoma	1.12	44,800,000
Oregon	1.10	44,000,000
Pennsylvania	6.94	77,600,000
Rhode Island	.52	20,800,000
South Carolina	.86	34,400,000
South Dakota	.33	13,200,000
Tennessee	1.39	55,600,000
Texas	4.86	194,400,000

[1] Includes District of Columbia.

[1] The Tax Foundation has made these compilations of percentages each year for a long time. These percentages were not computed with this particular piece of legislation in mind, but, rather, in line with the foundation's policy of bringing home to the people of all the States the meaning of the burden of Federal taxation in these years of great expenditures.

Colorado River storage project—Federal cost to be borne by Nation's taxpayers, by States—Continued

State	Percent of Federal taxes by States	Federal cost to be borne by taxpayers of each State
Utah	0.40	$16,000,000
Vermont	.19	7,600,000
Virginia	1.69	67,600,000
Washington	1.71	68,400,000
West Virginia	.89	35,600,000
Wisconsin	2.20	88,000,000
Wyoming	.20	8,000,000

THE COSTS OF REHABILITATION

Former Governor Cochran in the course of his long service in the Budget Bureau took note of the very considerable costs incurred by the Federal Government in rehabilitating irrigation projects. Since the ditches, gates and other mechanical aspects of an irrigation project suffer somewhat rapid deterioration, the Federal Government lends a hand without charge to the water users in repairing the damage. In the interview noted above, Mr. Cochran says: "Experience with irrigation projects indicates that after 30 years or so it is necessary in a considerable number of cases to spend further money on rehabilitation. This is another large item of expense for the Federal Government."

I have not taken account of these rehabilitation costs in my analysis because it would be difficult to anticipate their amounts in a generation in which inflationary forces seem to be uppermost. But they would be considerable and they would also be borne by the taxpayers of the Nation.

BENEFIT-COST TRICKERY

Sponsors of the Colorado River storage project, unable to contradict the plain arithmetic involved in the repayment calculations which I have set forth, fall back upon a speculative hocus-pocus known as "indirect benefits." This sort of thing is a product of the new economic thinking which flourished in the 1930's. Out of it came the so-called benefit-cost ratio. While it has no standing in the law, it has been used to a greater and greater extent since 1939 by the Bureau of Reclamation in claiming economic as distinguished from financial justification of projects.

In simple terms, a benefit-cost ratio means a ratio between the various economic benefits alleged to stem from a project and its cost in actual dollars. But in order to have a ratio mean anything, the two items must be comparable. In the usage of the term by the Bureau of Reclamation and the sponsors of the Colorado River storage project, each side of the ratio is measured by quite different criteria. Hence the ratio is meaningless.

The new and radical social and economic philosophy on which this comparison of the incomparable is based has never been more brazenly stated than in a report of President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950:

"Financial feasibility is not the same as economic feasibility. * * * For this reason the Commission is recommending that Congress eliminate the requirement that irrigation projects show financial feasibility * * * the principle of full reimbursement has ceased to be useful or necessary. The Government has come to be recognized as an agency for social and economic action which need not follow the rules of the private capital market * * * social benefits and national interests should be clearly differentiated from those for which reimbursement should be required. * * * Where the public interest is clearly established, public expenditures to promote it cannot properly be regarded as subsidies. * * * The justification for public investment in irrigation is that there are

public ends to be attained which the commercial price system cannot reflect."

Such vague terms as "social benefits," "public ends," and "national interests" can have no determination in financial terms. Their projection in calculations of reimbursability raise the question of who is to determine their value. Who is to be the judge? In this case it would be the bureaucrats who would love to spend more and more public money and the representatives of the beneficiary States. They presume to offer their own ex parte judgments. Indeed, their presumption is so great as to tell taxpayers in States far from the scene what they themselves stand to gain in selling more automobiles, carpet sweepers, and baby carriages to families subsidized at the rate of $5,000 an acre.

The Engineers Joint Council, a group including representatives of five of the great engineering societies of the Nation, had this to say of the benefit-cost ratio in a statement (Principles of a Sound National Water Policy) issued in 1951:

"(Increases in trade and commerce) have usually been computed on the gross volume of new business without recognition of the fact that there is no benefit to be derived from the mere circulation of money. Actually for such benefits to accrue there must be tangible gains to those who transport, process, and distribute goods to the ultimate consumer, all without increased cost to him."

The conclusion of the Engineers Joint Council, it would seem, must be the consensus of all people who believe in honest and understandable public accounting:

"Direct benefits should be limited to those new and increased values which are definitely measurable. Such tangible offsets to cost, under ordinary business standards, would be limited to the capitalized value or present worth of future net revenues to be derived from operation of the works constructed."

DISSENT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

In a review of the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado River storage project, the Department of Agriculture seriously questioned the estimates of agricultural benefits. Moreover, the Bureau of the Budget, in reporting on the initial project recommended by Secretary McKay, specified that the econmic justification of all of the 11 reclamation projects should be reexamined in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Truth About the Upper Colorado River Project—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part III of a booklet recently published by the American Enterprise Association on the controversy over the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project:

GLARING MISREPRESENTATION OF BENEFITS

One example of the abuse of the "benefit-cost ratio" is in the Bureau of Reclamation's estimates for the Seedskadee project. It is claimed that there are "indirect" benefits of $638,500, "public" benefits of $313,100, and direct benefits of $614,500. When all these are added and compared with the cost in real dollars of expenditure, a "benefit-cost ratio" of 1.46 to 1 is reached. Thus it is easy to see that if only direct benefits were considered, the "ratio" would betray the unsoundness of the project. Now let us see what these so-called indirect and public benefits are. "Indirect" benefits are "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers." "Public" benefits are "increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and stabilization of the local and regional economy."

It is difficult to find a proper characterization for an agency employed by the Government to serve the interests of the Nation which could seriously place a monetary estimate upon such a jumble of indeterminates as this.

The Bureau's estimate on the Hammond project is a benefit of $41.50 per acre per year. The Bureau also estimates that the irrigation farmers on the project will be able to pay only $2.02 per acre per year for water. Thus the "direct benefits" would seem to be 20 times the farmers' ability to pay.

It should be noted that in the recent report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, which the President transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1956, it is recommended that only direct or primary benefits be used in the calculation of benefit-cost ratios and that the evaluation period be limited to 50 years. In contrast, the Reclamation Bureau has included large indirect or secondary benefits evaluated over a 100-year period.

IS MORE CULTIVATED LAND NECESSARY?

Since vast surpluses have not only burdened the economy with subsidies running into billions but have partially darkened the farm economy with a cloud of falling prices, it has been necessary for the sponsors of such reclamation projects as these to invent a means of justification based upon pure speculation of future needs.

The favorite date when they say that the grim spectre of famine will come (unless we heed their advice) is 1975. To meet the vast appetite of 200 million people in that year, the Bureau asks that before 1959 there be authorized and initiated the irrigation of 1,400,000 new acres and that there be supplementary water provided for 1,711,700 acres now irrigated and in cultivation. For this the minimum construction cost would be $2,110,834,000—a per-acre cost of $700.

I have in my brochure, "What Price Federal Reclamation?" to which I have already referred, shown with abundant reference to authorities in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere the utterly groundless nature of this claim for more irrigated land, in 1975 or any other year. Here I should like to call attention to another survey made from data gathered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. This shows that there now exists on improved farms nearly 21 million acres of good land lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States. This land is neither woodland, pasture, nor publicly owned. It is located in regions where there is plenty of rainfall and, in most States, where the growing season is much longer than in the upper Colorado region. All that might be needed to bring this land into cultivation would be an expenditure of from $50 to $150 an acre when and if there is need for more food and fiber. The distribution of this presently existing soil bank is as follows:

South

State:	Acres
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338

Southeast

State:	Acres
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519

Midwest

State:	Acres
Illinois	627,185
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296
Grand total	20,937,153

This, I repeat, is a soil bank already in being. But with production bursting at the seams on the land already cultivated, this reserve need not be touched for years to come.

Indeed, the necessity now faces the Congress to put more millions into the reserve. This is what is meant by the "soil bank" plan submitted by the President to Congress. That would retire 40 million acres which are now in cultivation. This will mean that between the American people and the famine portrayed by sponsors of more irrigation, these are no less than 61 million potentially productive acres.

Even to consider irrigating the 1,228,000 acres in the Colorado Basin contemplated in S. 500 while we are attempting to eliminate 40 million that we don't need is a matter so irrational as to suggest that it could happen only in the mystic land of political legislation, the land in which regional and bureaucratic ambitions are paramount and the national interest is forgotten.

But the proponents of this project have apparently convinced some people, including themselves, that the crops to be raised upon these high arid slopes are a very special kind of crops—rare, exotic, never to be in surplus, and highly essential to the Nation's welfare. The reality is that the produce to be raised will be just like the crops that are raised on millions and millions of acres now in cultivation. They are mostly grains, dairy products (from the cattle which eat the forage which is to be raised on the land and which the proponents say is not in surplus), and wool (from the sheep which also partake of the said forage).

ENGINEERING DOUBTS CONCERNING GLEN CANYON

My analysis of the economic and financial aspects of the proposed upper Colorado River project presupposes that the Bureau's engineering plans and cost estimates based thereon are adequate. However, it appears that there are physical and geologic problems in connection with Glen Canyon—the major storage unit—which cast doubt on its engineering and financial feasibility.

The geologic formations along the walls of the reservoir pose two problems. First, there are huge formations of pervious sandstone which might cause such large losses of water from the reservoir as to seriously depreciate its conservation value and curtail anticipated power production and reve-

nues. Secondly, there exists along some 50 miles of the reservoir a formation known by geologists as "Chinle shale," overlain by massive sandstone. This Chinle disintegrates into mud on contact with water. Thus when the reservoir fills, the entire mass of Chinle and sandstone overburden would be precipitated into the reservoir—with possible adverse effects on the functioning of the reservoir.

In addition, there is the serious problem of providing adequate protection of the world-renowned Rainbow Natural Bridge. The reservoir as planned would back up close to the arch and endanger this fragile structure of soft sandstone. Thus far, no adequate protective plan has been perfected and there is doubt that the cost of protective features is provided for in the cost estimates for this dam.

Finally, there is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam on which the Bureau's cost estimates are based. Comparison with Hoover Dam which is about the same height indicates that a much more massive structure than now planned would be needed to secure a safe dam, involving a much greater construction cost than estimated.

The engineering and financial feasibility of Glen Canyon storage unit remain uncertain until these doubts are resolved.

THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET COMMITTEE

Nearly 2 years ago, when the Colorado Storage project first became a matter of national concern and the Hoover Commission's task force began to survey the problem of water conservation, the President appointed a committee on the general subject, no doubt to guide him in passing upon the demands upon the Federal Treasury. That committee consisted of Secretary McKay, chairman, and Secretaries Benson and Wilson. Their report, which appeared in December 1955, if scrupulously followed by the administration and heeded by Congress, could do a great deal to rationalize the Government's reclamation policies.

It proposed that State and local governments share the cost of water projects. That is exactly what I would suggest.

It also proposed that there be set up "an independent board of review * * * to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President." That would indeed be a step toward rationality. It is what many of us have been talking about for a long time. The only advice the President can now get officially is from a bureau whose propaganda in the past has completely discredited any standing it might have for impartiality, accuracy or concern for the public interest and from Congressional committees stacked with members from the beneficiary States.

The President's Committee also proposed that in setting up reclamation plans and estimates, interest should "be shown clearly as a Federal cost." In short, that all the cards be laid on the table when a project is presented to Congress. Hitherto this charge, which I have shown herein to be immense, has only been given when some Member of Congress has pried it out of the representatives of the Bureau.

This interest charge, since it is a vital, not to say the vital, element in determining the justification of reclamation projects, has always been hidden as much as possible by proponents. This recommendation of the committee hit a vital spot in the defense of the upper Colorado project. For a Congressman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, immediately objected, saying that "if they did not favor the elimination of the interest charge immediately after adding it to the cost of construction, there wouldn't be a reclamation project in the United States that would be economically possible." The Congressman in that simple statement has eloquently summarized practically all of my argument here and in everything I have written on the subject for years. It is a confession of the utter weakness of the case for this project.

A TRUE PARTNERSHIP

There is a strange claim by some proponents of the Colorado River storage project that they are supporting a partnership plan such as has been advanced as an administration policy in the Northwest. There is no resemblance at all. The party of the first part, the Federal Government, is paying for the entire project and is constructing it. The parties of the second part supply the arid land. I favor, with the President's Cabinet Committee and with the earlier report of the Hoover Commission, a true sharing of the responsibilities in this project.

I have never contended and do not contend now that the four States in the upper basin are not entitled to the share of the water of the Colorado and its tributaries which was specified in the Colorado River compact. Nor do I deny that the Federal Government should build the means to store that water when needed. For the Federal Government by long prescription has assumed the responsibility of regulating the flow of interstate rivers. But this does not mean that the Government should build huge storage dams unless and until needed for water conservation and regulation.

Beyond that, I do not believe the Federal Government has an obligation. The power companies of the region which offered their testimony to the effect that there was a market—at a price—for the power should finance the power aspects of the storage dams themselves and dispose of the power where such storage dams can be justified. That is exactly what the Eisenhower-McKay partnership policy means, as illustrated by the proposed John Day Dam on the Columbia River.

Moreover, those cities which are in need of water for domestic purposes should provide the means of getting the water from the storage reservoirs. Finally, those industrial companies which are in the area and which are now so eagerly seeking subsidized water, should provide the means of getting the water for themselves. In short, the Federal Government should provide storage for the water as needed, and the users should go and get it. This would be true of the irrigators who are in need of supplementary supplies and those people—unnamed—who are anxious to try their fortunes on new irrigated land. This could be done through the States concerned if—and this if is very large indeed—the bestowal of water will indeed produce the wealth which proponents of this project claim. So far as the Navaho Indians are concerned, surely a Government which has been engaged for a century or more in caring for and regulating the life of these natives can provide a less expensive way to make them self-reliant than to set them up on farms at a cost to the taxpayer of $200,000 a family.

THE ISSUE IN MORALS AND EQUITY

If the issue were a simple matter of taking from rich States and giving to poor States, there might be a case despite the financial, engineering and economic factors which I have mentioned. But these are not needy States. Their potential wealth is considerable, and their well-being is reflected in all that they pay for the benefit of the outside world. On the basis of per capita income, they rank with the average among the States.

There is, moreover, a final consideration. It can be shown that the propaganda of the Federal Government for reclamation has in innumerable cases imposed a cruel hoax upon the farmers who attempt to cultivate the land. Indeed, the progressive lengthening of the payout period from 10 years in 1902 to 20 years in 1914 to 40 years in 1926 to 50 years in 1939 has been in response to the cries of distress of the unfortunate farmers and their congressional representatives. Since I have been writing about this subject over the past 2 years, I have received pathetic letters from farmers whose state of affairs has progressively turned to the worse. Despite the immense amount per acre that it takes to put water on arid land, the cultivation of that land and the management of the irrigation itself is a heavy burden upon the farmer. It is time to play fair with these farmers, as well as with the taxpayers of the 44 States in whose interest this discussion of the Colorado River storage project has been written.

Colorado River storage project—Participating projects

Project	Project construction cost (in thousands)	Total area served (acres)	Irrigation allocation per acre	Percentage of irrigation allocation to be repaid by irrigators
1. La Barge	$1,673	7,970	$210	29.6
2. Seedskadee	23,272	60,720	383	20.6
3. Lyman	10,564	40,600	260	21.3
4. Silt	3,356	7,300	450	31.1
5. Smith Fork	3,367	10,430	321	31.3
6. Paonia	6,944	17,040	399	35.5
7. Florida	6,942	18,950	343	26.3
8. Pine River extension	5,027	15,150	332	40.7
9. Emery County	9,865	24,080	400	38.6
10. Central Utah (initial phase)	231,044	160,380	794	11.9
11. Hammond	2,302	3,670	627	16.1
Total, 11 projects	304,356	366,290	[1] 545	[1] 17.5
12. Eden	7,287	20,200	361	20.6
Total, 12 projects	311,643	386,490	[1] 536	[1] 17.7
13. Navajo	211,237	137,250	1,530	14.6
14. San Juan-Chama	135,169	225,000	480	25.8
15. Gooseberry	5,761	16,400	350	41.5
Total, 15 projects	663,810	765,140	[1] 694	[1] 18.4
16. Savery-Pot Hook	10,814	31,610	340	12.9
17. Dolores	24,633	66,000	370	6.2
18. Sublette	37,099	84,000	430	3.7
19. Fruitgrowers Dam extension	1,690	3,850	440	27.8
20. Bostwick Park	2,634	6,870	380	26.4
21. Dallas Creek	10,330	21,940	470	9.2
22. East River	212	2,750	80	44.8
23. Fruitland Mesa	11,551	19,400	590	9.2
24. Grand Mesa	20,164	25,300	800	0.1
25. Ohio Creek	3,402	16,910	200	1.0

Footnote at end of table.

Colorado River storage project—Participating projects—Continued

Project	Project construction cost (in thousands)	Total area served (acres)	Irrigation allocation per acre	Percentage of irrigation allocation to be repaid by irrigators
26. Tomichi Creek	$11,523	27,580	$420	0.0
27. Battlement Mesa	5,854	6,830	860	11.0
28. Bluestone	3,330	10,875	310	11.1
29. Eagle Divide	3,412	10,875	310	8.9
30. Parshall	11,882	27,510	430	12.0
31. Rabbit Ear	4,733	19,190	250	16.1
32. Troublesome	5,243	13,640	380	13.8
33. West Divide	79,676	65,610	1,220	7.5
34. Woody Creek	178	2,965	60	100.0
Grand total, 34 projects	912,170	1,228,845	[1] 633	[1] 14.8

[1] Weighted average.

Have We Let Soviet Take Lead in Missile Field?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in the forthcoming issue of Collier's magazine, Hanson W. Baldwin, the military editor of the New York Times, presents one of the finest and clearest pictures of our problems and programs for the intercontinental ballistic missile I have seen to date. Mr. Baldwin outlines with cold sober precision the effect of this ultimate weapon on our international policy of survival and the extreme dangers we now face in having fallen behind in this race for deterrent power. He has not sought to place the blame for this situation and he has not tried to lull us into a false sense of security by poohpoohing the basic facts. He has done us a great service in digging up and presenting the cold facts as they are and drawing their logical consequences. The door of public understanding of our position has finally been opened.

In the same issue the editors of Collier's go one step further in an editorial entitled, "There Can Be Too Much Secrecy," and point up one of the most disquieting aspects of the entire subject. Why has it taken so long for the United States public to be informed on our failure to keep up in the race? Why were the alternatives not presented to the people at a time when a decision made by them could have kept us in the lead. The editors of Collier's state the clearest democratic truth that—

The security of the United States is the primary, but not exclusive, concern of our elected representatives and our appointed military leaders. The great outlines of our defense policies and a broad knowledge of our relative defensive posture should be known not merely by a small group of leaders, but by all citizens. In a democracy, in a free society based on the wisdom and judgment of all its members, the final great decision must be made by the Nation as a whole.

This is apparently a philosophy foreign to the minds of our current administration. The ICBM is not the only example of deceit, duplicity, and double talk by an administration which places budgetary considerations above the risks of national survival, but it is one of the most alarming. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues both to Mr. Baldwin's article and the thought-provoking editorial which accompanies it:

ICBM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

It will not be long. In 10 years, 5 years, perhaps only 2 or 3, the historic countdown will start: "Ten, nine, eight, seven, six, five, four, three, two, one." At zero a new era will open up on the earth the era of push-button war. A giant rocket, 100 to 135 feet high, will lift slowly from its launching pad and, with voice of thunder, tongue of flame disappear into the stratosphere. Some 20 to 30 minutes later and 5,000 miles away, the world's first intercontinental ballistic missile will plunge toward the earth.

Where will it come from?

It could be launched from Cape Canaveral, Fla., at the United States Air Force Missile Test Center, to splash harmlessly into the South Atlantic near Ascension Island.

Or, the missile might be launched from a Russian desert to arch, in unseen ellipse, high above the uninhabited tundra of the north.

It will make a difference, at most, the difference between peace and war; at least, the difference between added security for the West and possible Communist domination of more of the world.

Dubbed ICBM in our research laboratories and Pentagon offices, the intercontinental ballistic missile has been called the ultimate weapon. This giant ocean-spanning, mountain-leaping rocket, mated to a hydrogen warhead with a destructive capability of megatons (millions of tons of TNT), is a supreme instrument of offense. It arches so high (600 to 800 miles above the earth), and moves so fast (12,000 to 16,000 miles an hour) that, once it has been launched, defense against it will be nearly, if not entirely, impossible. The German V–2, the small 200-mile range forerunner of the ICBM, bombarded London during World War II, and even the conventional explosives then used in the warhead caused thousands of casualties and blew whole buildings apart. The ICBM will, when developed, threaten every city on earth, not merely with damage but with destruction.

The implications are frightening, and sobering. In the early period of the coming ICBM era, before radar missile-detection and possible antimissile defenses are developed, an enemy could probably devastate the United States with a surprise ballistic missile bombardment before we could even detect the attack, much less before we could launch a retaliatory attack. One or two missiles for each of our 50 biggest cities might cause 10 million to 50 million casualties, knock out perhaps a third of our industrial capacity, and turn parts of America into radioactive deserts.

But if we beat Russia in the race to develop the first practical ICBM, the weapon could be still another deterrent to nuclear war and to overt, large-scale armed aggression of any sort. Our capability of retaliation against aggressors would be considerably increased; the aggressors would have certain knowledge that they might have to pay a very high price indeed.

How is the race going?

No one—in Washington or Moscow—can answer that positively. "We just don't know," a high United States official says.

But many of our intelligence officials and some of our scientists believe Russia leads today. The Communists are not ahead of us across the whole broad band of the missile spectrum. We don't think Russia has anything to equal our Nike or Terrier antiaircraft guided missiles, or the Army's short-range surface-to-surface bombardment missile, the Corporal. We are fat with other good missiles—air-to-air and ship-to-shore.

But in the field of long-range bombardment missiles—in which the ICBM is the ultimate objective—the Russians seem to be off to a head start. There is unmistakable evidence that last year they tested an intermediate-range ballistic missile—a bombardment missile of unknown accuracy but with a range of at least 800 miles, far greater than that of anything we have yet fired; a missile which is clearly a first cousin to the ICBM. Moreover, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, warned in the Senate last month that "there is a danger" the Soviets may fire a 1,500-mile ballistic missile before the end of this year. Possession of even these two intermediate weapons would give Russia the means to bombard from her own territory most, if not all, of our allies in Europe and Asia—the means perhaps to blackmail them into throwing in their lot with the Soviet bloc, denying us their bases and isolating the United States.

The truth is that the Russians have emphasized the finished hardware, and they are getting it. We have emphasized research and refinements, and ultimately this approach may pay off. However, our policy has been questioned within the administration itself; last month Trevor Gardner, who has urged a bigger, faster missile program, resigned his post as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development as the culmination of his long disagreement with the Pentagon on that subject.

Policy disputes aside; there is little doubt that time is important. We are coming into the homestretch of the race. In a year or so—perhaps less—the first earth satellites will be launched into outer space, and Russia may put hers upstairs first. The earth-satellite program, despite the general scientific knowledge it will produce for all, is really a dress rehearsal for the ICBM so far as the launching phase of the program goes. It will supply, too, some data—much needed for calculating accurate ballistic trajectories—about nature's unknowns in space. So the heat is on.

Last month Defense Secretary Wilson took cognizance of the need for speeding up our efforts by announcing that he shortly would name a special assistant to direct all our various ballistic-missile projects.

"We have always been under pressure," a misisle scientist working on the ICBM says—"only more so now. We cannot afford to believe in a 20-year peace; we have to pace our development as if war were just around the corner."

We must learn, then, whether we like it or not, to live with the ICBM, and hence we must understand not only what makes it tick and how it fits into our military armory, but what effect its development will have upon war and peace, strategy and society.

Let's suppose, for a moment, that the worst happens and Moscow does win the race for the most powerful offensive weapon known to man. The Soviet advantage would be temporary—and brief. No matter who wins the race, the other power will not be far behind—6 month, 1 year • • • 3 years. Moscow, then, would have a transitory advantage in offensive delivery capabilities, a temporary monopoly of long-range ballistic weapons. But this could not be "absolute" advantage; the ICBM won't cancel out all other offensive and all defensive systems, both active and passive. It won't mean world domination for the Kremlin—unless Russia also develops a virtually airtight defense against all other nuclear-explosive delivery systems, well-nigh an impossibility.

But Russia with an ICBM would be like a bully with a really big stick. Regardless of whether he used it, he would have the means to throw his weight around dangerously—and the other boys in the block might go out of their way to avoid offending him.

To the present Communist advantage of superior land power, then, the ICBM would add a temporary—though definite—qualitative superiority in the air offensive.

I don't agree with those prophets of doom who hold that a Russian monopoly of the ICBM—even though short-lived—would enable Moscow to accomplish her objective of absolute world power. It is true, and it is a frightening thought, that if Russia wins the ICBM race, some of the tough men in the Kremlin might (figuratively) push a button and destroy New York. But Moscow has the capability of destroying New York today—though with far more difficult and less certain methods. And Russia could not hope to escape heavy retaliatory damage, whether or not we had developed the ICBM, for the intercontinental ballistic missile will not automatically replace all other ground, ship, and air-based weapons. Short- and intermediate-range missiles and piloted planes, some of them firing aid-to-ground missiles like the Rascal, would still pack a powerful offensive punch. Some of these would get through, no matter how good the Russian defenses.

What might happen if Russia wins the ICBM race is suggested by the events that followed her conquest of the atom, when she broke our atomic monopoly. Her diplomacy became bolder; the Reds were more willing to take a chance. They started a war in Korea, got tough in Indochina and off Formosa. Right now, they are getting tough in the Middle East.

In other words, the Soviet political and psychological offensive would be greatly strengthened. Many of the world's peoples are band-wagon jumpers; they want to be on the side they think will win. We can depend on Soviet propaganda to exploit to the full a Soviet victory in the ICBM race. The Russians would be certain to hammer on the theme that the Soviet Union has displaced the United States as the most advanced industrial and technological nation in the world. The resultant loss of face for the United States could be damaging for the cause of freedom.

Furthermore, just as Soviet diplomacy would be strengthened by the new weapon, so ours—if we didn't have it—would be correspondingly weakened. Without the power of full retaliation, it would take a bold President and a bold Secretary of State to stand completely firm against Communist aggression and Soviet demands if our military leaders advised them that Moscow could destroy 20 major United States cities and pulverize our industrial plant in half an hour.

So, in my opinion, while a Russian victory in the ICBM race wouldn't mean all-out nuclear war or Communist world domination, it would mean a very critical period, indeed, in which United States diplomacy—already behind the eight ball in many parts of the world—would be still further handicapped. The danger would be that during this period Russia might make very large political-economic-psychological gains which would prejudice our future global position. The danger would be that Russia might press her campaign for the world to a point where another small war—like Korea or Indochina—might start, with unknown ultimate consequences.

What is the story behind the development of this amazing missile which can change the course of history?

The arms race today and tomorrow is centered around carriers of nuclear weapons rather than the weapons themselves. The world already has a whole family of A-weapons; it has about maximized weapons of destruction. The race now goes to the side that first develops the most efficient carriers for nuclear weapons: planes, ships, submarines—and missiles.

If any one man deserves the title of "Father of the Ballistic Missile," he is Dr. Wernher von Braun, a dynamic young German-born scientist. During World War II, he headed the German scientific team at Peenemünde which developed the granddaddy of the ICBM—the V–2 rocket, used against London. He and many of his countrymen were recruited by the United States Army after the war and brought to the United States to help develop our missiles. Now American citizens, they are an important part of the Army's missile-development team at Redstone Arsenal, near Huntsville, Ala.

To this group's pioneering research has been added a vast volume of basic and developmental work by United States scientists and engineers. As a result, the United States is already flying medium-range and long-range surface-to-surface bombardment missiles—all of them to date, however, operating in the earth's atmosphere and hence relatively easier to intercept than the space-flying ICBM. The United States Navy's Regulus, the Air Force's Matador—both of them small pilotless planes, with ranges of about 500 miles—are much improved versions of the German V–1 pilotless aircraft which bombarded London prior to the development of the V–2. Drone planes—really a form of guided missile—have flown coast to coast with their own self-contained navigation system.

The Snark—the first of this Nation's intercontinental-range guided missiles—has been test-fired at Cape Canaveral on Florida's east coast, and Northrop Aircraft Co., its developer, is reported to be about to receive a production contract. The Snark is a pilotless plane, powered by a turbojet engine, and it flies at aircraft altitudes and speeds (under 50,000 feet, 500 to 600 miles an hour) for about 5,000 miles.

The Navaho, North American Aviation's contribution to the armory of intercontinental war, is still in the development stage. Powered either with a turbojet or with a ram-jet engine, it is designed to fly higher and faster (50,000 to 75,000 feet and 1,000 to 2,000 miles per hour) than the Snark.

But all these missiles are really pilotless bombers, not intercontinental artillery like the ICBM. In fact, the wingless ballistic missile differs from a conventional artillery shell only in that it has its own integral propulsion system and can be guided from the ground in at least the initial stages of its flight. The path of a long-range artillery shell is an arc looping high into the air, then curving downward toward the target. A long-range ballistic missile follows the same elliptical trajectory—but loops into outer space and covers a few thousand miles instead of a few thousand yards.

By contrast, the long-range winged missiles now in use all follow so-called "cruise" or flat trajectories. Like piloted planes, they take off from runways, ramps, catapults or other launching rigs, climb to cruising altitude and level off. They are limited in speed, altitude and trajectory, by the need of their engines for the oxygen in the atmosphere and by their dependence on their stubby wings for lift. These limitations mean that missiles like the Snake and Navaho can be intercepted by fast piloted planes or by other missiles.

The ICBM—because it follows a ballistic trajectory outside the earth's atmosphere, because it flies so high and so fast—may become the world's first unstoppable weapon. Scientists envisage, in theory, a system of automatic tracking and intercepting missiles which might in time make possible a small "kill rate." But the time between launching and impact is so short, the technical difficulties so immense, that any such defense system is a long way off. Furthermore, even when it is developed it can never be more than fractionally effective—and that just wouldn't be enough. Only a few ICBMs would have to get through to knock out our own principal cities—and a good part of our warmaking potential.

Imagine trying to hit an artillery shell in midflight with another artillery shell. This is—in minuscule—the problem of intercepting an ICBM. The expensive and extensive radar, interceptor and missile-defense system we are now so hastily and painfully erecting will be of little use against the ICBM. We cannot even track a giant rocket through its entire ballistic trajectory with our present early-warning and control radar—much less intercept it. The ICBM represents, for the immediate future at least, the ultimate triumph of the offensive in war.

Russia's probable lead in the ICBM race can be traced in part to the way in which the Soviets were able to capitalize on the preliminary work done by the Germans in World War II. While Von Braun and a number of his colleagues came over to the West, the Soviets seized the Peenemunde station itself and found a number of V–2 production lines more or less intact. Recruiting those scientists who had not already fled to the West, the Reds started up the production lines again, stockpiled V–2s and, as time went on, gradually improved the range, accuracy, and performance of the missiles.

On the other hand, our immediate postwar effort in missle work was centered on basic research and preliminary development. We carried out a series of test-firings of V–2 type rockets and other research vehicles at the White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico, and awarded research contracts to a number of companies and universities. Not until the Korean war started did we attempt to turn basic knowledge into finished hardware, and even then the emphasis was more on the pilotless-plane-type missle than the ballistic kind.

Then, more than 2 years ago, Assistant Air Secretary Trevor Gardner built a fire under the ICBM. Such a missle had been under consideration ever since World War II, with Convair doing research and design studies, part of the time at its own expense. But a missile is very different from an airplane, and rather "early on"—as the British put it—Convair encountered some of the same difficulties other aircraft companies have since met in attempting to adapt to missle work. The ICBM studies, therefore, were more or less inchoate until Gardner appointed a scientific committee in 1953 to study the project and make recommendations. This committee—and another later—not only found that an ICBM was feasible, but laid the groundwork for the present high-priority organization.

That organization is centered around a specially created western development division of the Air Research and Development

Command, with headquarters at Los Angeles. Here, Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever of the Air Force, with the aid of a sizable staff and of the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp., is directing the development of the ICBM. (Dean Wooldridge and Simon Ramo are two brilliant young physicists who did some trailblazing work in electronics, while with Hughes Aircraft, on the Falcon air-to-air guided missle and on various Air Force fire-control systems.) An advisory committee, including Brigadier General Charles A. Lindberg and headed by the famous scientist Dr. John von Neumann, "kibitzes" and monitors progress.

Last year, the effort was broadened to a dual and competing approach. While Convair continued to develop its Atlas project, the Glen L. Martin Co. is attempting a different approach to the air-frame and configuration problem in a separate program. Companies working with Convair or Martin on propulsion matters include North American, Aerojet-General division of General Tire & Rubber Co., and Reaction Motors; while General Electric, Bell Telephone Laboratories, Sperry Rand, Bendix, AVCO, AC Spark Plug Division of General Motors, and American Bosch Arma Corp. are among firms assisting in solving guidance and other problems.

The United States has also entered—belatedly—the intermediate range ballistic missile race. The Air Force has a project of its own underway, and the Army and Navy have begun a joint high priority program centered at Redstone Arsenal under Maj. Gen. John Bruce Medaris and Dr. von Braun; their missile will be for both ground and shipboard launching.

All these competing projects will exchange technical data; a great increase in funds is to be provided in the next fiscal year, starting July 1, and in mid-1957—the year, incidentally, in which the United States hopes to launch some earth satellites into the upper atmosphere—the entire project will be reviewed. After considerable hesitancy and delay, the United States ballistic missiles program at last appears to be in high administrative gear.

But the technical problems are still immense, especially as they apply to the ICBM. Imagine a giant rocket—a Gargantuan version of a Fourth of July skyrocket, more than 100 feet high, weighing more than 100 tons—hurled to an altitude of 600 to 800 miles above the earth into a region of no air. Then envisage, if you can, the warhead or nose of this huge gadget slanting downward through the denser atmosphere—speeding at 15,000 miles an hour toward a target a couple of thousand miles away. How can you hit anything with such a long-range weapon? How do you even get this great mass to budge from the earth?

It can be done. One expert has said, "The missile can be built with the scientific knowledge now available, but basic research will enable us to do the job better. The work ahead is chiefly engineering."

There are three primary problems (and thousands of subsidiary ones) that collectively make up the problem of the ICBM. These are propulsion, guidance, and heat or reentry.

"It is going to take much or most of the engine development of the country to get the ICBM upstairs," a scientist predicted in outlining the propulsion problem.

The world's fastest rocket today probably loafs along at 4,000 to 5,000 feet per second. The Atlas (Convair's name for tme ICBM), if it is to travel 5,000 miles, will have to be moving in its first stages 5 to 6 times as fast, or 20 to 25 times the speed of sound.

The engines that will give the ICBM this "oomph" are rocket engines; they spew hot gases out of an exhaust in the tail and the reaction lifts the rocket. They differ from other jet engines in that they run on chemicals and carry their own oxygen with them to permit combustion. The fuels can be either liquid or solid. The V–2 used a combination of alcohol and liquid oxygen; the Army's corporal guided missile—a battlefield weapon with a range of under 100 miles—uses an acid-aniline combination.

Liquid fuels—chemicals in all sorts of combinations—produce a higher impulse, a greater thrust, than solid fuels, and they can be more easily "cut off" (combustion stopped) at a desired point in flight. But they are volatile, explosive and hard to handle, and the rocket engines that use them require a lot of "plumbing" in the form of piping. Solid propellants—really powder in various forms—haven't yet equaled the "kick" of the liquid fuels, and cutoff control is more difficult. But they are simple, reliable, rugged and give promise of providing a somewhat slower but more even acceleration.

Another potential fuel of great promise for the future (but unlikely for the first models of the ICBM) is fissionable material. A very small nuclear pile to heat and expand some type of gas might ultimately prove to be the most efficient type of propulsion for an ICBM.

But the ICBM's first rocket engines are likely to be powered with liquid fuels, or perhaps with liquids and solid propellants in combination.

A single rocket motor big enough to lift a hydrogen warhead sufficiently high for a 5,000-mile range has not yet been built. On the other hand, engines now under development could be used in multiple to provide the total thrust needed. The earth-satellite program (which really serves—in its launching phase—as a sort of "dry run" for the ICBM) will depend upon a multistage rocket for launching. Two liquid-fuel rocket engines will be connected in tandem. The first "stage" will lift the entire device rapidly into the skies; when its fuel is exhausted, a servomechanism will detach it from the main body, and the second "stage" will take over. Finally, at the apogee (top) of the trajectory, some 200 or 300 miles above the earth, a solid-propellant engine will tilt the satellite on its side and give it a final "kick" up to 30,000 feet per second in a path parallel to the earth's orbit. Thus, the earth-satellite launching program will probably involve what is called a "three-stage" rocket—three rocket engines connected in tandem, one behind another—the power of all of them used successively to get the satellite to the required speed and altitude.

The advantage of the staged rocket for the ICBM is obvious; speed increases as bulk and weight decrease, until finally the warhead—on its own and with all its propulsion mechanism dropped behind it—follows a ballistic trajectory, like an artillery shell, to its target.

Rocket motors thus can be linked in tandem, or stages, to provide the boost needed to put the warhead upstairs. Each stage would function successively; as each used its fuel and was detached the rocket would become lighter and lighter and its speed greater and greater.

But rocket motors can also be linked in parallel—or radially, like the cylinders of a radial gasoline engine. This so-called "honeycomb mesh," or "six-shooter-revolver" configuration, could also be arranged so that one or more of the engines would be detached from the central cylinder and would drop off when it had done its job.

No one yet knows which configuration—tandem or parallel motors—offers more promise; both can and probably will be used. But the ultimate ICBM will almost certainly be—as experts see it now—a staged rocket, perhaps 1½ or 2 propelling stages with the warhead on top.

That brings us to the second major problem—guidance. Like the jabberwockian talk of Alice in Wonderland, there have been a lot of semantics used to define guided missiles. One might ask: When is a guided missile not a guided missle? The answer would be: the ICBM. It will be guided only for about the first 300 miles of its 5,000-mile flight.

Imagine a gun barrel about 300 miles long. This represents the "guided" part of the ICBM's trajectory—the burning time when the rocket motors are functioning and accelerating the warhead for its 4,700 miles of free flight. Up until the last rocket-motor stage falls off, some control, some guidance is possible; after that, no human effort is likely to modify the ICBM's trajectory.

The guidance of the ICBM simply endeavors to put the warhead on a proper course at a proper speed at a fixed predetermined point in space. This is done primarily in two ways. The course and speed required to reach a fixed and known target are precalculated (as they are prior to the firing of an artillery shell), the amount of fuel and acceleration needed is determined, and the servomechanisms which will automatically cut off the fuel supply at the right point are adjusted before firing. Similarly, control mechanisms which will tilt the rocket toward the correct great-circle course can be preadjusted. These mechanisms can take two forms. The German V–2 rocket used graphite control vanes which were set in the blast of the jet stream; the angle at which these vanes were set deflected the jet blast and tilted the rocket. The United States Viking rocket, on the other hand, changed the angle of the jet blast by tilting the entire rocket motor.

In addition to careful prefiring calculations and adjustments (called "programed guidance"), some electronic control over the rocket during its climb into the blue-black emptiness of outer space is possible. The rocket is fitted with a so-called "transponder," or radar beacon, and its course during the 300 miles of guidance is tracked by ground radar. The data recorded is fed into computing machines, which immediately determine whether or not the rocket is on its predetermined course. If it is not, a new course is calculated by the machines, the correction flashed by electronic waves to the rocket, and servomechanisms deflect the jet stream and tilt the rocket, shut off, open, or regulate the fuel flow. If the rocket promises to be a "wild" one (like one of our test V–2's which went the wrong way at White Sands Proving Ground and landed across the border in Mexico), a self-destroying mechanism can be activated.

This limited guidance for the ICBM may in time be supplemented. A system of so-called inertial guidance, or automatic self-navigation, now applicable to cruise-type missiles like the Navaho, can be tailored to the propulsion stages of the rocket, and—perhaps—to the warhead to keep it in the proper flying attitude during its free flight. A so-called terminal guidance system, which would take over when the missile was approaching its target and would attract the missile to the target by light, heat, or infrared, might also have some future application to the ICBM. But the difficulties would be enormous.

The ICBM as now envisaged, therefore, is subject in free flight to the whims and vagaries of nature. And some of these are irregular and variable—one reason why the ICBM will never be a "bomb in a pickle barrel" weapon, but essentially a weapon of limited accuracy for area bombardment.

There are three groups of errors which affect the guidance of an ICBM, and none of them is easily susceptible to correction.

The first of these categories might be called "errors due to nature." There is a constant and unpredictable fluctuation in the thickness of the ionospheric layers of the atmosphere which influences the propagation of radio waves through space, and hence the accuracy of any electronic guidance systems.

There is, moreover, no way to predict variable changes in the direction and strength of gravitational forces, which could tend to pull an ICBM off course. And, finally, the earth's rotation—long considered a constant—has been found to change unpredictably and without uniformity; such a change could cause a missile properly launched to score a clean miss.

The second category of errors are instrument errors. These are more susceptible to human control, but will probably never be eliminated completely. Tiny errors at launching—and during the 300-mile gun-tube guidance phase—are multiplied geometrically by the long range to enormous errors on impact. An error in speed of 1 foot per second at the time of combustion cutoff could cause an error of 1 mile on impact.

The third category of errors are errors of mapping and surveying. To put it baldly, we don't know where the true north is, or where, say Sverdlovsk is. The ICBM follows a great-circle course from launching point to target. If it is to hit we have to know exactly where—on the earth's surface—the two points are. This is not as simple as it sounds; one of the great problems of missile warfare is the incorrect coordinates of many of the cities and points on earth, particularly those in Russia. Many of the world's maps are in error, especially those that show the vast area of the Soviet Union east of the Urals.

If the coordinates given on your maps and charts are in error you will miss. This may be one reason, incidentally, why the Russians are hostile to President Eisenhower's mutual aerial-inspection proposal. They know we don't know the exact location of cities and industries east of the Urals, and they know there is probably no good way for us to find out except by a great remapping job.

All these categories of errors, many of which appear unpredictable, mean that the ICBM will have to compensate for its inaccuracy by the frightful power and the extensive destructive effect of the explosive it carries, the hydrogen warhead. Just how inaccurate it will be no one now knows; the first ICBM obviously will be far less accurate than later models. An error of 1 percent in 5,000 miles, a figure once discussed, could mean that the missile might fall 50 miles from the target. That, scientists and military men agree, is not good enough. Scientists seem to believe that ultimately they may be able to reduce the circular error at 5,000 miles' range to 5 to 10 miles, provided the target is where it is supposed to be.

Dwarfing the tremendous, though, soluble, problems of propulsion and guidance, virtually all scientists agree, is the problem of heat generated by skin friction when the missile reenters the earth's atmosphere. Meteors that constantly bombard the earth nearly all burn up and disintegrate long before they reach the surface; the tremendous heat generated by their passage through the earth's atmosphere destroys them. The ICBM will be, in effect, a meteor; it will be hurled into upper space, and then fall back at high speeds into the denser lower atmosphere. The denser lower air will slow it up, perhaps down to Mach 2 or 3, but also it will heat and perhaps burn it up. In fact, the skin friction caused by the passage through the atmosphere will be so enormous that until some way is found of absorbing, or draining off, or neutralizing this heat, no intact ICBM will reach the earth.

This is a problem for metallurgists, chemists, physicists and a half a dozen other specialists with long names, like aerothermodynamicist. It is a giant problem, in fact, the major problem of the ICBM today. Reentry temperatures might, for example, reach 6,000 degrees or more, and today most of our low-carbon alloy steels lose their strength at about 1,000 degrees.

There are several approaches to this problem—and they are all being tried. You can try to slow the missile up—with wings or spoilers or some similar devices—and thus reduce the temperatures. You can plunge right on through, reducing the duration of heating, though increasing the temperature. You can try ceramic skins, or porous or sweating jackets, which exude moisture for liquid cooling. You can devise higher-temperature alloys. Or you can take a leaf from the lesson of the larger meteorites that sometimes reach the earth; you can increase the thickness of your missile's skin (and hence the bulk and weight) and provide a heat sink. This is the so-called brute force or boilerplate approach; it obviously takes longer for a thick metal skin to melt than a thin one. But the brute-force approach has its disadvantages; it increases the weight of the missile and thus greatly increases the problem of the propulsion engineer.

Today, there is no clear-cut answer in sight to the heat problem—though one will be found. But again, as in the guidance problem, the power of the weapon that the ICBM will carry—the thermonuclear explosive—reduces somewhat the importance of the re-entry factor. You don't have to design a missile that will remain intact all the way to earth. It can miss vertically as well as horizontally and still do tremendous damage.

Here, then, is what some military men have called "the ultimate weapon," "the absolute weapon"—"the weapon that will rule the earth." It will tower perhaps 100 to 135 feet above its launching pad. Its gross take-off weight—with fuel—may be between 100 and 120 tons. It will lift, slowly at first, virtually straight into the air, burning thousands of pounds of fuel in 60 seconds. It will slowly tilt toward its great-circle course. Probably under 100,000 feet its first stage will break away; the second stage will ignite and the smaller rocket will continue its climb toward the stars. At 300 miles—above the earth's thin envelope of air—the second stage will be detached and the great warhead, perhaps 30 feet long, 4 feet in diameter, will streak on alone toward outer space under the tremendous momentum given it. It will reach its apogee between 600 and 800 miles above the earth and will then start its elliptical fall—perhaps tail first (for there is no bite of thin air to straighten it out). It may tumble, particularly as it gathers speed and reaches the upper atmosphere; it should nose down under the resistance of thicker air—but erratic gyrations are possible. Finally, glowing white and slowed down to Mach 2 or 3, it will burst like a violent meteor above some unsuspecting metropolis of man.

The ICBM will be an awesome weapon—with frightening capabilities. It is well named Atlas; truly it carries man and his future on its shoulders.

Eisenhower Administration Risks National Security by Withholding Information on Russian Military Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to present this editorial from the current issue of Collier's magazine for the attention of my colleagues. This editorial calls attention to the failure of the administration to keep the American public informed on an issue vital to the survival of this Nation.

The editorial from Collier's follows:

THERE CAN BE TOO MUCH SECRECY

While we and the Soviet leaders have moved from one postwar conference to another, each of us has been building up his supply of weapons and perfecting new ones, in case of war. On the basis of recent assertions in Washington by responsible political leaders, and on the evidence adduced by Hanson W. Baldwin in this issue of Collier's, it has become at last abundantly clear that we and the Soviets are involved in a critical contest to develop the first intercontinental ballistic missile, otherwise known as the ICBM. This is not a guided missile in the sense that its automatic guidance apparatus carries it through its flight until the moment it finds and strikes its target. Although some form of terminal controls ultimately may be included in the weapon, although it is subject to guidance and correction during its first several hundred miles of flight, it is for most of the great arc of its trajectory very like a bullet. While, as pointed out by Mr. Baldwin, severe engineering problems still exist, the ICBM ultimately will be able to take off, achieve a velocity many times the speed of sound, and descend perhaps half an hour later on its target 5,000 miles away. There is no presently known method of stopping—or, as the military say, of interdicting—the missile once it has been launched.

Whether or not this is, indeed, the ultimate weapon or the absolute weapon, as it has sometimes been described, is a matter the experts may debate. Meanwhile, no one can argue the appalling capacities of a hydrogen bomb encased in a 5,000-mile-range missile which cannot be stopped. It is dangerous nonsense to quibble over the relative power of a weapon when, at a minimum, it can bring under the threat of total devastation any city on earth.

Nor may we, in relation to our military requirements, be greatly concerned with Soviet intentions. These, as has been abundantly illustrated, are highly fluid as to tactics, rigid only as to ultimate aims. To understand Soviet political aims and the various techniques used in pursuing them is the primary concern of our State Department. It is the task of the Department of Defense to make certain that regardless of Soviet intentions our Defense Establishment is at all times equal to or better than Soviet armed strength. That is its mission in peacetime no less than in wartime.

Yet there is increasing evidence that in the critical field of the ICBM the Soviets may well be ahead. As Mr. Baldwin points out, no one (including, fortunately, the Russians) can be entirely certain that this is so. But other statements have not been reassuring. Senator SYMINGTON has said flatly that the Soviets are well ahead in the race. Senator JACKSON of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also has indicated this in his speech in which he voiced the possibility that the Soviets soon may fire a 1,500-mile missile, with all that this threat implies against our present allies and our bases in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Many a leader in defense, in science, in politics has expressed the same opinion—that the Soviets are ahead of us.

Assuming that this is true, we should like to raise and examine the question—why? In a nation which has achieved one technological miracle after another, which rightly prides itself upon its enormous gifts of scientific brains and technological know-how, why is that we should fall behind a nation which we have all too often, out of smugness or vanity or plain bad judgment, underestimated?

Is it because the Soviets have concentrated their main effort on producing the

weapon with the clearest decisive advantages while we have scattered our effort over a variety of weapons, all excellent but none with the essential capability required?

Is it because, through dilatoriness or indecision or mistaken preoccupation with cost, we have proceeded on the ICBM program on a "business as usual" basis, keeping the essential plants on a single-shift basis when nothing less than a round-the-clock program will suffice?

The facts are, at least, that the plants have not been working at or anywhere near capacity; that only now, when the race has been in progress for nearly 3 years, has anything resembling a crash program been set in motion. And the apparent fact is that, as a result, we have let the Soviets get off to a head start in a matter which is of life-and-death importance to all of us.

Another, highly relevant, fact is that the vast majority of Americans have been going about their daily lives completely unaware not only of the fact that we are trailing in the race, but even of the significance of the race itself. In plain logic, such a situation is intolerable in a democracy such as ours.

This is not to quarrel with the basic requirement of maintaining essential security on many aspects of our national defense. It is obvious that a vast amount of technical data on individual defense projects, and information related to their progress, must be protected by secrecy. We clearly cannot afford to leak to the Russians data that enable them to widen their lead in the race for the ICBM—this is accepted by all.

But neither is it possible—and the ICBM may provide the grimmest example of this—for this democracy to exist in circumstances where the people are sealed off from all inkling of the great, strategic considerations which govern their very lives. This is a cynical denial of both the commonsense of the American people and the validity of the principle of self-government. More than that, it is harshly impractical, and self-defeating.

It is impractical, for one reason, because regardless of all else the people are invested with the power to govern, and they will govern, for better or worse, depending precisely upon the quality of information upon which their decisions are based. Every penny of money spent by the military on any project is provided by the House of Representatives, which alone has the power to initiate appropriation measures, and which, to a man, must return to the voters every 2 years for license to stay in office.

Ultimately any program such as that of the ICBM is inevitably based on public support, for it is only the public which can provide, out of pocket or through its existing institutions, the money, education and training, and scientific research programs to do the job.

The security of the United States is the primary, but not exclusive, concern of our elected representatives and our appointed military leaders. The great outlines of our defense policies and a broad knowledge of our relative defense posture should be known not merely by a small group of leaders, but by all citizens. In a democracy, in a free society based on the wisdom and judgment of all its members, the final great decisions must be made by the Nation as a whole.

But those final decisions can be made only when people have sufficient information to exercise thoughtful and careful judgment. The risk is great, but less great than when decisions are made in an absence of public knowledge, when the public has been deprived of access to information which will enable it to make competent decisions on the gravest matters of life and death and the survival of all we believe in.

It is not enough to know after the fact. It is necessary that the public be made aware of the great alternatives confronting it. Only thus do we, as a free people, retain ultimate custody of our lives and our freedom. Certainly neither history nor any possible future casualties will forgive those in power who feared to put into the hands of Americans the knowledge they needed to help prepare for their survival, but instead told them too little and too late.

The American Legion Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Department Commander John Andrew May, of the department of South Carolina, American Legion, at Greensboro, N. C., on January 14, 1956.

Mr. President, it so happens that the department commander of the department of South Carolina was for 2 years my military aide when I was Governor of South Carolina in 1943 and 1944. On my recommendation he was later sent to Germany by the President as an attorney in the Nuremberg war crimes trial. Commander May is an outstanding South Carolinian who has served well his country in both peace and war. As commander of the South Carolina American Legion he has rendered outstanding service. I think his address which I send to the desk tells well the story of the American Legion and the great work it is doing in preserving Americanism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION STORY

My first experience with the American Legion was on July 4, 1932, when the Department of South Carolina held their annual convention in my hometown of Aiken. I was not a member of the Legion, because I was not eligible, but I did attend the social affairs of that convention, and I remember very well what a good time those Legionnaires had. I saw them having fun at the dance, enjoying the beauty contest, and the parade, and that was all I knew of the the American Legion.

I believe that there are those today who have not had the opportunity to know the Legion and who still look upon it as I did back in 1932—as an organization of good fellows having a big time.

Since that time I have had the opportunity to work in the ranks of the American Legion, and now I know firsthand that there is much more to it than a bunch of good fellows having a big time.

I know now that the American Legion has become the most successful of all veterans organizations, because it has combined effectively high purpose with resolute action, and that its justification for existence is measured by what it stands for and what it does.

I know now that it is built around a great ideal and that ideal is the preservation of the free institutions of America. In its Preamble to the Constitution, that has often been called one of the great classics of the English language, we find an expression of the practical idealism of the American Legion. Sparkling with the purest gems of patriotic thought, the preamble is part of the oath of membership which every Legionnaire assumes—

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

"To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America;

"To maintain law and order;

"To foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism;

"To preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the great wars;

"To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation;

"To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses;

"To make right the master of might;

"To promote peace and good will on earth;

"To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy;

"To consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

The American Legion has four basic major programs. They are: Americanism, child welfare, rehabilitation, national security.

The Americanism program can be broken down into four main groups of activities. They are—

First, the protective activities. This is a program of militant and aggressive opposition to all subversive and un-American influence and activities. This is the fighting phase of our Americanism program. In this phase we man the ramparts. In this field we attack.

The second group is the educational activities. This is a program to educate all in America—young and old—to appreciate fully the blessings of our free American way of life. In this field we teach.

Our third group is the youth training activities. This is a program to inculcate American ideals and principles into the youth of America as the basis for future good citizenship. We make use of activities popular with youth to accomplish this objective. In this field we build.

The fourth group is a community service activity. This is a program to make every community in America a better neighborhood, as a steppingstone toward making all the world a good neighborhood. In this field we serve.

There you have the four cornerstones of the Americanism program of the American Legion.

Attack enemies of our freedoms.

Teach appreciation of our blessings.

Build solidly for America's future.

Serve our fellow men in Christian spirit.

I did not know, in 1932, of the Legion's fight against communism. I know now that since its organization in 1919 the American Legion has been the No. 1 enemy of communism and that the American Legion was responsible for the creation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I did not know in 1932 of the community service program. I know now that 17,400 posts last year engaged in some form of community service, and that thousands of cities have better civic facilities because of the activities of the Legion.

I did not know in 1932 of the school medal awards, awarded annually to deserving students throughout the land. I know now that last year over 16,500 medals were awarded to outstanding pupils selected by their teachers, who best exemplify good citizens.

I did not know of the Boy Scout work, but now I know that last year over 4,000 troops were sponsored by American Legion posts, and that thousands and thousands of Legionnaires served as Scout masters.

I did not know about junior baseball, but now I know that it is the largest organized amateur athletic program in the world for teen-agers—that last year over 17,000 teams

and almost a million boys participated in this great American sport.

I did not dream of such a thing as Boys' State and Boys' Nation. But now I know that this is one of the most effective youth training activities. Two hundred and fifty thousand boys have participated as Boys' Staters, where they learn by doing; and Boys' Nation—two from each State—attend the annual Boys' Nation in Washington; that they hold mock national conventions, elect a boy president, and hold a senate session; visit all historical and Federal points of interest in Washington, and are personally received by the President at the White House. For the past 2 years I have been counsellor and instructor at Boys' Nation. In this dramatic manner the American Legion brings to these boy leaders the never-to-be-forgotten insight into the functions of our Government, in order that they may make it better when they become active citizens.

I did not know of the American Legion oratorical contests based on a study of the American Constitution and Bill of Rights. Last year over 400,000 high-school students participated, and this year the national finals have been awarded to South Carolina, and will be held on April 16 in Columbia.

I had no idea in 1932 of the legion's great rehabilitation program. A program to make disabled veterans fit again to earn their livelihood. The American Legion has no equal in its service to the disabled veteran, war widows, orphans, and dependent parents, and all ex-service men and their families. We have a Veterans' Administration today because the American Legion convinced our Goverament that such an agency was necessary to administer veterans' benefits.

Of course, none of us knew about the GI bill of rights, but it is the American Legion's greatest single legislative achievement. Approximately 7½ million World War II veterans have had some form of educational training under the GI bill, and 3½ million have attended college, 1½ million received on-the-job training, and one-half million received farm training.

That under this bill almost 4 million veterans purchased homes; 221,000 received business loans; 68,000 secured loanas to buy farms; and that since this bill went into effect almost 11 years ago, it has produced 744,000 scientists, 700,000 mechanics, 750,000 modern farmers, 238,000 teachers, 145,000 engineers, 63,00 doctors, and 100,000 lawyers.

I had no conception whatever of the wonderful child-welfare program, but now I know that the American Legion is the leader in this great field of unselfish service and that together with the auxiliary and the 40 & 8 last year $10 million was provided for emergency financial help for the needy children of America. Most of this money went for food, clothing, and medical care.

I did not know in 1932 that those fellows who were having such a big time at the dance were also a religious-minded group, because now I know something of the great back to God movement that is sponsored by the Legion. The very first words of our Preamble are "For God and country we associate ourselves together." I know now that basic spiritual principles have always been the foundation of the American Legion. In 1950 the American Legion launched the nation-wide divine guidance appeal movement, and in 1952 we redesignated it as the "back to God movement." It has a three-fold program; first, to encourage regular attendance at churches; second, family prayer and devotion; and third, religious training of children. The American Legion believes that the church and home are our greatest character-building institutions and the American Legion is leading a nation-wide effort to bring the church and home into close partnership.

Let me mention some of the worthwhile things that I did not know about:

Mental health: Convinced that something should be done in this field, the American Legion contributed $25,000 to start this movement. This was the first major contribution to the newly established National Association for Mental Health, and 8 years ago the American Legion and Auxiliary donated $50,000 to help launch the first program of the American Heart Association.

Foreign relations: Foreseeing the approach of World War II, long before the public became conscious of the impending global conflict, the American Legion was the first to recognize the world-wide march of aggression. We were the first to demand that Hitler be stopped; that appeasements be condemned; to protest shipments of scrap metal to Japan; to call for an embargo on war materials to aggressor nations; to advocate the repeal of the Neutrality Act; and to demand the fortification of Guam and the Philippines. The American Legion urged an effective association of free nations long before the U. N. was a reality.

National security: From its birth in Paris in 1919, the American Legion has been the foremost champion of national security. Legionnaires, being war veterans, are keenly aware of America's need for a strong defense. We know, from experience, how important it is to go into combat with good and sufficient equipment. Between World War I and World II, the American Legion almost alone kept the torch burning for peace through strength. We were called militaristic by the pacifists, and subversive elements, but we point with pride that for 35 years we have championed adequate national defense.

The march of events has always justified the rightness of the American Legion, and our position on preparedness. In that connection, the American Legion favors universal military training. The framework of the American Legion's entire national security program has always been universal military training for the Nation's young men. In this atomic age when the payoff is on military "know how," the American Legion regards such training as security insurance for the Nation and survival training for its youth.

Civil defense program: Nine months before Pearl Harbor, the American Legion sent its own mission to England to study the functions of civil defense in modern warfare. The findings of this mission became the groundwork of the first civil defense program in America. The American Legion conducted 56 air raid warden schools in 31 States. We graduated 8,000 instructors, who, in turn, trained 225,000 wardens, and the American Legion paid for all these expenses. Since World War II, we see the need for continuing this program, and we vigorously supported the passage of Public Law 920 providing for the appointment of an administrator for civil defense.

Forty and Eight: Within the American Legion is a fun and honor society known as the 40 & 8. The official name is La Societe des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux. Translated it means 40 men and 8 horses. This name comes from the foreign boxcars which hauled American troops in the World Wars. American soldiers got a big laugh out of these cars, so when the Legion needed to laugh at their troubles after World War I, they thought of these cars and formed the Box Car Brotherhood. To become a member of the 40 & 8, a veteran must be a good Legionnaire. He must have served at least 1 year in the American Legion and performed some service of note for his post. Although primarily a funmaking organization, the 40 & 8 specializes in hard American Legion work. The voyageurs have been called the shock troops of the American Legion. The 40 & 8 actively supports the child welfare program and each voyageur contributed 50 cents annually to the child welfare fund.

The American Legion Auxiliary: Working in support of the American Legion in all its activities, is its fine auxiliary. The largest women's patriotic organization in the world. It is composed of the wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of Legionnaires, and those of deceased veterans, and also of women who, themselves, served in the Armed Forces. Its membership is almost a million. The sole purpose of the auxiliary is to aid in the accomplishment of American Legion objectives. The auxiliary's work is especially effective with the Legion's work for disabled veterans. Trained volunteers from the auxiliary are on duty in veterans' hospitals throughout the country. Their cooperation in child welfare work is also highly effective. In supporting the other training programs, they sponsor girls' state and girls' nation, similar to the Legion's boys' state and boys' nation. The help us in many ways and they make our work much more pleasant and much more successful.

In conclusion, let me say that I have now discovered that the American Legion is the largest veterans' organization in the world history. It is the greatest patriotic society ever formed. Its name today is the greatest name in genuine Americanism, national security, and community service.

The veteran who joins the Legion no longer faces the world alone. He marches side by side with millions of his comrades, all working together for a common objective—keeping America always American.

Why People Go Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Guardpost for Freedom, published by the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

WHY PEOPLE GO COMMUNIST—MOTIVES WHICH INFLUENCE PARTY MEMBERS AND THEIR SYMPATHIZERS

Communism can be fought effectively only if we understand the true nature of the Communist Party, just what a Communist is, and the motives that impel people to become Communists. The "Handbook For Americans" recently released by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is an excellent exposition of the nature of the Communist Party, what it is and how it works. The purpose of this study is to treat briefly the impulses that make people go Communist.

Before trying to analyze these motives, we must know exactly what a Communist is. Many people believe that only those who hold membership cards in the Communist Party are Communists. Others believe that anyone who is "very radical" is a Communist. Both of these views are wrong.

Radicals—people who disagree violently with generally acepted political, social, moral and economic ideas—existed long before communism came into being. They will exist long after communism is a thing of the past. Left radicalism may lead to temporary affiliation with the Communist movement. But a true radical is so much an independent thinker, a nonconformist, that

he will never remain a Communist. Communism demands complete conformity in thinking and thorough subjection of the individual to the will of the party. A real radical, by his very nature, cannot and will not accept communism.

The Communist Party, as a protective device, has not issued cards or books to any of its members since 1948. And even during and prior to 1948, when the great majority of Communists carried party membership cards, many members did not have them. These people were thoroughly Communist. They believed in the principles of Marxism—Leninism and accepted the dictates of the Communist Party on all matters. Because of the sensitivity of the positions they held, however, the party decided that it must never risk their exposure by issuing membership cards to them, even under fictitious names.

As a number of former high-ranking Communist have testified, a Communist is anyone who accepts the discipline of the Communist Party. He may or may not be radical. He may or may not have had a Party membership card in the past.

SYMPATHIZERS

In addition to party members, there are many kinds of "Communist sympathizers." A Communist sympathizer is a person who approves and, in many cases, carries out part of the program of the Communist Party. He may endorse just a small segment of the party program, or he may go all out for it, only stopping short of actual membership. The latter type of sympathizer is also known as a "fellow traveler."

COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

There are different kinds or "layers" of Communist organization with which the average American may come in contact. They fall into three main groups: the Party itself, Communist-front organizations, and Communist-infiltrated groups.

No less an authority than Stalin described the relationship of the Party to its front organizations as that of the sun to the planets. Just as the sun radiates energy to the planets, the Communist Party supplies the directive force to its front or "mass" organizations. Naturally, the farther away any organization is from the party, the less force or control the party can exercise over it. For this reason, some front organizations are less "red" than others.

When Communists cannot take over an organization, they try to infiltrate it in order to exercise some control over its policies. Strictly speaking, an infiltrated organization is not a front. From the viewpoint of Communist influence, however, it becomes very important. Communists try to inject more and more Communist energy into its activities until it finally becomes a front in the true sense of the word.

BACK TO MOTIVATIONS

Keeping in mind these definitions of the various kinds of Communist personalities and organizations, we may now try to answer the original questions: Just why do people go Communist? Our answers will apply to both the party member and the sympathizer, since the motives are similar in each case.

A party member may have more reasons for accepting Moscow's line than the sympathizer and will, in all probability, feel deeper conviction about the necessity of doing so. But the reasons which drive sympathizers into front organizations, while usually weaker in number and degree, are fundamentally the same in kind as those that drive others into the party itself.

TWO MAIN REASONS

All motivations that impel people to become Communists can be classified under two main headings:

I. Misguided sympathy for oneself or others (honest reasons).

II. Excessive personal ambition (a dishonest reason).

Every other reason can be fitted under these two headings. People follow the party line either because they believe they can obtain justice for themselves or others by doing so, or because they are seeking power.

I. HONEST REASONS

Many people who get mixed up in the Communist movement do so for more or less honest reasons. Please note that qualification: "more or less." No motive for following the party line can be regarded as completely "honest."

Troubled people often take a short-range view of their problems. They do not think their action through to their logical consequences. This lack of prudence common to troubled people is especially prevalent among the type of people who fall for the party line.

It should be kept in mind that while people may first join the Communist movement for more or less honest reasons, they inevitably become corrupt if they remain in it for any length of time. The indifference of the American Communist Party to any genuine redress of wrongs is such that, after a while, even the most excitable person must catch on to the deception. He or she will then either get out of the movement or remain in it for reasons which cannot be called honest.

1. Desire to correct an injustice done to oneself

It is not dishonest to seek after justice and equal treatment under law. People who suffer injustice contrary to the law of the Nation may, in their distress, imprudently turn their attention to a group which promises speedy relief, without inquiring into the organization's ulterior purposes.

2. Desire to redress wrongs done to others

Many charitable people want to help others less fortunate than themselves. In order to accommodate these eager souls, the Communist Party has built a system of front organizations espousing numerous apparently worthy causes.

It is easy to laugh off these fronts as obvious hoaxes that ensnare only emotional do-gooders. But the fact is that many of the causes which the party appears to support through these organizations are worthy of the efforts of honest people. The party manipulates its fronts so cleverly that, for a while at least, even well-educated people may not detect their real objectives.

3. Confused protest

Uneducated or perplexed people, taking a short-range view, may support the Communist movement out of a desire to protect against the seeming failure or inactivity of established, respectable organizations.

The Communist strategy of exploiting the protest vote of confused workers and peasants paid high dividends in Europe after the war. Because revived prewar methods failed to restore immediate prosperity in some countries, Communist short-range appeals to worker frustration received a ready ear. The Communists, by claiming to offer a quick and easy solution to all problems, gave the people an outlet through which they could express their dissatisfaction with what appeared to be the failure of legitimate political parties.

4. Being useful in life

A legitimate goal of every normal person is to be useful in life. Unfortunately, less talented people are too often brushed aside in the fierce competition of human society. Success should have its rewards—but the high achievements of a few should not be idolized to the neglect of the many who lack the opportunities and talents which are essential to success.

Through its front organizations, the Communist Party has shown great skill in utilizing the neglected talents of "little people." Such lowly folk are given assignments proportionate to their ability. The task itself may be slight, but the Communist sympathizer is made to feel that he is important, that he is contributing to the future welfare of humanity. From being a nobody in the established systems of modern life, the Communist sympathizer quickly becomes a somebody in the fight for socialism and progress. And if he eventually joins the party itself, he receives an elaborate education in techniques of self-expression and revolutionary leadership.

5. Desire for social participation

People are not naturally hermits. They have an inborn desire to belong to human groups, to associate with other human beings. We must carefully observe that this desire for association with other people is not necessarily the same as the ambition to be useful in life. What is referred to under this number is not the desire to be of service, but merely to belong.

By setting up a network of fronts that embraces many different fields—foreign relations, civil liberties, labor, politics, veterans affairs, music, the theater, photography, etc.—the Communist Party has been able to capitalize on the natural desire of people with varying interests to belong, to get together with others, especially those having interests similar to their own.

6. Opposition to Hitler

One of the most effective tricks the Communists ever pulled was to make it appear that they were the most energetic opponents of Hitler. During the late thirties, some people who were rightfully distraught at the Nazi persecutions came to think of activity in certain Communist fronts as the most effective means of fighting Hitler, nazism, and fascism.

II. MOTIVES BASED ON EXCESSIVE SELF-INTEREST

Not even a short-range point of view can make the following list of motives honest. Their inspiration and driving force is inordinate self-interest. God has endowed men with certain talents and capacities which they may—and should—develop. Such self-improvement, however, must be effected within the framework of honest society. A person has a right to get ahead in life, but he must respect the rights of others in doing so.

Many people who associate themselves with the Communist movement do so not in order to help humanity, but to further their own interests at the expense, and even through the extinction, of others.

1. Lust for power

Some people have an intense passion to dominate. This aggressive trait manifests itself in many different ways, one of which is attachment to the Communist movement. The party cultivates in its members the idea that they, and they alone, have a preferred right to reshape the destiny of the human race.

Anyone who has ever had personal contact with well-indoctrinated Communists cannot but be amazed at their insolence and contempt for other human systems which have passed the test of time. Communists know better than anyone else. They know that Communist ideology can remake human nature, that Soviet biologists can change the laws of animal heredity. This sense of unlimited superiority intoxicates some people who have contracted the fever for power over their fellow men.

In all probability, lust for power constitutes the strongest of all motives with the top command of the Communist movement. These party leaders work extremely hard. They also risk much, even their lives. But in exchange, they enjoy the delirium of "re-

creating" lesser people and, sometimes, of annihilating millions of them. What greater satisfaction can the tyrant who lusts for power over his fellow man hope for?

2. Frustrated capitalism

This is the principal motive of the superior-feeling Johnny-come-latelys who want the shortest and surest way to the top. These ambitious people may convince themselves that their intentions are altruistic, that they will help humanity once they got the right position. Actually, however, self-interest, conceit, and impatience are their real motives for joining the Communist movement.

Many students who prattle the Marxist line during their college days find it distasteful after they have found a good job. Vested interests make people cautious. It is better to have comfortable security within the capitalist system than to live in hopes of someday being a commissar in a Soviet "paradise."

Nevertheless, because not every Marxist-minded college student will be able to find a "bourgeois" position that satisfies him, the party can count on a steady flow of recruits from the ivy-covered halls of our universities. And since ambition is by no means limited to college students, some other Johnny-come-latelys will continue to take their chances with the Communist Party.

3. Cold-blooded opportunism

This motive has much in common with the immediately preceding one. But while the frustrated capitalist may deceive himself as to why he joined the Communist movement, the cold-blooded opportunist suffers from no such delusions. He knows very well why he is following the party line.

Cold-blooded opportunism has motivated people in many fields to use any device to further their avarice. It is no wonder that we find many instances of clever Communist manipulation of self-seeking individuals in the fields of entertainment, labor and the press—anywhere, in fact, where such individuals are in a good position to promote party propaganda.

4. Ambition to be esteemed outside one's own field

People who are successful in one field or profession often dream of being hits in other endeavors for which they lack qualifications. The Communist Party has been particularly successful in exploiting variations of "social climbing" and love for acclaim in undertakings outside the areas of prominent personalities' real competence. A successful astronomer or physicist, for instance, is put on a program about China with a Broadway or Hollywood actress. The actress gets the confused idea that she has become learned, the scientist thinks he is glamorous—and both believe they are "China experts." Everybody is happy, especially the Communists who collect the folding money.

5. Desire to have everybody chopped down to size

This is a negative, selfish motive of lazy people who want to deprive others of fair recognition and legitimate opportunities for advancement. Such people may lack the talents, enterprise, and courage which are necessary to get ahead. At the same time they hate to see others succeed. Love of deadening equality is much more popular with them than love of liberty and fraternity.

Fortunately this motive is far less common in the United States than it is in certain European countries where the culture is old and tired. After V-E day many Frenchmen and Italians joined the Communist movement out of cynicism rather than out of any expectation of seeing their country rescued from the exhaustion of the war. Voluntarily, they chose to be Communists without hope.

III. MOTIVES RELATED TO PERSONAL DISINTEGRATION

Some of the following motives have already been discussed in the two preceding sections. Here, however, a new approach to them is taken. They are considered as impulses which proceed from emotional instability, a psychological disorder.

1. Neurotic restlessness

To regard everybody who joins a Communist front as neurotic would be a serious mistake. Communist control over a front organization may be so cleverly concealed in the early months of its existence, that only its worthy motives show during that period. Moreover, enthusiasm for honest causes cannot be dismissed simply as an indication of neurosis.

On the other hand, a person's emotional life is certain to become twisted if he remains closely associated with the Communist movement over a long period of time. Superficial contact with one or a few front organizations may do no or relatively little harm. But close affiliation with the Communist Party itself makes people progressively unfit for normal human relations.

Those who doubt that life in the Communist Party involves a self-imposed segregation from normal human life need only read a few of the personal accounts of those who have had the courage to break away from it: Louis Budenz' 2 books, This Is My Story and Men Without Faces; Fred Beal's Proletarian Journey—or a work composed by 6 well-known ex-Communists, The God That Failed.

These saner people who could not continue to bear the abnormality and inhumanity of Communist existence poignantly depict the problems of psychological adjustment which an ex-Communist must face. In doing so they have shown that party membership can often be an escape hatch into a kind of unreal world for the restlessly neurotic person who cannot adjust himself to life in normal society.

2. Rebellion against the existing order—the conspiratorial appeal

Adolescents believe their freedom is unjustly restricted by the older generation. They therefore resent authority and are rebellious. Because they are also insecure, they join in gangs to give themselves confidence and the courage to defy authority. The Communist Party is a rebellious gang defying established order. As such it has a certain natural attraction for young people, who will accept strict discipline as long as they believe they have something to do with its making and it is not "the old kind."

Related to this is the conspiratorial and secretive appeal of the party. Doing things secretly and making plans against the existing order satisfies youths' resentment against authority.

The rebellion and conspiracy appeal of the Communist Party may be considered as a more or less natural appeal for adolescents. But when operative, as they often are, in the cases of adults who join the party, they are definitely indications of emotional immaturity and maladjustment.

3. Showing off

Communist organizers put to good use the urge for exhibitionism common to some young people. These youngsters are directed to show off on a picket line or on a visit to government officials. Communist leaders pretend to favor legislation which they secretly hope to defeat; social security, housing reform, etc. By sending a delegation of neurotic exhibitionists to visit a Congressman or Assemblyman, they can satisfy the craving of youth for excitement and also kill good legislation while pretending to be in favor of it. There are always some adults in such delegations, older Communists who have never grown up and crave the exhibitionist outlet this type of party activity gives them.

4. Desire for unihibited sex relations

This motive has been extensively employed as a come-on for certain types of people. A few years ago loyal party-line girls were directed to concentrate on the New York waterfront by providing entertainment and intellectual readjustment for the members of a maritime union.

In the early days of the party, sexual license was extremely common, especially in the case of the Young Communist League. This secondary end of party policies actually proved so interesting to certain uninhibited youth that the effectiveness of the YCL as a revolutionary organization was threatened. Nevertheless, since Moscow had encouraged sexual freedom, no American Communist would have dared to check it.

By the middle thirties the Soviet government had begun to revise its ideas about sexual morality. Somehow, free love and the 5-year plan had not mixed. Officially encouraged abortions had not provided sufficient heroes for the fight against fascist aggression. When the Soviet government went "puritan," the American Party had to follow suit—at least in theory.

5. Vague humanitarianism

This is an extremely cogent motive with many inveterate Communist fronters. One might call it the fundamental belief of the confused, actually psychopathic liberal who wants ever so much to do good but has only the faintest idea of how to go about it. Such warm-hearted but muddle-minded people pulsate with obscure vibrant sentiments that lack foundation in a rational philosophy of life.

As a result they become the natural prey of everalert, hard-boiled party organizers who herd them into a variety of "innocents clubs." In these heartwarming organizations the "softheaded liberals," as they are contemptuously referred to by party leaders, cannot refuse any humanitarian appeal. This type of person does the Communist Party the further service of befuddling and paralyzing many progressive movements.

6. Disillusion and pessimism as to the value of western civilization

This is the excuse often given by "lost liberals" for their uncritical acceptance of the Soviet myth. These people will search out every little defect in our own civilization with an X-ray eye, but will find nothing wrong with the Soviet way of life. They claim to be rational, but, like blinded moths, rush blissfully toward the bright light of Soviet concentration camps—while declaiming against some minor injustice in the United Staes of America. This is the nonthinking kind of pessimist who lacks the energy and ability to work out an adequate philosophy of life.

Other pessimistic and disillusioned people who have thought things through have also associated themselves with the Communist movement. Back in the depression days, many brilliant minds—such as those of Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss—could see no way out. They coolly and deliberately hitched their fortunes to what appeared to be a rising star, the red star of international communism. For a time this new course seemed to solve their problems.

"Realists" of this sort are not so much attached to the Soviet Union as to the desire not to make a failure of their lives. The effectiveness of Communist propaganda is shown by the fact that it has made such discontented people identify the goals of theoretical Marxism (their rational answer to life's problems) with those of the Soviet Union.

Hardheaded people do not like their objectives to remain abstract and vague. They want their goals expressed in concrete form.

This has helped Stalin's agents in their job of selling the Soviet Union as the concrete embodiment of theoretical Marxism. The fact that the real product was thousands of miles away and not, therefore, available for critical inspection has also helped a great deal in the marketing of this idea.

7. Desire for complete regimentation

Some people would much rather follow the leadership of others than be burdened with the problem of figuring things out for themselves. Party membership satisfies this desire. Communists carry submission to the utmost extremes.

What they ask of the party is total guidance, without which they know they will err dialectically and expose themselves to the horror of being purged. Not regimentation, but expulsion, is their greatest fear.

8. Personal reintegration through party activity

Without doubt, some unstable personalities achieve a measure of reintegration by absorption within the whirl of party and party-front activities. In the Communist movement the "whole of their lives" is made over and given a purpose. Louis Budenz in his book, "Men Without Faces," has vividly described the importance of this endless round of party functions for people who have hitherto been neglected or, at least, have failed to receive the attention they crave. There is one great catch to their newfound happiness: Never can they question the absolute will of their leader, even though it bring them personal annihilation. Their submission to this is a sign of still existent disintegration.

9. Identification with the powerful world force, Russia

A timid, weak man can act bravely and boldly when he thinks he has a strong protector. The might of the Soviet giant transforms the insecurity of many Communist sympathizers and infuses in them great vicarious power. For the party member, identification with Russia marks the summit of personal reintegration. What more is there to hope for in the universe than union, through the conspiracy, with one's glorious and mighty father in Russia?

IV. MOTIVES OCCASIONALLY EFFECTIVE AMONG WELL-TO-DO PEOPLE

To many people the most puzzling thing about the Communist movement is the fact that a minority of wealthy people have become involved in its meshes. While it may not seem illogical for a genuine proletarian to go Communist, the sight of a millionaire doing so is something to ponder.

1. Sense of guilt deriving from an unearned fortune

Sometimes rich people feel ashamed at having inherited a fortune which they realize they could not have earned. Communists have a wonderful talent for divining such delicate consciences. Very soon the guilt-stricken angel is promoting worthy causes under neatly concealed Communist direction.

2. Making a nuisance of oneself to attract attention

This is a variation of the tactic which the dumb boy adopts in order to get attention in school. If he cannot succeed at his studies, he may be able to annoy the teacher and thereby draw attention to himself. Every now and then a scion of a great business family realizes that he cannot make good at the profession of his father but that if he joins up with the enemies of capitalism, he can attract a lot of attention to himself. So he does just that.

3. Boredom, thrill-seeking

The jaded society woman may be looking for something different. So she tries a little proletarian slumming in a Communist front. Next year it may be yogi or yo-yo. Before she wearies of her penthouse communism she will have parted with a heap of folding money.

4. Desire to dominate others through the use of one's fortune

Occasionally, a person of great wealth will get the itch to influence public opinion with his ideas. For several years a male millionaire doubled as angel to an eastern newspaper popularly referred to as the uptown Daily Worker. When the wealthy man wearied of his progressive cause, an elderly female millionaire eagerly snatched at the opportunity to keep alive the fires of only slightly concealed communism.

V. MOTIVES RELATED TO RELIGION

1. Violent hatred of all God-directed religion

This is diabolical rebellion, the defiant cry, "I will not serve." One of Lenin's last acts was to order an intensified attack on religion. While party members may for a while retain vestiges of religious superstition, all top personnel must actively profess atheism.

2. Thrill of personal deification

In a vague, pantheistic way the Communist Party becomes the material substitute for God and each comrade, as part of the dialectically evolving force, somehow shares in its "divinity." Being a tiny segment of this all-absorbing monster provides an immensely flattering substitute for the old religion which required submission to a Creator outside oneself. When a comrade believes he is a part of the great force that imposes party discipline, he can endure that abnormal regimentation more patiently. If he is not near the top of the organization, however, he has to be a facile dreamer to suppose, after some years in the party, that his share in the world force amounts to anything.

3. Hunger to fill the void left by loss of the old faith

Attachment to communism is often a desperate effort to fill the emptiness left by the abandonment of God-directed religion. The lost liberal, wanting only to be "rational" and yet starving for something to believe in, ends up by making an act of faith in his daydreams—that is, in his own illusion of what the Soviet system ought to be. Any resemblance to reality is purely coincidental.

4. Paradise on earth

"God-directed religion promises pie in the sky, by-and-by," say the Communists. The materialist wants a big piece of cake with cream on top right now. And the comrade is sure that he will get it, along with strawberries and peaches, on Khrushchev's happy collective farms.

THE ENCYSTED MIND—AND SOUND ANTI-COMMUNISM

The person who fellow travels or remains a party member for any length of time, for whatever reasons, moves farther and farther away from normal human existence. Around himself he steadily erects a wall of Communist servitude. In the end he becomes completely encysted within the very dark world of a self-imposed segregation from healthy human society. Material success may come his way. But in order to live a normal life again, he must submit to a long and painful readjustment. The way of the ex-Communist is by no means easy.

This analysis of why people go Communist—a previously published study somewhat revised by the director of the VFW sovereignty campaign—is presented here as an aid to sound anti-Communist action.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's Handbook for Americans states that all anti-Communist programs must have two objectives in view:

"(1) The first objective must be the reeducation of Communists through methods of persuasion and experience in order to reincorporate them into the ranks of sane and constructive citizens. It must be recognized that this is difficult since we are confronted in many cases with hard-bitten bigots. Nevertheless, it should be attempted, since it is far more desirable to have a sophisticated, well-informed, and loyal citizen who can contribute his knowledge and experience to the fight against communism than one who is dedicated to defiance of the American Government.

"(2) The second objective must be to invoke the full penalty of the law against recalcitrants both as a deterrent and as a means of reeducation of those not responsive to objective number one."

It is hoped that this attempt to explain the principal motives that impel people to embrace communism in one form or another will aid in the accomplishment of the first objective outlined by the committee. It is difficult to get anyone to break with communism when you have no idea of why that person went Communist in the first place. Cause and cure are closely interwoven.

This study is designed to be of assistance in uncovering the principal reasons why certain individuals have become Communists or fellow travelers and thus providing a clue to the best means of promoting their defection from communism and their reintegration into normal society—an undertaking certainly worthy of the efforts of all lovers of freedom and men of good will.

Hon. Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and the keenest sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of our good friend and beloved colleague from Illinois, CHAUNCEY W. REED. As a Member of this body he lived up to its highest and best traditions in the performance of his duties; he had the mature wisdom of an understanding heart, a mind enriched with a knowledge of government and a full-rounded experience in legislative procedure. He guarded zealously the integrity and prerogatives of the Congress and the Committee on the Judiciary, which he served as chairman during the 83d Congress.

It was my good fortune to look to CHAUNCEY for guidance when I was first elected. I came to admire him and respect him as a fine, patriotic, conscientious public servant, and a friend of all who knew him. He was unassuming in his manner but stood firm as a rock for the principles which he believed were for the betterment of our country.

Everyone takes pride in a man who thinks straight, says what he thinks, and votes the way he talks. Such a man was CHAUNCEY REED. He worked and voted for what he believed was right. He had unbounded courage to publicly state his convictions and stood steadfast by those convictions.

I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his family. We will miss his human qualities which endeared him to us all.

Inauguration Day Should Be a Legal Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following statement which I submitted on February 24, 1956, to the House Committee on the Judiciary during its hearing on bills providing for a legal holiday on Inauguration Day:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to present a statement in support of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 19, which I introduced on January 5, 1955, for the purpose of declaring a legal holiday on January 20, 1957, and on the day in every fourth year thereafter which is celebrated and known as inauguration day.

Permit me to say that I had the privilege to appear before your committee in behalf of a similar resolution on June 17, 1953. In that statement I stressed the importance of the event and the fact that, in practice, all over the country the national economic life, public and private, comes to a standstill.

We all recognize inauguration day as a significant event in the public and private life of our great country. On that day the attention of all persons is unremittingly fixed on the auspiciousness of the occasion. Through the media of radio and television our country and, indeed, the entire world, participate in the solemnity of the occasion and in the festivities of the day.

In this statement I wish to emphasize the unique moral and ideological importance connected with this vital quadrennial occurrence in our national life. Generally, holidays are directed to the memory of a past event, and in their commemoration the event becomes a symbolic example and a guiding pattern for our future life. We are grateful for the past and, implicitly, we promise to make our future life more and more worthy of those sacred ideals.

Inauguration day is the day which celebrates the most outstanding expression of the will of our people and elevates it as a symbol of the will of our Nation. On this day the Nation more than ever is one and united; on this day we look with new confidence, assurance, and faith toward the future. In the ensuing 4 years the political, economic, cultural, and moral life of our people will establish new landmarks.

Why do we allow free time for our people to vote if we do not permit them the opportunity to celebrate nationally the direct result of their voting. We look upon the right to vote as the blessing bestowed upon us by a true democratic way of life. If we esteem it as a transcendent privilege for the old and young, for all classes, races, and creeds, should we not afford our countrymen the opportunity to celebrate in their political choice—the final outcome and expression of their will.

On inauguration day we do not rejoice in a single man, in a certain name, in a particular political leader. On that day we reaffirm our faith in and our allegiance to a most sacred institution—we honor and extol the office of President as the cornerstone upon which our Constitution is preserved, protected, and defended.

The proposed legislation is not without precedent in the annals of our history. Permit me to call to the attention of the committee the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 980, 50th Cong., 2d sess.), which declared a national holiday on April 30, 1889, the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of our first President. It provided:

"That in order that the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States, George Washington, may be duly commemorated, Tuesday, the 30th day of April, anno Domini 1889, is hereby declared to be a national holiday throughout the United States. And in further commemoration of this historic event, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the second Wednesday of December, anno Domini 1889, when suitable ceremonies shall be had under the direction of a joint committee composed of 5 Senators and 5 Representatives, Members of the 51st Congress, who shall be appointed by the presiding officers of the respective Houses. And said joint committee shall have power to sit during the recess of Congress; and it shall be its duty to make arrangements for the celebration in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the second Wednesday of December next, and may invite to be present thereat such officers of the United States and of the respective States of the Union, and (through the Secretary of State) representatives of foreign governments. The committee shall invite the Chief Justice of the United States to deliver a suitable address on the occasion."

Various public groups have given their support to the purpose of this proposed legislation. It is common knowledge that most businesses come to a standstill that day.

In view of all the above factors, I do hope the proposed legislation will receive the favorable consideration of this committee in order that all our countrymen may participate to the fullest extent in the importance of Inauguration Day.

Nixon Would Subvert the Eisenhower Ticket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the President's announcement today, I feel that the article which I found in the Fresno (Calif.) Bee of February 22, 1956, is of most vital concern to the people of our country:

NIXON WOULD SUBVERT THE EISENHOWER TICKET

Every thinking American with the best interest of his country at heart must pause before these words of Walter Lippmann, the eminent New York columnist.

"This central thing is that Eisenhower unites the country and heals its divisions. This precisely is what NIXON does not do. Instead of being a national leader, he is a ruthless partisan. He is a politician who divides and embitters the people."

Coming from a man of sober and moderate expressions, this indictment is both devastating and completely perceptive.

Lippmann is saying the Republicans in good faith cannot run both Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and President Dwight D. Eisenhower on the same ticket. To do so would be to build a moral contradiction into the ticket. To do so would be to sak the people to sign a contract for one set of principles in the full knowledge events might foist an entirely different set of principles upon them.

Such a contract would be dishonest. It would reveal the Republican Party to be a Janus-faced monstrosity. It would display it as devoid of all consistency of principle and as willing to peddle disunity and rancorous partisanship as it is to sell constructive unity.

It would be one thing for the party to bait its ticket with a man like NIXON to catch the more virulent party vote if it were reasonably certain the second would remain the second and the first the first. But is is quite a different thing when the tragedy of the President's illnes has made it less than certain that the ticket's bottom will not become its top.

Under such circumstances it is vital, if Eisenhower is to run again, that the second man on the ticket partake of the character of the first man. It is of course unthinkable that a man who has suffered a crippling blow to his health would run again. But if he should do so, the least to be expected of an honorable party is that it be able in the character of its ticket to assure the American people 4 years of the best qualities possessed by Eisenhower.

It would be an act of historical and unprecedented bad faith to ask the American people to vote for a ticket which contains within itself the exact reversal of its best principles and qualities.

Declining Farm Prices and Greater Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter which I have received from Mr. John Zellerman, secretary of the United Farmers of America, Inc., Edwardsville, Ill.

Mr. Zellerman asks some very pertinent questions concerning our Nation's farm problem. He expresses greatest concern over low hog prices in the United States, while each year brings an increase in importations of hams, shoulders, and bacon.

In checking for the information requested by Mr. Zellerman, I personally was amazed to find that the Department of Agriculture records indicate imports from Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Poland chiefly of canned hams in dollar value and by years as follows:

1947	$24,000
1948	252,000
1949	1,535,000
1950	18,462,000
1951	29,370,000
1952	46,976,000
1953	88,247,000
1954	95,752,000

It is evident that Mr. Zellerman and the membership of his farm organization have cause for concern. Mr. Zellerman's letter follows:

UNITED FARMERS OF ILLINOIS, INC.,
Edwardsville, Ill.

Hon. Congressman MELVIN PRICE.

DEAR SIR: I wish to take this opportunity of writing you on behalf of myself, my neighbors, and the membership of the United Farmers.

I don't know what you found out about the farm problem in your recent adjournment of Congress, but I have a few questions I wish you would answer for me so that we can report them to our membership.

Many of our members are hog producers, and my first question pertains to hog prices. Hogs are selling here for about $12 per hundred with many undesirable weights bringing less than $10.

Now under the present administration the Government is spending your and my money trying to keep the prices of hogs up. At the same time millions of pounds of pork are being imported and sold in our local stores.

Question: "Who is responsible for these conditions?"

I have been reading the papers looking for the major farm organizations to take a stand on the imports of farm products. To date I have not seen or heard one of them mentioning the fact that we are importing many farm products that we are told we have in surplus here.

Question: "Why are imports of farm products allowed when we are told we have them in surplus here? Who is responsible?"

If you do not have the answers to the above questions, I hope you can get them and forward them to me. The loss of farm income is beginning to have its effect on all types of business in the rural communities.

To bring this important matter before all the Congressmen, Senators, and the public I would like to request that you have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Best wishes for the New Year.

JOHN ZELLERMAN,
Secretary, United Farmers of America.

Proposed Soviet-American Treaty of Friendship—Some Reasons for Its Rejection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the press throughout the Nation gave headlines to the report that President Eisenhower had received a friendly letter from Soviet Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin. It was eventually disclosed that this letter was in fact a Soviet proposal for a treaty of friendship and cooperation with the United States Government. In a letter to Premier Bulganin on January 28, President Eisenhower politely but firmly rejected the proposed pact.

Could the President have acted otherwise?

The answer is "No."

In the Bulganin proposal the Soviet Government asked the United States to conclude a pact "on the basis of equal rights, mutual respect for State sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs." It also declared that all disputes arising between the two countries were to be settled by peaceful means. Both contracting parties were also pledged to "contribute to the development and strengthening of economic, cultural, and scientific cooperation between the two States, on the basis of the principle of mutual benefit and equal rights."

On the face of it the Soviet proposal seems harmless. Indeed, to some it may be desirable; for the Bulganin letter and the proposed treaty read like a perfectly sensible appeal by the head of one government to the head of another to cooperate in easing international tension and to promote world peace.

After a careful and thoughtful analysis of the instruments, however, it is clear that the entire proceeding is nothing more than a propaganda trick, and if the United States Government were foolhardy enough to conclude such an agreement, it would mean a diplomatic victory of the first order for the U. S. S. R.; it would destroy the unity of the Western coalition; it would undermine the strength and spirit of the free world; it would in the long run lay open Western Europe and other areas of the world to Soviet aggression and expansion. In a word, the conclusion of such a pact would gravely endanger the life of our Nation.

The Soviet Government cannot be trusted.

Here is the first and foremost reason for rejecting the proposed pact.

Our relations with the Soviet Government have been a source of continuous disillusionment. In nearly four decades of our experience with the Russian Communist regime that regime has done little to inspire the type of confidence and trust that should exist among nations who want peace. No sooner was the Bolshevik regime established in Moscow than the Third International, the so-called Comintern, was founded; and at once the C. P. U. S. A., the American counterpart of the Russian Communist Party, began its work of subversion and intrigue to destroy the American Republic. When the United States finally recognized the Soviet Government in 1933, one of the key agreements in the negotiations was the Soviet pledge that it would not carry on subversive activities in this country. The agreements bearing on recognition were excellent agreements; they provided for every safeguard, except the one that rests with the intent of the contracting parties to fulfill their obligations in good faith. This, of course, the Soviets did not do; and even to this very day its agents, the members of the C. P. U. S. A., ever faithful to the Socialist homeland, the U. S. S. R., continue their destructive work in the name of "Americans."

The necessities of war brought the United States and the Soviet Union together as allies in 1941. Important agreements were concluded by the Allies at Yalta and Potsdam which, if carried out in a spirit of truth and justice, would have meant a real peace for the world today and genuine democracy in Eastern Europe. Our postwar experience with the Soviet Union has, however, demonstrated to us how little faith one can put in Soviet agreements. The ruthless sovietization of Eastern Europe was carried through in outright violation of engagements negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union. Civil war in Greece was a graphic demonstration of Communist calumny and Soviet interference in the internal affairs of another state. The blockade of Berlin was another attempt to undermine the word and the spirit of allied agreements bearing on the occupation of Germany. And finally the Moscow-inspired Korean war—a hard and bitter experience for all of us—demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt how faithless the Communists really are.

Nor has Soviet conduct with other nations inspired any greater confidence and trust. In 1939, when Hitler was about to launch World War II, the Soviet Government concluded a pact with the Nazi government which divided Poland and other areas of Eastern Europe into spheres of conquest. At that time Soviet Russia had in force a pact of friendship and nonaggression with Poland, but it did not stop it from violating this pact by wantonly invading eastern Poland and annexing those territories to the U. S. S. R.

The Baltic States suffered the same fate. Pacts of friendship and nonaggression had been concluded between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States. A network of unilateral and multilateral treaties bound the Soviet Union to recognize the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of those states and to pledge its word not to intervene in their internal affairs. But all these treaties were no barrier to Soviet conquest in 1940 and reconquest in 1944.

Nor has the British or French experience with the Soviet Union been any more wholesome. Pacts of nonaggression were concluded during the war between the Moscow government and the British and French. Those pacts, however, did not prevent the launching of a Soviet-inspired Communist campaign to destroy French sovereignty over Indochina and to undermine British constitutional authority in Malaya. Only recently the Soviet Government tore up these pacts when West Germany joined the western coalition. This is itself a striking demonstration of the respect with which the Soviet Union holds formal international engagements.

Soviet Russia need not have a pact of friendship and nonaggression with the United States or any other member state of the United Nations. This is the second reason for rejecting the Bulganin proposal.

All major points proposed by the Soviet Premier are in fact substantive articles in the Charter of the United Nations. Soviet Russia and the United States agreed, when they signed the charter, "to develop friendly relations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." By this solemn treaty they agreed to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. And they agreed to work for "solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems" and strengthen "international cultural and educational cooperation."

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are pledged by the United Nations Charter to advance world peace and in-

ternational cooperation. What end can be served, therefore, by heaping upon this fundamental agreement pledge after pledge, reiterating the very same principles? Is not this initial pledge of peaceful intent and nonaggression sufficient if Soviet Russia did not have other motives? There are, in fact, many areas of the world where international tension could be eased and peace assured if Soviet Russia indicated a willingness to do so. We need no pacts of friendship to do that. At the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference in October of last year the Moscow government had every opportunity to indicate a desire to resolve the German question, which is the central problem of Europe today, and thus ease tension in that quarter. To solve the German question would be to set off a chain reaction that would lead to peace in Europe if not the whole world. But Soviet Russia would not risk a genuine German election, the key to reunification, knowing full well that it would mean the end of the East German Communist regime and thus the loss of a springboard for the eventual Communist conquest of Western Germany and perhaps even Western Europe.

Disarmament, too, is a question that could be brought within workable limits of negotiation if the Soviets desired to do so. Rather than taking a positive attitude, they have shown marked intransigence in accepting a formula that would insure genuine arms control.

Recent Soviet activity in southern Asia and the Middle East is another instance where Soviet conduct in international affairs is not calculated to inspire trust among nations and peace in the world. On their tour of the subcontinent Premier Bulganin and Nikita Khrushchev, the First Secretary of the Soviet Russian Communist Party, resorted to every distasteful technique, even outright lies, to open up old wounds inflicted long ago by Western colonialism. Easing tensions was not their purpose in condemning the West; it was rather to stir up an already excited Asian nationalism and direct it against the West to their own peculiar advantage.

At the same time Moscow had acted in the most questionable way by pledging arms to Egypt. The Israeli-Arab question is an explosive question which could, if out of hand, spread war and destruction throughout the Middle East. Surely, if Bulganin were sincere in his desire to ease world tensions and insure peace, as he professed to President Eisenhower, he would not have intervened so recklessly in the troublesome Middle East.

Soviet policy in this area exposes the insincerity and duplicity of Bulganin's proposal to the President and points out clearly another reason why its rejection was imperative.

Finally, if the President had chosen even to negotiate with Bulganin within the terms stipulated in the proposed treaty of friendship, the United States would have done irreparable harm to the unity of the Western coalition. In the first place, the pact itself was intended to undermine the unity of the West when it singled out the United States among the Allied Powers as a contracting party. A pall of suspicion would unquestionably descend upon the capitals of Western Europe if the United States—the heart and core of the Western coalition—decided to step outside the framework of the Western defense system and negotiate unilaterally with Moscow. Such an unwise step would have almost required the nations of Western Europe to seek an accommodation with the Soviet Union in which case the Western coalition would have been smashed to shambles.

Clearly the Bulganin proposal could not be otherwise than obnoxious to the United States. So extraordinary is this proposal that no other conclusion can be drawn than that it was nothing more than a propaganda trick. Soviet Russia can, and probably will, throw its vast propaganda machinery into action and hammer this point relentlessly in the countries of the neutralist world. There is no doubt that this pact was drafted with Soviet eyes not upon American leaders in Washington but upon the men of the East.

In many respects the proposed Soviet pact points up the dilemma of America and the Western nations in the conduct of international relations today. In every conceivable manner Soviet Russia has tried to exploit the natural desires of humanity for peace. We want peace more thany any other people on this earth. Democracy thrives upon peace; it abhors war, and engages in it only as a last measure of defense. But we are dealing with a nation whose ideology thrives not upon peace but upon contention and war; for communism is a creature of struggle, oppression, and misery. It seeks to conquer and destroy; and peace is nothing more than a tactical weapon in its array of armaments. Such a dilemma in which we are caught up presents no happy prospect for future generations, but it is one, nonetheless, that we must live with. However, as long as the leaders of our Government never lose hight of the wide and irreconcilable ideological breach that separates the democracy of the United States and the communism of the U. S. S. R., the interests of our Nation will forever be protected. For, it is only upon this knowledge that a wise and enduring policy can be based.

Korea's Fight for Freedom and Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 I was given the privilege of the floor to speak about the tragic death of Maj. Gen. Kim Chang Young, who was shot down in cold blood on the streets of Seoul, Korea. I came to know General Kim and was very much impressed by his dedication to the cause of human freedom and the preservation of the national independence of the Republic of Korea. That is why I brought to the attention of the Members of Congress the many things that the late General Kim did to support the cause that is as dear as life itself to all Americans.

I received a letter from His Excellency, You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, after he had read in the RECORD my speech of February 1 concerning the late Maj. Gen. Kim Chang Young. The letter of the Ambassador contains a number of observations which I believe the American people will not only understand but for which they will be most grateful.

The letter follows:

KOREAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

The Honorable MICHAEL FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FEIGHAN: Your eulogy of the tragic death of General Kim Chang Young on the floor of the United States Congress on February 1 is one of the finest tributes paid to anyone. You have made very clear the constant threat and menace of communism in Korea as well as in any other part of the free world.

When I go around in this country to fulfill my speaking engagements, I find, to my great amazement and disappointment, that too many American people are too complacent and think that it cannot happen here, i. e., Communist attack, but slumber with dreams of peace.

The Communists work day and night to conquer and enslave all the free peoples of the world while we of the free world only wake up when the pain gets too great, but men like you and others in the United States Congress who have traveled to these trouble spots in the world due to aggressive communism realize more than anyone the dangers ahead and what will happen to all of us.

I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart on your informative statements regarding our late General Kim and the warning of the constant menace of communism and the sad plight of Korea, the frontier of freedom today.

Sincerely yours,

YOU CHAN YANG,
Korean Ambassador.

Conclusive Case Against United States Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, among the many splendid editorials which have appeared in the public press throughout the Nation in recent months on the unfortunate and tragic decision of the United States Supreme Court on the school-segregation matter appeared in the editorial column of the February 19 issue of the Mobile Press Register, Mobile, Ala.

The analysis of this decision is both devastating and true.

I am sure that there are few constitutional lawyers who would find fault with the conclusions reached therein. Moreover, I am confident that there are few laymen familiar with the situation in the South who would deny the assertion that in rendering this political decision the handpicked Court did a monumental disservice to the splendid progress that

was being made in the country, and particularly in the South, in the elevation and advancement of the Negro race. For surely that progress has not only been stymied, but it has suffered a setback that will require many years to overcome.

The editorial follows:

CONCLUSIVE CASE AGAINST UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

The case against the United States Supreme Court of today in its ill-founded, injudicial decision on school segregation is clear, complete, and conclusive.

This decision, a concoction of psychology, sociology, and politics, flouts at precedent after precedent established by able judicial minds. It astonishingly invades the Federal legislative prerogative. The Court puts itself so up a tree that it tries to save face by licensing an indefinite continuation of the constitutional violation it says exists in racially segregated public schools.

Never before in American judicial history has the highest court in the land bungled its way into the embarrassment which this tribunal as now constituted has brought upon itself.

On this court sit the Roosevelt-made Justice Black of Alabama, the Eisenhower-appointed Chief Justice Warren of California and other justices whose political backgrounds are well etched but not their reputations for judicial acumen.

What a disappointment—what a misfortune—has come to the United States when the Federal Supreme Court usurps a power it does not have to amend the Federal Constitution and then seeks to extricate itself by presuming for itself the authority to license, for an unspecified period, the very violation of the Constitution it charges is being committed.

Since when, from whom, and from what source did the United States Supreme Court of Chief Justice Warren, Justice Black, et al., inherit an incongruous double-pointed power never before assumed by the Court—namely, the power first to so amend the traditionally recognized and accepted law of the land as to charge a violation of it, and then to expressly give permission for this alleged violation to be carried on indefinitely?

Something new and disturbing is witnessed when the highest Court in the Nation holds that any division of Government operating segregated schools is violating the United States Constitution in a manner historically subject to punishment for contempt if the violation persists, but shows itself to be so uncertain of the tenability of its decision that it retreats to the point of saying the alleged violation may be kept up, subject only to the understanding that ultimately it should cease.

This is the incredible, amazing, and astounding position of the present-day United States Supreme Court.

It is nothing less than a distressing national misfortune when the highest Court in the land so departs from its own prescribed field of function as to maneuver itself into the position of the present-day United States Supreme Court.

The blunder of this Court is colossal in the disservice and damage done by it. The prestige of the Court, which should so function as to maintain the greatest respect for it and the fullest confidence in it, has suffered in a way that is incurable so long as the present makeup of the Court sits on the bench.

The vacillation of the United States Supreme Court of today almost to the point of open contradiction in its action on the school-segregation issue is, to us, equivalent to a confession by the Court of its blunder in overruling all manner of earlier United States Supreme Court decisions to declare segregation unconstitutional.

What has happened is more than a national misfortune. It is a national disaster, a national catastrophe.

Reclamation Projects Do Not Increase Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there have been many specious arguments advanced by the opponents of western reclamation against bringing farmlands into production in a so-called period of food surpluses.

The corporals of disaster who view with alarm any increase in reclamation acreage might with great profit read an editorial entitled "Reclamation Projects Do Not Increase Surpluses," which appeared in a recent issue of the Sacramento (California) Bee. The editorial in question reads:

RECLAMATION PROJECTS DO NOT INCREASE SURPLUSES

One of the cries raised by opponents of western reclamation projects is the question: Why construct these projects to bring more farmlands into production when the Nation already is burdened by staggering agricultural surpluses?

The question becomes apocryphal in the light of a survey recently made by the Federal Reclamation Bureau at the request of Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah.

The answer is that crops grown on lands irrigated by the Federal projects have a negligible effect upon the farm surpluses and the Government's price-support program.

As of September 30, 1955, nearly nine-tenths of the Government's investment in price supported commodities was in wheat, upland cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice.

The reclamation projects produce none of the tobacco, less than 2 percent of the national yield of wheat, one-third of 1 percent of the corn, less than 1 percent of the rice and about 6½ percent of the upland cotton. And, of this, only from 5 to 50 percent of the production has been under price support.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer points out the great bulk of the agricultural yield on reclamation lands consists of fruit, nuts, vegetables, and seed crops, which are not in surplus, and forage which gives a stable spring feed supply for livestock on the West's 700 million acres of rangeland.

The opposition to reclamation projects obviously is phony and is raised either out of ignorance of the facts or as a coverup for antagonism to the low cost public power features of the developments.

As a matter of fact, agricultural land is being retired from production by urban and industrial expansion 10 times as fast as irrigation dams are making new lands available for tillage.

Agricultural experts estimate the increase in population will eliminate the Nation's food surplus within 3 to 5 years, or as soon as an irrigation project begun today could be completed.

Beyond that time, these experts figure, the Nation will face a food deficit unless steps are taken at once to bring the potentially irrigable land of the West into production. But this threat is not apt to faze those special interests which profess to see the great reclamation projects only as creeping socialism.

Statement on International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a particularly important statement made by the AFL–CIO executive council in Miami on the question of international trade. The continued solid support of the labor movement for the vital trade agreements program is of first importance. They urge the establishment of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, a matter which will soon be before the Congress.

May I also point out that the newly merged labor organization urges legislation to assist workers, enterprises, and communities which are adversely affected by adjustments in trade legislation. This is directly in line with the purposes of H. R. 229, the trade adjustment bill, of which I am the sponsor. It is my hope that the Congress will give attention to this critical problem soon.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, MIAMI, FLA., FEBRUARY 7, 1956

Expansion of international commerce and the lessening of barriers to international trade must be key objectives in this country's total foreign policy. Economic development—in many instances, the economic survival—of many countries throughout the world is dependent upon the ability to buy American goods and products. Many American industries are dependent to a substantial extent upon the exports of their products.

On the other hand, many basic commodities needed to continue production in key American industries are available only in overseas countries. Certain foodstuffs used daily by American families must be imported.

There is a great interdependence among nations of the world. Many nations actually depend upon trade as their vital bloodstream. It is in the interest of the free world to keep this vital bloodstream flowing.

If the United States does not foster mutually advantageous trade relations with the other free nations, there is a real danger that the Soviet bloc will step into the breach. If the United States is interested in preserving a free world, in building strong and effective economies in these countries, in preventing the spread of communism and totalitarianism, in maintaining markets for many of our products, in preserving a steady flow of raw materials and foodstuffs into this country, then we must actively support and participate in the extension of multilateral trade among the free nations of the world.

Such a program was started in the middle thirties when the reciprocal trade agreements program was enacted. The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have consistently supported the reciprocal trade agreements program from its inception. It has been extended

periodically, with modifications, ever since. At first, the United States negotiated bilateral agreements which incorporated the most-favored-nation clause. The program of reciprocal trade, which includes the escape clause and the peril-point procedure, was designed to promote exports and imports without causing serious injury to American industries. Beginning in 1947, multilateral trade agreements were negotiated. There are now some thirty-odd countries that are parties in one way or another to these negotiations.

The next vital step is to tie these nations together in an administrative organization to coordinate their work between negotiating sessions, as well as to facilitate their periodic negotiations. To accomplish this objective, a charter for the establishment of an Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) has been drafted. President Eisenhower has submitted this to Congress for approval. We wholeheartedly endorse this proposal and urge that the Congress not delay its approval. The establishment of OTC will not affect trade policy, decisions, or concessions in any way. It is purely an administrative body.

On the policy side, there are many questions. As long as the reciprocal trade agreements program is carried out without doing serious injury to American industry, it will have the wholehearted endorsement and support of the AFL-CIO. Serious injury, in the main, can be avoided by the continuation of the present procedure for peril-point findings which precede all multilateral negotiations. The peril-point concept goes a long way toward implementing the basic tenet that trade concessions shall be granted without doing serious injury to American industries.

Every trade agreement, as the result of a legislative mandate, contains an escape clause that permits the affected industry to appeal to the United States Tariff Commission and the President for relief from serious injury or the threat of serious injury resulting from tariff concessions. This provision should be continued.

Many times the industries affected by increased imports are located in communities dependent upon one industry. Such communities are hit quite hard and become distressed areas. Legislation should be enacted to assist these communities by aiding the workers, industrial enterprises, and communities to adjust to the situation.

In addition, injury that might result from tariff concessions can be minimized by improving labor standards of workers abroad. During the multilateral trade negotiations, no tariff concession, for example, should be granted on products made under labor standards that are considered substandard in the exporting country. Failure to establish and maintain at least minimum labor standards in the exporting country should be considered valid cause for withdrawing United States tariff concessions.

American labor will continue to work with the ILO and the ICFTU, so that national labor centers in countries throughout the free world will be better able to attain living standards that enable their countries to compete more equitably on the world market.

With the improvement of worldwide living standards, the development of an adjustment program in the United States, the continuation of an effective administration of the escape clause and the peril-point procedures, and the approval of the OTC by Congress, we in the AFL–CIO are confident that the free world will be aided by the continued, but necessarily gradual reduction of trade barriers and the expansion of international trade and commerce.

Inconsistency, Thou Art a Jewel—We Are Helping Russia To Build Armaments, Believe It or Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by that outstanding political writer, Mr. David Lawrence, which recently appeared in the Evening Star. Mr. Lawrence points out the inconsistency of our concessions to our allies for the release of strategic material which is surely helping to rearm the Communist world:

HELPING RUSSIA TO BUILD ARMAMENT—CONCESSIONS MADE BY UNITED STATES TO ALLIES FOR RELEASE OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

(By David Lawrence)

Sometimes the most sensational news is overlooked in the hurry of modern news gathering and maybe it's because the subjects themselves are not easily grasped.

Thus a $2,500 contribution to a campaign fund makes headlines because it is easily understood or is announced under dramtic circumstances. But one would think that the revelation of a scandal in which the allies of the United States obtain American money and then proceed to help to arm and industrialize Soviet Russia might also get full coverage in the press. But it received scant mention.

On Thursday of last week, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations, made a sensational speech on the floor of the Senate which was recorded verbatim in the CONGRESSION RECORD. He spoke of the most asounding secret concessions made by our Government in a conference with its allies. He gave instance after instance of strategic materials released which will help the Soviet Union to build an armament machine that some day can be used to kill American soldiers and to devaste American cities.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the all-important Armed Services Committee of the Senate, rose afterward to characterize it a most startling state of affairs. Three other members of the Armed Services Committee joined to deplore a scandal that shocked them. It was disclosed that Defense Department experts had protested in vain.

Senator MCCLELLAN reported to the Senate this his investigating committee had conducted hearings to try to find out how and to what extent the United States Government had agreed to allow its allies to arm Soviet Russia. After reading the Arkansas Senator's speech, one wonders whether the American Government in refusing to let Israel have arms or in letting tanks go to Saudi Arabia isn't straining at a gnat in the Middle East while swallowing a camel in central Europe.

For Senator MCCLELLAN said that in August 1954, at a secret meeting of the United States and its allies, 200 of the 450 items previously under embargo to the Soviet Union were released. The Soviets know what the items are because they are buying them, but to this day the executive branch of the Government here refuses to disclose to Congress just what the items are that have been released though they have been published in technical periodicals abroad and in an official journal of the British Government's Trade Bureau.

Here are four conspicuous examples of the 200 articles released to the Russians:

1. Boring mills essential to the manufacture of tanks, artillery, aircraft, and for atomic reactors used in submarines.

2. Vertical boring mills essential to the manufacture of jet engines.

3. Dynamic balance machines used for balancing shafts on engines for jet airplanes and guided missiles.

4. External cylindrical grinding machines which a Defense Department expert testified are essential in making engine parts, guided missiles, and radar.

"It was emphatically stated," says the Arkansas Senator in describing the testimony of a Defense Department expert on machine tools, "that it would be better to permit shells, guns, or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent to the Soviet Union, for they could be used against us only once while these machine tools will be used to make armaments of war which could be used against us many times."

Mr. MCCLELLAN said that the testimony showed, moreover, how metals and minerals—which were being stockpiled in the United States because they are essential—were now removed from the embargoed list of strategic materials. While America was forced to divert 143 million pounds of copper from its stockpile to help industry here, our allies have shipped since August 1954 about 250 million pounds to the Soviet Union and everybody who knows anything about strategic materials knows what a vital material copper is in armaments of all kinds.

Senator MCCLELLAN and other Senators served notice in the same debate that they wouldn't vote for the $4.9 billion asked by the administration for aid to our allies unless the whole matter was satisfactorily cleared up. Mr. MCCLELLAN said to the Senate:

"If we are providing these funds to our allies for the purpose of helping them to develop their military power and strength as a defense against communism, then how inconsistent is it for the same allies, for the sake of trade and profit, to place in the hands of the Communist bloc the machines, materials, and other essentials of the war potential in a war effort? Is not the advantage we are trying to gain and for which we are trying to provide being offset by the making of such machines, tools, and materials available to a potential enemy?"

Also in the offing is a demand in allied circles abroad that the list of articles now permitted for export to Soviet Russia should be released as well to Red China though there is still a state of war between the United Nations and the government of that country due to the unfinished business in Korea.

Plainly the administration is in for trouble in the Senate on the whole foreign-aid program because of what has been done secretly and injudiciously to satisfy allied pressure for more trade with the enemy.

The Communists Are Anti-Semitic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have long known the

destructive force of communism and the efforts of the Kremlin to create a Soviet man who will be completely responsive to the will of his Russian masters. We also know that the Communists will stop at nothing to attain their evil goals. They have even destroyed entire nations of people such as the Crimea Tatars, the Chechen-Inguish, and the Kalmuks. But I thought Members of Congress would be interested in a current piece of intelligence concerning a new crime of genocide being carried out by the Communists. A recent Associated Press dispatch from Baltimore quoting a well-known Israeli journalist and labor leader to the effect that the Jews in Russia will be exterminated within the next 15 years should be of special interest to all, and under leave previously granted, I include it with my remarks, as follows:

SOVIETS SEEN ANTI-SEMITIC

BALTIMORE.—An Israeli journalist and labor leader says he has found strong evidence of a Russian governmental policy of obliterating the Jewish people of Russia.

Chaim Shurer, editor of Israel's largest daily newspaper, Davar, said in a speech he reached this conclusion last year while studying Jewish life during travels in the U. S. S. R.

"Russian Jews will cease to exist in 10 or 15 years unless the trend is changed inside the Soviet," he said.

The Howard A. Hanson Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Seattle Times. All who live in the western King County area know of the contribution of Colonel Hanson to the construction of this flood-control project and feel it only fitting that the dam should bear his name.

The editorial follows:

NOTHING COULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE

In a resolution introduced by this State's Representative Pelly, Congress is asked to name the flood-control dam to be constructed at Eagle Gorge in honor of Col. Howard A. Hanson, Seattle attorney. It would, in fact, be impossible to think of a more appropriate designation for this improvement, for Colonel Hanson for more than a quarter of a century headed every phase of this area's protracted effort for a flood-control program for the Green-Duwamish River Valley.

Colonel Hanson assumed leadership of this fight in the late 1920's as the chairman of a Seattle Chamber of Commerce rivers and harbors subcommittee and continued to head the effort as support was widened to include all the principal communities of western King County. Dozens of others worked with him, including members of the State's congressional delegations and of the State legislature, district engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers, county and city officials, members of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and its staff, and a host of others.

It was Colonel Hanson, however, who was always on hand to carry the ball. Few efforts of this type have enjoyed, from first to last, the sustained leadership of a single devoted individual.

The naming of the Eagle Gorge Dam to honor Colonel Hanson thus is a natural. Representative PELLY'S resolution will have the support of all the communities and organizations that are interested in flood control for the Green-Duwamish Valley and the future agricultural and industrial development of that area.

John P. Holland—Floating an Undersea Venture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Jersey Business, February 1956:

YESTERYEAR IN NEW JERSEY

(By William Casperson)

JOHN P. HOLLAND—FLOATING AN UNDERSEA VENTURE

The history of the submarine is replete with romance. The idea of navigating a vessel under water caught the fancy of men with inventive imaginations as far back in history as 322 B. C., when Aristotle advised the diver to provide himself with an inverted kettle to keep out the water and provide a supply of air for breathing.

One of the earliest references to a submarine is in the Wonderful Power and Art of Nature by Roger Bacon in 1557.

The oldest submarine of history of which a drawing exists is described by Borelli in 1680. Propulsion was by a flexible oar which worked like the tail of a fish. Submergence was by changing the volume of water in sacks within the boat.

Other inventors of undersea craft were David Bushnell who built the *Tortoise* in 1775; Robert Fulton with his *Nautilus* in 1800; Wilhelm Bauer with the *Brandtauscher* in 1859; and Theodore Stormy who built the Confederate submarine *David* in 1864. Another Confederate submarine, *Hundley*, blew up the United States boat *Housatonic* February 17, 1864.

All submarine boats up to this time were propelled by manpower and thus were not practical. With the advent of electric power and the gasoline internal-combustion engine, a new chapter opened in submarine history.

This chapter was introduced by John P. Holland, of New Jersey, who designed and launched the first submarine having the necessary elements of success, the prototype of all modern submarines.

In 1954 the Paterson Museum acquired about 500 original letters, papers, sketches, and blueprints of Holland's. In these, Holland gives some account of his work and experiences, some of them amusing, and some carrying the pathetic story of the inventor deprived of his legitimate rights.

WAR DETERRENT

An interesting sidelight on submarine history is revealed in Holland's statement that adoption of the submarine would have a deterrent effect on war. He lived to see the submarine come to maturity, but he did not live to witness its destructive role in warfare.

Undoubtedly the most fanciful concept of underwater transportation was that given by Jules Verne in his fictional version of the *Nautilus* in Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea, written in 1869. It was while John P. Holland was reading this book to a brother in the Christian Brothers School in Ireland that he became interested in submarine construction.

Holland was born in Liscanor, County Clare, Ireland, February 24, 1842. He entered the United States in 1872 and came to Paterson, N. J., in 1873, where he taught in St. John's Parochial School until 1879, when he moved to Newark. He died on August 12, 1914.

While teaching in Paterson, Holland originated a plan for a submarine and drew up specifications which he submitted for acceptance in 1875, to the United States Navy.

His specifications were rejected by the Navy in a letter signed by E. Simpson, captain inspector of ordnance, in charge of station at Newport, R. I., dated February 25, 1875.

The reason given for the rejection was, principally, because there were so many gadgets to attend to, that even if the boat were successful, no man could handle them all.

The rejection did not discourage Holland. He writes in one of his personal papers, "I held a good deal back, and described something I didn't want to do as I believed they would have no regard to my desire for secrecy." He further comments: "I was right in this point for Commander Barber published the drawings and an abstract of the specifications."

Holland's papers say that the boat described in these specifications was never built but that a larger one was built and equipped with a petroleum engine, which proved a failure, but that "the experiments were not prevented."

AN EXPERIMENT

What happened was that he secured a steam launch owned by William Dunkerly of Paterson, and Dunkerly towed the submarine up and down the Passaic River with Holland in it. In this way, the inventor was able to determine by experience what was required to make it successful. He states that the longest time he remained submerged in the boat was 1 hour.

This was his first submarine. The boat, as he referred to it, was built at the Albany Street Iron Works at the corner of Albany and Washington Streets in New York City, during the year 1876–77. It was brought unfinished to Paterson and completed in the Todd & Rafferty shops. The boat measures 14 feet 6 inches in length, 3 feet in width and 2 feet 6 inches in depth. It weighs approximately 1,400 pounds. It is constructed of riveted sheet iron plates. It was completed and tested in the Passiac River at Paterson in May, 1878.

Holland's idea of a submarine submerging was that it should descend and ascend in water as a prorpoise dives and rises, with the keel of the boat at an angle parallel to the desired angle of travel down and up in the dive and ascent.

In order accomplish this operation he placed in this first boat a shaft running transverse to the longitudinal axis of the boat, from side to side at the center of gravity. The shaft extended out on either side past the hull. On each end he fastened a flat plate to act as a rudder in lowering and raising the boat in water.

NO RESPONSE

He found the boat would not respond to the action of these rudders. He then adopted the principle of water ballast within compartments of the boat, designed and operated to increase and decrease the specific gravity of either end of the boat as desired. Holland strongly opposed the principle of having water ballast operate full lengthwise of the boat, a feature which later caused submarine disasters.

In furnishing the inventor with calculations required for successful navigation of an underwater craft this No. 1 submarine proved to be of inestimable value. It must be given its rightful place in submarine history. It is now on exhibition in the Paterson museum.

With calculations based on actual experience completed, Holland began the construction of his second boat on May 3, 1879 This is known as the *Fenian Ram*, and it is now mounted in Westside Park, the property of the city of Paterson. The *Fenian Ram* received its name from the newspapers because financing of the boat was done by the Fenian Society.

In his notes on *Fenian Ram*, Holland says: "There is scarcely anything required of a good submarine boat that this one did not do well enough, or fairly well."

The *Fenian Ram* was launched in April 1881. Tests were begun in June of that year. It was equipped with two 15-horsepower internal combustion engines. It marked the first successful use of an internal combustion engine in a submarine.

STOLEN SUB

The inventor was not able to complete all his tests with the *Fenian Ram*. It was stolen by creditors of one of Holland's financial helpers and hidden. It came to light many years later and was purchased by E. A. Browne and presented to the city of Paterson.

With the success of the *Fenian Ram* and public interest in submarines growing, Holland succeeded in attracting capital. A company was formed which absorbed the J. P. Holland Boat Co., under which Holland had been operating. The new company became the Electric Boat Co., which is today a division of General Dynamics Corp.

Under contract with the United States Navy, Holland and his associates built the *Holland*—the first submarine purchased and commissioned by the United States Government. It was constructed in 1898. After 2 years of rigid testing, it was purchased by the Navy and commissioned in 1900. The *Holland* was propelled on the surface by a gasoline engine, and by electricity furnished by batterys when submerged. The Electric Boat Co. subsequently built a large number of submarines for the United States Navy.

The third chapter in submarine development opened with the construction and commissioning of the Navy's atomic submarine, *Nautilus*. What the future holds in this new chapter in submarine history is an unfinished story.

Hill Report Does Not Claim California Will Receive Less Water Than Due Under Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the upper Colorado River project yesterday and today, reference has been made to a report entitled "Report on Water Supply for Probable Future Developments in the San Diego County Water Authority" by a board of engineers comprising Raymond A. Hill, John S. Longwell, and Carl R. Rankin. This report is cited as the basis for the claim that southern California's water rights will be jeopardized by the upper Colorado basin project.

This report does not assert that southern California will lose water to which it is entitled under the compact. It says exactly the opposite because the report is based on compliance with the compact. It does say that there may be less water than was originally thought, and therefore not enough to go around.

It must be remembered that California, under its own limitation act, is entitled to 4.4 million acre-feet, plus half of any surplus; but if the water in the river is short there may be no surplus to divide. That is exactly what Mr. Hill and his associates are saying. In other words, under conditions of maximum use in the upper basin, plus short water-years, there may be no surplus, and therefore no surplus to divide. But, this is no fault of the upper basin in the exercise of its rights to take the water to which it is entitled. And California cannot complain that the amount of water available in the river does not meet its expectations, provided that the water which is in the river is divided according to the terms of the compact—which is presupposed in the report of Mr. Hill, as well as in the legislation before us.

Moreover, the conditions of maximum use in the upper basin which Mr. Hill and his associates use as the basis for their conclusions do not apply under the bill which is now before us. That is true because the maximum amount of water which the upper basin will use in the projects under this bill amount to less than 2 million acre-feet. The water already in use in the upper basin is less than 2½ million acre-feet. Therefore, the total uses when this project is in full operation 28 years hence will be less than 4½ million acre-feet—which is 3 million acre-feet less than the total amount to which the upper basin is entitled under the terms of the compact. Consequently, there is at least 3 million acre-feet of slack available before the conditions of maximum use on which Mr. Hill and his associates predicate their prophesies of short water.

For those who are interested in checking the matter through the Hill report, I would like to call their attention to the following quotations from that report.

The Hill report is based on the construction and operation of the Colorado River storage project in compliance with the Colorado River compact. I quote as follows from page 12:

> The Colorado River compact, among other things, provides that "the States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years, reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding ratification of this contract."
>
> It now appears, however, there is a possibility that the releases past Lee Ferry may be increased by an amount equal to the following items:

	Acre-feet per annum
One-half of required treaty delivery to Mexico (½ × 1,500,000)	750,000
One-half of estimated operating wastes past the international boundary (½ × 200,000)	100,000
Total	850,000

> If such an increase is agreed upon, the average annual flow passing Lee Ferry after construction of the upper Colorado River storage project and related works would become 7,500,000 + 850,000 = 8,350,000 acre-feet per annum. This may be taken as the probable maximum future flow past Lee Ferry.

I would like to point out, on the basis of the above language, that the study by this board of engineers is based on releases at Lee Ferry of not only an average of 7½ million acre-feet per year, or 75 million in each consecutive 10 years, but releases of an additional 850,000 acre-feet, making the total releases at Lee Ferry available to the lower basin amount to 8,350,000 acre-feet per year. The study goes on to show that with depletions of 6 million acre-feet between Lee Ferry and the international boundary—the 6 million acre-feet being the depletion for the year 1953–54 of the maximum of record—plus 1,500,000 acre-feet for Mexico, plus 200,000 acre-feet to meet half the operating waste past the international boundary, it will still be possible to increase diversions between Lee Ferry and the international boundary by 650,000 acre-feet. I want to emphasize that this increase is above the highest year of record, and I quote from the report:

> The data presented in table 4 and in the previous paragraphs clearly shows that when the upper Colorado River storage project is constructed and the flows at Lee Ferry are regulated to comply with the Colorado River compact, with possible additions as referred to in table 4, compliance with the Mexican Treaty and with allowance for reasonable waste past the international boundary which, from a practical operating standpoint, cannot be avoided, it will be possible to divert only 650,000 acre-feet per annum from the river between Lee Ferry and the international boundary in addition to that actually used during 1953–54.

Now to go just briefly to the quotations which have been made from this report with respect to California's water rights being threatened. The metropolitan water district has no right to 1,212,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River. Even the report refers to this as a "claimed right," as indicated by the following from page 14 of the report:

> Plate B shows that very little surplus water from the Colorado River Aqueduct of the metropolitan water district will be available to the authority under the assumed condition providing the diversion from the Colorado of the metropolitan water district claimed right of 1,212,000 acre-feet per annum.

The claim of the San Diego County Water Authority to 112,000 acre-feet is based upon the metropolitan water district's claim to 1,212,000 acre-feet—so that if the metropolitan water district's right under the compact is only half the amount claimed then, of course, the amount for the San Diego County Water Authority would be also cut in half, and this is just the conclusion reached by this board of engineers.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*——3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.